

# Aoraki Mount Cook NP Draft Management Plan: Response to Submissions by Section

09-Jul-20

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>General (National Issue)</b>		
<i>Furner, Warren</i> 2/1	General support for the Plan. Significant given its timing and alignment with Coalition Policy settings. Plan should provide template for pending protected area policy reviews. Plan should test community support for Government Policy, particularly Climate Change and the Carbon Agenda.	1. Modify to strengthen and instruct alignment with General Policy 2. Rewrite generic recreation and visitor sections to lead direction informing revision of future National Park Plans 3. Remove ambiguous language ("work with", "seek to", "encourage", "should", "may") to clearly state how objectives will be achieved.	
<i>Ladbrook, Brett</i> 4/1	To involve people with mobility issues in contributing to the plan review through their experience in Disabled Design and practical experience. Review the information available, and the practicality of NZ standards in relation to this issue.	1. Amend the plan to have inclusive Disabled access to parking areas, tracks, viewing platforms, where possible.	
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/2	The adoption of "Landing zones", instead of landing sites, should not be allowed.	Remove the landing zones and replace with landing sites	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/1	The Mount Cook National Park should remain a wilderness area and not be opened to (half) day trippers. Exclude casual trippers. Say No to pressure to open up and increase flight access	No specific change sought	
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/6	The whole document basically fails to make any provision in policy for access for people with disabilities and as such does not comply with the NZ Disability Strategy.	include a specific audit/review of accessibility, particularly in gateway and key attractions and locations. Identify a programme of works to proactively improve access.	
<i>Paardekooper, Luke</i> 22/1	Overseas tourists should pay a suitable amount per person to cover general admission, park and ride and information fee. A % of fee should go back to MDC	No specific decision sought	
<i>Churton, Troy</i> 23/1	It is utterly wrong to permit any dogs (other than specialist trained sniffer dogs for detecting other dangers) into this (the Park) environment. Dogs are an introduced animal not part of this environment. Dogs are known pest for many NZ birds particularly kiwi and many shorebirds.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/2	There has been no relationship to any mobility/disability sector in regards to Universal design or possibility of opening up areas to all.	Include structure in design that accounts for all abilities	
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/3	Milestones / Goals: The plan has no goal to open existing areas or account	Amend the plan so that the goal to open tracks, trails, gates, bridges, toilets to all is top priority.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	for the future of ever increasing aged travel, the disability sector, Inclusive tourism and mobility impaired		
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/4	Policies make no mention of improving access to all at a management level	Policies and education in trail management is essential for the future of all DOC policies	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/15	Use of the term "Cultural values" in all sections: Throughout the plan the phrase "cultural values" is used where what it actually means is "Kāi Tahu values". Simply using "Kāi Tahu values" would be more informative (as has been used in the Westland draft NPMP)	Amend the use of the heading "Cultural values" to read "Kāi Tahu values" in all sections of the plan.	
<i>Keast, I</i> 61/1	Oppose the concept of 350,000 acre dryland park.	Suggests for Government to form a development subsidy to assist the procedure of development for this area to achieve a grassland producing large area capable of producing and breeding high quality merino sheep and wool	
<i>Barraclough, Dr Robin</i> 130/1	I would like to see a freeze on the proposed new concessions for tourist flights on and over the glaciers of Mt Cook. I would also like to see a freeze on more development on the ground as well.	I would like to see a freeze on the proposed new concessions for tourist flights on and over the glaciers of Mt Cook. I would also like to see a freeze on more development on the ground as well.	
<i>Coc-Kroft, Emmalean</i> 150/1	No submission points included	No decisions requested	
<i>Gibbons, Steve</i> 151/1	No submission points included	No decision requested	
<i>Gibbons, William</i> 152/1	No submission points included	No decision requested	
<i>Backes, Clare</i> 163/2	Th plan fails to enact the National Parks Act. Overall this Plan concentrates on peoples benefit and enjoyment of the National Park, but does not focus on preserving in perpetuity the natural values of the Park as it should	Rewrite the whole Plan with clear outcomes, objectives, policies and milestones to enact NPA and General Policy for National Parks.	
<i>Meridian Energy Limited</i> 175/2	The Aoraki National Plan is in the vicinity of the Waitaki Hydro Electric Power Scheme. Meridian relies on access to the Park to to install and maintain equipment relating to and providing metrological and other data to provide it with accurate information relating to the hydrology of the Waitaki Catchment and amount of snow pack existing at any time. This information is critical to the operation and management of the Waitaki Power Scheme.	To ensure the plan provides for and enables the installation and maintenance of monitoring equipment associated with operating the Waitaki Power scheme, including helicopter access.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Powell, Gail</i> 181/1	Above all, I want to protect the beauty of this "heartland" of New Zealand, the integrity of the ecosystem and the biodiversity of the area. I support the principle of partnership planning and management of this area. I strongly urge a concerted effort to reduce visitor numbers to a more manageable level with less negative impact. I think the plan should prohibit additional development for the purpose of attracting and accommodating more tourist. Concerted and widespread pest control for all invasive species must be a priority.	New Zealand recreational interest must have priority over international visitor tourism interests.	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/6	There is a growing number of large tour groups in the National Park, there needs to be upgraded facilities such as more toilets in the Park to handle the increase or limit the number of tour groups at any one time. Unlicensed tours are becoming more common and not being dealt with effectively by DOC.	Add more toilets in the Park to handle the increase or limit the number of tour groups at any one time. Ensure more DOC staff are qualified as warranted officers to enforce NP and conservation legislation.	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/7	Camping and hut fees need to be increased for overseas visitors (with NZ citizens paying half as much) to help fund infrastructure in the National Park. There should be an entry fee to the Park for overseas tourists and free entry for NZ citizens.	Ensure NZ citizens get priority over tourists when booking huts. Investigate an entry fee to the Park for overseas tourists. Increase hut fees for overseas tourists.	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/1	The new management plan should clearly prioritise the natural values of the Park ahead of any development driven by visitor and tourist demands.	Amend the plan to include this passage from the previous plan: "The Park has been established to preserve its valued scenery, ecological systems and natural features in perpetuity. These values can be considered scarce and irreplaceable.....the purpose of this plan is to provide for the management of the Park in accordance with the Act so that the Park's intrinsic worth can be retained." (ANCNPMP 2004)	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/8	The first few sections of the Plan are difficult to read compared to the existing Plan. Amend plan per the submission below.	Edit relevant sections of the Plan to make them accessible to the general reader. Offer English translations to some Maori words/concepts to assist with comprehensibility. Remove DOC/planning jargon as far as possible. Increase plain English usage and simplify sentences.	
<i>Snoyink, Jules</i> 228/7	Support a reduction in number of concessions for recreations and tourism. Support increased charges for concessions and more rigorous monitoring and enforcement of conditions of concessions.	Increase charges for concessions and more rigorous monitoring and enforcement of conditions of concessions.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i>	Support, in full, the submission by the New Zealand Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association (NZHGPA) - see Sub77		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
233/39			
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/1	No suggestion of upper limits or optimal tourist numbers	Need sensible restrictions set to preserve the natural, cultural and historic values of the Park and to ensure the enjoyment of all user groups.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/1	It needs to be remembered that Aoraki Mt Cook National Park has UNESCO World Heritage Status and new policies should not undermine the values reflected by this status. The National Parks Act prioritises preservation of national parks in their natural state, and clearly places conservation first, ahead of recreation and tourism.	I would like to see the reinstatement of this purpose statement in the new plan and it should be made clearer that the Department of Conservation is prioritizing the preservation of national park values ahead of any development driven by growing tourism demand.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/1	<p>A number of key issues raised :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There needs to be more focus on encouraging environmentally sustainable tourism rather than mass tourism.</li> <li>2. Aoraki/Mount Cook has its own special network of huts, shelters, bivvies and camp sites, catering to a large range of users and their chosen adventures. There needs to be increased support for maintaining and improving the current alpine hut network.</li> <li>3. There is an ever increasing presence of aircraft in Aoraki/Mount Cook and it is becoming increasingly hard to find quiet spots or areas where they don't yet have access. The natural and recreational values of a place indisputably change when aircraft are given access. The remaining remote areas do not have much in the way of hut facilities. Lets keep the areas that are accessible from huts available for the multi-day trippers and free of aircraft-dependent day trippers.</li> <li>4. the Tasman, Murchison, Mannering, Aida, Darwin and Bonney Glaciers are easily hut-accessible ski touring terrain and are considered by many to be the "classic" terrain for high alpine glaciated trips. There should be more protection places on this iconic glaciated ski touring terrain and should be an area kept free of aircraft-based heliskiing.</li> </ol>	Take these matters into consideration in the review of the draft plan.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/2	The current Aoraki Mt Cook National Park Management Plan (2004) purpose statement is missing from the draft plan. Strongly support this purpose statement be reinstated in the plan, but DOC needs to ensure that this is reflected in the rest of the plan - especially with regard to aircraft policy.	Reinstate the current Aoraki Mt Cook National Park Management Plan (2004) purpose statement and make it clear that DOC is prioritising the preservation of National Park values ahead of development driven by rapidly growing tourism demand.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Rogers, Ian</i> 276/1	Found the draft plan hard to follow with repeated use of Maori.	Amend plan with english names for sections etc	
<i>McMaster, Luke</i> 298/1	Submission refers only to the draft Westland Tai Poutini NPMP		
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/1	Support in full the submission by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club - (Submitter 602)		
<i>Bridson, Dr David</i> 305/1	Develop something like a constitution of rights to ensure universal participation by hikers, fisherman, adventurers, hunters, mountain climbers, rafters, helicopters, explorers, 4 wheel drivers, campers and more. Without a question it is for the benefit, health and enjoyment of all to have a broad purpose of use	Amend plan as in submission.	
<i>Dickerhof, Nina</i> 315/6	Statements like "fostering a culture of sustainable recreation" and "promoting the use of sustainable recreation and services" stand in direct contrast to the statement about allowing helicopter access and allowing helicopter flights up the Hooker Valley. Leave no trace - this should encompass noise pollution caused by helicopters.	Remove these from the plan	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prefer the use of terms "tourists" and "New Zealanders", rather than "visitors" and "public" as have been used in the plan</li> <li>2. There is insufficient definition of terms such as "formal authorisation", "private accommodation" to understand what they mean in the context of the NZDA</li> <li>3. Plan contains some ill-informed statements and inconsistencies and incorrect spelling (e.g. should be Thar Lodge)</li> <li>4. The plan focuses a lot on the front country - there should be more emphasis on the back country</li> <li>5. While the plan reflects significant and valued emphasis on the consultation process with Kāi Tahu as mana whenua, there needs to be a well comprehended recognition of the heritage and aspirations of other New Zealanders.</li> </ol>	Make changes to the plan to address the issues raised.	
<i>Wills, Gavin</i> (Managing Director, Glide Omarama Ltd 325/2	The sport of gliding is not included in the draft plan as a valid Park recreational activity.	The Plan should be amended to recognise gliding as a recreational activity that occurs within or over the Park.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Sutherland, Scott</i> 332/1	While Te Reo place names are appropriate, omission of English place names makes the plan significantly more difficult to read for those unfamiliar with less commonly used Te Reo place names	Provide place names in both Te Reo and English	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/1	That the plan should expressly recognise the contribution to wild animal control made by recreational hunting at no cost to the government.	Amend the plan to acknowledge recreational hunting as the primary means of management and control of game animals. Wild animal control should be the subject of open negotiation among DOC, the Game Animal Council and the NZDA.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/2	Objectives, policies, outcomes and milestones are not clearly differentiated and often vaguely worded in a way that doesn't require making any actual progress.	Review the wording of outcomes and milestones to provide for more accountability	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/22	1. The lack of a proper Table of Contents, and any Index is a hindrance to the use of this document. 2. Include cross-references to page numbers	Amend the Plan to address the issues raised.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/1	Oppose the presumption in many policies that a concession should be granted. This approach is at odds with Section 6 of the Conservation Act which gives primacy to the management of the land for conservation purposes, not commercial operations. The policies should, at the very least, adopt a neutral stance towards applications for concessions, or state they are likely to be declined.	Delete the words "Should grant" concessions / authorisations from the plans policies and reword to set out criteria for assessing concession applications, and/or for policy direction for decision-makers.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/11	"Fostering sustainable recreation" should be the centrepiece of the whole management plan as far as recreation goes and how we interact with and treat the Park in the future.	Amend the plan to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/25	"Cultural values" in all sections: Throughout the plan, the phrase "Cultural values" is used where what it actually means is "Kāi Tahu values" - Every New Zealander has culture - it is odd to talk of cultural values and limit it to Kāi Tahu values. - What about the rich mountaineering cultural values of each area? - "western" culture is considered to be "normal" and is not seen as a specific culture in the document. - Simply using "Kāi Tahu values" would be more honest	Replace the heading "Cultural values" with Ngāi Tahu values"	
<i>Vance, Maureen M. - duplicate of Sub 857</i> 345/1	Note this submission is a duplicate of Sub 857		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wilkins, Brian Joseph</i> 380/1	Fully support the submissions and findings identified from : - Federated Mountain Clubs (Submission 424) - NZ Alpine Club (Submission 600)	Support the decisions as requested in the identified submissions	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/8	Draft milestones are placed with an apparent randomness that is difficult to understand. Planned activities should have clear pathways and milestones for action and reporting.	Review milestones in light of concerns above.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/10	Words and phrases are used throughout the draft with no clear indication of what is meant. The phrase "visitor experience" is open to wide interpretive range as it is used in the draft.	Reference should be made to the Act and General Policy to determine meanings of words and phrases. Link 'visitor experience' to publicly agreed visitor management zoning which are unambiguously provided for by the NP Act, the CA and General Policy.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/11	Climate change: It is surprising that the draft plan does not address climate change beyond the level required of non-conservation-focussed organisations, even though the effects of anthropogenic climate change are highly pronounced in this Park.	Include a position on, and clear guidance for immediate actions that will contribute to a reduction of anthropogenic climate change in the Park.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/151	The draft plan does not genuinely express the spirit, intent and letter of the statute or General Policy, largely because of its accommodation of commercial interests related to commercial tourism, and inadequate detailed knowledge of the Park's history and culture.	Withdraw the present draft plan and prepare a new draft.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/2	Difficult to understand the proposed changes in the draft.	Provide a brief summary with main changes and the reasons for them to allow more understanding and input from the public.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/3	Concerned all user groups are not being considered. Too much focus on foreign tourists doing short visits over those using foot access over multiple days to backcountry ski and ski mountaineer.		
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/11	Support the "Growing Voices" workshop and submission. It successfully anticipated and argued against a lot of the proposed changes in the draft. Please see this submission again.		
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/19	The draft plan outlines many issues, including noise pollution. The vision statements are beautifully constructed and consider the principles of kaitiakitanga, guardianship and preserving Aoraki for future generations. However, the actual contents and policies within the draft are not confluent and most often directly		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>contradict many of the goals it hopes to achieve. Demoting wilderness areas to backcountry areas without any stated reason and proposing to increase landings on the upper Tasman Glacier to a ridiculous 200 per day is an insult to backcountry enthusiasts and New Zealanders.</p>		
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/1</p>	<p>Is the intention of Plan to revisit the place of National Parks in the relationship between New Zealanders and the natural environment? Or to reinterpret to National Parks Act? Clearly the answer must be ‘no’ since this is not a National Parks Act review. National Parks are not just any old conservation land. However, the draft Plan appears to treat them that way. In doing so, it undermines the very reason we have National Parks and what they represent.</p>	<p>To address this, the revised Management Plan needs to more directly acknowledge and give effect to its primary purpose which is essentially to give effect to the National Parks concept. This has already been defined by, and to my knowledge is valued by, the New Zealand public as a whole, and reflected in the National Parks Act with some additional contributions from the General Policy. In terms of practical matters for management, the protection of these special places requires a balance between developing recreational and tourism opportunities and managing their impacts. National park management plans are a key tool in which this balance is articulated, and actions identified to achieve the desired outcomes.</p>	
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/2</p>	<p>Lack of information to highlight proposed changes. Difficult to identify the nature of proposed changes to the status quo. Proposed changes are not described in relation to the current situation and this is compounded by use of low resolution maps for key planning tools such as management zones. Readers need to have in-depth knowledge of the existing plans or to physically analyse them to identify important changes, and to understand consequences. This is the biggest shortcoming of the planning approach. Would prefer if all proposed changes were clearly described and their impacts, both positive and negative, documented for the reader in relation to a) status quo management, and b) objectives of the applicable legislation, particularly the National Parks Act. The planning approach currently lacks detail on the extremely relevant concept of what the impacts of new proposals would be, with regards to existing values. It is hard to understand why a more transparent planning approach has not been adopted.</p>		
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/6</p>	<p>There is a general lack of attention to demonstrating consistency with the NPA that can be traced back to the planning approach, layout, and content of the draft plan.</p>		
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/7</p>	<p>It is appropriate to see the increased visibility and substance of provisions in the Plan for the recognition of Kāi Tahu values.</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Pettinger, Tracy &amp; Richard</i> 459/1	Withdraw and review draft Plan. Necessary as it is inconsistent with relevant legislation.	Review whole Plan, especially the proposed increase in commercial visitor numbers so it is not inconsistent with legislation.	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/11	Development of "Icon Places": The Draft presents a jarring lack of imagination as to catering to increasing visitor numbers to the park in a manner consistent with the Act's core preservation purpose. That approach seems to consist solely in allowing very large and practically unbounded numbers of aircraft landings. In the absence of consideration of alternatives, this strains very strongly against sections 4 and 43 of the Act and is probably unlawful. The Plan ought to discuss the wider development of so-called 'Icon' locations. For example: - The Murchison Valley, with existing huts, spectacular faces and more stable weather, presents an obvious area for development. - The true left of the Tasman River, with its view of the Mount Cook Range presenting Aoraki in context, and high-value east-coast ecology, is another.	Review plan to address the issues raised.	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/14	It is commendable that DOC respects Kai Tahu's role as kaitiaki runaka of the park. So in my view it is all well to base the Draft around 'places' named in solely Te Reo. The way to work their usage in general conversation, which I would welcome, will be to start in this Draft by denoting them in a format of "Te Reo / English" as for Aoraki itself, and as in the Westland Draft Plan. Track-change copies of the Draft obtained through OIA requests show the deletion of this format.	Reinstate Te Reo / English naming for Place names.	
<i>Bamford, Dave</i> 488/1	Support the New Zealand Alpine Club (NZAC) submission on this plan.	Make all changes as requested in the NZAC submission	
<i>Bamford, Dave</i> 488/2	Aircraft policies: The plan is excessively permissive for air access into a national park. Basically the plan provides for minimal control of air access. Many national parks in developing nations have very sensitive and restrictive aircraft management policies and plans. The issues of international best practice for air access into national parks have been a key focus and concern of international delegates to the Sustainable Summit conferences. Many have expressed surprise at the	No specific decision requested	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	permissive nature of aircraft access into our alpine national parks.		
<i>Bamford, Dave</i> 488/3	This plan actively supports a growing and burgeoning aerial mountain tourism industry. This is not sustainable and eventually needs addressing including a full rewrite of the plan.	Rewrite the plan to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Bamford, Dave</i> 488/4	I am a strong supporter of tourism and recreation in our national parks, and of the benefits that tourism to New Zealand and in particular to our national parks can provide. However need to ensure that all activities, both individually and collectively, will leave our parks in the same or a better position in 20, 30 or 50 years time. I do not believe this plan will provide for this.	No specific decision requested.	
<i>Clearwater, Ronald</i> 490/4	Opposed to this park plan being used as a template for future park plans. All our National Parks have their own special characteristics and to ignore that and consider them the same is pointless and foolish.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/1	General - Navigating this plan: One has to keep scrolling back to determine which section at particular point comes under. By having a proper structure the table of contents would have meaning. The only way to reference items is by page number, which will change as the document is modified. If written without structure will be difficult to read, maintain. It will become a doorstop, rather than a working useable document. Furthermore, it will cost much time and money, now and in the future, for people to easily understand the content.	Amend the plan so navigating is easier: - e.g. Place the current section at the top right. - Alternatively, the document could be structured that all headings have a reference, e.g.. Use section numbering to see the structure of the document, and for clear referencing without using pages numbers. To illustrate: 2.3.3 Haupapa Place 2.3.3.1 Outcomes 2.3.3.2 Policies 2.3.3.2.1 Recreation Having a numbering system that has absolute referencing system. The table of contents will quickly show the structure and any inconsistency with the structure.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/3	This submission has two principal focuses: 1. The perceived negative impacts of increasing scope and frequency of air traffic for tourists. 2. Need for objective, measurable targets for all milestones. Without these and without monitoring them, the plan is wasted effort. The DOC estate is for people to enjoy; it is not a commercial playground. We have a Labour Government now, so the commercial imperatives to survive under the		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>previous government are no longer valid.            However, DOC infrastructure growth is required to meet the expanding tourist population; it needs to be funded by tourists.            Focus must be placed on reducing anthropogenic noise. 'Quick-fix' tourists should not compromise the enjoyment of people who use their feet.</p>		
<p><i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/4</p>	<p>Length of the plan is too long            At one hundred and eighty eight pages this plan is far too large.            The people whose feedback you are seeking have a day job.            - the introductory text could be placed in Appendices;            - the five different places create lots of duplication.            If the objective of this document is to be a working document and gather feedback from a large number of people; then we think it has failed dismally.</p>	<p>The long wording of the document and the lack of good structure. It will be a barrier for getting a wide range of feedback.            1. When designing such an important document keep in mind the two primary (we think) objectives:            a. Write the plan to be a working document, i.e.. write in plain language for everyone to understand.            b. Make it as easy as possible for people to provide feedback.</p>	
<p><i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/5</p>	<p>General - Questions            1) Identifying changes from the previous plan:            Is it possible to write this plan in such a way that a reviewer can identify the difference between the current plan and the proposed changes?            2) Partners' experience in AMCNP            Have all partners involved in developing this plan been in the park's mountains, been recreational climbers/trampers, experienced the solitude and tranquillity that the direction of this plan will negatively impact?            Or have they just been up onto a glacier in a plane for a brief period and not appreciated the impact on the intrinsic quality of the AMCNP of increased tourism-aircraft activity, over a wider area than currently permitted?</p>		
<p><i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/30</p>	<p>Conclusion:            If we had the time and patience this submission could have equalled the number of pages in the plan.            We trust from the above that you will have the idea that flying anywhere within the MCNP must have a very worthwhile meaning.            Disturbing the enjoyment and serenity of others by having superficial flights ('quick-fix' tourists should be eliminated from all national parks.)            Suggests in summary:</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Employ professional writers to clearly communicate and engage with the intended audience.</li> <li>2. Structure and condense the document to be readable and useable.</li> <li>3. Have clear measurable milestones.</li> <li>4. The document should be a working document written to engage people, rather than repel.</li> </ol>		
<i>Ross, Fraser</i> 508/1	I fully support the provisions of the legislation which gives first priority towards the protection of biodiversity and the inherent natural features of this special area. Which has also been given the high status as a World Heritage Area and such be given appropriate recognition in a final plan.		
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/11	I support a redraft of the Plan as the proposed draft document is large and difficult to read for most lay people. It includes a lot of repetition. I hope the Hearing Panel will consider re drafting to align with the current 2004 Plan and fulfil the requirement nto preserve the intrinsic values of the National Park. Concise and clear language will assist, and an index and Table of Contents to help negotiate the document. I notice the use of RMA language in the draft NPMP, using terms such as "avoid, remedy or mitigate".	The Park is managed under the National Parks Act and requires preservation as a priority over recreation and tourism. National Park status is the highest status in the country for land, features, ecosystems, flora and fauna which are all highly significant. There is no room for remedying or mitigating adverse effects on National Park land. The word "avoid" could be retained in the draft but the terms "remedy or mitigate" should be deleted.	
<i>Hall, Susan &amp; Dunn, Kevin</i> 517/1	DOC must prioritise the preservation of the National Park's natural values over and above providing for development driven by tourism and recreation demand.	Reinstate the current purpose statement (Aoraki/Mt CookNPMP 2004) in the draft Plan: "The Park has been established to preserve its valued scenery, ecological systems and natural features in perpetuity. These values can be considered scarce and irreplaceable. As development proceeds elsewhere, they will become even more valuable, which may bring greater pressure on them. The purpose of this plan is to provide for the management of the Park in accordance with the Act so that the Park's intrinsic worth can be retained."	
<i>Jolly, James N.</i> 530/7	Regarding Introductory sections from "Journey, Mana and Vision" to "Recreational values" Gross overemphasis on Maori cultural values and gross underemphasis on the vast majority of user values. Alpine climbing (as opposed to general mountaineering) and ski touring (as opposed to heli-skiing) are not even mentioned. Yet these activities are what Mt. Cook is famous for internationally and sets it apart from our other national parks.	Delete and re-write all of the introductory sections with an appropriate balance between Maori traditions and the predominant user, particularly mountaineer and hunter, cultures. Modify all policy statement introductions to consult with Runanga but approval from all parties sought in a genuinely democratic process.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>van Reenen, Gilbert</i> 537/1	I request that any proposals in the draft plan that are not compatible with the intentions and ethos, encapsulated in the General Policy Document and Act, be rescinded from the plan.	Amend plan as outlined in the submission.	
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/1	<p>Purpose of the National Parks Act: Mackenzie Guardians support the draft Plan in general and strongly support objectives and policies which will ensure that the National Park's scenery, ecological systems, natural features and heritage are preserved as required by the National Parks Act. Recognise the importance of public access, recreation, and other benefits that may be derived from the National Park experience. It is our understanding, however, that these activities are not equal in status to the purpose of preservation of native plants and animals, or the general welfare of the park, but are subject to the provisions of the Act and the imposition of conditions deemed necessary to preserve the park's natural state and general welfare. (refer to NPA 1980, section 4 (1) and (2)).</p> <p>Included as attachment to their submission the evidence prepared for their submission on Mackenzie District Council Plan Change 13.</p>	<p>Place priority on the preservation of native plants and animals and the general welfare of the Park over commercial development. Re-instate the current purpose statement (Aoraki/Mt Cook NPMP 2004): "The Park has been established to preserve its valued scenery, ecological systems and natural features in perpetuity. These values can be considered scarce and irreplaceable. As development proceeds elsewhere, they will become even more valuable, which may bring greater pressure on them. The purpose of this plan is to provide for the management of the Park in accordance with the Act so that the Park 's intrinsic worth can be retained."</p> <p>Also seek improved provisions to protect the National Park from development effects.</p>	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 549/4	The National parks act states that Aoraki should be preserved in perpetuity and preserved as far as possible in its natural state. I find it surprising that there appears to be no consideration in the draft plan made for the effects of anthropogenic climate disruption. The effects of climate change are very likely to make a large impact on the national park in terms of "visitor experience" and management practice.	Implement a new section regarding climate change. The plan should provide an intention to develop a strategy that will contribute to reducing anthropogenic climate disruption. I feel that it would be prudent of the writers of the proposed MP to recognise the loss of the Tasman Glacier in the near future. I feel that the management plan should make preparations for the impact of glacial retreat and predicted glacial extinction within the park within the next 80 years.	
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/6	To improve the safety of visitors, I suggest that there needs to be better operational co-operation between AMC & WTP National Parks to track intentions of climbers who cross from one to the other. I have observed this not happening when I was warden at Welcome Flat Hut.	Implement a system of co-operation between the two National Parks regarding intentions of climbers.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/1	Fully endorse the submission by the New Zealand Alpine Club and the Canterbury Mountaineering Club.		
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/1	Attached the NZAC submission (600) to submission and says to support this submission, although doesn't believe		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>the plan requires a complete re-work and considers some increase in helicopter traffic inevitable.</p> <p>The unique and important history of mountaineering in the Parks and the culture and involvement of the climbing community as stewards of these landscapes should have a greater part in this plan.</p> <p>The failure to provide a narrative on how the current management Plans have informed the proposed changes in the draft Plans, especially for visitor and aircraft monitoring programmes that exist in the current Plan.</p> <p>More rigorous inclusion of international park management best practices should be considered in developing the Plans.</p>		
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/1	<p>Support reinsertion of the following statement from the 2004 AMCNPMP.</p> <p>"The Park has been established to preserve its valued scenery, ecological systems and natural features in perpetuity. These values can be considered scarce and irreplaceable. As development proceeds elsewhere, they will become even more valuable, which may bring greater pressure on them. The purpose of this plan is to provide for the management of the Park in accordance with the Act so that the Park's intrinsic worth can be retained"</p>		
<i>Dodd, Jonathan &amp; Blakely, Nicola</i> 587/1	<p>We oppose the plan as it will damage the biodiversity in the Park and also damage the visual, aural and spatial beauty of the park through overcrowding, over-commercialisation, crowds and noise. The Tongaririo Crossing is a perfect example of a wilderness experience completely destroyed through over popularisation.</p>	Delete and rewrite the entire plan.	
<i>Horn, Dr Chryst</i> 594/3	<p>Please adjust this plan to more strongly signal the values expressed in its introduction:</p> <p>National parks are held for their intrinsic worth -- that is for the value that they have, just because they exist - quite separate from any value that humans may ascribe to them. They are places where human interference, modification and control should be minimal, and enjoyment of them should be on nature's terms.</p>	adjust the plan to more strongly signal the values expressed in its introduction.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/1	<p>Contents Page:</p> <p>As a working document the draft Plan is difficult to access by means of the table of contents</p>	Develop a table of contents with detail similar to that of the current plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/65</p>	<p>NZAC applauds the involvement of Kai Tahu in the preparation of the draft Plan (in partnership with the Department and the Board) and the way the draft Plan enables Kai Tahu, as mana whenua, to give practical effect to kaitiakitaka in the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.</p>	<p>No specific decision requested</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/66</p>	<p>NAC considers that the draft Plan fails to grasp the first principles of National Park protection and preservation embedded in the National Parks Act of 1980. A number of reasons are given for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the purpose of the Park and provisions of General Policy to achieve this are not prominently present nor comprehensively addressed</li> <li>2) the proposed aircraft landings are 10 times the current number. The need for this proposed increase in aircraft landing zone areas is unsubstantiated.</li> <li>3) the removal of the distinction between user groups for aircraft access is important and should be retained</li> <li>4) the obfuscation of the linkages between and utility of existing and new management frameworks, such as visitor management zones, aircraft access zones and desired tranquillity outcomes.</li> <li>5) the lack of evidence for adequate formal consultation and engagement of the outdoor recreation community. This has not be commensurate with the scale of the proposed changes which are enormous and conflicting.</li> <li>6) the scant mention of the unique and important history of mountaineering in the Parks and the culture and involvement of the climbing community as stewards of these landscapes.</li> <li>7) the failure to provide a narrative on how the current Plan has informed the proposed changes in the draft Plan, especially for visitor and aircraft monitoring programmes that exist in the current Plan.</li> <li>8) the continuation of heli-skiing as a unique activity with separate access areas and landing zones un-coordinated with visitor management zones and aircraft access zones.</li> <li>9) difficulties with the usability of the Plan as a document for decision-making</li> </ol> <p>In the light of these reasons, the Club asks that the draft Plan be withdrawn and reworked.</p>	<p>To withdraw and rework the draft Plan.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/67	The current Plan struck a balance between the tensions of the National Parks Act for managing preservation and enjoyment and this balance was reached through robust consultation. The draft Plan proposes a significant move towards tourism development focus, in conflict with the Department's responsibilities under the National Parks Act - this would be a pronounced deviation from current park philosophy and is in danger of severely devaluing the 'natural features' that contributed to the formation of the Park.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/68	The Plan is also subject to the Conservation Act 1987 and the functions of the Department in section 6 where all activities are subserviant to conservation, recreation is to be encouraged and tourism allowed. We expect the draft Plan to retain the distinction between recreation and tourism.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/69	The Department is required to administer and manage the Park in accordance with the Generla Policy for National Parks 2005 (the "GPNP"), the Canterbury (Waitaha) Conservation Management Strategy ("CMS") and this Plan. Essentially the GPNP provides a framework for the development of national park management plans. The GPNP manadates requirements for national park management plans in Policy 12(b) which requires the Plan to take into account a list of matters. Our review confirms that while most have been satisfied, the following appear to have been satisfied only in part: - the identification of effects, including cumulative effects, of different uses, and their minimisation - the explanation of how conflicts between desired outcomes are to be resolved. We expect that, after its revision, the final Plan should be audited against the GPNP to ensure it is consistent and compliant with the GPNP.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/70	New Zealanders treasure the Park for different reasons and in different ways. The Plan needs to emphasise the mana felt by both Maori and non-Maori for these places. They are both important and need to be developed in the explanatory text, and given weight when formulating policies.	Give weight to the relationships of non-Maori in the development of the explanatory text and formulation of polcies.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/71</p>	<p>Maintaining the opportunity for mountaineering and other mountain recreation is of fundamental interest to the NZAC and the wider backcountry outdoor community. Inherent in this is the preservation of the environment, freedom of access, and basic affordable accommodation within the Park. Protecting these matters will also help to safeguard the cultural heritage of mountaineering and its continuation in the Park. Aspects of the draft Plan present material threats to this opportunity.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/72</p>	<p>The NZAC does not support the Plan direction to allow further, virtually unconstrained, development of tourist services and facilities in the Park to meet tourism demand - particularly in remote and special parts of the Park.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/73</p>	<p>The Plan needs to reflect more strongly that Park preservation is the number one goal. While this goal is recognised in the Vision statement for the Park, the objectives, outcomes and policies need to address this goal more strongly. A number of areas identified to illustrate this include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the inconsistency of the Plan responses to visitor pressure</li> <li>2) the absence of monitoring and analysis information to support the draft Plan approach</li> <li>3) the balance proposed between intrinsic values and tourism is too much in favour of commercial activities</li> <li>4) the extremely permissive approach to aircraft and aircraft landings in the alpine areas. These need to be managed within the context of section 4(2)(e) of the National Parks Act 1980.</li> </ol> <p>The Club considers that the balance of s4(2)(e) is now not being achieved, and with each review of the Plan the general welfare of the Park is diminished.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/75</p>	<p>The NZAC disagrees with the approach taken in the draft plan to remove the link between aircraft landings and the activities being undertaken on the ground. The Club disagrees with the justification given that "the effects of landing are the same regardless of what those on board do once they get out of the aircraft". While backcountry recreationists probably have little effect on the experiences had by scenic tourists, the reverse is not necessarily the case:</p>	<p>The Club considers that in some areas, landings should be allocated for specific on-the-ground user activities</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>- under the draft Plan backcountry users will not be able to avoid the high intensity scenic landing areas as they could under the current plan</p> <p>- under the draft Plan scenic landings could quickly use up all flight allocations leaving none for other activities.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/81</p>	<p>Overflights: Overflights disrupt natural quiet and compromise the experiences of recreationists and others in the Park. The draft Plan acknowledges the adverse effects of powered aircraft including overflights (section 1.2, page 45). NZAC considers the Plan needs policies that detail methods and monitoring for overflights that are robustly measurable to inform the achievement of VMZs and outcomes for Places. Section 29A of the Civil Aviation Act (CAA) provides a pathway for control over sensitive areas in the public interest. We submit that the Department must pursue this pathway and undertake a review of best practice in other countries with the objective of significantly reducing overflights of the Park, particularly in remote zones.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Undertake a review of best practice for overflights in other countries and jurisdictions.</li> <li>2. Incorporate into concessions an appropriate term controlling overflights by all aircraft owned or operated by the concessionaire.</li> <li>3. Amend Policy 1 in 1.3.3 Aircraft to extend the actions to be taken, including for flight paths and the use of tracking devices, to address this issue.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/82</p>	<p>Foot access: The increased aircraft access provisions in the draft Plan contradicts Policy 1.3.1 of the GPNP which seeks to foster access into the backcountry to enable those with the required skills to experience more remote areas. The draft Plan also encourages the provision of 'new day and overnight walking facilities' to manage overcrowding on high-use tracks. NZAC considers that the draft Plan has an overall focus on accommodating demand and lacks a broader approach of demand management to minimise adverse effects.</p>	<p>Amend to address the issues raised</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/83</p>	<p>Visitor management zones: The NZAC supports a zoning system for recreation values. However, the NZAC considers that the current zone framework does not clearly explain the change from 'settings' (current plan) to "zones" in the draft plan, or how the zones relate to the tranquillity tool or to the proposed aircraft landing zones. Compared with the existing VM settings, the draft zones are confusing and vague, in particular: 1. the draft plan should retain the ROS settings wrt</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain the current visitor management settings as in the current Plan.</li> <li>2. Include a milestone to require annual monitoring of visitor perceptions of crowding, conflict and aircraft noise. This should be conducted in a range of locations that represent the range of users in the park.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>aircraft operations, perceptions of crowding, natural quiet and natural views and the new tranquillity outcomes unless the Department can justify their removal</p> <p>2. the combining of the backcountry accessible and walk-in groups - the Department needs to justify how the experiences in both groups are the same before combining them</p> <p>3. the language on visitor encounters and interactions is more vague than the current plan. This language is not measurable. How does the Department know whether these setting objectives have been met?</p> <p>4. A link between the VMZs and aircraft management is imperative, but has been largely removed in the draft Plan. It needs to be brought back into Appendix 2.</p> <p>5. The Aircraft Zoning map needs to include the areas of expected overflights as in the current Plan</p> <p>6. There are conflicting designations between aircraft landing zones and VMZ in the draft Plan. Clarification is needed as to what kinds of visitor experiences are likely in these areas with confounding designations where there are multiple VMZs within an aircraft landing zone.</p> <p>7. There is no provision for monitoring crowding or recreation conflict specified in the VMZ Table (Appendix 2). The draft Plan should outline how the new zoning system will attempt to reduce the perceptions of crowding and conflict</p> <p>The NZAC therefore recommends that the current visitor management settings are retained in the draft Plan.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/85</p>	<p>Alpine huts: NZAC built and owns the Murchison and Godley huts. They are effectively public huts as a requirement of the concession. Hut fees are used to pay for operating and maintenance costs but there are challenges to the collection of hut fees, and those collected are insufficient to cover these costs. Many people come and go from the huts using aircraft. NZAC seeks provisions in the draft Plan to gather information from concessionaires providing aircraft access to monitor hut user numbers and collect all hut user fees.</p>	<p>Include monitoring requirements to address the matters raised by the submitter for the collection of hut user information.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/89</p>	<p>Consistency and co-ordination of Aoraki/Mount Cook and Westland Tai Poutini NPMPs: The NZAC identifies a number of examples of where these two draft Plans are not co-ordinated, or where there is ambiguity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the potential for aircraft landing near the Harper Saddle under the Westland High Alpine Landing Zone would provide a "loophole" for flight access to the upper Hooker Glacier</li> <li>2. inconsistencies in the pack-out method across the two draft Plans</li> <li>3. the Club supports the backcountry intentions systems identified for the Aoraki/Mount Cook NP. It identifies that there is no such system for the draft WTPNPMP</li> </ol>	<p>Amend the two draft Plans to achieve consistency and co-ordination as requested</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/90</p>	<p>Usability of the draft Plan: The NZAC appreciates many of the presentational aspects of the draft Plan. These include the interactive maps and the writing style. The Club has also identified a number of themes regarding the usability of the Plan that have made it less user friendly and that should be rectified:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the contents page needs to be more comprehensive with more subsections needed</li> <li>2. an Index is required</li> <li>3. Include cross references to GPNP , particularly to specific policy requirements</li> <li>4. The Glossary should include full definitions for terms found in the Act - reference to the Act is counterproductive</li> <li>5. In some places policies are absent even though topic is covered in the text or the Outcomes</li> <li>6. Milestones are variable in their importance and do not necessarily match the policies. The Club submits that many timelines could be compressed.</li> <li>7. Historical texts characterised by a lack of balance , omissions and errors. NZAC has offered to assist in areas within its expertise.</li> <li>8. A lack of integration of the Aoraki/Mount Cook and Westland Tai Poutini draft plans.</li> <li>9. The style of the current management plan was frequently found to be more informative and user friendly</li> </ol>	<p>Consider, and as far as possible rectify, the deficiencies identified.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/138	Appendices: Including the Mount Cook National Park Bylaws 1981 as an appendix would assist users of the Plan.	Append the Mount Cook National Park Bylaws 1981	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/139	Climate change: As climbers we want to continue to climb on the glaciers and we would expect the draft plan to detail what the Department is doing to decrease greenhouse gas emissions from park operators and visitors as well as adapt to the effects of climate change.	Insert policies on climate change reflecting Departmental policies.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/140	The Park in 20 years: We submit there should be a description of the Park in 20-50 years from the adoption of the draft Plan. It needs to be longer than the 10 year period in deference to its preservation in perpetuity as a national park.	Include in the beginning of the draft Plan a description of the Park in 20-50 years.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/141	The current Plan: Most references to the current Plan made in submissions have suggested that the provisions of the current Plan are better. This may be for a number of reasons: - the draft plan proposes major policy changes or u-turns - the apparent change in template has not served the public well - the indication that many babies have been thrown out with the bathwater	1. Review the current Plan for its content and readability 2. Reconsider and revise the draft Plan in the light of identified deficiencies.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/5	CMC has a strong interest in several sections of The Plan, and sees the current wording as having material threats on the ability of climbers and mountaineers, including CMC members to safely and practically practice the sport of mountaineering in Aoraki / Mt Cook National Park.	It is important that the draft Aoraki / Mount Cook National Plan reflects the purpose of the Park as stated in the opening paragraph of section 4 of the National Parks Act 1980: "For Parks to be maintained in natural state, and public to have right of entry, it is hereby declared that the provisions of this Act shall have effect for the purpose of preserving in perpetuity as national parks, for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery of such distinctive quality, ecological systems, or natural features so beautiful, unique, or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest."  The CMC seeks a plan which encourages and allows for continued sustainable, safe, and practical access and use of The Park, as well as the protection and enhancement of The Park's existing unique characteristics, including the	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		wilderness areas, biodiversity and cultural significance.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/10	<p>CMC supports and greatly appreciates the services provided by Search and Rescue. The most cost-effective and response-efficient system is to have a core of SAR staff based at Mt Cook village.</p> <p>General management of the Park will always require personnel who have specific mountain skills that allow them to live, work and travel in high alpine conditions and that these skills can also be employed in Search and Rescue.</p>		
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/11	<p>It is CMC's view that the plan contains numerous and fundamental errors and inconsistencies, particularly but not limited to the systems used to zone land, allocate commercial opportunities, and which are likely to be inconsistent with legislation and general policies. Do not believe the plan is fit for purpose.</p>	<p>Urge the CACB and DOC to consider the gravity of the errors and make fundamental changes to the plans. If the fundamental changes are not possible, we request that the Board declines to advance the plan changes and request DOC draft new plans.</p>	
<i>McKellar, Thomas</i> 613/1	<p>The information presented in the plan on the cultural and geological history of the Park, and on the biodiversity and natural heritage, and the introduction to each Place in Part Two, is an invaluable resource.</p>	<p>Retain this level of detail in current and future plans.</p>	
<i>Layburn, Stephen</i> 632/1	<p>Agrees with the broad thrust of the NZAC submission and, in particular, to agree with the bottom line that the Plan should be withdrawn and reworked.</p> <p>Very supportive of the work that DOC has undertaken to build on and preserve the strong foundations, built up over several generation, for preserving and protecting significant places in our National Parks. And I agree with NZAC's submissions that preserving these places for climbing and related activities is of the utmost importance.</p> <p>Concerned that the draft Plan erodes this protection and has other measures that are of concern esp. the increases in landing zones and numbers for flights.</p> <p>Also further dialogue and work required on points such as those required to implement the park and ride schemes.</p>	<p>Plan should be withdrawn and reworked to better preserve and protect the National Park.</p>	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 637/1	<p>Include the following purpose statement from the 2004 plan "The Park has been established to preserve its valued scenery, ecological systems and natural features in perpetuity. These values can be considered scarce and irreplaceable. As development proceeds elsewhere, they</p>	<p>Amend plan as in the submission.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	will become even more valuable, which may bring greater pressure on them. The purpose of this plan is to provide for the management of the park in accordance with the Act so that the Park's intrinsic worth can be retained" (AMCNPMP 2004)		
<i>Gilbert, Ruth</i> 638/1	Support the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society's entire submission (Submission 700)		
<i>Pinfold, Terry</i> 640/1	I support the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society's entire submission. (Submission 700)		
<i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/11	Supports the identification of places within the Park to assist their effective management.		
<i>Stäger, Ines</i> 653/1	The National Parks Act prioritises preservation of National Parks in their natural state over use and enjoyment; and the hierarchy in the Conservation Act is in the following order: conservation, recreation then tourism. The emphasis in the draft plan seems to lean towards the development of visitor facilities. This puts unnecessary pressure on the park and its unique values.	The preservation of natural values in the National Park needs to be the top priority, and this has to be recognised and affirmed in a new management plan.	
<i>Stäger, Ines</i> 653/5	Support the Department of Conservation to re-draft a management plan that adheres to the principles of the National Parks and Conservation Act	Re-draft a management plan that adheres to the principles of the National Parks and Conservation Act.	
<i>Shaw, Dr Vivienne &amp; Dr Christopher T</i> 655/1	DOC appears to have lost sight of one of its key functions under the Conservation Act which is to 'foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism'. Instead DOC is positively encouraging tourism by upgrading the Hooker Valley track and actively promoting it to tourists.	Lessen the over-promotion of the area, as it is placing undue pressure on the natural environment and the facilities cannot cope with the high numbers of people visiting key locations such as the Nohoaka and Aroarokaehe places.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/29	Would like to see the inclusion of No Smoking permitted policy within the Aoraki Mt Cook National Park. This would be in line with the Government's goal of Smoke Free Aotearoa NZ within the life of this management plan. It would also remove a source of fire from the park and would stop native birds being exposed to carcinogenic cigarette butts.	Add policy to prohibit smoking in the park	
<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/1	Heritage NZPT makes comments and seeks amendments to increase clarity around the management and regulation of archaeological sites in particular.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/23	There is room for ambiguity in relation to some terms commonly used in the Plan. For example, the term 'recreationists' at Mt Cook were recently interpreted to include helihikers, whereas in the current Westland Plan, this is not the case. The correct definition is important and should be able to be consistently applied across both plans.	Accurately define the terms 'heli-hike', 'recreationist', 'alpine guiding' and 'snow landing'.	
<i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/8	There is much emphasis in the plan on Maori values, and although both Maori and European history is included, there appears to be little awareness of the recent and current contributions that experienced guides, trampers and climbers, and other interested parties make to the park.	Amend the plan to acknowledge the contribution of all parties and recognise that such stakeholders and contributors have an important role in the future development of the park.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/1	<p>Wishes to acknowledge the extent of the effort that has been involved in planning and preparing the draft and provides broad support to the draft Plan. The draft Plan is thorough and sets the intended future management of the park even beyond the life of the Plan.</p> <p>The Plan has been drafted in partnership with Kāi Tahu and this signifies the direction in which the Department is managing conservation lands and waters within the Kāi Tahu rohe. The cultural narratives (whakataukii) are supported to honour the significance of Aoraki and his relatives to tangata whenua.</p> <p>Where AMCAVL has reservations about the intended shared management framework (subsequent principles and mechanisms) it is addressed specifically in this submission.</p> <p>The primary concerns are around uncertainty with procedures and systems for statutory processes, and transparency and conflict of interest relating to these.</p>	<p>Reasonable consideration of all constructive suggestions made by AMCAVL by all partners and consulted stakeholders who have been instrumental in the preparation of the plan.</p> <p>Want a response to all of AMCAVL's suggestions, whether they are to be incorporated or disregarded. The response to include explanations as to why any suggestions are being disregarded.</p>	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support statements in the draft plan that recognise internationally and nationally outstanding qualities of Aoraki Mount Cook National Park.</li> <li>2. Acknowledge and support statements that recognise the Tiriti o Waitangi/Treaty of Waitangi partnership between the Department and Kāi Tahu as mana whenua, and Aoraki the place, that is the home of important ancestors. Also acknowledge Te Rūnanga o Arowhenua, Te Rūnanga o Waihao and Te Rūnanga o Moeraki as kaitiaki rūnaka over Te Manahuna, The Mackenzie Basin.</li> </ol>	Retain statements and use of Te Reo as requested above	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	3. Support the use of Te Reo Māori in the plan and the integration of takata whenua values into objectives and policies.		
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/2	<p>1. Forest &amp; Bird are concerned that preservation in perpetuity as national parks for their "intrinsic worth", meaning the national park's natural character, its natural features, including natural sound, is not core to this draft plan.. Consider that natural park values as set out in the NPA have been wrongly interpreted in the draft plan, and as currently presented results in loss of national park values. In our view, the draft plan is extremely limited in its provisions to preserve national park values, as set out in the NPA therefore the Aoct's purpose will be impossible to achieve.</p> <p>2. Concerned that he proposed management of authorised activities in the park will undermine the national park's intrinsic worth, where preservation in perpetuity will not be achieved, and people will no longer be able to gain the full measure of inspiration from the national park.</p> <p>3. Enabling authorised activities to remedy and mitigate adverse effects in a place of national and global importance is inappropriate. This approach erodes national park values.</p> <p>4. The objectives and policies for preservation of indigenous ecosystems are not well integrated into general park management, and milestones for preservation of indigenous ecosystems are weak.</p>	Review the draft plan in light of the concerns raised	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/3	Forest & Bird object to the inclusion of references to the Department's Statement of Intent (SOI) in the draft plan. The SOI is the Department's business plan which has no bearing on a national park management plan.	Remove all references to the SOI from the draft plan.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/5	<p>Section 12 of the National Parks Act 1980 (NPA) provides for specifically protected areas within a national park to ensure public access can be controlled to places in the national park to preserve values of significance.</p> <p>Forest &amp; Bird recommend that as visitor pressure increases to parts of the park, more use of this mechanism could strengthen preservation of national park values.</p>	Review the draft plan to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/9</p>	<p>The draft plan is not clear about what it is seeking to preserve, therefore describing adverse or cumulative effects or when conflicts occur between uses is not possible. The proposed management regime makes it almost impossible to reconcile objectives and policies for preserving national park values. Therefore the draft plan cannot comply with the GPNP12.</p>	<p>Make the following changes to enable the draft plan to comply with the GPNP::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clearly set out the national park values at Place</li> <li>- identify the range of outcomes at Place consistent with values identified</li> <li>- Clearly articulate adverse effects, including cumulative effects, of activities on values that can be anticipated</li> <li>- explain how conflicts between uses will be resolved</li> <li>- present a set of integrated objectives and policies to manage authorisations in accordance with the desired outcomes that are consistent with national park values</li> <li>- take into account the values and objectives of other national parks.</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/10</p>	<p>The use of Te Reo Maori throughout the draft plan is a valuable addition and in the true spirit of a partnership. The Contents page requires translation into English and into practical management language.</p>	<p>Amend Contents page to include English translation</p>	
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/12</p>	<p>Milestones should be more accountable and measurable. Use of the words "developed", "implemented" and "reported on" are very vague terms</p>	<p>Amend the plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/15</p>	<p>Overall plan structure: The plan structure could be simplified to avoid repetition. Use of more succinct language would be helpful the use of more directive language would promote a sense of respect and understanding of values.</p>	<p>Recommend the use of a more simplified structure, such as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Foreword</li> <li>2. Introduction</li> <li>3. National park values to be preserved</li> <li>4. Recreational opportunities and management issues</li> <li>5. Places - values and desired outcomes</li> <li>6. Overarching management objective consistent with national park purpose</li> <li>7. integrated objectives, policies and milestones (where appropriate)</li> <li>8. Implementation, monitoring, reporting and evaluation.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/18</p>	<p>Climate Change: Much of the policy referencing climate change in the draft plan relates to visitor health, access and placement of infrastructure. There is little policy direction to suggest added precaution to safeguard indigenous biodiversity from the impacts of climate change and greater biosecurity risk. Consider that the plan supports policy that is manifestly incompatible with maintaining and preserving</p>	<p>Strengthen the objectives and policies for climate change by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Including provisions for climate change adaptation that recognise the complexity of predicting how native species will respond</li> <li>2. Taking a precautionary approach to development and a proactive approach to preserving indigenous species that reflects the necessary urgency in the context of climate change.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	indigenous species from the impacts of climate change.		
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/32</p>	<p>Aircraft: Forest and Bird are concerned by the lack of justification for the proposed increase to landing zones (LZs) and increases to numbers of snow and back country landings, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft plan claims the effects of climate change mean that aircraft will become a more common means of getting into and around the Park (Page 45). There seems little else to justify the increase in landings and landing zones (LZs) other than commercial pressure.</li> <li>2. The proposed increase in landings will result in a significant loss of natural quiet and enjoyment of the Park</li> <li>3. While F&amp;B accept that commercial aircraft have been used for decades, just 10% of all visitors use aircraft. We consider the proposed LZs and increases in landings are not warranted.</li> <li>4. We believe limits to landings and LZs are necessary to preserve national park values.</li> <li>5. While aircraft policy seeks to avoid adverse effects on national park values, the proposed regime contradicts this policy.</li> <li>6. There is no reference to considering the adverse effects of aircraft noise and activity on native wildlife or on people who choose not to fly.</li> <li>7. We do not consider the tranquillity mapping tool (TMT) appropriate for assigning desired tranquillity levels on the basis of one season of data. It does not account for impacts on native wildlife and natural quiet, nor does it adequately account for the on-ground experience of non-flying visitors.</li> </ol>	<p>Address the concerns raised by the following means:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. retaining the current aircraft landing regime</li> <li>2. consider the effects of additional aircraft landings in remote areas and subsequent effects such as pollution, including noise, on native species and unmodified ecosystems</li> <li>3. more rigorous monitoring to strengthen the TMT before it is applied</li> <li>4. Reducing aircraft over time</li> <li>5. Investigate designating the Upper Tasman or Murchison as a specially protected area within the Park.</li> <li>6. Identify and establish specially protected areas, no fly zones and no fly periods during the life of this plan</li> <li>7. Take account of national and international obligations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions when developing aircraft landing policy.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Abaffy, Clare</i> 711/1</p>	<p>Support, in full, the submission by the New Zealand Alpine Club (NZAC) on the draft Plan and I submit that the draft Plan be withdrawn and reworked. New Zealand has a long history of protecting significant mountain places in national parks for their intrinsic worth. Further, preserving these special places for enjoyment, including climbing and related activities, is of the utmost importance. The draft Plan erodes this protection and has other aspects that are of concern.</p>	<p>withdraw and rework plan  CHECK AS THIS A SUBMISSION ON WTP</p>	
<p><i>Brookes, June</i> 716/3</p>	<p>Want to see much more focus on conservation in the plan and the future management of the park. This</p>	<p>Amend the plan to include more attention and resources given to wild animal control, pest control, native fauna</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	includes much more attention and resources given to wild animal control, pest control, native fauna protection and finally protecting the park from the pressures and demands of tourism.	protection and protecting the park from the pressures and demands of tourism.	
<i>Brookes, June</i> 716/4	I have found the insistence on using te reo exclusively for chapter headings on the Contents Page and other places an impediment to reading the draft plan and easily finding relevant chapters for comment. Te reo "Place" names allocated to the various management areas in the park should be accompanied by their commonly used geographic names in each instance and with similar prominence throughout the document to facilitate public comprehension and comment.	The department should put out two versions of the plan: English and te reo. The public can choose the version of the document they find most accessible.	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/26	There is room for ambiguity in relation to some terms commonly used in the Plan. For example, the term "recreationists" at Mt Cook were recently interpreted to include helihikers, whereas in the current Westland Plan, this is not the case. The correct definition is important and should be able to be consistently applied across both plans.	The new Plan should accurately define the terms 'heli-hike', 'recreationist', 'alpine guiding' and 'snow landing'.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/1	The current draft plan (the Plan) should be withdrawn and rewritten.	Withdraw the current draft Plan and rewrite.	
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/1	The vision of the draft plan does not reference, or provide a clear link to, the objectives of the National Parks Act 1980 (NPA).	Revise the draft plan to better articulate and achieve the primary purpose of the NPA: to preserve the intrinsic worth of the Aoraki-Mt Cook National Park.	
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/2	In places, the policies of the draft plan depart substantially from the General Policy for National Parks 2005.	Assess and provide an explanation for why this has occurred. If a strong reason cannot be found, reconsider whether such a departure is warranted.	
<i>Pohl, Peter</i> 726/1	Oppose the draft plan.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/1	A consistent use of concepts is needed with respect to references to the tourism industry body representatives. - Where the plan refers to recreation, TIA is often not included in the consultation process - The provisions of the plan that relate to recreation (whether private or commercial) need to provide specific assurance that decisions will be made in accordance with consultation of appropriate industry body representatives including TIA Reference to the DOC/TIA formal partnership agreement would ensure certainty in such provisions	Make amendments to the plan to reflect the issues raised Amend the plan to ensure TIA specifically included in the consultation process in relation to recreation	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/3	The plan refers to a possible review of the conditions of the concessionaire system, but does not specifically mention the need for industry consultation. It must be amended to include this	Amend the plan to include the need for industry consultation in any review of the concessionaire system	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/7	Define the purpose of our parks as in the National Parks Act 1980. While the detail of the Plan strongly supports conservation aims, TIA believes that the contextual statements should give more weight to this point to better reflect our and the NZ public's conservation expectations.	Amend the plan to reflect the issues raised.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/9	Milestones: - seem sparse, particularly around recreational opportunities - do not represent all the work required to achieve the objectives in the plan - unclear whether DOC will focus on achieving the objectives, or only on the milestones - unclear what will happen if monitoring required in the milestones identifies the need to change something in the plan.	Make the following amendments to the Plan: 1. the Plan clarifies how milestones will interact with the delivery of objectives and policies which they do not address 2. The Plan includes many more milestones, particularly around supporting recreational opportunities and facilities - including the backcountry. 3. Milestones include the requirement to monitor and review any hard limits, and to amend the Plan in response to findings as relevant.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/10	There are limits stated in the Plan. The Plan must also include objectives, policies and milestones to monitor, review and amend the limits as required to manage their real impact.	1. Include objectives, policies and milestones to monitor, review and amend any limits stated in the Plan 2. Milestones include the requirement to monitor and review any hard limits, and to amend the Plan in response to findings as relevant.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/11	Plan layout: The Plan is extensive and detailed. It would be useful if the proposed objectives, policies and milestones were collated in the one place.	Amend the layout of the Plan to address the issues raised.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/19	Managing restrictions and limits: TIA considers that where prescriptive limits are set in the Plan, these must be based on sound and tested evidence to justify the need for such a limit. A hard limit in a national park plan has the potential to become quickly outdated and therefore not provide for the purpose of the Plan. TIA considers that where there is insufficient evidence to justify a hard limit for use of resources, the Plan should instead provide clear guiding principles, objectives and methods to establish a consistent framework under which decision makers can assess and provide for suitable uses. In those circumstances, the	Amend all hard limits set in the Plan to address the matters raised above.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Plan should set the narrative objective for a site or area, and limits set adaptively outside of the Plan, to give effect to the set objective.</p> <p>TIA would like the Plan to include the following matters in relation to the setting of limits within the Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Each particular resource which is desired to be subject to a limit on its use be clearly identified for its particular aspects which require protection.</li> <li>- Evidence is gathered which considers the particulars of the resource against the impacts of use of that resource, and that the nature of this evidence be communicated in the Plan.</li> <li>- Where the evidence establishes a finite capacity of use of the resource, and that limit is justified by evidence and accepted by the community and decision makers, a limit be prescribed by reference in the Plan. A reference in the Plan to such limits provides an appropriate balance between certainty and flexibility so as to ensure that changes in the industry in the future can be provided for in the Plan without requiring full scale reform.</li> <li>- Before implementing a limit in accordance with the finite capacity of a resource, regard must be had to other alternative options, including a preference for providing flexible limits which are determined according to guiding principles and policies.</li> <li>- Where there is no reliable and tested evidence to establish a limit on use, specific principles and provisions should be established to give guidance to a decision maker and stakeholders to determine the appropriate level of use for the resource.</li> <li>- DOC involve concessionaries and relevant recreational group in informing it's thinking on all aspects above.</li> </ul>		
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/22</p>	<p>Consistency with Industry Best Practice: Park plans should provide that industry best practice standards should be followed by park users rather than providing for duplicate standards. This will ensure consistency across a number of sectors operating within parks, and ensure that park plans have the necessary flexibility to adapt to industry changes and improvements. Industry best practice is often found in written</p>	<p>Amend the plan to make reference to the DOC safety and audit requirements to ensure there is no conflict with industry best practice or regulatory requirements. Retain Section 1.3.5</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>guidelines or user group agreements, however where no such formalised structure exists for a particular area or activity park plans should refer to implementation of 'industry best practices' so as not to implement standards which might not otherwise have an evidential base.</p> <p>TIA supports the Plan reference to external good practice standards in relation to Bolting within the Park.</p>		
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/24</p>	<p>Consideration of the risks of Climate Change and the Alpine Fault: TIA commends the Plan's recognition of the risk presented by both Climate Change and the Alpine Fault, and the efforts it makes to plan for their impact.</p>	<p>No specific decision sought</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/27</p>	<p>The Plan often refers to the provision of 'safe' outdoor recreation opportunities e.g. 'identify, provide and manage a range of safe outdoor recreation opportunities'. TIA is a strong advocate for safe and quality experiences, however we are aware that 'safe' is a highly subjective term which relates very much to a particular context and visitor expectation. Its use as described here does not add value to the Plan, rather it could cause misleading expectations in decision makers and visitors alike.</p>	<p>Review the use of the word "safe" and adjust to reflect the concerns raised</p>	
<p><i>Jefferies, Bruce</i> 729/1</p>	<p>Oppose the draft plan. Benefit, use, and enjoyment are overemphasised in the draft management plan and preserving in perpetuity and intrinsic worth are seriously discounted .</p>	<p>Rework the plan so it reflects the provisions and intent of the World Heritage Convention, National Park Act (1980) and General Policy for National Parks (2006)</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/37</p>	<p>It is disappointing so see that while both this Plan &amp; the draft Westland Tai Poutini National Park Management Plan share a similar approach towards managing the impact of short term visitors, they do not take the opportunity to explicitly synergise in terms of management of other issues including species conservation, noise pollution, or recreational opportunities.</p> <p>By kowtowing to commercial interests at every possible opportunity, the Plan demonstrates contempt for the basic tenets of the Conservation Act and the National Parks Act, and places activities detrimental to the natural environment above and beyond the conservation of landscapes, species, natural quiet, and wilderness.</p> <p>Fundamental failings of the draft Plan include</p>	<p>Completely rewrite the Plan with the Conservation Act, National Parks Act, General Policy Statement for National parks and Ngai Tahu Settlement Act as guiding principles.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>widespread provisions that will increase aircraft activity and noise (including unlimited aircraft landings for heli-skiing and the loss of natural quiet and wilderness in the Hooker Valley), a disregard for the decades of mountaineering and hunting in the Park by kiwi outdoors clubs (the proposal to remove or relocate club-owned huts), and the elimination of straightforward access to the Park for bona fide recreational users of the Park by implementation of a blanket Park and Ride scheme tailored to manage only the current glut of short-term visitors. None of these concessions to the increasing commercial or tourism pressure will do anything to further "the conservation of natural and historic resources generally and the natural and historic resources of New Zealand in particular" (Conservation Act 1987, section 6 c i).</p> <p>The role of the Department of Conservation (DoC) is constrained: its role is "to the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism" (Conservation Act 1987, section 6 e). Tourism concerns are explicitly trumped in law by broader environmental concerns, and for that matter recreation is a priori placed ahead of tourism too. Here, tourism is taken to mean fee-paying activities (guided walks, flights, adventure tourism, etc.) whereas recreation includes outdoor activities carried out by private individuals (tramping, mountaineering, skiing, day hiking), whether they be visitors or locals alike.</p> <p>At a time when burgeoning tourism places serious pressure on public facilities nationwide, DoC needs to strike a balance between facilitating the enjoyment of our wild places with as little impact as possible, and the temptation to adopt policies and rules that might offer a quick fix to current issues. The plan needs to be forward looking, and recognise that current trends in tourism may change; campervans and heli-hikes simply reflect the recent bimodal distribution of tourists towards low- and high-spending styles of travel (a common theme perhaps being the pursuit of in-vogue Instagram locations). Demographic and cultural changes, or continuing increases in the costs of fossil fuels (whether</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>by supply constraints or increased taxation) may radically alter the types and intentions of tourists as they seek to enjoy Aoraki Mt Cook National Park (the Park).</p> <p>Against this backdrop, recreational activities have changed little since the Park was established, or before; day hiking is popular in the front country, and mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the backcountry. Therefore, the Plan need not radically alter existing provisions for recreational activities, and should not actively support tourism activities that are unlikely to be resilient to tourism changes or climate change, including a Park and Ride scheme and increased or unlimited scenic flights/landings.</p> <p>There is little acknowledgement of the importance of recreational activities such as mountaineering to the history of the Park, or of the intrinsic value of protecting our wilderness - the sacred whenua, indigenous species, and outstanding natural landscapes of the Park are treated essentially as a giant airport, with the purpose of the plan being a brief discussion on air traffic control.</p>		
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/22</p>	<p>Overall, it is the submitter's position that layout and readability of the draft Management Plan including the use of the nationally consistent aircraft landing zones is an improvement over its predecessor.</p> <p>The clarity of the provisions and readers overall understanding would be greatly enhanced by using topographical maps with overlays to illustrate the visitor management zones, tranquillity zones and aircraft landing zones.</p>	<p>The clarity of the provisions and readers overall understanding would be greatly enhanced by using topographical maps with overlays to illustrate the visitor management zones, tranquillity zones and aircraft landing zones.</p>	
<p><i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/1</p>	<p>This submission has been developed by SCDHB in conjunction with Community and Public Health, a division of the Canterbury District Health Board, which provides public health services to Canterbury, South Canterbury and the West Coast.</p> <p>SCDHB wishes to acknowledge the importance of enriching outdoor experiences for overall wellbeing, and commends the plan for ensuring access to these environments for a variety of visitors</p>	<p>Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park should be made completely smoke free.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/10</p>	<p>SCDHB notes that many smokefree policies, both in New Zealand and internationally, have been successfully implemented and positively received.</p> <p>In New Zealand, many local councils have implemented smokefree outdoor environment policies. Covering various outdoor spaces, these policies aim to reduce cigarette litter, denormalise smoking, and curb the harmful effects of tobacco on both people and the environment. Commercial ski-fields, including the Remarkables and Mt Ruapehu, have also implemented smokefree policies.</p> <p>Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park is part of the UNESCO Te Wāhipounamu South West New Zealand World Heritage Area. Internationally, a number of UNESCO world heritage sites in the Western Pacific region have been supported by the World Health Organisation to go completely smokefree. UNESCO's theme "One Planet, One Ocean" discusses the importance of conserving the diversity of life on earth. This is in clear alignment with Smokefree environments.</p> <p>In the United States, a number of municipalities have introduced outdoor smokefree policies at beaches and public parks. An increasing number of state parks are also smokefree, and there have been campaigns for smokefree national parks.</p>	<p>Ban smoking in AMCNP.</p>	
<p><i>Environment Canterbury</i> 743/1</p>	<p>Support the draft plan and will continue to work closely with the Department and other agencies on alignment for improved integration of environmental management within the wider Mackenzie Basin.</p>		
<p><i>Environment Canterbury</i> 743/3</p>	<p>Opportunities identified in the draft plan for the Department to work together with Environment Canterbury and others are acknowledged.</p> <p>The statutory responsibilities of Environment Canterbury and the requirements for resource consents for activities under the RMA and Regional Plans, where these apply need to be emphasised.</p>		
<p><i>Kaye, Brenda</i> 747/1</p>	<p>Oppose the current plan.</p>	<p>Rewrite the plan with an emphasis on valuing and treasuring our natural heritage rather than short-term economic gain.</p>	
<p><i>Ballance, Julian &amp; Roberts, Elizabeth</i> 754/1</p>	<p>We fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission on the draft management plan (Submission 600)</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/1</p>	<p>Acknowledge and thank the Department as a huge investor and delivery body of recreational opportunities in the Mackenzie Region and more widely across New Zealand.</p> <p>Submits that the presentation of the Draft Plan, associated maps &amp; papers and the process in general, do not make it easy to understand the extent of proposed changes, relative to the previous National Park Management Plan. It requires considerable previous knowledge, access to the previous Plan and a great deal of time to determine how the status quo will be altered by the proposals in the Draft. We respectfully suggest that this be considered in future Departmental planning processes.</p>		
<p><i>De Lu, Dirk</i> 757/1</p>	<p>The increased aircraft pressure by commercial interests proposed in the draft plan is in conflict with the government's stated intention to lower NZ's carbon footprint.</p>	<p>The plan needs to be redrawn and re-consulted on.</p>	
<p><i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/1</p>	<p>Our interest in the Draft NPMP is founded on the exceptional locations that exist within Aoraki/Mt. Cook National Park as part of the wider South Island/NZ offering. We are a user group with an established historical use in the Park. Access to remote locations is crucial to the film industry - if we can't get there, then effectively the location doesn't exist. In national parks, practical access is very often reliant on aircraft. Historically, the use of national parks is extremely low in both quantity and duration and there is very little evidence of issues caused as a result of this activity. Even though our cumulative use is very low, the ability to offer it up as a possible location is paramount to the success of the New Zealand film industry. Although we were actively engaged in the recent Canterbury CMS process and had signalled our desire to be consulted, unfortunately we were not included in the pre-consultation of this draft plan. We greatly value and appreciate the strong relationship that we have developed with the Department. Would encourage the planners of this plan to engage with staff who administer the Fiordland and Mt. Aspiring NPs. This will give us the ability to create a plan based on actual experience of filming in national parks. The film industry has the ability to help DOC further its goals in Conservation. By capturing the park on film, we are able</p>	<p>Plan needs a reassessment and overhaul in regard to tranquillity outcomes and aircraft management. Encourage the Department to widen its engagement and produce a second version of a draft plan.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>to provide people the ability to experience the wonder of the park with zero impact. We look forward to continuing to work with the Department to pursue these opportunities.</p> <p>The film industry had also previously developed a Code of Conduct for Filming on Public Conservation Land as well as a Guideline for Filming within Takiwa of Ngai Tahu. Both of these documents are in need of updating, and we would be happy to engage with both the Department and Ngai Tahu to contribute to this process. Appreciate the effort that has gone into getting the draft plan to its current stage. Also appreciate the difficult position that the Department is in, in that it tries to balance the views of a wide variety of park users whose issues are sometimes real and sometimes perceived. In principle, the concept of tranquillity mapping/desired tranquillity outcomes has merit and we support further research and engagement in pursuing this. However, the current process has lacked transparency in its process and methodology and the resulting outcomes are flawed and illogical. As such, the current draft plan is in need of a large reassessment and overhaul in regard to tranquillity outcomes and aircraft management.</p>		
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/1</p>	<p>General perspective on the plan: If one is of a mind to be generally in support of the conservation of our taonga species, active in traditional kiwi outdoor activities, and concerned about the legacy and impact of current generations on our sacred whenua, then it would be impossible not to see the Plan, in its current drafting, as a direct assault on those values. By kowtowing to commercial interests it places activities detrimental to the natural environment above and beyond the conservation of landscapes, species, natural quiet, and wilderness.</p> <p>The role of the DOC) is constrained: its role is "to the extent that the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation or tourism is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism" (Conservation Act 1987, section 6 e).</p> <p>(first environmental concerns, recreation and than at last tourism). DoC needs to strike a balance between facilitating the enjoyment of our wild places with as</p>	<p>Complete re-write.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>little impact as possible, and the temptation to adopt policies and rules that might offer a quick fix to current issues. The plan needs to be forward looking, and recognise that current trends in tourism (meaning fee paying e.g. guided walks, flights) may change. Against this backdrop, recreational activities (tramping, mountaineering etc) have changed little since the Park was established. Therefore, the Plan need not radically alter existing provisions for recreational activities, and should not actively support tourism activities that are unlikely to be resilient to tourism changes or climate change. There is in fact little acknowledgement of the importance of recreational activities such as mountaineering to the history of the Park, or of the intrinsic value of protecting our wilderness. This Plan is so utterly wide of the mark that a complete rewrite, with the Conservation Act, National Parks Act, the General Policy Statement for National Parks and Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act as guiding principles, Endorse the position of the Canterbury Mountaineering Club and the New Zealand Alpine Club in their submissions: namely that the Aoraki Mount Cook National Park draft plan be withdrawn and entirely rewritten from scratch.</p> <p>Due to DOC's undemocratic process and improper consultation throughout this entire process, I would caution the Department and drafters of this plan that in its current form, the plan leaves wide scope for judicial review to be taken, given the inconsistencies with the principles of the relevant legislation and the Treaty.</p>		
<i>Edie, Vaughan</i> 774/1	This submission was transferred to the Westland Tai Poutini file		
<i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/7	Oppose the lack of cost information, and the lack of identification of funding sources to undertake the plan policies, outcomes and actions.	Would like to see a decision that outlines the level of funding commitment from central government for DoC. I would like to see a decision made on funding streams for the national park that are used within the park area and allocation of costs proposed.	
<i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/8	Adaptive Management Planning: would like to see a decision that allows for more regular reviews and ongoing consultation of the Management Plan and monitoring of outcomes to allow faster action and response.	Allow for more regular reviews and ongoing consultation of the Management Plan and monitoring of outcomes to allow faster action and response.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Anderson, A. G. N.</i> 789/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Gawith, David</i> 791/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/1	<p>Have observed first-hand the growing pressures that tourism and recreation are placing on the natural landscape, formed tracks, aircraft traffic, road traffic, parking and DOC facilities and staff. I commend DOC for endeavouring to mitigate the impact to park in all ways possible and encourage the Department in these efforts.</p> <p>However, have multiple concerns that the plan as drafted caters far too much for front-country, short-term visitors and does little to maintain the interests of regular recreational users. Through restrictions on parking, hut use and park access, some of the many trips I have described above would become impossible or increasingly difficult. Further, changes to aircraft access destroy tranquil and remote nature of some of the places these trips may go, and irreparably alter the spirit and mana of these places.</p> <p>Strongly contest the narrative that glacial change is making these areas inaccessible, and challenge detractors to go and actually attempt a trip for themselves - for I have never been turned around on a trip due to glacial conditions. If the current day ethos of risk-avoidance and lassitude continues, we will one day simply fly to the summit to avoid all difficulty.</p> <p>Fail to understand how the proposed approach to climate change is to directly promote further polluting activity in the park. If Aoraki is losing his ice and snow, we do wrong by him to accelerate this loss.</p> <p>Intrepid visitors to the New Zealand mountains frequently remind me of my privilege in enjoying these mountains as they are accessed today - without helicopters, roads, cable-cars, aeroplanes or crowds.</p> <p>Increasing aircraft access will deprive us of a priceless and irreplaceable asset - the spiritual quiet and isolation of the mountains, seen no-where else in society or country.</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Owen, David</i> 800/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Ellis, David</i> 803/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Association, Hutt Valley Branch Inc.</i> 804/7	The draft plan should be put on hold and proper consultation occur at a later date when the proposals have been better considered.	The draft plan to be put on hold and proper consultation occur at a later date when the proposals have been better considered.	
<i>Liddel, Gerrard</i> 805/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/9	The plan is too long-winded and complex, needs to be simpler for more public engagement.	Implement the information in the plan to a simpler format for the public, which will in turn increase the level of public involvement.	
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/1	I fully support the Canterbury Mountaineering Club submission (Submission 602)		
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/1	Excellent that the plan has been drafted in accordance with the partnership principle of the Treaty of Waitangi, however having the section headings only in Te Reo makes the document difficult to navigate.	Make section headings dual Te Reo + English.	
<i>Carnaby, Penny</i> 813/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/1	I fully support the Forest and Bird submission (Submission 700)		
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/8	I have found the structure of the draft management plan difficult to follow easily.	Amend the plan to be easier for the public to understand.	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/15	Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park must be protected in every way to ensure it remains in its best possible state of Conservation. There is no doubt that there are some things that are far more important than the tourist dollar and Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park is certainly in that category.	Amend plan to according to submission.	
<i>Wilcocks, Lara</i> 821/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Wilcocks, Lara</i> 821/2	The draft Plan proposes a significant move towards a tourism development focus, in conflict with the Department's responsibilities under the National Parks Act.	This needs to be dealt with at a whole of government level in determining ways of reducing tourist impact and numbers rather than sacrificing the legislation that protects our National Parks in perpetuity in exchange for short term	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		financial gain of a few individuals and companies.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/1	The draft plan omits the purpose statement from the current plan.	The purpose statement from the current (2004) plan should be inserted as it is very relevant to the requirements of the National Park Act and the Conservation Act	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/2	The Conservation Act 1987 places the greatest weight on intrinsic value, followed by noncommercial recreation, and then by tourism . These three separate considerations need to be maintained. No where does it say they are to be balanced as if on equal planes. The draft plan takes the stance of balancing park visitor facilities development with the need to preserve and protect the values in the park. This is unacceptable. Ever increasing numbers of visitors to the park will inevitably have damaging impacts on the ecology of the park and also lead to a steep decline in the quality of visitor experience.	Ensure, through clear wording throughout the plan, as is necessary, that the preservation of natural values in the park has priority over providing facilities for ever increasing visitor and tourism demand. Carry out an assessment of the capacity of the park to cater for visitors and establish limits and ways to ration visits.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/11	We find the plan unfriendly to use and even off-putting. All headers need to have English translations. Material that would be useful in the body of the plan is often in the appendices. There is too much excluding language and a lack of plain English.	Make the final plan easier to follow and read with an improved structure and by using plain English and avoiding jargon and excluding language. Provide English translations for all headings and sub-headings. Provide easier to find context and background information on issues	
<i>Iles, Hilary</i> 824/1	I support the Federated Mountain Clubs submission (Submission 424)		
<i>Grinsted, Jack</i> 825/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Wratt, Gillian</i> 826/1	I support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc - Nelson-Tasman Branch</i> 827/1	The purpose statement from the existing Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park Plan is omitted from the new Plan	Include the purpose statement from the existing Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park Plan in the new Plan.	
<i>Moore, Bryan</i> 828/1	I fully support the NZ Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association submission (Submission 77)		
<i>Tapper, Louis</i> 830/1	I fully support the NZ Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association submission (Submission 77)		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hāpai te Hauora Tapui Limited</i> 831/1	While we focus our submission on the effect of this management plan for Māori, we also support the submission of the Christchurch District Health Board - Submission 742 which outlines the health impacts of this plan for all people.	Review the plan to address the concerns raised by Submission 742.	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/1	I fully support the Canterbury Mountaineering Club submission (Submission 602)		
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/1	I fully support the NZ Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association submission (Submission 77)		
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/2	I fully support the Canterbury Mountaineering Club submission (submission 602)		
<i>Freyens, Ben</i> 835/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Jessop, Keith</i> 836/1	I support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 838/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Tompkins, Jean</i> 839/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/1	ECO is concerned that this particular Management Plan seems not to conform to the National Parks Act 1980 requirements, particularly but not only in Section 4 of that Act. As such, it could be challenged in the courts and would not achieve the Purpose of the Act and the biodiversity protection and conservation outcomes of that Act.	Review the plan in light of the concerns raised.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/2	In light of increasing pressures from climate change, many of which are quite difficult to control, we suggest that this management plan is crafted in such a way to control as best as possible all local pressures on the Park's biodiversity. By local pressures we are referring to issues such as pest species, human disturbance, increasing visitor use, and resource extraction.	Amend the plan to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/4	ECO draws the attention of DOC and the Conservation Authority to the IUCN Recommendation WCC_2016_102_EN, passed at the 2016 World Congress of the members of IUCN, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. New Zealand is one of the Government members of this body, as are a	Review the Plan to address the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>number of New Zealand NGOs.</p> <p>Consistent with this IUCN Recommendation especially operative paragraphs 1-4, ECO submits the following additions to the National Park Management Plan as rules that apply across the whole of the National Park:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mineral activity including prospecting, exploration and mining and associated activities are prohibited in, on or under the National Park, as is any industrialisation of the Park from any industrial or industrial scale activities or infrastructure, since these are inconsistent with sections 4 and 5 of the National Parks Act.</li> <li>2. No genetically modified organisms or materials may be introduced or allowed to stray into the National Park.</li> </ol> <p>*Note - A copy of this IUCN Recommendation WCC_2016_102_EN has been attached,</p>		
<i>Vance, Maureen - duplicate of Sub 345</i> 857/1	Note this is a duplicate of Sub 345		
<i>Duff, Jim</i> 858/1	<p>Climate change is affecting the planet in major ways and will impact greatly on NZ and in particular the parks. The government and Parks should pay this close attention when they plan for future will not be kind to blind 'business as usual'.</p>	Climate change as management consideration	
<i>Waters, Jay</i> 859/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Waters, Dana Lee</i> 860/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Peters, Duncan</i> 861/1	<p>The vision for our National Parks has already been set, enshrined in legislation: to preserve in perpetuity, for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery of such distinctive quality, ecological systems, or natural features so beautiful, unique, or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest.</p>		
<i>Kershaw, Paul</i> 862/1	No submission points provided		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hammelburg, Baud</i> 863/1	I (only partially read it) support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>Hopper, Megan</i> 865/1	I fully support the NZ Alpine Club submission (Submission 600)		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/34	<p>Consultation - Engagement for Changes and Plan Reviews:</p> <p>The consultation appears to be restricted to several focused special interest groups - like Forest &amp; Bird, Fish &amp; Game, FMC, NZAC.</p> <p>Individuals who register with DOC should also be consulted with</p> <p>DOC could establish a register of individuals who wish to be consulted / made aware of changes in policy for specific areas - such as Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.</p>	Review the engagement and consultation for policy review as identified above.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/1	<p>When a country designates a national park the intention should be to keep that extraordinary piece of land in it's natural state. It was set-aside by people past for people today to enjoy now and for people not yet born to enjoy in the future. I feel that it should be our aim to allow only natural processes to take part in the park and mitigate the effects of unnatural detrimental processes such as tourism and climate change to the best of our ability.</p> <p>The draft plan does recognise tourism growth and subsequent pressure, but seeks to 'balance' development of the park visitor facilities with preservation and protection. I do not think that the plan should seek a balance between these two but should aim to be restrictive in current anthropogenic effects. The plan should not provide facilities for people but weight itself towards protection from both international and domestic tourism and climate change.</p>	Review the plan to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/9	<p>Climate Change:</p> <p>The National parks act states that Aoraki should be preserved in perpetuity and preserved as far as possible in its natural state. I find it surprising that there appears to be no consideration in the draft plan made for the effects of anthropogenic climate disruption. The effects of climate change are very likely to make a large impact on the national park in terms of "visitor experience" and management practice.</p>	Review the plan to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>The plan should provide an intention to develop a strategy that will contribute to reducing anthropogenic climate disruption. I feel that it would be prudent of the writers of the proposed MP to recognise the loss of the Tasman Glacier in the near future.</p> <p>When considering vehicular activity in the park in terms of carbon emissions and contribution to anthropogenic climate disruption, transportation activity should be limited as much as possible and not developed. In light of current climate change science the management plan should be aiming to reduce cars, buses (which it is, but not for climate reasons) and aircraft. Not increase them. I feel that the management plan should make preparations for the impact of glacial retreat and predicted glacial extinction within the park within the next 80 years.</p>		
<p><i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/1</p>	<p>The new Draft Aoraki Mount Cook National Park management plan, although recognising tourism growth demand and subsequent pressure on the park, seeks to 'balance' development of park visitor facilities with protection and preservation of its natural values. This is contrary to the National Parks Act, which prioritises preservation of National Parks in their natural state over use and enjoyment; and the Conservation Act, which prioritises conservation over recreation, and thirdly, tourism.</p>	<p>The purpose statement from the existing Aoraki Mount Cook National Park Plan should be included in the new plan.</p> <p>The preservation of National Park natural values must be prioritised over providing for development driven by growing tourism consumer demand.</p> <p>The objectives of the Conservation Act and the National Parks Act must be followed.</p>	
<p><i>Jessop, Keith</i> 877/1</p>	<p>1. I support the submission by the New Zealand Alpine Club (NZAC) - Submission 600.</p> <p>2. In particular I share the following concerns with NZAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- New Zealand has a long history of protecting significant places in national parks. Preserving these special places for climbing and related activities is of the utmost importance. The draft Plan erodes this protection.</li> <li>- the increases in aircraft landing zone areas and allocated landings, while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings, will impact enormously. This, combined with no distinction between tourist landings and those, say, for climber drop-offs on the Grand Plateau, will extend tourism in the park. Recreation users of the National Parks will be competing with tourists for flights, tranquillity will be diminished and</li> </ul>	<p>Withdraw the draft plan as currently written and address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>overflights will increase. I do not support these increases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- While I support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</li> <li>- I support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.</li> <li>- I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River.</li> </ul> <p>3. I submit that the draft Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park plan be withdrawn and reworked.</p>		
<p><i>Brookes, June 878/5</i></p>	<p>I want to see much more focus on conservation in the plan and the future management of the park. This includes much more attention and resources given to wild animal control, pest control, native fauna protection and finally protecting the park from the pressures and demands of tourism.</p> <p>Most tourists only ever visit the park for a day but their impacts are having long term effects on the park and the way it is managed. This is the key issue which has to be managed. It is a national park, not an tourist adventure park.</p>	<p>Review the plan to address the concerns raised</p>	
<p><i>Brookes, June 878/6</i></p>	<p>Language in the Document</p> <p>I have found the insistence on using te reo exclusively for chapter headings on the Contents Page and other places an impediment to reading the draft plan and easily finding relevant chapters for comment. This is disrespectful to English language speakers.</p> <p>In future you should put out two versions of the plan - one in English and one in te reo. Then the public can choose the version of the document they find most accessible.</p> <p>Use of "Place" names</p> <p>When you use the "Place" names allocated to the various management areas in the park you should also state their commonly used geographic names in each instance and with similar prominence throughout the document to facilitate public comprehension and comment. Most people would not readily recognise the "Place" names. It is disrespectful to use obscure terms which the general public do not readily recognise.</p>	<p>Review the language used throughout the plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/7</p>	<p>Introduction - National Park Values. There appears to be a complete lack of any indication in the plan of the need to place any limits on numbers. Jim Robbins, 2017 Yale Environment 360 states: "There is a need to limit the numbers in Parks in order to try and save them. The visitor crush creates a steep decline in the quality of visitor experience." Let us learn from what has happened in the USA and act before it becomes a whole lot harder to manage the impacts of increasing visitor numbers. The National Parks Act prioritises preservation of national parks in their natural state, and clearly places conservation first, ahead of recreation and tourism. The current Aoraki Mt Cook Management Plan (2004) states: "The Park has been established to preserve its valued scenery, ecological systems and natural features in perpetuity. These values can be considered scarce and irreplaceable. As development proceeds elsewhere, they will become even more valuable, which may bring greater pressure on them. The purpose of this plan is to provide for the management of the Park in accordance with the Act so that the Park's intrinsic worth can be retained." In addition, Aoraki Mt Cook National Park has UNESCO World Heritage Status and new policies should not undermine the values reflected by this status. In the draft plan, the purpose of the park is stated as being "to enable the public to receive inspiration, enjoyment - one of the most valued benefits is the ability to experience tranquil places." Strongly support this, but DOC needs to ensure that this is reflected in the rest of the plan - especially with regard to aircraft policy.</p>	<p>Reinstate the current Aoraki Mount Cook National Park Management Plan (2004) purpose statement and make it clear that DOC is prioritizing the preservation of National Park values ahead of development driven by rapidly growing tourism demand. The ever increasing demand for quick-stop visits does not need to be fully catered for, rather mass tourism needs to be managed and controlled to support conservation values and ensure long-term enjoyment for all visitors. If numbers are not controlled, then National Park status and World Heritage Status will become meaningless.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/7</p>	<p>Introduction - National Park Values. There appears to be a complete lack of any indication in the plan of the need to place any limits on numbers. Jim Robbins, 2017 Yale Environment 360 states: "There is a need to limit the numbers in Parks in order to try and save them. The visitor crush creates a steep decline in the quality of visitor experience." Let us learn from what has happened in the USA and act before it becomes a whole lot harder to manage the impacts of increasing visitor numbers. The National Parks Act prioritises preservation of national parks in their natural state, and clearly places</p>	<p>Reinstate the current Aoraki Mount Cook National Park Management Plan (2004) purpose statement and make it clear that DOC is prioritizing the preservation of National Park values ahead of development driven by rapidly growing tourism demand. The ever increasing demand for quick-stop visits does not need to be fully catered for, rather mass tourism needs to be managed and controlled to support conservation values and ensure long-term enjoyment for all visitors. If numbers are not controlled, then National Park status and World Heritage Status will become meaningless.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>conservation first, ahead of recreation and tourism. The current Aoraki Mt Cook Management Plan (2004) states: "The Park has been established to preserve its valued scenery, ecological systems and natural features in perpetuity. These values can be considered scarce and irreplaceable. As development proceeds elsewhere, they will become even more valuable, which may bring greater pressure on them. The purpose of this plan is to provide for the management of the Park in accordance with the Act so that the Park's intrinsic worth can be retained."</p> <p>In addition, Aoraki Mt Cook National Park has UNESCO World Heritage Status and new policies should not undermine the values reflected by this status. In the draft plan, the purpose of the park is stated as being "to enable the public to receive inspiration, enjoyment - one of the most valued benefits is the ability to experience tranquil places." Strongly support this, but DOC needs to ensure that this is reflected in the rest of the plan - especially with regard to aircraft policy.</p>		
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/56</p>	<p>The use of Guides: Since late 1800's, guiding was an integral part of our engagement with the mountains.. Initially it was seen as "unacceptable" to go into the mountains without a guide. By the 1930s more recreationalists were opting to explore the mountains self-sufficiently, and over time a balance was struck where both guided and non-guided groups found their place. Recently guided groups are becoming more prevalent and the balance is tipping back towards people actively choosing to go with a guide. Guides have become the default guardians of these places, both in the huts and on the mountains, often assisting recreational groups with information, route knowledge, hut etiquette and rescue assistance. There has generally been a harmonious relationship with the Department over the years. The Plan should ideally work with this, however there are some policies in the draft that would severely impact the ongoing work of guides in the Park.</p>	<p>Review the Plan to find a balance with all those who have interactions with the Park, that is supportive to all.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/58</p>	<p>Consultation with recreation groups, and recognition of mountaineering history in the Park.: 1. Concerned about lack of engagement with recreation groups before proposing drastic increases in visitation</p>	<p>Review the plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>and aircraft use in remote areas. The level of engagement should be commensurate with the scale of the proposed changes.</p> <p>2. Scant mention of the unique and important history of mountaineering in the Park, and the culture and involvement of the climbing community as stewards of these landscapes. This history and culture should be included to give context to the importance of protecting these mountain landscapes and shed light on the benefits that the use of these landscapes brings to New Zealanders.</p> <p>3. The failure to explain how the current management Plan has informed the proposed changes in the draft plan, especially for visitor and aircraft monitoring programmes that exist in the current Plan.</p>		
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/62</p>	<p>There is a missing discussion on the co-ordination of the two Park plans despite their concurrent revision and shared geography. I submit that a more rigorous inclusion of international park management best practices be considered in developing the Plan.</p>	<p>Review the plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>Pengelly, Stuart</i> 882/1</p>	<p>I support, in full, the submission by the New Zealand Alpine Club (NZAC) on the draft Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park Plan (Submission 600)</p> <p>I submit that the Plan be withdrawn and reworked.</p>	<p>Withdraw the Plan and rework it</p>	
<p><i>Pengelly, Stuart</i> 882/2</p>	<p>New Zealand has a long history of protecting significant places in national parks. Preserving these special places for climbing and related activities is of the utmost importance. The draft Plan erodes this protection and has a number of measures that are of concern;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the huge increases in aircraft landing zones and allocated landings (see 1.3.3)</li> <li>- the park and ride system (see Nohoaka Place Discussion Box - Park &amp; Ride and cycleways)</li> <li>- future outcomes for management of club lodges (see 1.3.1 Policy 14)</li> <li>- closure of the legal road up the Godley River (see 1.3.2 Policy 1)</li> </ul>	<p>Review the plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/1</p>	<p>NZDA has a duty to its members to support and enhance continued use of regional hunting resources, and to advocate their values in all public and governmental forums and in any local or central government processes</p>	<p>Review the plan to reflect the issues raised by the submitter.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
890/1	<p>that may affect or make decisions on the status, management or public interest in such resources. Hunting is part of our national heritage. It provides recreation, puts food on the table, controls wild animal numbers at no cost to government and contributes to tourism earnings. Hunting is an activity of special significance to Maori. Hunters also are proactive in establishing initiatives to provide and maintain huts and tracks, and carry out valuable conservation work, in particular control of pests (rats, mustelids, possums, etc). Hunters are conservationists and nature lovers at least as much as other users of the outdoors, most of whom make no contribution to conservation when recreating in the outdoors but do have significant environmental impacts. In contrast, the contribution to wild animal control made by recreational hunting at no cost to government is well known. We feel this point should be expressly recognised in this and other CMPs.</p> <p>The NZDA also contributes through community-based projects, encouraging firearm safety, teaching hunting ethics and safe hunting practices and provides advocacy for hunting and responsible firearm ownership and use. We believe that recreational hunting should be the primary means of management and control of game animals, and that any proposals concerning such animal control should be the subject of open negotiation among DOC, the Game Animal Council (GAC) and the NZDA.</p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/4</p>	<p>Statements of outcome The CMP does not provide clear statements of outcome. Instead the emphasis is on vague "milestones" such as "to report on" - a phrase that diminishes accountability. Objectives, policies, outcomes and milestones are not clearly differentiated and often vaguely worded so that, for example, the act of "reporting" or "seeking" at the end of 3, 5 or 10 years doesn't require making any actual progress.</p>	<p>Review the outcomes through the plan to address the concerns raised</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/7</p>	<p>Lack of proper information and statistics: Regrettably, once again we see a draft CMP that places a lot of emphasis on operational detail. Objectives, policies, outcomes and milestones are not clearly differentiated or defined and often vaguely worded. In particular, many all-important goals and milestones are so vaguely stated that the reader gains little impression that the Plan is driven by any sense of accountability.</p>	<p>Review the plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Nor is the draft Plan adequately informed with statistics. You cannot plan for growing visitor use without statistics but we find no figures on past, present and projected visitor numbers except the rather buried and far too vague statement on p. 94 that numbers are expected to "more than double" within the life of this Plan (which is not explicitly stated as 10 years). Visitation information on pp. 42 and 45 (e.g. "64% of visitors to the Park are from overseas") gives no indication of actual numbers.</p> <p>There is a particular need to clarify visitor numbers by distinguishing between</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "transient visitors" who are very numerous but arrive and leave by coach on the same day and have negligible impact beyond Mt Cook village, and</li> <li>- "longer-term visitors" who arrive by vehicle or scheduled aircraft services, stay overnight or longer, and travel into the more remote areas of the Park.</li> </ul> <p>This breakdown is essential to properly inform the Plan, in particular with regard to proposals for Park &amp; Ride (see later).</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>The journey</b>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/1</p>	<p>Oppose the imbalance of signatories to the management plan. There are no signatories on behalf of anyone who lives at Aoraki Mount Cook, or anyone who has investment in the village.</p>	<p>Include a representative of permanent residents and also of concessionaires of Aoraki mount Cook National Park</p>	
<p><i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/6</p>	<p>Support focus on Treaty Partnership and partner obligations - a good approach. Have individuals and representatives of the three papatipu rūnaka spent time in the region, particularly the remote areas, and experienced the qualities of tranquillity and natural quiet that tourism operators have such a huge impact on? That is, do they understand the reality of this plans' intent for aerial tourism?</p>	<p>Question answered</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Guide to this Plan</b>		
<p><i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/3</p>	<p>Concern raised that there has been a long delay with the revision of this plan. A delay of more than 4 years is unacceptable.</p> <p>There seems to be no commitment to a timescale set by statute, nor is anyone being held accountable.</p>	<p>Make the following amendments to address the delay in revision of this plan by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. on page 9 : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- explain the reasons for the delay</li> <li>- stating what steps will be taken to ensure it does not recur</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. Adding a new Policy under Interpretation, page 12 to read:</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		<p>"4. Remain aware that the Plan is subject to a statutory 10-year period and take steps accordingly to ensure it is reviewed within 10 years of the date it comes into effect."</p> <p>3. Adding to the Milestones (page 20): "9. Revise this plan to ensure a new Plan is in place by the end of Year 10."</p> <p>4. Including corresponding reminders of this timeframe elsewhere, such as on pages 36, 49, 52 and 112 and especially 152.</p>	
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/11</p>	<p>1. Plan structure: - numbering system is difficult to follow and the purpose of each part is not clear</p> <p>2. Interpretation: - Lack of consistent interpretation of terms between the draft Aoraki/Mount Cook and the Westland Tai Poutini NPMPs. No reason has been given for inconsistency.</p> <p>3. An introduction setting out the purpose of the plan is necessary.</p>	<p>Amend the draft plan to address the matters raised above by:</p> <p>1. Create a clearer numbering system and purpose for each part of the draft plan</p> <p>2. Amend the Interpretation section where necessary to use wording consistent with the draft Westland Tai Poutini NPMP</p> <p>3. Include an Introduction that sets out the purpose of the management plan and explains national park values as set out in the NPA Section</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>Guide to this Plan Intro</b></p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/5</p>	<p>"Ten-year" plans: On p. 9 we are concerned that there has been a long delay with the revision of this CMP, which theoretically expired in 2014. The delay of more than 4 years is unacceptable. There is no explanation offered for this delay, nor any discussion of the reasons or implications. Section 17H (4) (b) of the Conservation Act stipulates that the duration of a CMP is 10 years. A plan designed to operate for 10 years cannot be expected to "uphold the mana of this national park"(p. 9) over a longer period nor to be up-to-date on major issues. In a fast-changing world a CMP gazetted in, say, 2020, and designed to last 10 years, is unlikely to still be fit for purpose after 2030, especially since visitor numbers are projected to more than double in that time. There appears to be no commitment to a timescale set by statute, nor is anyone being held accountable. Please give us reason to feel confident that you will finally take this matter seriously.</p>	<p>address the concerns raised by the following means:</p> <p>1. On pp. 9 and 12 by: - explaining the reason for the delay; - stating what steps will be taken to ensure it does not recur; and</p> <p>2. Adding a fourth Policy under "Policies" (p. 12) to read: :"4. Remain aware that the Plan is subject to a statutory 10-year period and take steps accordingly to ensure it is reviewed and approved within 10 years of the date it comes into effect.</p> <p>3. Adding a Milestone to read: "Revise this plan to ensure a new Plan is in place by the end of Year 10."</p> <p>4. Include corresponding reminders of this timeframe elsewhere in the plan, with revision to be commenced by Year 8 or 9 - 1.2.1 Milestones, page 36 - 1.2.3 Milestones, page 49 - 1.2.4 Milestones, page 52 - Nohoaka Place Milestones, page 111</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		- Part Three Milestones, page 152	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Guide to this Plan Interpretation - text</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/7	The definitions provided differ in many respects from those in the draft Westland Tai Poutini National Park Management Plan, which could lead to difficulties for park managers and users.	Provide for interpretative consistency at high levels in national park managements plans, particularly where parks are contiguous.	
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/9	Submit the suggestion that all area names in the plan contain the bilingual area names e.g Pae Tata / Murchison, Haupapa/Tasman etc. This enhances the connection to those traditionally known areas and the Maori names and makes understanding the plan easier.	Amend the plan to use bilingual area names.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Guide to this Plan Policy 2</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/2	Should state clearly that all policies in the draft are to be applied collectively, rather than linking to them in individual policies.	1. Remove the references to linking policies 2. Add the following new policy or words to similar effect: "4. All policies will be read and considered together. Where Part 2 of the Plan contains a policy on the same subject, a more specific policy will generally take precedence."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Guide to this Plan Policy 3</b>		
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/13	Concerned that the use of "should" and "may" provides for too much flexibility and not the urgency required to preserve values.	Strengthen the policies by more use of "will" and "must", and conversely "will not" and "must not"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Part One</b>		
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/6	There appears to be a complete lack of any indication in the plan of the need to place any limits on numbers.  The NP Act prioritises preservation of national parks in their natural state, and clearly places conservation first, ahead of recreation and tourism.	Reinstate the current Aoraki Mount Cook National Park Management Plan (2004) purpose statement and make it clear that DOC is prioritising the preservation of National Park values ahead of development driven by rapidly growing truism demand.	
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/1	The status of National Parks needs to be preserved and respected.	Amend the plan to include the purpose statement from the existing plan.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Vision</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/3	Stretch goals and Key priorities - page 16: Intermediate outcome: " The diversity of our natural heritage is maintained and restored": The goal as stated is to be predator free by 2050, but it does not make it clear how this goal is to be achieved. If the goal is to continue to use toxic chemicals such as 1080 that do great harm, because "there is no better	Include effective, non-toxic solutions for achieving Predator free 2050 that do no harm to the earth, the people, all living things, and the water. Put in a trial programme at Aoraki of exclusive trapping with digitally monitored Goodnature traps. Build a sanctuary here using geographical areas to keep pests out	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>solution", then the cost is too high.</p> <p>The solution for removing pests must fit the Department's national long-term vision "New Zealand is the greatest living space on Earth". A key part of this is protecting the land and water from toxic chemicals.</p>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/4</p>	<p>Intermediate outcome: New Zealanders and our visitors are enriched by outdoor experiences".</p> <p>- support this outcome. Currently concession operators provide much of this experience, but will not be able to continue under increased rentals</p>	<p>Amend "Annual outputs - Concession management" to read: "Concession management executed reasonably and fairly to all NZ concessionaires regardless of size of operation, Maori or non-Maori."</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/2</p>	<p>Strongly support the whole vision statement, in particular this part "It is a place where people experience the beauty.. Aoraki and his wider whanau."</p>	<p>More evidence of support and encouragement of multi-day recreationists needs to be shown in the plan, not just quick-tick scenic flight tourists.</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/3</p>	<p>Strongly support the entire vision statement, but in particular the statement "It is a place where people experience .. and his wider whanau". In order for people to be able to appreciate the environment they are in, to form a connection and to respect it, they need to be able to spend quality time there . Ensure this vision is adequately supported by policy.</p>	<p>There needs to be more support and encouragement of multi-day recreationalists in the plan and more focus on quality rather than quantity tourism.</p>	
<p><i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/2</p>	<p>Regarding the statement "Resilience and sustainability underpin all management decisions and practices within the Park, responding to changing hazards and pressures from natural processes and visitors." Pressures from natural and changing hazards are more difficult to manage but limiting numbers of visitors has an immediate and lasting effect on preservation of National Parks.</p> <p>I support a reduction in visitor numbers in order to preserve the natural character of Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement a reduction in visitor numbers.</p>	
<p><i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/2</p>	<p>SCDHB supports the plan's overall focus on preserving our natural environment. We suggest that a smokefree policy is a logical addition to the management plan. The vision for Aoraki/Mount Cook National park describes the park as "a place of awe, inspiration, and natural beauty...indigenous nature is thriving and recognised for its internationally significant natural values and landscapes". Becoming smokefree will help to maintain this.</p>	<p>Add a smoke-free policy to the Management Plan</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/2	Oppose the vision for Aoraki/Mt Cook as it does not separately identify the outcomes for New Zealanders and Ngai Tahu (who live, work, and breathe the heritage, scenic value, and recreation of the park) and Domestic/International visitors who may come once.	Amend the plan to state that the outcomes for New Zealanders/Ngai Tahu are separate from our visitors.	
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/2	I would like to have the purpose statement from the existing Aoraki/Mount Cook management plan in the new plan.	Include the purpose statement from the existing Aoraki/Mount Cook management plan in the new plan.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Vision Vision for Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park</b>		
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/1	Oppose Vision as it fails to make any aspiration for accessibility for people with disabilities.	Amend the Vision to include "access for all New Zealanders regardless of age and ability".	
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/1	There is no vision to bring this beautiful places accessible to all, disabilities, aged, or mobility impaired.	Amend vision to address "Access for all, regardless of age, mobility and disability"	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/8	Strongly support entire vision statement, but in particular the paragraph "It is a place where people experience the beauty and delight of the mountain environment in a way that inspires them ..."	Ensure this vision is adequately supported by policy. Increase support and encouragement of multi-day recreationalists in the plan and more focus on quality rather than quantity tourism.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/12	Paragraphs need to be reorganised to reflect the statutes and General Policy requirements. Natural values should come before human appreciation of them.	re-organise the Vision to accurately reflect national park priorities as identified above.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/1	Your vision says nothing about supporting amateur New Zealanders in their long cherished recreational climbing space. Nothing.	Rewrite policy to include New Zealanders recreating in their own space.	
<i>Kilvington, Dr Margaret</i> 494/2	<p>Inconsistency between section 1.3.3 (increase in aircraft activity) and the espoused core values of the plan expressed in the introduction.</p> <p>Lack of recognition of changing views and values around tourism and climate change.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The economic sustainability of NZ's tourism industry relies on tourist who already travel great distances.</li> </ul> <p>Internationally there is growing awareness of the impact this has on climate change and NZ must show that it is responsive domestically if it is to maintain credibility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The future will bring many creative enterprises that more sustainably utilise the wonderful landscapes of the area and create meaningful experiences for visitors. The management should anticipate and move away from 'fast tourism' (those with limited time).</li> <li>- The introduction of the plan outlines core values of intrinsic worth that are not well defended by decisions (e.g. aircraft)</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Would like the plan to signal intentions to move away from the support of 'fast tourism' in preference for more sustainable tourism and recreational activities.</li> <li>2) Would like the plan to reflect a recognition of the importance of contributing to the national endeavour to address climate change and emissions reductions in decisions about concessions for various activities within the park.</li> <li>3) Greater consistency between decisions to provide for recreation and tourism and the core intrinsic values of the park as expressed in the introductory paragraphs (NP's are held for their intrinsic worth- that ..enjoyment of them should be on nature's terms): the importance of signalling what we value.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>- Decisions on air access are expressing that gaining income from tourist and entertainment needs in short term are more important than the spiritual, cultural and environmental values of Aoraki/Mt Cook. This, in turn, will be reflected in the respect with which visitors treat Aoraki.</p>		
<p><i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/1</p>	<p>I oppose the Vision statement (p16) "New Zealand is the greatest living space on earth" and the stretch goals and key priorities. These goals appear loose, vague and irrelevant, and depart from the purpose of the NPAct legislation which requires DOC to preserve NZ's National Parks, on behalf of the public of NZ, in perpetuity, for their intrinsic worth as set out in Part 1 of the National Parks Act.</p>	<p>No specific decision sought.</p>	
<p><i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/8</p>	<p>I support the section, A Vision for Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park, completely.</p>	<p>Implement the vision for Aoraki Mt Cook National Park in all parts of the management plan.</p>	
<p><i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/1</p>	<p>I support the general vision of Part One however this is an opportunity to be bold and address the whole purpose of the park and restore it to the original values of the Conservation Act (Section 6e "That the use of any natural or historic resource for recreation is not inconsistent with its conservation, to foster the use of natural or historical resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism"). In other words put conservation first - including the values expressed by Kai Tahu in this document. This must also line up with Treaty of Waitangi obligations and the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act. Here is an opportunity to support reducing some of mankind's climate change effects by limiting rental vehicles into the park, charging foreign nationals to enter (which would mean a change to the National Parks Act), and limit air travel within the park among other things. This could make the park meaningful for all people not mainly for tourists and commercial operators as it is now.</p>	<p>Support general vision but put conservation first. Not tourists or commercial operators.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/6</p>	<p>TIA generally supports Vision statement for the Park - particularly endorse the focus on preservation of the Park's intrinsic values and on resilience, sustainability and responsiveness - believe it lacks sufficient emphasis on the important role of the Park in enriching peoples' lives through outdoor recreation.</p>	<p>1. Amend the Vision to include reference to the important role of the Park in ensuring that the lives of New Zealanders and visitors are enriched by inspiring and enjoyable outdoor recreation experiences. 2. Remove the statement regarding pressures from visitors and replace with: "... Responding to changing hazards and opportunities from</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>- believe that the focus on visitor pressure is a management issues and not suited to inclusion in the vision</p>	<p>natural processes and visitors."</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/1</p>	<p>The final passage in the vision statement for the Park is 'New Zealanders care deeply about the Park and take pride in sharing its special values with international visitors.'</p> <p>No aspect of the vision statement includes any recognition of the importance of recreational activities in Aoraki Mt Cook. For nearly 140 years, Aoraki has been the drawcard of New Zealand mountaineering, the training ground for Sir Edmund Hillary, and the scene of nationally important tales of personal achievement and heroism (the race for the first ascent by locals against visiting climbers, Gough and Glasgow's first ascent of the Caroline Face, Inglis and Doole's rescue). The Park is where countless thousands, however lofty their goals, have been inspired by this history and become motivated to experience this outstanding alpine region for themselves; Aoraki remains the preeminent training ground for New Zealand mountaineers and alpine skiers.</p> <p>It is inappropriate that the Plan places the values of international visitors over and above the cultural importance of the area for New Zealanders themselves. This issue of misplaced priority pervades the entire plan.</p>	<p>A more appropriate statement could be "All visitors care deeply about the Park, particularly in terms of its sacred value to Māori, and also its cultural importance for the sport of mountaineering. Visitors take pride in these special values."</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/3</p>	<p>Submits that there is inadequate reference to the National Parks Act (1980) and the Conservation Act (1987) in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>-The National Parks Act is only briefly mentioned with regards to the purpose of National Parks (page 14) which is concerned with 'Preservation'. But even that section does not include the crucial title "Parks to be maintained in natural state, and public to have right of entry."</p> <p>The tone of the Plan would be strengthened and better balanced by the inclusion of parts of NPA 1980, 4 (2).</p> <p>- Include reference to CA (6): "to the extent that the use of any natural..their use for tourism."</p> <p>Have the view that this establishes a hierarchy in which recreation sits above tourism with regards to priorities. Note that the word 'foster' is far more proactive than 'allow'.</p> <p>The Draft Plan is heavily skewed towards catering to</p>	<p>Strengthen and better balance tone of the draft with inclusion of parts of NPA 1980 (section 4 (2) and CA 1987 (section 6 e).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>and managing the flow of International Tourists in and around the National Park. The interests of the New Zealand Recreation Community have been diminished throughout the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Submit that it is not the role of the Department to meet the demand of International Tourism, but rather supply opportunities for International Tourism only in accordance with The Conservation Act (1987), The National Parks Act (1980) and the General Policy for National Parks (2005).</p>		
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/2</p>	<p>The final passage in the vision statement for the Park is "New Zealanders care deeply about the Park and take pride in sharing its special values with international visitors." No aspect of the vision statement includes any recognition of the importance of recreational activities in Aoraki Mt Cook. For nearly 140 years, Aoraki has been the drawcard of New Zealand mountaineering, the training ground for Sir Edmund Hillary, and the scene of nationally important tales of personal achievement and heroism.</p> <p>It is inappropriate that the Plan places the values of international visitors over and above the cultural importance of the area for New Zealanders themselves. This issue of misplaced priority pervades the entire plan.</p>	<p>A more appropriate statement could be "All visitors care deeply about the Park, particularly in terms of its sacred value to Māori, and also its cultural importance for the sport of mountaineering. Visitors take pride in these special values."</p>	
<p><i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/1</p>	<p>Support the last 3 paragraphs under Vision. Sadly, much of the draft plan is contrary to them, especially protection of intrinsic values, managing visitor pressures, natural hazards and climate change.</p>	<p>Retain the Vision and amend the plan to implement it.</p>	
<p><i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/2</p>	<p>We are concerned that the draft plan for Aoraki Mt Cook National Park does not place sufficient emphasis on the use and enjoyment of the park, but in many places seems to regard visitors as a problem to be managed, rather than a fundamental purpose of the park. For example in the Vision statement which heads the draft plan:</p> <p>"The Park's indigenous nature is thriving and</p>	<p>Amend the Vision to address the issues raised</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>recognised for its internationally significant natural values and landscapes. Continued preservation of the intrinsic values defines any future development within the Park. Resilience and sustainability underpin all management decisions and practices within the Park, responding to changing hazards and pressures from natural processes and visitors."</p> <p>Protection and preservation of the natural landscape must be balanced with provision for access and enjoyment. Recreational (including tourism) values need to be more fully recognised and explicitly provided for in the plan. This access and enjoyment also needs to be controlled and monitored so that costs and benefits of recreational use are fairly allocated and shared.</p>		
<p><i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/8</p>	<p>Strongly support the entire vision statement, but in particular the quoted part: "It is a place where people experience the beauty and delight of the mountain environment in a way that inspires them and increases their connection to it, including feeling the mana of the Kāi Tahu ancestor Aoraki and his wider whānau." In order for people to be able to appreciate the environment they are in, to form a connection and to respect it, they need to be able to spend quality time there. Ensure this vision is adequately supported by policy. Currently there is a large allocation for aircraft-intensive quick-stop visitors completing a must-do tick list - it is questionable as to how this type of tourism supports the vision statement and values of the park. There needs to be more support and encouragement of multi-day recreationalists in the plan and more focus on quality rather than quantity tourism.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to address the concerns raised. Ensure that this vision statement is adequately supported by policy.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/8</p>	<p>Strongly support the entire vision statement, but in particular the quoted part: "It is a place where people experience the beauty and delight of the mountain environment in a way that inspires them and increases their connection to it, including feeling the mana of the Kāi Tahu ancestor Aoraki and his wider whānau." In order for people to be able to appreciate the environment they are in, to form a connection and to respect it, they need to be able to spend quality time</p>	<p>Amend the plan to address the concerns raised. Ensure that this vision statement is adequately supported by policy.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>there. Ensure this vision is adequately supported by policy.</p> <p>Currently there is a large allocation for aircraft-intensive quick-stop visitors completing a must-do tick list - it is questionable as to how this type of tourism supports the vision statement and values of the park. There needs to be more support and encouragement of multi-day recreationalists in the plan and more focus on quality rather than quantity tourism.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Vision National long - term vision</b>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/2</p>	<p>Page 15 para 3, 2nd sentence states "In doing so, it requires the Department to build empathy, trust and understanding ..."</p> <p>The actions of the Department have been at odds with this worthy aspiration by recent actions, such as increasing bare ground rentals on village sites, creating obstructions to concession building operations, applying different concession processes to smaller operators etc.DOC actions need to work by good will rather than by trickery.</p>	<p>That the management plan notes that Departmental aspirations are intended to be affordable to those people who overcome barriers to live and work in the village and provide valuable services for visitors.</p>	
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/13</p>	<p>The NP Act does not mandate economic references and they have no place in this plan.</p>	<p>Remove or amend the paragraph beginning "Conservation protects New Zealand's natural capital ..." to eliminate economic references.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/2</p>	<p>The Department's Statement of Intent is not a planning document. The reference to the Statement when other statutory documents are not mentioned is inappropriate and confusing..</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete references to the Statement of Intent in the first sentence and delete all other references in the draft document.</li> <li>2. In the 2nd paragraph make reference to the CMS.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Cancer Society of New Zealand, Canterbury West Coast Division</i> 773/1</p>	<p>The Smokefree 2025 goal requires strong leadership across many sectors. Embedding smokefree practise into the priorities within the Draft Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park Management Plan would help towards many outcomes for Aoraki/ Mount Cook area and help to preserve the 'outstanding natural values of the park'. Many iconic national parks internationally, have embraced smokefree policies to preserve their areas of outstanding natural beauty (New South Wales, Yellowstone, Queensland), In the draft Plans own inspired words like Aoraki, reaching 'towards the sky, standing taller than all others' taking leadership for a voluntary smokefree designation demonstrates a partnership in leadership that 'strives for excellence, pushing through obstacles to achieve things that</p>	<p>Endorsing the Smokefree 2025 goal in partnership with Kāi Tahu kaitiaki rūnaka, and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and embed this within key priorities, particularly in those areas which would enrich the outdoor experience of visitors to Aoraki/ Mount Cook. Such endorsement could contribute towards Kāi Tahu commitment to explore and develop opportunities to support intergenerational wellbeing. (P18) in a way that aligns to 'A living Treaty partnership based on shared values' (p19).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>previously seemed out of reach.’</p> <p>Embedding a commitment to the smokefree 2025 goal within:            -"New Zealanders and our visitors are enriched by outdoor experiences."            Doc Huts are already smokefree (voluntary policy) so widening out the smokefree policy to areas used by the public such as walk routes would be consistent and would seek to strengthen smokefree leadership.            -"The diversity of our heritage is maintained and restored'            Smokefree is aligned with and would contribute to this outcome. Cigarette butt litter is hazardous to wildlife, ecosystems and contributes to fire risk. Cigarette butts contain hazardous chemicals, when a butt is discarded, these chemicals can leach into the environment, contaminating our waterways and land.            Extending smokefree areas would also support the ‘protection of recreational freshwater fisheries and freshwater fish habitats in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park’ (P34) Cigarettes can also be ingested by wildlife.            Cancer Society would urge all partners and leaders to voluntarily designate public gathering spaces including car parks, lookouts, picnic areas and shelters and designated walk routes, as smoke free supported by visible smoke free signage.            Also asks for more prominent stand-alone smoke free signage at DOC huts to promote their smoke free status.</p>		
<p><i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/2</p>	<p>Regarding pp15-16 much of the section is irrelevant to the NPMP. The SOI is not necessarily consistent with the NPA and General Policy, as it is a political document. The diagram on p16 is not appropriate.</p>	<p>Delete pp15-16. Replace with more legally appropriate wording such as the paragraphs fully setting out the legislative context i.e. National Parks Act, General Policy and Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy.</p>	
<p><i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/2</p>	<p>Fully support the Department's long term stretch goals and key priorities.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/1</p>	<p>Stretch goals and Key priorities:            We note and endorse the Department’s goals to 2025 in the introduction to the draft plan which include goals that 50% of international visitors come to New Zealand to connect with our natural places, and 90% of New Zealanders have their lives enriched through connection with nature. Our National Parks are essential to these experiences.</p>	<p>Retain the Stretch goals as identified</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/3	DOC's future vision of New Zealand as 'the greatest living space on earth'. DOC's mandate is conservation and recreation, and seems to us to be having difficulty enough fulfilling its statutory obligations without becoming distracted by any lofty and gratuitous vision of its own. DOC should remember that it has no mandate in key areas influencing the "greatness" of a country such as education, health, social policy and justice, and should not be distracted from its statutory functions. Furthermore, it is certainly not for any government department to reduce New Zealand's statehood to some kind of global one-upmanship contest to be the "greatest". We have raised this in a previous submission and are unimpressed that DOC has not seen fit even to pass comment.	Review the Vision statement in light of the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>A living Treaty Partnership</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/14	Traditional management should only be incorporated into present management practices where it is consistent with up-to-date relevant technical expertise.. Protection of intrinsic worth should be an explicit priority of this section.	Reword objective, policies and milestones to include the above concerns.	
<i>Buchan, George</i> 475/1	New Zealand's true founding document is Queen Victoria's Royal Charter/ Letters Patent of 16- 11-1840, ratified 03-05-1841, the day New Zealand was born. This Royal Charter carries no mention of the Treaty of Waitangi, leaving the history of the ToW inside the boundaries of NSW. New Zealand's true founding document, Queen Victoria's Royal Charter/ Letters Patent of 16- 11-1840, ratified 03-05-1841, gave us our first constitution and English law only where all British subjects are treated equally within the law. There is no racial governance within English law, none. I submit that New Zealand's true founding document be given the recognition it deserves by using it to replace the illegal Treaty of Waitangi and have all Ngai Tahu Treaty of Waitangi rights withdrawn on legal grounds.	I submit Ngai Tahu be given no rights unavailable to other New Zealander's.	
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/1	Concern this not balanced in the past by actions eg moving statue of Sir Ed to inside café. Boundary. Visitors do not have access	Decision not stated.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/4	Support A living treaty partnership including Objective 1 and policies 1 - 3.	Retain Objective 1 and policies 1 - 3.	
<i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/7	<p>SCDHB supports the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park management plans explicit focus on the importance of the area to Kāi Tahu, and obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi.</p> <p>Nationally, there are huge inequities in smoking rates, with Māori being overrepresented in both smoking prevalence and negative health outcomes. Māori smoking prevalence is 35%, compared with 16% for the general population. Māori mortality rates from lung cancer are 60 per 100,000, compared with 19.7 per 100,000 for non-Māori. Reducing Māori smoking rates is one of the most important ways to improve Māori health and enhance intergenerational wellbeing.</p> <p>Smokefree environments are also in keeping with Kāi Tahu values, including Manaakitanga (looking after our people). The Kāi Tahu people maintain a strong connection to the Aoraki area, so protecting this environment is an integral part of treaty obligations.</p>	Ban smoking in AMCNP	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/5	<p>Regarding Milestones 1,4 and 6: Mana whenua involvement in the management of their taoka is accepted. However some of the provisions appear to exceed the Minister and Director-General's powers of delegation under ss 57 and 58 of the Conservation Act 1987 such as the extent of the shared decision-making. The practicality of implementing this is questioned, requiring a dual management structure that is costly and inefficient.</p>	Amend to be consistent with s 43 of the NPA and review partnership references to be consistent with legislation.	
<i>Carr, Anna</i> 808/2	I support the involvement of in the preparation of the Plan (in partnership with the Department and the Board) and the way the Plan enables Kai Tahu, as mana whenua, to be kaitiaki in the Park.		
<i>Carnaby, Penny</i> 813/3	Support the proposed co-management of the park between DOC and Kai Tahu.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/4	Support all Objectives and Policies outlined in 'a living Treaty Partnership based on shared values for the benefit of Aotearoa New Zealand'.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Hāpai te Hauora Tapui Limited</i> 831/2</p>	<p>Hāpai Te Hauora (referred to as Hāpai) affirms the right to good health and wellbeing enshrined in Te Tiriti o Waitangi, and that whānau Māori, hapū and iwi have the right to good health.</p> <p>We believe that having a strong management plan for our land is necessary in ensuring that we have standards as a collective of which we can hold ourselves accountable.</p> <p>We advocate for policy that protects all whānau who enter Aoraki from the effects of second-hand smoke. Such a policy partially fulfils Crown obligations in guaranteeing Māori the same right to health as non-Māori..</p> <p>We recommend that Aoraki national Park be completely smoke-free.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to be cognisant of Māori culture and world views, and to incorporate the best evidence of Māori wellbeing, in accordance with Te Tiriti o Waitangi.</p> <p>Ensure that the Aoraki national park is completely smoke-free.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>A living Treaty Partnership Treaty of Waitangi and Treaty partner obligations</b>		
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/2</p>	<p>Translation of Te Reo: Limited provision of English translation in this section compared to other sections of the draft Plan. Recognises direct translation is not necessarily appropriate or possible in every situation. Understands that the Glossary does provide definitions of words and phrases. However, Section 1.1.1 Who is Aoraki provides many translations/definitions.</p>	<p>Review and see where further translation can be provided within this section of the Plan to enable easier use by those who do not understand Te Reo.</p> <p>Possibly providing footnotes, and/or hyperlinks for the electronic version (of the operative Plan) to the glossary or definition.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/14</p>	<p>Support the Plan giving life to Iwi's role as treaty partner in administering the Plan.</p> <p>The Plan should also acknowledge that Iwi may have a commercial interest in the Park and that where this occurs it must be given due regard in how Iwi fulfil their administrative role.</p>	<p>Amend Plan to reflect the issues raised</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>A living Treaty Partnership Objective 1</b>		
<p><i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/4</p>	<p>The stated objective of a shared partnership needs to be completely inclusive of, and to the benefit of, all New Zealanders..</p> <p>The NZDA has had a partnership with the National Parks Board and subsequently DOC for 60+ years as regards facilities in the Park. This has been, and is, of a positive nature and mutually beneficial to the Park, Park users and the local economy.</p> <p>The NZDA wishes to be included among the groups to be consulted, from the outset, as having a vested interest due to our historical connections to the Park and our on-going contribution to the Park and the work of DOC</p>	<p>Amend the plan to recognise the issues raised</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/2	The Department's application of its Treaty responsibilities as outlined in the General Policy and contained in Appendix 1 is supported.	Support Objective 1.	
<i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/5	Support this objective - particularly decision making, honouring the treat settlement, and true katiakitanga of the physical, heritage, cultural and other aspects of the park.	Retain objective	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/3	Regarding Objective 1 a) Mana whenua involvement in the management of their taoka is accepted. However some of the provisions appear to exceed the Minister and Director-General's powers of delegation under ss 57 and 58 of the Conservation Act 1987 such as "enable mana whenua rakatirataka".	Amend to be consistent with s 43 of the NPA and review partnership references to be consistent with legislation.	
<i>Hāpai te Hauora Tapui Limited</i> 831/3	Objective 1(e), Policies and Milestones: Environmental wellbeing is one measure of whānua wellbeing. Māori world-views place value on the environment and the values that underpin kaitiakitanga. Māori are trustees for future generations and guardians, especially in connection with land and the environment. A good outcome for environmental wellbeing will therefore be one where the value of physical resources accrues so that future generations can enjoy an expanded Māori estate.	Review the policies and milestones to reflect the concerns raised above.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>A living Treaty Partnership Policy 1</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/5	Policy 1(b)(i): This appears to put Ngāi Tahu in a position of power over other concessionaires, which raises them to a level of government without being voted into power by the people. Also Ngāi Tahu has commercial interests of their own, so they could be seen to have a vested interest that is detrimental to other applicants who do not have the same advantages.	Ensure all applicants are treated fairly in evaluations of authorisations. Delete Milestone 1 and replace with: "Developed mechanisms to consult in liaison with Kāi Tahu, while ensuring such consultation is transparent and fair to all." Amend Milestone 6 to align.	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/1	Supports the Department's application of its Treaty responsibilities as outlined in the General Policy for National Parks 2005 and contained in Appendix 1 of the Draft Plan. Have some concerns, however, in relation to some parts of the Draft Plan that intend to give effect to kaitiakitanga in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park. In particular, the reference to "shared consideration of authorisation applications"(Policy 1 b) creates the potential for conflict of interest given that Ngai Tahu is, or may become, a commercial tourism operator in the	While we support Objectives 1 (a-f), we oppose the current wording of Policy 1b(i) on the grounds that it may give decision-making powers to parties who have or may have commercial interests in the Park. The Plan needs to be amended to ensure that all references to joint decision-making within the Park are free of the potential for conflict of interest. The Plan should make explicit reference to the exclusion from any Park decision-making role of Ngai Tahu where Ngai Tahu has a commercial interest in the outcome of that decision, or may have such an interest, during the	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Park.</p> <p>The Draft Plan appears to elevate Ngai Tahu to joint-decision-maker in relation to matters beyond those considered by the Deed, the Conservation Act and the National Parks Act. Seeks clarity on the legal ramifications of this situation where a future decision made is reviewed or challenged by third parties. We submit that, where there is any possibility for a conflict of interest, Ngai Tahu ought to be excluded from a decision-making role</p>	<p>life of the Plan.</p>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/3</p>	<p>Generally supportive of the intended active management partnership between DOC and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and kaitiaki rūnaka (to represent all of Kāi Tahu), provided there is transparency and fairness in processes and procedures.</p> <p>Appreciates that the approach through the objectives, policies and milestones set out in the draft Plan are an evolution of how the parties have related in the past on management policies and decisions.</p> <p>Have some reservations over the shared management and decision making framework and the policies that relate to consideration and decision making for authorisation applications (Policy 1(b)), the statutory basis for this level of shared management, and the milestones for development of the new mechanisms. Greatest concern over developing this framework and implementation of it, is decisions being made in a timely manner, transparency and consistency of process, and any conflict of interest being tabled.</p> <p>The potential impact (unintended or not) of this approach on other stakeholders of the national park is unidentified and unknown.</p> <p>It also raises the question; what will happen in the interim, prior to the framework being developed? Specifically in the circumstance of an authorisation application submitted for consideration [in the meantime], what is the process prior to the mechanisms for shared consideration of authorisations being developed and for the Minister to make a decision? Will it be status quo?</p> <p>Wishes to understand if in the instance there is disagreement between the Department of Conservation and Kāi Tahu on management matters, how this will be addressed within the shared management framework?</p>	<p>Clarify the statutory basis for Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu to have shared decision making for authorisation applications. Stakeholders require some surety and security of the statutory authorisation processes they already engage in. Develop and implement a protocol that will keep those stakeholders and parties who will be affected informed about the development of the framework and mechanisms. Once the framework and mechanisms have been developed make these publicly available so other stakeholders and operators are able to understand the process and requirements fully.</p>	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/1	Policy 1 b) i) The reference to "shared consideration of authorisation applications" creates the potential for conflict of interest given that Ngai Tahu is, or may become a commercial tourism operator in the Park. The draft Plan appears to elevate Ngai Tahu to joint decision-maker in relation to matters beyond those considered by the Deed, the Conservation Act and the National Parks Act. Clarity is needed on the legal ramifications of this situation where a future decision made is reviewed by third parties. Where there is any possibility for a conflict of interest, Ngai Tahu ought to be excluded from a decision-making role.	Amend to ensure that all references to joint decision-making within the Park are free of the potential for conflict of interest. Make explicit reference to the exclusion from any Park decision-making role of Ngai Tahu where Ngai Tahu has a commercial interest in the outcome of that decision, or may have such an interest during the life of the Plan.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/4	Regarding Policy 1 b) Mana whenua involvement in the management of their taoka is accepted. However some of the provisions appear to exceed the Minister and Director-General's powers of delegation under ss 57 and 58 of the Conservation Act 1987 such as "shared decision-making at all levels".	Delete the wording: "at all levels". Amend to be consistent with s 43 of the NPA and review partnership references to be consistent with legislation.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>A living Treaty Partnership Policy 2</b>		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/6	Regarding Policy 2 c) "Identify and implement measures to build Kāi Tahu capability and capacity.. training and employment opportunities" is this consistent with the Treaty legislation?	Amend to be consistent with s 4 and 43 of the NPA and review partnership references to be consistent with legislation. Review the legality of the department providing employment opportunities and devolved management confined to Kāi Tahu.	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/3	Regarding Policy 2 b) Support adding cultural criteria to the New Zealand World Heritage Area inscription to acknowledge and recognise the relationship Kai Tahu whanui have with Aoraki and his relations within the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park on an international stage, and further raise the profile of the World Heritage Area.	Retain text as written.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>A living Treaty Partnership Milestone 1</b>		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/4	Review and consider bringing forward the timeline for developing the mechanism for a shared decision making process and clarify in the Plan what the intention is for the interim (continue with status quo or other process, as has been done with other policies in the draft Plan). Considering the framework and mechanisms it is pertinent that there are enforceable timeframes to be included where appropriate.	Review and change timeline.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.1 Aoraki Matatu The Alpine Fault and climate change</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/8	Plan is not clear why DOC are planning a base at Birch Hill. Concessionaires should be given opportunity to be allotted space in this new area, and this new area must be declared safe from rock fall and landslide, otherwise the purpose for moving would be redundant..	Amend this section to: - Be clear and honest about the reason for the relocation of services and facilities so people can plan accordingly. - Include a statement that land will first be offered to current concessionaires. - Confirm that any site chosen is safe from future potential rock fall or landslides in the event of an earthquake.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/15	Korero: The wording of this korero needs to be revised. We question the prudence of language that suggests all people aspire to be leaders. While such a generalisation may have no direct impact on the management of the Park, its arguability has an indirect negative effect on the entire draft..	Amend the language of 1.1 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Hall, Susan &amp; Dunn, Kevin</i> 517/2	DOC should be taking a leading role to reduce the effects of climate change on landscapes and biodiversity.	Include the Paris Agreement on Climate Change and refer to the IPCC for scientific information. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing powered aircraft flights over the next 10 years to ensure peace and tranquility are maintained.	
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/13	Of major concern to Mackenzie Guardians is the adverse effect of climate change on the National Park. The retreat of glaciers and warmer temperatures will provide new opportunities for the incursion of pest and weed species and increase the spread of several key predators. Also concerned that the recession of glaciers and ice will drive the demand for access to the higher alpine environment by commercial operators. There are only two references to the precautionary approach in the draft Plan. These are in relation to the safety aspects of structures, utilities and facilities, and the replacement of bolts and fixed anchors in a climbing development area. Mackenzie Guardians are concerned that the degradation of New Zealand' s landscapes and indigenous biodiversity loss is occurring at pace and accelerating. See this plan as an opportunity to learn from the mistakes of other countries and produce policies that will 'protect the goose that lays the golden eggs' so to speak. If the loss continues on land with the highest preservation status in NZ, there is little hope of halting the decline elsewhere.	DOC should take a more precautionary approach when considering the cumulative effects of climate change and increased visitor pressure on landscapes and indigenous plants and wildlife in the Park. Once native species are lost, they are gone, forever.	
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/2	Seek that DOC take the lead on climate change to manage the potential adverse effects on the biodiversity	As in submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and landscapes of Aoraki National Park.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.1 Aoraki Matatu whakataukī</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/7	The whakataukī mentions early Kāi Tahu guides. My research suggests that earliest guide was 1905. The earliest New Zealand born mountain guide was Jack Adamson who played a key part in guiding in the 1800s. Consider the lack of mention of other guides is unbalanced and disrespectful. Noted that Sir Edmund Hillary didn't spend much time at Aoraki.	Provide a more balanced and accurate coverage of the early mountain guiding history as well as the first summiters of Aoraki - Jack Clarke, Tom Fyfe and George Graham. Identify the earliest NZ born mountain guide, Jack Adamson.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.1 Aoraki Matatu Who is Aoraki?</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/6	This section makes no mention of mountain and ski guides who spend their lives in these mountains and have a very close relationship with them spiritually, mentally and physically. Respect needs to be given to the mountain whānau.	Include mention of the mountain guiding whānau that have built their skills in this most challenging of mountain environments, to become the best in the world.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/9	Amend 3rd paragraph under 1.1.1 Who is Aoraki? From the second sentence, to be more accurate and balanced.	Amend as follows: "The highest peak in New Zealand, Aoraki/Mount Cook, and his surrounding peaks have drawn visitors from all over New Zealand and the world, for the challenge and beauty of their landscape. Canterbury explorer Julius von Haast ...Since that early colonial time, Aoraki/Mount Cook has been the centre point to attracting increasing numbers of visitors ranging from sightseers to dedicated mountaineers . Many great New Zealand and world explorers, European aristocracy, and the nineteenth century scientific community have had peaks named after them..." {the word 'also' should be deleted from this last sentence }	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.1 Aoraki Matatu The Alpine Fault and climate change</b>		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/2	When discussing climate change it is important to recognise that this has occurred due to anthropogenic carbon emissions and that reducing emissions is a priority to reduce the severity if future climate change. Adding this to the park plan is important as the plan has the ability to influence the degree of carbon emissions from the park.	Retain section 1.1.3 on climate change. Add to section 1.1.3 text to recognise that climate change is linked to anthropogenic carbon emissions and to highlight the need to mitigate emissions to help reduce future climate change.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.1 Aoraki Matatu Natural features</b>		
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/2	First paragraph states: "Aoraki and his whānau live in a spectacular and unique environment. The area within Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park is a narrow rectangular shape extending 65 km along Ka Tiritiri o te	Support the recognition of the whole glacial and braided river systems.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Moana /the Southern Alps, and out 15 km into Te Manahuna/Mackenzie Basin."</p> <p>Our members recognise the importance and connectedness of Aoraki/Mt Cook and the whole glacier and braided river systems that form Te Manahua/Mackenzie Basin. The Society is pleased the draft Plan recognises through the concept of ki uta ki tai that Aoraki is connected and a part of the wider Te Manahua/Mackenzie Basin.</p> <p>Much of Te Manahua/Mackenzie Basin area outside the National Park boundary is still critically under-protected, mainly as a result of the disconnect between governing agencies; Mackenzie Guardians look forward to the new alignment of agencies and integrated management of the whole area. The Guardians hope that a Mackenzie Drylands Park or Natural Heritage Area, linked to the National Park, can be achieved this year, and that the Basin's cultural and heritage values, its range of ecosystems and landscape types can be protected and preserved in perpetuity.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.1 Aoraki Matatu Recognition and protection</b>		
<p><i>Winkler, Prof. Dr. Stefan</i> 329/1</p>	<p>Support the recognition given to Aoraki in this section, however the plan doesn't mention that several internationally recognised key sites for the investigation of glacier and climate variability over the past 10,000 years are located within the Park. Providing access for future research at key sites is important for the international community to consolidate and increase knowledge within the fields of past, present and future environmental change.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to recognise the international significance of the Park as a key site for the study of past and present global environmental change, and the consideration of the necessity of research access. A number of changes proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend section 1.1.5 to include mention of international glacier and climate research significance, and the necessity of ongoing research access being provided.</li> <li>2. Amend Appendix 5 to include important sites for international glacial and climate research</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/1</p>	<p>Support the inclusion of the Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve in the considerations of this plan. The AMIDSR seeks to protect the values of the National Park through raising awareness of the natural values and processes of the Park.</p>	<p>Retain</p>	
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/10</p>	<p>Map 2 An important map putting AMCNP in context with other conservation lands. But the park boundary is not very obvious and the captioning is confusing.</p>	<p>Change the infill for AMCNP to pink , take 'boundary ' out of the caption and caption the yellow infill as 'Other national parks'.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/2	Support the importance of being part of the UNESCO South West New Zealand World Heritage Area being emphasised, and the proposal to add cultural criteria to the WHA inscription.	Add milestone to have cultural criteria added to WHA inscription.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2 Aoraki Huanui Rau</b>		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/1	<p>All other objectives, outcomes, policy and milestones in the draft must be measured against this statement</p> <p>The 'opportunity' to experience nature on its own terms must remain 'available into the future', and while the draft has made provision for this in the Pae Tawhiti Place, provision must also be made in the central part of the park amongst the biggest peaks in the Southern Alps. Under the current management plan this already exists in the Upper Hooker Valley.</p>	Retain and emphasise this statement	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/16	Self-reliant recreation that is consonant with the park's preservation in perpetuity for its intrinsic worth, should be addressed separately from commercial activity.	Amend the wording of the introduction to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/3	<p>New Subsection - Monitoring history and context: The plan should include a pop-out box that contextualises the monitoring of visitor use and visitor management over the life of the current plan, and how this has laid the groundwork for proposed changes presented in the draft plan. Milestones in the draft plan mentioning monitoring lack context and specificity. See section 14. Monitoring for further detail.</p>	Insert a new subsection that includes a pop-out box that captures the history of monitoring programmes in the Park and how those programmes justify the need for changes to visitor management zones and aircraft access.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/4	<p>The draft plan sets out five value categories being natural, cultural, historic, recreation and engagement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Forest &amp; Bird support natural, historic and cultural values as national park values</li> <li>2. We do not consider engagement a national park value. Engagement is a useful method to promote awareness and increase understanding of national park values.</li> <li>3. We are concerned that the line between recreation and tourism is blurred which has ramifications for the plan, especially where recreation has been identified as a cultural or historic national park values to be preserved.</li> <li>4. Recreation and tourism are management issues subject to the NPA purpose and to compatibility with preserving national park values. Fundamentally a</li> </ol>	Review the categories of values and their management as addressed in the concerns raised above.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	management plan is about controlling use to preserve specific values.		
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/16	Support the policies and objectives related to restoration and protection of natural heritage, but lack of integration with other parts of the plan is a major weakness. Lack of integration means that the draft plan isolates nature preservation from general management. The Department appears to focus on controlling supply of services to meet commercial demand rather than nature's terms. The effect of his is to erode national park values.	Integrate the objectives and policies in Part 1.2 throughout general management to ensure that management of activities in the Park contributes to achieving the natural values objectives in Part 1.2.1	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/2	The introductory section should cover more comprehensively, albeit briefly, topics relevant to the history, geology, flora/fauna of this NP. Needs to more on outdoor recreation in the park. AMCNP is a special place and the continuing centre for high climbing in NZ, the foundation for international mountaineering exploits and formative of our NZ outdoors character in many ways.	Amend the introductory section to include more information on: the history, geology, flora/fauna and outdoor recreation in the park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage</b>		
<i>Warner, James</i> 75/1	Management of Tahr. Work with hunters to ensure an acceptable outcome. Add and change policies as below.	Reword Policy 5: "Control introduced plants and animals in AMCNP, seeking eradication only where feasible in consultation with the public. Add Policy 8 b) "Undertake geographically widespread peer-reviewed monitoring of vegetation within AMCNP to assess the effects of tahr. Reword Policy 9: "Implement management programmes in consultation with hunting groups to manage tahr populations in accordance with the HTCP 1993." Retain Policy 10 in full. Reword Policy 13 a) "maintaining public access and safety including 4wd access along marked access routes".	
<i>Backes, Clare</i> 163/1	Section 1.2.1 Natural Heritage should state how DOC intends to preserve and protect the full range of indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems in a healthy functioning state	Amend text as in submission.	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/5	Support the need for Conservation Education and enforcement of the Park. Many visitors are ignorant of what is allowed in National Parks in New Zealand. DOC needs to do more to educate visitors.	There needs to be more engagement with visitors on what is expected of them in National Parks and Conservation areas. Increase signage in the National Park. Work with Air New Zealand to develop an in-flight educational video to help overseas visitors understand what is acceptable in out National Parks.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/17	References to "pest control" should be amended for accuracy and clarity to "pest and wild animal control". The distinction should always be made between "pests" and "wild animals", consistent with the definition of wild animals in the Wild Animal Control Act 1977. The zero policy for tahr numbers in the Park is generally considered unachievable because of the cost and scale of operation needed. The Plan needs to minimise disincentives to hunt within the Park, such as access to and use of Tahr Lodge. Rather than the zero-tahr policy for the Park (p.33, Objective 1(c) and Policy 9), it would be better to set less aggressive, more realistic goals for tahr control and stick to them. The Plan overstates the damage caused by tahr in the Park - nowhere is there any evidence of a reduction in abundance of native plants, or any extinctions. If Douglas fir, pine and larch have some heritage value (p.31), when will wild animals have such value as well as value for their worth for meat and trophy. The loss of opportunities to see tahr in the Park would be regretted.	Amend the plan to distinguish between "pest" and "wild animal" as identified in the submission. Amend the plan to address the range of concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/20	Should be an additional policy to policy 6 to prohibit the feeding of exotic plant species to pastoral animals in the Park.	Include a new policy to prohibit the feeding of exotic plant species to pastoral animals within the Park, effective immediately.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/22	Milestones: Should consider short and longer-term milestones for the effective management of pest guilds/ecology, and if of benefit to the Park should be included in the plan.	Consider the benefit of including milestones for the study and effective management of pest guilds within the plan.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/23	Milestones: Ensure all milestones are in accordance with section 4(2) of the National Parks Act 1980.	Review all milestones and amend where necessary to ensure accordance with Section 4(2)(b) of the National Parks Act 1980.	
<i>Stäger, Ines</i> 653/4	Regarding Climate change; support a proactive approach in maintaining and preserving indigenous biodiversity; urgency and a long term view are necessary to not only avoid further loss, but also avoid a higher burden on future generations.	Implement a long term view/strategy regarding climate change	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/5	Supportive of this section, providing the public and stakeholders with the priorities for natural heritage management. Feel encouraged to consider opportunities as a stakeholder of the national park to work cooperatively to restore and/or maintain indigenous species and habitats.	Retain objectives and policies within this section of the Plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Costello, Margaret</i> 694/1	The protection of native fauna and flora and their habitats should be the primary purpose for the National Park, but that does not come across as the main feature in this draft.	Amend the plan to take concerns from conservationists and scientists about the provisions included, or not included, in this area seriously.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/25	A policy needs to be included that seeks to identify macroinvertebrate species and abundance in waterways at places within the Park, and that uses the MCI as an indicator of instream health.	Include a new policy to address the matters raised	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/26	Forest & Bird support objectives and policies in 1.2.1 for wild animal control and pest management.  Support proposal to work cooperatively with others and reinforce the need for integration of pest management.	Retain policies and objectives as written	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/9	The ecological milestones are disappointing; merely monitoring and reporting.	Amend milestones to Include targets for reduction of tahr, removal of cattle and pest plant removal as well as threatened species action plans.	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/1	Ask that the department provide the highest level of conservation to conserve and protect Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park's natural resources and heritage.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/6	I endorse the Department's commitment for enhancing the protection of the threatened species mentioned in the Draft Plan. Support all objectives, policies and milestones under 'Natural Heritage'.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc - Nelson-Tasman Branch</i> 827/3	There is a lack of information and interpretation of cultural and biodiversity values which would enable greater understanding and respect for the important values of the park.	Information could be provided beyond the boundaries of the park so that visitors can experience these while having a great mountain view.	
<i>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc - Nelson-Tasman Branch</i> 827/5	Pest weed and animal control priorities need to be established to provide protection of natural values.	Establish Pest weed and animal control priorities.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/8	All policies: ECO opposes the approach taken in the policies in section 1.2.1 for the following reasons: a) It isn't consistent with the National Parks Act Section 4 Parks to be maintained in natural state, and public to have right of entry. This section states that the public have entry and access to the Park unless restrictions	ECO seek the following additions to section 1.2.1 policies to address the issues raised: a) Explain the conditions under which the public wouldn't have entry or access to the Park because of restrictions put in place to protect indigenous flora/fauna. Also provide detail as to how the Park will be maintained in its natural state, and how it will be protected for its intrinsic worth	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>exist to protect flora/fauna. There is no acknowledgement of any circumstances that would restrict the public from having entry or access to the Park. There is no detail about how the Park will be maintained in its natural state, and protected for its intrinsic worth (section 4.1).</p> <p>b) There are no specifics on biosecurity controls, and weed, pathogen and predator control for the Park.</p>	<p>(section 4.1), rather than for human use or extractive purposes. We are considering intrinsic worth to include ecosystem functions, bio-physical processes, flora and fauna, and ecological interactions.</p> <p>b) Provide detailed information for biosecurity controls, and weed, pathogen and predator control for the Park. ECO does not support the introduction of genetically modified organisms into the Park's ecosystems.</p>	
<p><i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/3</p>	<p>Policies 1 - 14: Support the policies as written Special focus on the eradication of geese, goats, deer, non-indigenous fish - especially sports fish, introduced plants</p>	<p>Retain 1.2.1 Policies 1 - 14</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Intro</b></p>		
<p><i>Ross, Fraser</i> 508/2</p>	<p>The park is home to several threatened species, including kea, rock wren and jewelled gecko. As well as special indigenous native fish and unusual plants, strands of native beech forest and rata trees. The focus of the draft plan is not biodiversity but providing for tourism and recreation.</p>	<p>This is totally unacceptable and that misplaced focus should be reconsidered by rewriting those parts of the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/5</p>	<p>Support the Department prioritising ecosystem management by identifying a number of ecosystem management units that collectively represent the full range of terrestrial and freshwater diversity in New Zealand, within the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park due to their high ecological value and the presence of rare or threatened species and ecosystems</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/5</p>	<p>ECO draws the attention of DoC and the Conservation Authority to the IUCN Recommendation WCC_2016_102_EN, passed at the 2016 World Congress of the members of IUCN, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. New Zealand is one of the Government members of this body, as are a number of New Zealand NGOs.</p> <p>Consistent with this IUCN Recommendation especially operative paragraphs 1-4, ECO submits the following additions to the National Park Management Plan as rules that apply across the whole of the National Park:</p> <p>1. Mineral activity including prospecting, exploration and mining and associated activities are prohibited in,</p>	<p>Amend section 1.2.1 to address the concerns raised</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>on or under the National Park, as is any industrialisation of the Park from any industrial or industrial scale activities or infrastructure, since these are inconsistent with sections 4 and 5 of the National Parks Act.</p> <p>2. No genetically modified organisms or materials may be introduced or allowed to stray into the National Park.</p> <p>* Note - a copy of this IUCN Recommendation WCC_2016_102_EN has been attached,</p>		
<p><i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/6</p>	<p>ECO has raised a number of issues in relation to section 1.2.1:</p> <p>1. "Ecosystem management units":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the plan doesn't provide any detail regarding the type of ecosystems comprising the ecosystem management units described, or acknowledge the presence of any sensitive habitat and/or rare/threatened flora &amp; fauna within the units and their location on a map.</li> <li>- the plan provides no information as to how the units will be managed, what the overlap is with human use, potential threats to the units, and what the management &amp; conservation goals are.</li> <li>- section 1.2.1 has little consistency with the Historic &amp; cultural heritage section. This section includes a table identifying (what we are guessing to be) high priority historic places - Table 1 Actively-conserved historic places. It would be effective to also include a table like this for all of the ecosystem management units, including priority units.</li> </ul> <p>2. "Priority ecosystem units":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the plan doesn't explain why the Godley and Tasman rivers have been ranked as priority ecosystem management units.</li> <li>- the plan contains no details as to how the units will be managed, what the overlap is with human use, potential threats to the units, and what the management &amp; conservation goals are.</li> </ul>	<p>Address the concerns raised by making the following additions to the text of section 1.2.1:</p> <p>a) Clearly identify the ecosystem(s) comprising the ecosystem management units, along with any associated sensitive habitat and/or rare/threatened flora &amp; fauna. Reword to read "the following ecosystems comprise the four different management units within and adjacent to Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park: riverine, wetland, alpine, montane etc."</p> <p>Also depict said units &amp; locations of any sensitive habitat and/or rare/threatened flora &amp; fauna on Map 3 Ecosystem priorities. We suggest changing the name of Map 3 to Ecosystem management units, as this is a slightly broader title that will also encompass the Priority ecosystem management units.</p> <p>Also, on the map's key, change 'other ecosystem units' to ecosystem management units, and change the colour of 'priority ecosystem units' to red in both the key and map.</p> <p>b) Explain how the units will be managed, including managing for human use (limiting human access where necessary) and potential threats, particularly those threats to threatened/at-risk/endemic plants/animals &amp;/or sensitive habitat. Also explain the conservation &amp; management goals/objectives for each ecosystem management unit.</p> <p>c) Create a table for all ecosystem management units, including priority units, similar to Table 1 Actively-conserved historic places, on page 38. Reword column 3 Heritage topics and significance to read "Biological/environmental topics &amp; significance"</p> <p>d) Explain why the Godley and Tasman rivers have been ranked as priority ecosystem management units. What</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		<p>makes them priority units? Is this because of sensitive habitat and/or rare or threatened species?</p> <p>e) Explain how the units will be managed, including managing for human use (limiting human access where necessary) and potential threats, particularly those to threatened/at-risk/endemic plants/animals &amp;/or sensitive habitat. Also explain the conservation &amp; management goals/objectives for each ecosystem management unit.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Fauna</b>		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/1	Support this paragraph, however, this plan does little to address the threats to the fauna of Aoraki / Mount Cook National Park. DOC keeps allowing more aircraft movements into our backcountry, without looking into the effect they have on kea.	DOC needs to work with universities and instigate studies on the effect of aircraft on our wildlife, then adopt the findings in the planning of aircraft movements in the Park.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/9	Page 31, para 2 states that 'protection of these threatened species will be a priority for the department ...' This needs to be achieved without the use of toxic chemicals.	Amend para 2 to read: Enhancing the protection of these threatened species, through non--toxic means, using methods that cause no harm, will be a priority for the Department ..."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Pest plants and animals</b>		
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/2	By omission of a statement regarding GAC in this section the plan is omitting a statutory legal organisation from the discussion.	Reword to include GAC with same importance as Kai Tahu and state legal requirements.	
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/3	No policy can be implemented if there is no evidence back that it is a sensible science based policy. The 1993 Tahr plan is not evidence based and is based on at latest 1993 dated speculation.	Reword to acknowledge that browsing animals may not also have an affect on ecosystems as previously existed. Recognise that even Moa as a native animal browsed as DOC's own information on their website says this.	
<i>Snoyink, Jules</i> 228/4	Support eradicating pest plants and animals from the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/10	<p>In order to protect native species, and to protect what is downstream, then protection of the current water treatment through the successful UV should be mentioned.</p> <p>Organic pest control methods should be used wherever possible - no 1080, Roundup. Allow for creative uses of pests.</p>	<p>Amend section 1.2.1 "Pest plants and animals" to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Consultation with local residents who have their home at Aoraki in regard to any form of pest control.</li> <li>2. Immediately employ trappers at MCNP, with the new digitally monitored traps, to eradicate pests in the area.</li> <li>3. An intention to form a group of entrepreneurs who could assist the Department and the Rūnanga in brainstorming and additional non-toxic ways pests can be brought under control to protect the native flora and fauna without poisoning this sacred environment and also helping NZers in such a goal.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		4. Keep the water free of added poisons.	
<i>Mark, Dr Alastair</i> 267/1	Support eradication of all exotic flora and fauna, especially tahr.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/9	I support the eradication of all pest weed and tree species including gorse, broom and wilding trees. I support lupins being added to the pest species list for eradication in the National Park and connected areas of the Mackenzie Basin, and in the internationally significant braided river beds. I support the eradication of pest animal species in the Park including possums, mustelids, rats, cats, wasps and other new threats such as wallabies. I believe DOC should step up the eradication of the pest species present in the park.	DOC should step up the eradication of the pest species present in the park.	
<i>Hall, Susan &amp; Dunn, Kevin</i> 517/3	We support DOC's aim to establish landscape scale pest control and weed eradication programmes. Wilding conifers and lupins are a major concern and continuing efforts are required.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Jolly, James N.</i> 530/1	Spur-winged plover and harrier are protected native species not pest species. Black-backed gull is native but not a protected species and can be a serious predator of native fauna and not just exhibiting aggressive behaviour as stated.	Correct wording. Retain magpie as pest species and add black-backed gull.	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/1	Strongly support the landscape scale approach outlined in the plan. Noted extraordinary numbers of possums, rabbits, cats and stoats on my frequent visits to the park. It is my understanding that no routine possum control is undertaken in Aroarokahe place. These are particularly visible at night, and I have seen possums on the moraine wall on the west side of the Hooker lake on multiple occasions. Cats are visible in the day time around Mt Cook village and in the White Horse Hill area.	Amend Section 1.2.1 Policies- to contain specific reference pest animal control in Aroarokahe Place.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/1	1. Pest plants and animals, para3 page 131: Contains an incorrect statement saying that Mount Cook homestead at White Horse Hill.  2. page 32, para 3 reference to "Sheep and cattle graze the river flats along the Tasman River, occasionally straying into the lower reaches of the National Park ..." This is not correct - there has been no grazing since 2014.	1. Reword the last paragraph, page 31 to read: "Douglas fir, pine and larch, initially planted around the original Hermitage site at White Horse Hill, ..."  2. Remove reference to sheep and cattle grazing the river flats	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/2	Agree with 1.2.1 Natural Heritage and pleased to note that Climate Change and its effects on Flora and Fauna are acknowledged. The objectives cover this.		
<i>Environment Canterbury</i> 743/2	Support the consistency of provisions between the draft plan and the Environment Canterbury Regional Pest Management Plan to manage pest species and recommend coordination of activities between agencies within and adjacent to the National Park.	Recommend recognition of incursion pathways such as vehicles, contaminated machinery and aggregate.	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/2	Strongly support the landscape scale approach outlined in the plan. Noted extraordinary numbers of possums, rabbits, cats and stoats on my frequent visits to the park. It is my understanding that no routine possum control is undertaken in Aroarokahe place. These are particularly visible at night, and I have seen possums on the moraine wall on the west side of the Hooker lake on multiple occasions. Cats are visible in the day time around Mt Cook village and in the White Horse Hill area.	Amend Section 1.2.1 'Policies' to contain specific reference pest animal control in Aroarokahe Place.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Objective 1</b>		
<i>McGee, Rob, Prof.</i> 32/1	<p>Support this objective entirely, but would like to see a reference to the NZ government goal for the nation to be Smokefree 2025 including controlling tobacco smoking in the park, ensuring cigarette butts don't litter wilderness areas and so on.</p> <p>To support this we propose that the National Park is smokefree. This includes protecting the ecological integrity of the area, encouraging people to safely enjoy and treasure these locations, and emphasising consistency of a Smokefree National Park with traditional and cultural values of freshness and purity of the air we breathe.</p>	Reword Policy to read the Management Plan supports the NZ government Smokefree 2025 goal.	
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/1	Support providing additional protection for indigenous species where it does not affect our responsibilities and functions as outlined in the Conservation Act (1987). Oppose the eradication of sports fish within the Tasman River and its tributaries, and the Godley River and its tributaries where these waters hold valued sports fish populations.	Amend Objective 1(c) to reflect the issues raised.	
<i>Appleton, Dr Clive</i> 62/1	The diversity of our natural heritage is maintained and restored		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Stent, Elisabeth</i> 173/5	Regarding Objective 1 c) Support the eradication of pest species and weeds in the National Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/3	Support Objectives 1 and 2. They are consistent with, and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks	Retain Objectives 1 and 2	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/17	Objective 1(a) should be aiming for the preservation and protection of all indigenous species, habitats and ecosystems in natural states.	Amend Objective 1(a) to read: "(a) preserving and protecting ... ecosystems in their natural state;"	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/18	Objective 1(d): Should be seeking to preserve all natural features, not just those of significance.	Reword Objective 1(d) to read: " preserving and protecting all geological features, landforms and landscapes, ..."	
<i>McCabe, Alister &amp; Haidee</i> 463/1	Regarding Objective 1 c) Oppose this objective as it proposes the eradication of all introduced animals and wild animals, which therefore includes tahr. Managing tahr to zero density means there will be no tahr, so why would recreational and commercial hunters want to work with DOC to achieve this ridiculous goal!	Reword objective to exclude tahr: "eradicating, as far as possible, all introduced pest plants and animals, and wild animals, with the exemption of tahr that are proposed to be strategically managed"	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/3	Objective 1 d) The natural light cycles of the Park include daylight night time with moon light cycles, seasonal differences, and astronomical events such as aurora, meteorites, eclipses etc. The dominant light cycles have a profound impact on life on earth including migration/navigation, feeding breeding and predator/prey relationships. Artificial light at night encroaching into the Park can disrupt the "exceptional, cultural significance, beauty and scientific importance of the Park".	Reword Objective 1.d to include: "preserving and protecting natural processes such as natural light cycles"	
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/2	Regarding Objective 1 a) Support as high priority, unique.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/10	Regarding Objective 1 c) I support the continued removal and control of pests within the National Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 637/7	Regarding Objective 1 c) Support DOC to increase pest eradication and weed control generally in and around the National Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/3	Agree with 1.2.1 Natural Heritage and pleased to note that Climate Change and its effects on Flora and Fauna are acknowledged.The objectives cover this.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/2	Fully support these objectives. I also support the complete elimination of tahr and other recreational hunting species from the park, or very large areas of it; these species thrive in adjacent areas. I say this as an occasional tahr hunter myself; I would like to see the area tahr free, yet routinely see large groups of tahr in areas as accessible as the Ball Shelter 4WD road - clearly the levels of this pest are unacceptably high.		
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/3	Fully support these objectives. Also support the complete elimination of tahr and other recreational hunting species from the park, or very large areas of it; these species thrive in adjacent areas. I say this as an occasional tahr hunter myself; I would like to see the area tahr free, yet routinely see large groups of tahr in areas as accessible as the Ball Shelter 4WD road - clearly the levels of this pest are unacceptably high.	Retain	
<i>Cancer Society of New Zealand, Canterbury West Coast Division</i> 773/2	Smokefree designation for AMCNP is in alignment with the objective of preserving the diversity and integrity of natural values. Would contribute to healthy functioning ecosystems & protecting indigenous species and habitats. Cigarette butt litter is hazardous to wildlife, ecosystems & contributes to fire risk. Chemicals in cigarette butts can leach into the environment, contaminating our waterways and land. A commitment to smokefree areas is a meaningful way for others to contribute to the conservation of shared values for AMCNP. Embedding smokefree practice into the priorities within the AMCNPMP would help towards many outcomes for AMC area and help to preserve the 'outstanding features of the park'. Many iconic national parks internationally have embraced smokefree policies to preserve their areas of outstanding natural beauty. Taking leadership for a voluntary smokefree designation demonstrates a partnership on leadership that 'strives for excellence, pushing through obstacles to achieve things that previously seemed out of reach.'	Embed a commitment to the smokefree 2025 goal within this objective. Designate public gathering places including car parks, lookouts, picnic areas, walking routes & shelters as smoke free supported by visible smoke free signage. Commit to more prominent stand-alone smoke free signage at DOC huts to promote their smoke free status.	
<i>Belton, Alexis Daniel</i> 799/1	Strongly support the landscape scale approach in the plan. Support yearly reporting. Objective 1 should be changed to include the word enhance as well as preserve to reflect a high-level of ambition.	Reword Objective 1 to state: "The diversity and integrity of natural values in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park is preserved and enhanced as far as possible, including:"	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/8	Regarding Objective 1 c) Concerned at the continuation of ad-hoc weed eradication using a variety of toxic chemicals - several which have now been banned.	The plan should provide a more focused approach identifying specific species, ecological benefits and how the long term toxic effects will be monitored and managed.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/3	Support the emphasis on the importance of preserving the diversity and integrity of natural values in the park.	Retain objective 1.	
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/7	Support an increased pest eradication effort, especially for tahr, and increased weed control.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/10	Support an increased effort to eradicate pests and weeds in and around the Park.	Provide for an increased effort in weed and pest control in the Park.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/1	Support Objectives 1 and 2	Retain Objectives 1 and 2	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Objective 2</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/4	Support Objectives 1 and 2. They are consistent with, and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks	Retain Objectives 1 and 2	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/2	We support the inclusion of the Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve in the considerations of this plan. The AMIDSR seeks to protect the values of the National Park through raising awareness of the natural values and processes of the Park.	Retain Objective	
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/3	Support objective but balance with visitor numbers entering at night.	Amend objective to allow visitor numbers entering at night.	
<i>Carr, Anna</i> 808/4	The World Heritage status of the Park should be treasured and is in danger of being lost. In particular values that are often not 'values' i.e. natural quiet will be increasingly sought after. I hope the plan will recognise the value of natural quiet.	Support the World Heritage status of the Park. Amend the plan to recognise the value of natural quiet,	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/2	Support Objectives 1 and 2	Retain Objectives 1 and 2	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 1</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/5	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/3	The Department's Statement of Intent does not fall from conservation legislation and is non-statutory in terms of the national park management plan. It is an irrelevant consideration and should not have a role in the plan.	Remove any reference to the Statement of Intent in the provisions of the management plan.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/5	Support policies 1 -14		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 2</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/6	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 3</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/7	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 4</b>		
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/2	The policy to eradicate introduced species, including sports fish, must be appropriately managed and consultation on how this is done is crucial. CSIFG is opposed to the eradication of sports fish within the Tasman and Godley Rivers and their tributaries, which would be enabled via the combination of proposed objectives and policies, both in relation to the current park boundaries and any proposed future park boundaries.	Amend Policy 4(c) and (d) to reflect the matters raised above.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/8	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/4	Policy supporting the objectives 4c, 4d for Freshwater fisheries seem contradictory: "protection of recreational" in 4c and "eradication .. " in 4d.		
<i>Environment Canterbury</i> 743/4	Under Policy 4 d) "identification of any waters in the Park where the eradication and control of introduced species, including sports fish, will be a priority" it will be necessary to construct and use weirs to exclude trout. Adequate ecological assessment is needed to avoid		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	impact on the upstream movement of native fish species and conflict with Policy 4 b) regarding indigenous fish passage.		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/7	A policy to prevent any further introductions of exotic fish into the park is required.	Include a policy to prevent any further introductions of exotic fish into the park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 5</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/11	Include in pest control policies the intention to keep the area free of poisons and to seek better ways of pest control that do not involve poisoning our land and to employ non-toxic means, such as Good Nature traps, already acknowledged by DOC as successful.	<p>Amend Policy 4(d) to include the words "through non-toxic means"</p> <p>Amend Policy 5 to add the words: "... investigating the possibility of using some of this cull for food for those in need, and creating products from the cull that will be able to be sold commercially, thereby reducing the expense and removing the need for using poisons."</p> <p>Add new policies to read: "Protecting the purity of the water by continuing the UV treatment and not allowing poisons to be added to this sacred area." "Develop new policy that leans towards non-toxic solutions for pest control which will enable the Park to become organic."</p>	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/9	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/1	<p>Work with hunting groups to ensure that tahr are retained as part of the landscape. Do not seek to wastefully kill them.</p> <p>Tahr contribute millions of dollars towards taxes and DOC concessions.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 5 to state that: "Control introduced plants and animals in Mount Cook National Park to existing levels, and only reduce populations if there is scientific justification to do so, and in consultation with hunting groups."</p>	
<i>McCabe, Alister &amp; Haidee</i> 463/2	Oppose the policy as it proposes the eradication of all introduced animals and wild animals, which therefore includes tahr. Managing tahr to zero density means there will be no tahr, so why would recreational and commercial hunters want to work with DOC to achieve this ridiculous goal!	Reword policy to state: "Eradicate where possible, otherwise contain and reduce the range of introduced plants and animals in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park and prevent any new incursions into the Park. With the exemption of tahr which will be strategically managed with a management plan approved by NZ Deer Stalkers or other appropriate hunting representatives."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/8	The spread of wilding conifers in the National Park (and throughout the Basin) is also of major concern. The Guardians acknowledge the work that DOC is doing in the Mackenzie and Upper Waitaki Area to manage the spread of wilding conifers and other wilding tree species. The Society supports the NP policy to eradicate incursions of pest plants and animals and exterminate (where possible) as required by Section 4 (2) (b) of the NPA.	Support the establishment of landscape-scale pest control programmes for the extermination of key pest and weed species.	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/1	Support this policy in relation to wallabies; the text does not provide a very complete summary of the current range and threat these pests are to the Park.	Summarise the threat wallabies are more accurately and provide a more specific approach to preventing their dispersal into the Park.	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/1	Strongly support this policy; eradicating introduced plant and animals.	Retain and enforce Policy 5	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 6</b>		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/2	Support: Livestock grazing has a negative impact on the park's flora	Retain text as written.	
<i>Nelson, Sandy</i> 321/1	Support Policy 6. Glentanner Station should no longer be able to graze sheep within the National Park.	Retain (and enforce) Policy 6	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/10	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/19	The removal of grazing from the Park should have a related milestone	Amend the Milestones for 1.2.1 Natural heritage to include a short milestone to achieve Policy 6.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/2	Oppose this policy. Glentanner Station has an existing use right to graze in the Birch Hill Flat area.	Delete Policy 6	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/2	Strongly support this policy; the grazing of sheep in the national park has to end- it is at odds with the ethos of national parks.	Retain and enforce Policy 6	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 7</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/11	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/6	Of major concern to Mackenzie Guardians is the adverse effect of climate change on the National Park. The retreat of glaciers and warmer temperatures will provide new opportunities for the incursion of pest and weed species and increase the spread of several key predators. The Society supports the Department in establishing landscape-scale pest control programmes for the control of key pest and weed species.	Support the establishment of landscape-scale pest control programmes for the extermination of key pest and weed species.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/59	TIA supports the inclusion of concessionaires in its statements about working with others on conservation efforts and pest control.	Retain the specific inclusion of concessionaires in Policy7(b)	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/7	Policy 7(a): ECO oppose the approach taken in Policy 7(a) because; a) It isn't consistent with the National Parks Act Section 5 Indigenous plants and animals to be preserved, because it doesn't specify that people are prohibited from disturbing, taking, hunting, destroying and killing indigenous plants and animals per the National Parks Act. b) It doesn't provide a management plan for how indigenous species, habitat, and natural features will be maintained, restored or conserved. Policy 7a simply states that this will happen.	Make the following amendments to Policy 7: a) Add text to specify that people are prohibited from disturbing, taking, hunting, destroying and killing indigenous plants and animals per section 5 of the National Parks Act. b) Create specific management plan for maintenance, restoration, and conservation of indigenous species, habitat, and natural features within the various ecosystem management units of the Park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 8</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/12	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/2	Work with hunting groups to ensure that tahr are retained as part of the landscape. Do not seek to wastefully kill them.  Tahr contribute millions of dollars towards taxes and DOC concessions.	Add to Policy 8 to state that: "Peer-reviewed monitoring of vegetation within Mount Cook National Park is to be undertaken to assess the effects of tahr, and no additional tahr are to be culled until this research occurs."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 9</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/13	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/3	Work with hunting groups to ensure that tahr are retained as part of the landscape. Do not seek to	Change Policy 9 to state that: "Implementation management programmes in consultation	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>wastefully kill them.</p> <p>Tahr contribute millions of dollars towards taxes and DOC concessions.</p>	<p>with interested hunting groups to manage tahr in Mount Cook National Park in accordance with the Himalayan Tahr Control Plan 1993."</p>	
<p><i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/7</p>	<p>Fully support the Himalayan Tahr Control Plan which requires populations be reduced and maintained at zero density within the Aoraki/ Mt Cook National Park boundary.</p> <p>Note the plan does include the wallaby as a potential new arrival. The wallaby is in the Mackenzie Basin and has been seen outside of the Wallaby Containment Area.</p>	<p>Support the Tahr Control Management Plan and removal of tahr by DOC and contractors to eradicate tahr.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/4</p>	<p>The statutory requirement of section 4(2)(b) of the National Parks Act 1980 needs to be mentioned - that unless the NZ Conservation Authority determines otherwise, introduced plants and animals shall as far as possible be exterminated. Suitable amendments need to be made to this and other relevant policies in the draft plan.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 9 and other policies in accordance with the submission.</p>	
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/3</p>	<p>Support this policy</p>	<p>Retain policy 9 as written</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/3</p>	<p>I support the complete elimination of tahr and other recreational hunting species from the park, or very large areas of it; these species thrive in adjacent areas. I would like to see the area tahr free, yet routinely see large groups of tahr in areas as accessible as the Ball Shelter 4WD road - clearly the levels of this pest are unacceptably high. Suggest adopting an approach of extermination of tahr as for other pest species, or else embark on a publicly consulted but conservation and science-led revision and update of the now 26 year old Himalayan Tahr Control Plan.</p>	<p>Remove statement referring to the 1993 tahr control plan. AMCNP Plan should supersede 1993 tahr plan, tahr control should fall under Policy 5.</p>	
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/4</p>	<p>Remove Policy (see also submission under Objective 1). Suggest adopting an approach of extermination of tahr as for other pest species, or else embark on a publicly consulted but conservation and science-led revision and update of the now 26 year old Himalayan Tahr Control Plan.</p>	<p>Remove policy. Plan should supersede 1993 tahr plan and eliminate Tahr. Tahr control should fall under Policy 5.</p>	
<p><i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/8</p>	<p>Use more direct language to specifically refer to action to achieve zero tahr in the park.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 9 to state: "Reduce tahr populations in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park to zero density in</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		accordance with.."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 10</b>		
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/7	<p>Support policy to "Encourage commercial and recreational hunting groups to contribute to effective control of wild animals ..."</p> <p>Concern that there are conflicting statements in the Objective and policies re the "eradication" and "management" of tahr. There needs to be clear policy in line with Policy 10 for "effective control".</p> <p>We do not support the reported figures of the number of tahr - we believe they are greatly exaggerated and cannot be well defined by methods currently used. If the current cull numbers are achieved it will likely lead to annihilation, not management. Hunting provides valuable revenue to DOC and contributes to the local economy.</p>	Amend section 1.2.1 Natural heritage, including the text, objectives and policies to address the concerns raised.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/14	<p>Policy 10(b):</p> <p>Oppose policy as written as considered an inhumane proposition to "shoot all wild animals seen while hunting inside the Park;". Probably the majority of tahr seen while hunting are too far away to kill humanely.</p>	Reword policy 5(b) to read: "shooting all wild animals considered to be within close range to ensure a humane kill, while hunting inside the Park"	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/14	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/4	Support retention of Policy 10.	Retain as written	
<i>McCabe, Alistair &amp; Haidee</i> 463/3	Regarding Policy 10 b) Oppose the policy as it proposes the eradication of all introduced animals and wild animals, which therefore includes tahr. Managing tahr to zero density means there will be no tahr, so why would recreational and commercial hunters want to work with DOC to achieve this ridiculous goal!	Reword policy 10 b) to state: "shooting all wild animals seen while hunting inside the Park, with the exemption of tahr where nannies will be the target under a strategic management plan"	
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/2	The Game Animal Council (GAC) notes that the implementation of the Himalayan Thar Control Plan (HTCP) is the Department's responsibility. The HTCP places obligations on the Department to manage tahr, and does not place responsibility for that on either recreational or commercial hunters.	Amend Policy 10 to address the matters raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>The presence of trophy bull tahr is the primary motivator for commercial and recreational hunters. The current Department operating procedure, to not target bulls during culls, should be maintained to maximise hunting sector control efforts and benefits.</p> <p>The GAC has received feedback from recreational hunting organisations regarding the differential aerial access provisions to Aoraki/Mount Cook NP for the purposes of controlling game animals. The plan should establish a process for resolving this issue and the GAC offers to work with DOC on such a process.</p>		
<p><i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/9</p>	<p>Oppose commercial tourism, guided hunting concessions for the hunting of tahr and other animal pest species. Recreation and commercial hunting can occur outside the Park.</p>		
<p><i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/3</p>	<p>Policy 10 b) This policy as worded directly encourages hunters to shoot at all animals they see in the park. This presents a risk that it may create a culture of widespread shooting activity and a 'kill everything' ideology. Hunters in New Zealand have a disappointing history of failing to identify targets and accidentally shooting other hunters, trampers and innocent bystanders. This policy will directly increase the risk of an accidental hunting death in this manner.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 10 b)</p>	
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/4</p>	<p>Strongly support Policy 10</p>	<p>Retain Policy 10 as written</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/1</p>	<p>This Policy identifies the contributions commercial and recreational hunters make to management of game animals. However, the implementation of the Himalayan Tahr Control Plan (HTCP) and the obligation to manage tahr rests with the Department of Conservation. Hunters can play an active role in HTCP implementation, under guidance and with assistance from the Department.</p>		
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/4</p>	<p>The statement "shooting all wild animals seen while hunting inside the Park" implies permission for reckless</p>	<p>Remove or significantly rewrite statement.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>hunting behaviour and is impractical given that only centrefire rifles are permitted for recreational hunting. Encouraging shoot-on-sight for hares, rabbits etc. with high-calibre firearms gravely risks accidental shootings of human visitors. This statement needs serious clarification to reflect an intent that hunters should target only large browsing ungulates. Other control methods are appropriate for smaller pest species, or else permission for recreational shotgun use ought be granted (this carries further risk and is unlikely to be acceptable).</p>		
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/5</p>	<p>The statement "shooting all wild animals seen while hunting inside the Park" implies permission for reckless hunting behaviour and is impractical given that only centrefire rifles are permitted for recreational hunting. Encouraging shoot-on-sight for hares, rabbits etc. with high-calibre firearms gravely risks accidental shootings of human visitors. This statement needs serious clarification to reflect an intent that hunters should target only large browsing ungulates. Other control methods are appropriate for smaller pest species, or else permission for recreational shotgun use ought be granted (this carries further risk and is unlikely to be acceptable).</p>	<p>Remove or significantly rewrite policy 10 b).</p>	
<p><i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/3</p>	<p>Policy 10 b) This policy as worded directly encourages hunters to shoot at all animals they see in the park. This presents a risk that it may create a culture of widespread shooting activity and a "kill everything" ideology. Hunters in New Zealand have a disappointing history of failing to identify targets and accidentally shooting other hunters, trampers and innocent bystanders. This policy will directly increase the risk of an accidental hunting death in this manner.</p>	<p>Delete policy 10 b)</p>	
<p><i>Belton, Alexis Daniel</i> 799/2</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 10 b) Partially support - concern is that this will promote a culture of disregard for the suffering of animals considered pests and will increase the risk of accidentally shootings.</p>	<p>Amend policy to state: All animals need to be positively identified before shooting and the identification should be confirmed after shooting. In addition, when shooting an animal care should be taken to minimise suffering by ensuring as quick a death as possible.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Association, Hutt Valley Branch Inc.</i> 804/1	Regarding Policy 10: Whilst using terms such as "eradicate" and "pest" in the document in the context of tahr, to then seek to encourage recreational hunters or commercial interests to enthusiastically contribute to the demise of their recreational interest seems doomed to failure.	Amend the plan to not use the word "eradicate" regarding tahr management. Remove reference to the extremist stance of eradicating tahr and seek recreational hunter input into appropriate game animal management.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/1	Regarding Policy 10 b) This policy as worded directly encourages hunters to shoot at all animals they see in the park. Hunters in New Zealand have a disappointing history of failing to identify targets and accidentally shooting other hunters, trampers and innocent bystanders. This policy will directly increase the risk of an accidental hunting death in this manner.	Remove Policy 10 b) from the plan.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/9	The Himalayan Tahr Control Plan states that tahr will be controlled to zero density in national parks. Tahr should be removed by DOC and hunters contracted by DOC for pest eradication. This is essential to meet the requirements of the Tahr Control Plan and the National Parks Act. There should be no commercial hunting concessions to hunt tahr and other animals in the National Park; recreational and commercial hunting can occur outside the Park.	DOC should cull tahr and other introduced animals in the national park, to preserve the park's natural values. DOC should be resourced to increase pest eradication and weed control generally in and around the National Park.	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/2	We believe that recreational hunting should be the primary means of management and control of game animals, and that any proposals concerning such animal control should be the subject of open negotiation among DOC, the Game Animal Council (GAC) and the NZDA.	Review Policy 10 and other relevant parts of the plan to address the issues raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 11</b>		
<i>Button, Margaret</i> 165/1	Support this policy	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/3	Policy 11 states "Identify potential risks for long-term protection of significant natural and cultural landscapes and features in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park, and the preservation of the Park's natural character, including natural quiet, natural light cycles and the night sky quality."  Natural light cycles and night sky quality are addressed in the milestone, natural quiet is not.	Develop a plan, and add milestones, to protect and enhance the natural quiet in the park.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mellish, Diane</i> <i>(Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/15	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/1	Although natural light is addressed in the milestones, a glaring omission is the lack of milestone for enhancing (restoring) the natural quiet of the park. This has been consistently degraded within this park to the point of non-existence.	Develop a plan for restoring the natural quiet within the park, and set milestones to achieve this.	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Society</i> 493/4	Policy 11, 12 a) and 12 b) Support the intent of these policies	Retain	
<i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/3	Cigarette smoke and litter are damaging to the environment. Tobacco product litter has the potential to contaminate the environment. Littered cigarette butts have been shown to leach out heavy metals (including, aluminium, barium, cadmium, chromium, copper, iron, lead, manganese, nickel, strontium, titanium, and zinc), and other chemicals. According to one study, the leaching of metals from cigarette butts, "may increase the risk of acute harm to local organisms". Cigarette litter is particularly harmful to aquatic organisms, as most waste eventually ends up in waterways. Freshwater ecosystems are a vital part of Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.		
<i>Hāpai te Hauora Tapui Limited</i> 831/4	Hāpai considers that advocating for the "protection of indigenous natural, historic and cultural values" would show integrity if it also specified that Aoraki be smoke-free because it would mean encompassing a world view that emphasises the link between people and their natural environment as a fundamental starting point for wellbeing. The Aoraki Management plan also articulates that it is necessary to assess the results of environmental management in order to determine the extent to which Ngāi Tahu environmental ethics have been retained. We believe that a good result is one where there is evidence of ongoing application of Māori values, for example, clean and healthy environments. Unless Māori are able to access the physical environment, as of right, then the	Amend Policy 11 to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcome will be unsatisfactory. Both access and environmental quality are the characteristics of this outcome goal.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 12</b>		
<i>White, Mike</i> 179/3	Regarding Policy 12 b) Support this policy, Ongoing liaison with the IDA should ensure best practices are continually followed to maintain status of the area. Contacting the IDA is not as strong as consulting the IDA.	Reword "IDA are contacted" to "IDA are consulted".	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/16	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/4	Support the integrated approach taken in the Plan to protect the integrity of the Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve	Retain as written	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/4	Regarding Policy 12 b) Support that the World Heritage Centre be contacted regarding any application for new activities or developments within the park potentially affecting the status of the World Heritage Area. Many subsequent policies in the draft plan, particularly regarding the increase in aircraft access, would result in developments that may indeed affect the status of the World Heritage , but those policies do not contain any mention of the effect they may have on the WHA status.	Retain Policy 12 b). The remainder of the draft plan should be audited against this objective.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 13</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/17	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/5	Work with hunting groups to ensure that tahr are retained as part of the landscape. Do not seek to wastefully kill them.  Tahr contribute millions of dollars towards taxes and DOC concessions.	Change Policy 13(a) to state that: "... maintaining public access & safety, including practical 4wd access up the Godley River bed ..."	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/5	Support the intent of this Policy. Suggest to re-write Policy 13 d) to include protecting "natural processes or character" e.g. natural light.	Reword policy 13 d) to include protecting "natural processes or character" e.g. natural light	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
493/5			
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/3	As a NIWA scientist involved in research on braided rivers, I have a particular understanding of their importance and vulnerability. Pleased to see the inclusion of this policy to advocate for responsible riverbed/freshwater management outside the park.	Retain section 1.2.1 policy 13.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/5	Strongly support Policy 13 including allowing recreational access to the upper Godley which will enable Policies 7,8,9 and 10 to be undertaken (hunting, pest control by volunteers groups etc)		
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/1	Support advocacy in and outside the Park.	Change wording from "activities outside Aoraki/Mount Cook" to "activities in and outside Aoraki/Mount Cook".	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Policy 14</b>		
<i>Appleton, Dr Clive</i> 62/2	At access points to the valleys there should be clear signage with information about when birds are nesting on the river beds and how best to avoid them. One location could be at the Macaulay River Crossing	add to policy 14 with a (c) how public access onto river beds can be best managed to minimise disturbance to endangered bird species during the nesting season	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/18	Support plan's policies as they are consistent with and give effect to the General Policy for National Parks (2005)	Retain Policies 1 - 14	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/21	The plan needs to specifically address the threats to the protection of natural values, posed by human activities. Actions on this should be expressed in short and longer-term milestones.	Amend Policy 14 to add a new clause (c) to read: "(c) threats posed by human activities." Include short and longer-term milestones to implement this policy.	
<i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/5	Policy 14 a): Discarded cigarettes are a known cause of wildfires, and banning them completely will eliminate this risk. In the United States, 90% of wild fires are caused by human behaviour including discarded cigarettes. Research from Australia has provided conclusive evidence that discarded cigarettes can cause wildfires, and has led to campaigns educating about safe disposal of cigarette butts. The safest approach is to eliminate cigarettes altogether.	Ban smoking in AMCNP	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Milestone 1</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/19	Support the Milestones 1 - 11 as they are the logical outcome of, and give effect to, the proposed natural	Retain Milestones 1 - 11 as written	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
338/19	Heritage policies.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Milestone 3</b>		
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/9	ECO opposes the approach in the draft plan because it doesn't identify what the biodiversity objectives and outcomes are for the Park. Where are the biodiversity objectives and outcomes located in this management plan?	Seek the following additions to the text in section 1.2.1 to: - Provide detailed information on the biodiversity objectives and outcomes referenced under Ecological integrity milestone #3.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Milestone 4</b>		
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/4	This statement says establish and implement a pest management program but doesn't say how. By actively promoting a "exterminate at all means" policy for the Park, DOC is ignoring the positive benefits that hunting brings to the community.	Reword significantly to state pest management needs to be considered in a holistic sense.	
<i>Johnson, Linda</i> 516/2	Support the management of pest plants and animals. Oppose timing of establishing and implementing a management plan: it is absolutely critical that exotic plants and animals are reduced to extremely low levels.	Amend plan to bring forward milestone 4 to year 1 not year 3.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Milestone 5</b>		
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/3	Support Milestone 5, but request that: - continued contributions of hunting sector to HTCP-related policy decisions be made through the Tahr Liaison Group; and - GAC provide assistance to help co-ordinate operational matters between the Department and the hunting sector.  Not clear what the precise achievements by years 2, 5 and 9 will be. Urge the department to work with TLG to develop an appropriate research agenda.	Retain Milestone 5 Clarify the achievements proposed by years 2, 5 and 9	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Association, Hutt Valley Branch Inc.</i> 804/2	We strongly disagree with the zero density goal of the HTCP 1993 used as the basis for this milestone.	The milestone should be removed, pragmatism not dogma is needed.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Milestone 9</b>		
<i>McCabe, Alister &amp; Haidee</i> 463/4	Oppose the milestone.	Amend milestone 9 as follows: Tahr are exempt from the above milestone, whereby a strategic management plan and annual operational plan will be, approved by the NZ Deer Stalkers or other appropriate hunting representative.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/4	Support Milestone 9. See comments made in relation to Milestone 5 in submission point 3. The GAC encourages early publication of annual tahr control operational plans to enable commercial and recreational hunters to complement the Department's plans.	Retain Milestone 9	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Milestone 10</b>		
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/6	Milestones 10 & 11 support the intent of these milestones..	Retain milestone 10 Retain milestone 11	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.1 Natural heritage Milestone 11</b>		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/5	Support the integrated approach taken in the Plan to protect the integrity of the Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve	Retain Milestone 11	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage</b>		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/12	Telling the tourism and recreation story: TIA supports the Plan's strong emphasis on the iwi story and connection with the Park. However consider that the history and heritage of tourism and mountain recreation is not suitably told. This history has very much shaped the use of the Park today, and the deep connection of tourism and recreational stakeholders with the Park. This history should be integral to the context of the Plan and in the information available to visitors. Ensure that this story is a fundamental aspect of the Plan's value statements Tourism operators and New Zealand Mountain Guides Assn must be consulted in the formation of this story	1 .Amend section 1.2.2 to clearly tell the story of the Park's history and current context of tourism and mountain recreation that reflects the matters raised by the submitter 2. Reassess the policies and milestones to suitably reflect the importance of this history 3. Include a new milestone in section 1.2.2 to specifically reflect this.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/5	Just two lines in a 1 ½ page statement of the historical and cultural heritage of the Park make reference to mountaineering history, yet nearly all identified historical sites in Table 1 specifically relate to this sport.  The former Hooker Hut is implied to be a publicly accessible historical asset - this is questionably accurate; it is in pieces, with no plan for its future.	Rewrite passage to better reflect the importance of mountaineering in the history of the Park.  Identify appropriate location for the reconstruction of the Hooker Hut (in storage).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/6	Insufficient reference to mountaineering history	Rewrite objectives, policies and milestones in a way that acknowledges mountaineering history as integral to the recent (postEuropean settlement) history of the Park	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/7	Support all objectives and policies under 'Historic and Cultural Heritage'.	Retain text as written.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/4	Objectives and Policies: Support the objectives and policies as written	Retain 1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage. - objectives and policies	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Intro</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/12	<p>Omits the rich history of traditional mountain guiding here in Aoraki NP in the 1800's. The information relating to Maori guides is not considered accurate - there are no reports of Maori guides at Aoraki in the 1850s and 1860s when the first non-Maori high country farmers arrived to settle.</p> <p>Early mountain guides have been completely omitted from this historical and cultural heritage section, including the first NZ born mountain guide Jack Adamson in the early 1890's. Nor is there any mention of the first men to ascend Aoraki.</p>	<p>Amend the draft plan to address the concerns raised by adding the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ensure that the earliest guides of the 1800s that were on this side of the Main Divide are mentioned in this part of the plan, which began with Jack Adamson.</li> <li>2. Mention should also be made of the rich history of mountain guiding that began at Aoraki in the 1890s and from which New Zealand men and women mountain guides have become known as some of the most respected guides in the world. Before that there were mountaineers seeking to climb Aoraki and before that there were early settlers in this area, since the 1850s.</li> <li>3. Cover the history of the outstanding guiding history that developed from the 1890s through to the present day.</li> <li>4. Note that homesteads were in the vicinity of Aoraki since 1856 (John and Mary McHutcheson) and not just "since the Park's new-found fame as the premier climbing destination in NZ", which is the 1950s. The 1880s cannot be classified as "new-found".</li> <li>5. Name each of the historic trails in this area.</li> <li>6. Name any of the historic buildings as such including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Copland Shelter</li> <li>b. Sefton Bivy</li> <li>c. The original Ball Hut area as an historic site</li> <li>d. Green's camps (5)</li> <li>e. Mick Bowie's old home (even though it is in the vicinity of the Hermitage it should be registered as historic so it is preserved).</li> <li>f. Other Hermitage buildings that should be registered and preserved.</li> <li>g. Hooker hut site.</li> <li>h. Memorial Hut/Haast hut.</li> </ol> </li> <li>7. The Waitaha Nation were also active in the Mackenzie and it seems right that the name Waitaha should be included</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		<p>on this page, as the Waitaha were a Nation of people.</p> <p>8. It was my understanding that the Kāi Tahu went from East to West further north across Browning Pass (Greenstone Trails) and other passes in the North, not at Aoraki, which was heavily glaciated. This should be corrected if it is inaccurate.</p> <p>9. Delete "Due to the Park's new-found fame as the premier climbing destination in NZ". This is incorrect. It's fame as a premier climbing destination has been in existence since the 1880s.</p> <p>10. Delete: ". . . many more permanent structures were erected around Aoraki from the 1950s onwards". This makes it look as though European settlement wasn't here until then which is inaccurate. "Structures" have been built in the area since the 1850s/1860s. In the 1800s the following homesteads were here: Birch Hill, Mt Cook Station, Glentanner, The Mistake station homestead, Lilybank homestead, the Hermitage Hotel, Ball Hut and Malte Brun Hut. The Hermitage was here in the late 1800s.</p> <p>11. Add in the historic trails which have a charm of their own including: Wakefield track, the old Ball hut track from the Hooker bridge, Kea Point, Mueller track, Red Tarns track, the Hooker track and the trail to the waterfall on the old Ball hut track, as well as Green's historic 5 campsites.</p> <p>12. The alpine memorial is a sacred site and should be noted as this as well as its registration as an historic place. There is a note of a revered mountain guide whose remains were laid in the vicinity of this memorial. It is a taonga of the mountain guiding whānau and should be noted as such.</p> <p>13. Add to Table 1.1 "Additional archaeological sites ...": The grave of the Glentanner shepherd, John Brown (see High Country Stations of the Mackenzie Country, Glentanner chapter, photo of gravestone, 1870)</p>	
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/1</p>	<p>Climbers, recreationists, naturalists, and New Zealanders generally - and their rich histories and living cultures at Aoraki should be properly acknowledged and described in the plan. Currently they are barely represented.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to provide and properly acknowledge all people with connection to the Park.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/5</p>	<p>Introductory text: The history of mountaineering presented in the Plan must be balanced and accurate. - mention should be made of internationally influential climbers like Freda du Faur, Harry Ayres, Sir Edmund Hillary</p>	<p>Rewrite European mountaineering history in this section in accordance with submission. Retain Table 1</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>- a number of errors in the text are noted.</p> <p>Table 1: Support the inclusion of Hooker Hut and Sefton Bivvy as actively conserved historic places.</p>		
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/1</p>	<p>CMC would like to see Wynn Irwin Lodge recognised as one of the few remaining original climbing/mountaineering lodges within the Park, especially given that the proposed Plan acknowledges that few of the original huts/lodges now remain.</p>	<p>Add an additional sentence to the final paragraph on page 37, following the sentence "Few of these have survived the intervening years or effects of fire, wind, flood and ground instability." to read " Wyn Irwin Lodge, maintained by CMC was constructed as a base lodge for climbers and mountaineers in 1954 and is still actively used by members."</p>	
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/5</p>	<p>There was a strong farming presence in the area from 1858 but this is not mentioned. Reverend Green's first attempt to climb Aoraki Mount Cook was done with the assistance of the occupiers of Birch Hill in March 1882 The plan needs to make mention of this early history.</p>	<p>Amend the introduction to include a reference to the presence of farming and the farming families of Birch Hill Station.</p>	
<p><i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/2</p>	<p>Supports the definition of historic heritage to include buildings, structures, archaeological sites, wāhi tapu, wāhi taonga and historic or cultural landscapes, as described within the explanatory text in this section. This section also describes the layers of history within the Aoraki/Mount Cook area.</p>	<p>Definition historic heritage supported.</p>	
<p><i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/3</p>	<p>Paragraph three on page 38 begins by stating that the Department protects 12,000 archaeological sites, and then discusses Icon Heritage Sites, Landmark Whenua Tohunga and the NZ Archaeological Association. HNZPT suggest that the management of archaeological sites is explained in a dedicated paragraph. This could be combined with the final paragraph on p39, which explains the Archaeological Authority process.</p>	<p>Suggest the following paragraph: The heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 defines an archaeological site as a place associated with pre-1900 human activity, where there may be evidence relating to the history of New Zealand. Archaeological sites are irreplaceable parts of our heritage. It is a statutory requirement under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, section 42, to have an authority from the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for any works or actions that will modify or destroy the whole or any part of an archaeological site. This applies to any archaeological site, whether it is recorded or not. Recorded archaeological sites are on the NZ Archaeological Association archaeological recording scheme website: <a href="http://www.archsite.org.nz">http://www.archsite.org.nz</a>. Recorded archaeological sites within the Aoraki /Mount Cook National Park are shown in Table 1.1.</p>	
<p><i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/4</p>	<p>Paragraph three on p 38 mentions Icon Heritage Sites, and states that these are also known as Landmark</p>	<p>Recommend that the paragraph is amended to reflect this.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
674/4	Whenua Tohunga. HNZPT understands that these are two separate projects. The name of Landmarks Whenua Tohunga has recently changed to Tohu Whenua. Tohu Whenua: Landmarks that tell our stories is a joint initiative of Manatu Taonga Ministry for Culture and Heritage, the Department of Conservation Te Papa Atawhai, Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment and HNZPT to promote significant places to visit that tell New Zealand's defining stories.		
<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/5	HNZPT recommend that paragraph four is amended to explain that on a national level, the Department is guided in its identification of historic heritage by the New Zealand Heritage List /Rārangi Korero. This text would give further context to the identification of historic heritage in New Zealand, and would be consistent with 'Our history is brought to life and protected', Policy 3.	Recommend amendment of text as per submission.	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/6	Just two lines in a 1 ½ page statement of the historical and cultural heritage of the Park make reference to mountaineering history, yet nearly all identified historical sites in Table 1 specifically relate to this sport. The former Hooker Hut is implied to be a publicly accessible historical asset - this is questionably accurate; it is in pieces, with no plan for its future.	Rewrite passage to better reflect the importance of mountaineering in the history of the Park. Identify appropriate location for the reconstruction of the Hooker Hut (in storage).	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Table 1</b>		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/4	Haast Hut is not included in the table of actively conserved historic places in the Park.	Add Haast Hut to the list of historic places actively conserved in the park.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/3	Haast Hut is not listed in the historic places	Amend Table 1 to add Haast Hut	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/4	It is commendable to maintain historic places when so many have been lost over the years. This section contains specific references to the conservation of Hooker Hut. It is currently in storage. I contest that it is not an actively conserved historic place when it is chopped in pieces and inaccessible.	Amend Section 1.2.2 Policies to contain a specific plan for reconstruction, conservation and public access to Hooker Hut.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/7	Support the inclusion of the various huts and memorials associated with recreational pursuits and appreciates		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
756/7	their recognition as historically significant. Thank the department for their efforts to actively conserve these Taonga.		
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/4	It is commendable to maintain historic places when so many have been lost over the years. This section contains specific references to the conservation of Hooker Hut. It is currently in storage. Contest that it is not an actively conserved historic place when it is chopped in pieces and inaccessible. Note that there are plans to build a hut up the Hooker for the purposes of an overnight experience in this valley. If this proposed hut includes a plan for the historic Hooker hut, it should be clearly articulated.	Amend Section 1.2.2 Policies to contain a specific plan for reconstruction, conservation and public access to the historic Hooker Hut.	
<i>Belton, Alexis Daniel</i> 799/3	This section refers to Hooker Hut but notes that it is in storage. There are also references to a planned hut in the Hooker valley. If the proposed new hut includes plans for the historic hut, this should be articulated. If not, a specific plan for restoring the Hooker Hut should be developed.	Amend 1.2.2 Policies to include a plan for the reconstruction and conservation of Hooker Hut, as well as public access to it.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/5	Support the inclusion of Hooker Hut in the list of Actively-conserved historic places in the park.	Retain the inclusion of Hooker Hut in Table 1: Actively conserved historic places.  Add milestone to have Hooker Hut positioned so that New Zealanders can engage with it within five years.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/10	ECO opposes the approach taken in Table 1 because: a) It doesn't clearly explain in text how the actively-conserved historic places will be protected and managed. Also, no information given about what the management goals are considering the threats listed in "Table 1 Actively conserved historic places" b) Table 1 doesn't reference the policy number that would pertain to management of each historic place, making it hard to understand how each historic place will be protected and managed.	Seek the following amendments to address the concerns raised: 1. Add text to the Introduction to read: "the general management approach for these places includes the following__. Given the various threats, with visitor impact being the most common, our goals are to ____" 2. Revise Table 1 Actively-conserved historic places to identify the policy number that pertains to the management strategy for each place listed. 3. Adoption of 'historic places management units' and of 'cultural values and features management units' might be a helpful approach to preserve and manage cultural values and features as well as historic places.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Table 1.1</b>		
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/6	Because of the strong history of farming in the Aoraki/Mount Cook NP, we believe that Conservation area H37 018 should be an actively-conserved historic	Amend Table 1.1 by removing Conservation Area H37 018 and adding it to Table 1	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
611/6	site and listed in Table 1		
<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/6	<p>For the purpose of accuracy and clarity, HNZPT suggests the following additions and amendments to table 1.1.:</p> <p>a) clarify the 'Reference Number' column heading by including where the numbers come from. It appears that these are New Zealand Archaeological Association Archsite numbers.</p> <p>b) The reference number for the Conservation Area at Birch Hill river flats (H37 018) appears to be incorrect, the New Zealand Archaeological Association Archsite number is H37/2.</p> <p>c) There are two recorded sites with archaeological values (post 1900) within the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park area which are not included in the table. HNZPT recommend that they are included, as the table already includes a post 1900 site with archaeological values.</p> <p>D) HNZPT recommends that the sites included in the table are differentiated according to whether they are pre-1900 sites, and therefore meet the definition under HNZPTA, or are post-1900 sites.</p> <p>E) HNZPT recommends that the information from Archsite is included in the column titled 'Heritage topics and significance' for accuracy.</p> <p>F) HNZPT recommends that when items from table 1.1 are on the same site as Table 1 (actively-conserved historic places), there is cross referencing between tables.</p>	<p>a) Amend column heading as follows: Reference number (NZAA Archsite)</p> <p>b) Amend as follows : Conservation area H37/2</p> <p>c) Additional recorded sites and their heritage topics and significance to be included in table: H36/13 Remains of stonewalls H36/11 Ball Road, c.1930</p> <p>d) Amend table by listing and identifying pre-1900 and post-1900 sites separated by a double line, or by some other appropriate method.</p> <p>e) Suggested amendments and additional text: H36/2: Replace 'rubbish dumps' with The first Ball Hut site: hut foundations and historic midden H36/12: Telegraph line: stump of poles H36/10: Tasman Valley Track H36/1: remove 'oven' and change to: The first Hermitage Site: historic midden, foundations and chimney bases</p> <p>f) cross reference items that are on the same site, from table 1.1. and table 1</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Objective 1</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/13	Objective mentions the relationship between Kāi Tahu whānui and the lands, waters and resources of the Park, but omits other New Zealanders who call this place home.	Amend Objective to acknowledge the relationship New Zealanders who call this place home also have with the land and waters and mountains in the Park.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/7	Objectives are important including b) "engaging more New Zealanders in their heritage" and allowing vehicle access to the historic Ball hut site would meet that objective (as in Policy 4, section 1.2.2)	Support objective	
<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/7	Support this objective.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/7	Hardly any reference to mountaineering history in the Park (see under submission under section 1.2.2. intro)	Rewrite objectives, policies and milestones in a way that acknowledges mountaineering history as integral to the recent (post-European settlement) history of the Park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 1</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/4	The Department's Statement of Intent does not fall from conservation legislation and is non-statutory in terms of the national park management plan. It is an irrelevant consideration and should not have a role in the plan.	Amend the remove any reference to the Statement of Intent from provisions in the plan	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 3</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/14	Policy fails to mention local historians who have done extensive research and know many of the historical stories through such research.	Amend Policy 3 to read: "Work with local historians / published authors and Heritage New Zealand ..."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 4</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/15	Policy 4 mentions marking historic sites. Any signs need to be put in an unobtrusive place as large signs in a beautiful place do detract - such as the sign in front of Red Tarns.	Amend Policy 4 to include that the signs on site be placed in an unobtrusive part of the area so marked	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 5</b>		
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/4	Support status and preservation of icon sites. Increasing the benefits of historic and cultural values	Retain text as written.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 7</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/16	Should include consultation with permanent residents as well as with kaitiaki rūnaka.	Amend Policy 7 to include consultation with permanent residents.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 9</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/17	Retrieving deceased persons should always include consultation with the family, but policy only refers to consultation with the Rūnanga.  In the event that ancient skeletons are found in this Park that the rūnaka do not acknowledge as their own, that these remains be dated and this information is made known and the remains are treated with the greatest dignity and respect.	Amend Policy 9 to address the concerns raised	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 10</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/18	Support policy with the addition of interpretation to also enhance early New Zealanders' presence in the Park so	Amend Policy 10 to recognise and include early New Zealanders' presence and visibility within the Park	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
254/18	that this history is not lost.		
<i>Nelson, Sandy</i> 321/2	Support Policy 10. Kai Tahu have an important role in the Park. Interpretation needs to reflect this.	Retain Policy 10.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 11</b>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/1	For many Nzers, the scattering of a loved one's ashes is an incredibly profound cultural practice. To ban it from the Park because it jars with the values of one group of Nzers is unacceptably draconian. Accept there is a conflict of values , but to prohibit such a deeply meaningful act for many Nzers appears very culturally insensitive.	Delete Policy 11, or amend Policy to allow for the scattering of ashes within Mt Cook national park: " Work with kaitiaki rūnaka ... To allow the spreading of deceased individuals' ashes ..."	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/2	For many New Zealanders the scattering of ashes is an incredibly profound cultural practice. To ban it from the park presumably because it jars with the values of one group of New Zealanders is unacceptably draconian and the height of cultural insensitivity	Delete Policy 11, or specifically allow the scattering of ashes within Mt Cook national park.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/24	there should be the opportunity for the spreading of ashes with appropriate courtesy if it is the wish of an individual/group with intimate connections to the area..	Amend Policy 11 to provide nuanced direction on how ashes can be spread with appropriate courtesy in the Park.	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/13	The Draft's approach to the partnership principle under the Treaty of Waitangi is questionable and, in places, likely to be unlawful. Policy - Policy 1.2.2.11 has the object of preventing the spread of ashes in the park. There are both legal and policy issues with the enforcement or advancement of this policy. For example, it may offend sections 42 and 21(1)(c) or (d) of the Human Rights Act, and may be ultra-vires the Conservation Act. The Draft presents simply no engagement with these core rule-of-law issues. A superficial reference to section 4 of the Conservation Act, is, in this context, wholly inadequate. Unquestionably, rahui issued over the park or parts of it ought to be respected. But It is wholly another matter to compel access restrictions based on particular cultural norms without a cross-cultural settlement that is reflected in legislative change.	Delete Policy 11	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 12</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/19	Policy 12(f): Under the points to consider (f) is totally understandable	Amend Policy 12(f) to reflect the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
254/19	and appropriate for an area of rūnaka history, but inappropriate if it is to do with non-Maori structures. This is an alpine environment and structures should reflect alpine design. To enforce all structures to copy each other does not seem appropriate.		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/25	Policy 12(b): Should include further criteria for making public facilities available for public use that this is also environmentally feasible.	Reword Policy 12(b) to read: "the structure, utility or facility is readily available for public use where this is culturally appropriate and environmentally feasible;"	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/26	Policy 12(e): It is inappropriate to require the adaptive use of structures where they are functioning in accordance with the Act and General Policy	Amend Policy 21(e) to remove the general requirement for adaptive use	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/27	Policy 12(g): Clause (g) is irrelevant to the Act and General Policy, particularly GP section 8.3(a) and should not be included.	Delete Policy 12(g)	
<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/8	If the intent of this policy is that it covers any new works, including new tracks and earthworks, HNZPT recommend an amendment to criteria h) to include consideration of archaeological sites. To ensure that the archaeological obligations under the HNZPTA are met, HNZPT suggests an additional Policy	amend 12 h) to: h) the adverse effects on tangible or intangible cultural values, artefacts, archaeological sites, wāhi tapu or wāhi taoka are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Add additional Policy: Engage with Heritage Ne Zealand Pouhere Taonga before undertaking new works on or adjacent to archaeological sites, whether recorded or suspected, within Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.	
<i>Wood, Nicholas</i> 685/1	Regarding Policy 12 b) clarification is needed on what is meant by "readily available for public use"	Reword Policy 12 b) to state: "the structure, utility or facility is readily available for public use - either directly by the public or by bookings through concessionaires offering guided tours - where this is culturally appropriate."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.2 Historic and cultural heritage Policy 13</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/20	DOC should also be working in liaison with local historians for other history of the area.	Amend Policy 13 to reflect the concerns raised for interpreting historic and cultural values within the tōpuni landscape.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values</b>		
<i>Mulvany, Dr Stanley</i> 9/3	There's a lot of discussion in the draft about "Tranquility Zones". That's fantastic and something I firmly believe in.	No specific decision sought	
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/8	There is a complete lack of education and awareness within DOC of information, mobility products, inclusive	Provide for education and consultation to understand the possibilities and be informed of inclusive tourism /	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	tourism, universal design and opportunities for access within the Park. Note this submission point titled "Accessibiltiy Goals"	disability sector / universal design / modern mobility products / equality.	
<i>Warner, James</i> 75/2	Add a new policy to the recreation section.	Add Policy 11: "Recognise the primary historic recreational uses of AMCNP by continuing to encourage, foster and support hiking, hunting and climbing within the park."	
<i>Christchurch International Airport Ltd</i> 104/1	Supports the approach outlined in the Draft Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park Management Plan to enrich visitors' outdoor experience through the protection of natural, historic and cultural values and provision of safe, accessible destinations. A zoning plan to assist the development of vacant sites within the Mount Cook Village for high-quality visitor facilities is also supported, as is the investigation of complementary visitor opportunities with the adjoining Westland Tai Poutini National Park.	In terms of a future vision for management of the Park, the Plan should seek to facilitate the projected increase in visitor numbers and associated services and facilities that enable the enjoyment and protection of the wider natural, historical and cultural values of the National Park environs.	
<i>Garton, Simon</i> 162/4	Oppose flying in the Hooker Valley and Ball Pass.	No flying in the Hooker valley or over Ball Pass. Remove the paragraph starting with "Aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years"	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/6	Retain the existing policies and add a new policy to recognise recreational hunting	Add a new policy to state that: "recognise that hunting is an important recreational use of Mount Cook National Park. DOC will support hunting within the park."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/32	New policy: Growing visitor numbers can overwhelm intrinsic values. An additional outdoor experiences policy is needed to provide for environmental constraints to human activities.	Include a new policy to provide for environmental restraints to future human activities to protect the park's intrinsic worth.	
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/8	I submit that, instead of focusing on providing immediate access to these mountains via helicopters, the Plan should be to assist people to walk in and out, which avoids the detrimental consequences of noise, overcrowding and higher risks associated with fly-in and immediately conquer. I recognise the increasing difficulties of negotiating the moraine walls and crevasses but these could be minimised via good route guidance and the maintenance of poled routes and some aids (eg ropes) by DOC.	Encourage "walk in and out" moreso than helicopter access for mountaineering.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering</i>	The CMC has not identified any parts of the Park Plan that details the installation of new huts or the	Consider relocating or building additional hut facilities to meet the needs and ensure the safety of backcountry users.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Club</i> 602/7</p>	<p>maintenance of existing backcountry huts in detail. With climate change, access may potentially become more difficult in some areas, but similarly could become easier in other areas. Consequently, the CMC promotes the idea of simple, relocatable shelters of up to 6 to 8 people.</p> <p>CMC supports the maintenance and / or relocation of huts for historical reasons as well as for access and safety.</p>	<p>Provide a mechanism to enable the consideration, planning and building of new/replacement huts in the backcountry. This process should include the identification of appropriate sites (taking various considerations into account - access, safety, environment etc.)</p>	
<p><i>Haugh, Andrew</i> 607/5</p>	<p>Increase the track network in the Park and re-establish/improve existing tracks. Many areas are difficult to access, but could be easier with more track development.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to include increased track maintenance/development and repair/upgrading.</p>	
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/16</p>	<p>General Comment on Policies: These fudge the role and relevance of commercial development and concessionaires to the on-going management of AMCNP and developing visitor experiences appropriate to a World Heritage and Alpine National Park.</p> <p>Is 2 solely DOC's role? The "in addition to those provided by concessionaires" strongly implies a secondary role i.e. that 2 is actually subservient to 3 and 4. These policies are likely to lead to the tail wagging the dog with commercial developments benefiting concessionaires taking precedence over less highly organised support for independent travellers e.g. heli -fl ights versus better marked walking routes and suitable huts.</p>		
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/13</p>	<p>Telling the tourism and recreation story: TIA supports the Plan's strong emphasis on the iwi story and connection with the Park. However consider that the history and heritage of tourism and mountain recreation is not suitably told. This history has very much shaped the use of the Park today, and the deep connection of tourism and recreational stakeholders with the Park. This history should be integral to the context of the Plan and in the information available to visitors. Ensure that this story is a fundamental aspect of the Plan's value statements Tourism operators and New Zealand Mountain Guides Assn must be consulted in the formation of this story</p>	<p>1 .Amend section 1.2.3 to clearly tell the story of the Park's history and current context of tourism and mountain recreation that reflects the matters raised by the submitter 2. Reassess the policies and milestones to suitably reflect the importance of this history</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/16</p>	<p>Policies 1 - 10: The policies do not recognise or enable the role of concessionaires in achieving the objectives. Local businesses are mentioned, however not all concession businesses are locally based. Concessionaires are a critical part of ensuring that the lives of New Zealanders and our international visitors to Aoraki Mount Cook National Park are enriched by outdoor experiences. DOC is not the sole provider of these experiences, and nor should it be. Commercially provided opportunities also present a strong tool for DOC to help manage safety and ensure people have valuable experiences in the Park.</p>	<p>Amend the policies to suitably enable the role of the concessionaires in achieving the objective.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/25</p>	<p>Support the recognition in Section 1.2.3 of the importance of New Zealanders and our visitors being enriched by outdoor experiences.  Concerned that the majority of policies in section 1.2.3 have no associated milestones.</p>	<p>Add milestones to Section 1.2.3 to address the policies. Consider those in the Westland Tai Poutini Park Plan section 2.4.1.</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/7</p>	<p>It is stated "aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years and at times has been much busier than it is today." This unsupported claim should not be used to justify an expansion of aircraft activity.  It is stated "aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings" This bleak view is essentially a self-fulfilling prophecy given that the Plan substantially facilitates an increase in aircraft activity. In the context of acknowledged climate change issues and national and DoC goals of sustainability, it is more appropriate that the Plan takes an aspirational view towards encouraging low-impact travel.</p>	<p>Shorten statement to "aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years."  Rewrite statement: "as continuing glacial recession affects traditional means of access to Aoraki and his surroundings, new strategies to facilitate on-foot and self-powered access, in addition to limited aircraft access, are needed in order to foster ongoing recreation activities in the Park."</p>	
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/13</p>	<p>Map 5: The additional map 5 with topographical features which was uploaded after notification of the draft plan is much more useful.</p>	<p>The additional map 5 with topographical features which was uploaded after notification of the draft plan should be retained as the primary map.</p>	
<p><i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/8</p>	<p>SCDHB acknowledges the importance of enriching outdoor experiences in fostering wellbeing. A pristine</p>	<p>Ban smoking in AMCNP.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
742/8	environment is critical to an enriching outdoor experience. Banning smoking is likely to be positively received by the majority of New Zealand and international visitors. In January 2018 a survey was conducted in Tekapo by Community and Public Health and the Cancer Society to canvas opinion on the introduction of smokefree outdoor areas. The participants of this survey were 6% local, 21% New Zealand tourists, and 73% international tourists. Almost a third (30%) of participants believed smokefree outdoor environments would have a positive impact on tourism, and a further 57% thought it would have no impact. The majority (90%) believed outdoor spaces should be smokefree, 7% had no opinion, and only 3% thought spaces should "possibly allow smoking". No participants thought smoking should definitely be allowed. There were many positive comments in support of smokefree outdoor environments. This was summed up nicely by one person who said "it makes sense when we come here to look at the clear sky". Tourists value the clear skies of the dark sky reserve and the pristine environment, and allowing smoking is a clear contradiction to these values.		
<i>Carr, Anna</i> 808/6	The plan needs to specifically outline how DoC will balance international visitors' satisfaction levels alongside those of domestic visitors/recreationists.	Amend plan as in submission.	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/10	In regard to the Objective and Policies set out in 'Recreational Values' suggest they should be enacted only if they fully protect and enhance the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.	Give the objectives and policies consideration as in submission before enacting.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/5	Support the objectives and policies as written	Retain 1.2.3 - Objectives and policies	
<i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/5	The policies set out on Page 48 of the draft plan refer back to the purposes and vision of the plan, which we believe needs to have a greater emphasis on the recreational purpose of the park.	Amend the policies in section 1.2.3 to address the issues raised.	
<i>Brookes, June</i> 878/3	The noise generated by aircraft activity is incompatible with National Park values and the quiet enjoyment of the park environment by the majority of users. The establishment of so called tranquillity zones is entirely spurious if this number of aircraft movements is permitted. How do you reconcile tranquillity with ever	Review the plan to address the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>increasing rates of aircraft activity. It is clearly a contradiction and a symptom of the overwhelming focus on tourism in the plan.</p> <p>I note the plan does not address or quantify the effect of aircraft noise and movements on wildlife. This is a serious omission and needs to be addressed.</p> <p>I note the plan anticipates the need to accommodate increases in the demand for scenic flights and aircraft landings in the future as the glaciers recede and the increasing number of visitors want to access the high alpine areas by air.</p> <p>I oppose this. The preservation of natural values is being compromised by ever increasing demand for aircraft access.</p> <p>The inevitable retreat of the glaciers is a natural phenomenon which everyone will have to learn to live with including the tourist aviation industry and visitors.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Intro</b>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/2	<p>p45, para 3: "Aircraft access is expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access ..."</p> <p>This is a defeatist attitude to foot access and the possibility of sustainable recreation within the Park. Air access is a mal adaptive response to the issue of glacial recession and climate change. This encourages a totally unsustainable culture within the park.</p> <p>This statement jars with Policy 9.</p>	<p>Reword to say "... Foot access is expected to become the main means for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this plan as continued efforts to work towards zero carbon emission by 2050 (in accordance with the Zero carbon Act) is undertaken and general opportunities for on foot access is fostered."</p>	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/6	<p>This statement pre-empts and pre-accepts the condition of "aircraft being the main mechanism for access"</p>	<p>Reword the last paragraph as follows Continued pressure for aircraft to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki is expected with justifications including that of continued glacial recession reducing alternative means of access to him and his surroundings. Ensuring the protection of natural and cultural values within the park, including the protection of natural quiet and the fostering of foot access into the mountains where this is reasonable, will be a key issue for management and monitoring of future recreation opportunities.</p>	
<i>Perry, Mike</i> 78/1	<p>Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Stothers, Grant</i> 79/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kunac, Scott</i> 80/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ching, Malcolm</i> 81/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain curent access both for recreational and emergency search and rescue by powered watercraft.	
<i>McQuilkin, K John</i> 82/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Rolleston, James</i> 83/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Bates, Duncan</i> 84/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hindmarsh, John</i> 85/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Barker, Nathan</i> 86/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ferguson, Mark</i> 87/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Edwards, Paul</i> 88/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Owen, Jordan</i> 89/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Workman, Clive</i> 90/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Miller, Bruce</i> 91/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Davies, Mitch</i> 92/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Workman, Jan</i> 93/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Warren, Mark</i> 94/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Groundwater, Murray</i> 95/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hardie, Andrew</i> 96/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McCaskey, Richard</i> 97/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McTaggart, Norman</i> 98/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shaw, Dallas</i> 99/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Tapley, Mark</i> 100/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thompson, Nathan</i> 101/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Vincent, Mark</i> 102/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Quinn, John</i> 103/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Watts, Henry</i> 105/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Staley, Sam</i> 106/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Patterson, Graeme</i> 107/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Patterson, Kate</i> 108/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Heileson, Lindsey</i> 109/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McCook, William</i> 110/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Christmas, Blair</i> 111/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Dunn, Todd</i> 112/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Faulkner, Neale</i> 113/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kean, Tony</i> 114/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Haug, Stewart</i> 115/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Bromley, Cheryl</i> 116/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Staley, Gregor</i> 117/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Staley, Brad</i> 118/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Haycock, Alan</i> 119/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sewell, Paul</i> 120/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ridder, Scott</i> 121/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Souter, John</i> 122/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Vincent, Christopher</i> 123/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Pearce, Kerry</i> 124/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cowdy, Sam</i> 125/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Price, Stephen</i> 126/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Bushell, Michael</i> 127/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Acton-Adams, Simon</i> 128/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Munro, Brad</i> 129/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Jackson, Peter</i> 131/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hardie, Mathew</i> 132/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kelly, Mark</i> 133/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Morris, Andrew</i> 134/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cruickshank, Timothy</i> 135/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Chilton, Elly</i> 136/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hargreaves, Tom</i> 138/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Joshua</i> 140/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>O'Sullivan, Maurice</i> 143/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>O'Sullivan, Phillip</i> 144/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Laing, Jabin</i> 145/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/1	Do not support the plan's approach to aircraft access in the park. Climbers and trampers who are fit and willing enough to walk to these places should be supported and encouraged, as it is far more environmentally friendly than relying on aircraft.	Delete the statement "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings.	
<i>Smith, Paul</i> 149/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Devine, Rory</i> 153/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Morris, Charles</i> 154/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mead, John</i> 155/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Schaumann, Geoffrey</i> 156/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Lawrence, Alastair</i> 157/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Souness, Quintin</i> 158/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 166/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McGregor, Gary</i> 168/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKenzie, Tony</i> 177/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKenzie, Anna</i> 178/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McQuilkin, Gerard</i> 180/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ottaway, Ian</i> 183/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cutts, Mikhala</i> 184/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cutts, Jason</i> 185/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Allan, D.A.</i> 186/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Roberts, Chris</i> 187/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mills, Toby</i> 188/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Abermethy, Justine</i> 189/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McBreen, Paul</i> 191/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cummerfield, Karl</i> 192/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKay, Alan</i> 194/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Clarke, Ash</i> 195/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Anderson, Richard Grant</i> 196/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Trott, Robert</i> 197/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cooney, Sean</i> 198/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Colthorpe, John</i> 199/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sullivan, Nick</i> 202/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Matheson, Cam</i> 203/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Brueton, Robbie</i> 205/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Coldicott, Jessica</i> 206/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Coldicott, Tim</i> 207/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Steel, Stephen</i> 208/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Street, Bruce</i> 210/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Richens, Steve</i> 211/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>O'Donoghue, Patrick</i> 212/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Lat, Mandy</i> 213/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Luke, Jeffrey</i> 214/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McBain, Murray</i> 215/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Capstick, John</i> 216/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Jennings, A.K and Anthill, J</i> 217/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mullan, Robyn</i> 220/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Trott, Dale</i> 221/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/6	Oppose this statement: "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings."	Remove statement in its entirety. Replace with a statement acknowledging the fact that use of aircraft is an important source of atmospheric CO2, and as such a direct cause of global warming and of glacial recession.	
<i>Cambie, Rowan</i> 223/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Watson, Ray</i> 224/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kriletich, Mike</i> 226/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cross, Paul</i> 229/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Elliot, Hamish</i> 230/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Morrison, Alex</i> 234/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Horrell, Clark</i> 235/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>O'Brien, George</i> 236/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKenzie, Douglas</i> 238/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Neal, Emma</i> 241/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Neal, Gill</i> 242/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Neal, Hugh</i> 243/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/7	This section fails to mention recreational hunting. Recreational hunting by its very name must be considered recreation	Add mention of recreational hunting to the Recreational Values	
<i>Christmas, Holly</i> 249/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Agnew, Paul</i> 251/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ayson, Derek</i> 255/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Scott, Konrad</i> 256/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McGregor, Warren</i> 257/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thomas, Richard</i> 260/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McPhee, Geoff</i> 261/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Webster, Brent</i> 262/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Cerny, Martin</i> 263/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cairns, Josh</i> 264/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hardie, Tony</i> 265/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Herbert, Kerry</i> 268/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Whitaker, Matt</i> 270/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thornfield, Sharyn</i> 273/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Brady, Dean</i> 274/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shane, Mark</i> 277/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cox, Tyrone</i> 279/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hymon, Chris</i> 280/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shane, Angela</i> 281/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Scott, Lynn</i> 282/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kirkcaldie, Andrew</i> 283/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Holden, M</i> 285/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hardie, Janine</i> 286/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hardie, Ron</i> 288/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Matheson, Cam</i> 289/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Street, Emily</i> 291/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Street, J</i> 292/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Frederickson, Pam</i> 293/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Francis, Jonny</i> 294/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hamilton, Mike</i> 296/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Morrison, Fraser</i> 302/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Grant, Ben</i> 303/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Turner, Paul</i> 304/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Whitford, Neil</i> 308/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mantell, Garry</i> 311/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Baker, Roger</i> 312/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Bramhall, Sarah</i> 313/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Richers, Matt</i> 314/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dickerhof, Nina</i> 315/1	Regarding the sentence "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings." - The wording seems to be a self-fulfilling prophecy and may detract from efforts to encourage foot access and thus discourage sustainable access within the park.	Delete this sentence.	
<i>Hau, Nick</i> 316/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Lucas, Jeremy</i> 320/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Denize, Brendan</i> 322/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Robertson, Paul</i> 324/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Denize, Trudy</i> 326/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Miller, Cameron</i> 333/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Simpson, Greg</i> 335/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/5	Concern that Plan is not adequately informed with statistics: -we find no figures on past, present and projected visitor numbers, except that numbers are expected to "more than double" within the life of this Plan. Visitation information gives no indication of actual numbers. - need to clarify visitation numbers by distinguishing between transient visitors and longer-term visitors. This breakdown is essential to properly inform the Plan.	Amend plan to address the issues raised	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/12	The statement that "Aircraft are likely to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan ..." sounds like a statement of policy that ought to be far more prominently discussed. Need to know whether more landing sites will be permitted to insert trampers and mountaineers, and for use by recreational hunters assisting with wild animal control.	Provide clarity and explanation as to what activities will be permitted to use aircraft, and where.	
<i>O'Malley, Ben</i> 337/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/5	The statement that "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreational access ..." is a defeatist attitude to foot access and the possibility of sustainable recreation within the park. Air access is a fundamentally mal adaptive response to the issue of glacial recession and climate change. This statement especially jars with Policy 9 which is to	Reword the text to read: "Foot access is expected to become the main means for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing efforts to work towards zero carbon emission by 2050 (in accordance with the Zero Carbon Act) is undertaken and general opportunities for on foot recreation is fostered."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	"Promote the principles of "Leave No Trace" and foster a culture of sustainable recreation practices ..."		
<i>Winskill, Nicholas</i> 342/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Rusbach, Simon</i> 343/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hurst, Jarrod</i> 344/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hamilton, Nathan</i> 348/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hamilton, Frazer</i> 349/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hamilton, Jasmine</i> 350/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Millard, James</i> 352/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Owen, Chris</i> 354/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hurst, Hamish</i> 360/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Vernel, Paul</i> 361/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Newton, Chris</i> 362/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Christensen, Kaj</i> 363/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McCallum, Brent</i> 365/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Terry, Dwayne</i> 366/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Grafton, Wayne</i> 368/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sáez, Paulina</i> 369/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>King, William</i> 374/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKenzie, Craig</i> 375/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Preston, Roger</i> 376/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kiesanowski, Phillip (Patron Jet Boating N,Z,)</i> 378/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Blacklock, Quintin</i> 379/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Stokes, Andrew</i> 381/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Walker, Warren</i> 382/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Court, Cameron James</i> 383/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Beattie, Mark</i> 384/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Richardson, Hamish</i> 385/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Woods, Rob</i> 387/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dann, Brett</i> 388/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Spring, Luke</i> 389/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McLachlan, Jason</i> 390/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dornbusch, Sandy</i> 391/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dornbusch, Mark</i> 392/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Dornbusch, Rhys</i> 393/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Edwards, Matthew</i> 395/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Osborne, Graham</i> 396/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Irwin, Josh</i> 397/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Anderson, Hayden</i> 398/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, M.</i> 399/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sutherland, Jason</i> 400/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Rowan</i> 401/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Atkinson, CGH</i> 402/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Beets, Bart Reinoud</i> 404/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Horncastle, Rhys</i> 405/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Bills, Lance Arthur</i> 406/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Moore, Bill</i> 407/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Steenon, Bruce</i> 408/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKenzie, Eddie</i> 409/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Newell, Tim</i> 411/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Belcher, Brent</i> 412/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Clarkson, Maria</i> 414/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cromie, Nigel</i> 415/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Clarkson, Nick</i> 417/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kendrick, Justin (and family)</i> 419/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Johnstone, Hanlin</i> 420/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Anderson, Wayne</i> 422/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/28	Paragraph 3, page 45: The statement that "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access ..." is acceptance of, and buy-in to a tragedy of the commons. Endorsing a carbon-emitting activity is unequivocally not in accordance with national park principles.	Amend the Introduction to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Earnshaw, Brent</i> 425/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Elliot, Murray</i> 426/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Wilson, Terry Malcolm</i> 429/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shearer, Nicholas, Thornton</i> 433/5	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Walker, Marc</i> 436/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>French, Len</i> 437/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Goodland, Bruce</i> 444/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Tuirirangi, Cory</i> 445/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Presto, John</i> 451/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Edmonds, Toni</i> 453/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Edmonds, David</i> 454/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Edmonds, Theo</i> 455/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Steele, Peter David</i> 458/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Baylis, Simon Paul</i> 461/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McCabe, Alister &amp; Haidee</i> 463/6	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Tobeck, Leigh</i> 465/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Wicken, Ed</i> 467/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Foote, Richard</i> 469/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Taylor, James</i> 472/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Robertson, Evelyn</i> 474/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Polaschek, Nikki</i> 476/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Forge, Gareth</i> 477/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Wilson, Scott Patrick</i> 479/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wright, Hamish</i> 482/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Goldingham, John</i> 483/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Brady, Andrew Michael</i> 485/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Clearwater, Ronald</i> 490/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/10	<p>Oppose emphasis on heli-skiing/hiking activities. Traditional use of Mount Cook NP was (and still is) for climbers and trampers; people who worked hard to experience the serenity of the park.</p> <p>Heli-skiing/hiking are 'recent' introductions. These activities along with glacier landings and overflights for 'quick-fix' tourists all impact the serenity sought by the climbers and trampers.</p> <p>Have flown into (and out) Tasman Saddle to climb in the area. This (we believe) is different from people who touch down on glaciers only for a brief moment, photo opportunity etc.</p> <p>That aircraft "at times has been much busier than it is today" is irrelevant information. Because something has happened in the past doesn't mean it should happen in the future. Native birds used to be hunted in the past. It is illegal now.</p> <p>Again, the core principle ; Why should anyone's activity impact the serenity of others?</p> <p>Again, people flying in to Tasman Saddle to climb in the area, is completely different from people landing at Tasman Saddle to set foot on the glacier, take a selfie, then taking off again.</p>	Reword to emphasise climbing and tramping are the main activities of the park.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/11	<p>Find the structure on this section could progress from the climbing history, through to the more 'quick-fix' tourist activities, e.g.. Glacier landings.</p> <p>A SCRAP structure would be useful. For example:</p> <p>Situation: There are a wide range of visitors to the park. Those who are prepared and skilled enough to walk into the backcountry and experience the rewards and serenity that this brings.</p>	<p>Reword. Apply a SCRAP structure</p> <p>S - Situation</p> <p>C - Complication</p> <p>R - Recommendation</p> <p>A - Action</p> <p>P - Politeness (may not always be applicable).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Complications: Other visitors have neither; the time, fitness, motivation or experience to work for the serenity. Overflights and brief landings sought by these tourists impact on the tourists who have worked for their 'fix'.</p> <p>Recommendation: Establish more shorter walks to cater for these tourists.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- survey tourists to find out what type of non-flight activity would meet their requirements.</li> <li>- establish walkways &amp; cycleways</li> <li>- create a rental bike/e-bike outlet</li> </ul> <p>Politeness: Suggest other areas for heli-skiing/hiking. People who can afford to pursue these activities should be relocated.</p> <p>Why should their activity impact the serenity of others? This should be a core principle for DOC.</p>		
<i>Scott, Andrew</i> 492/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Aitkan, Graham</i> 495/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cameron, Simon J.</i> 497/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Lilybank Station Holdings Limited</i> 499/1			
<i>Green, Angie</i> 500/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Meredith, Allen</i> 509/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Clark, Shaun</i> 510/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Keen, Malcolm</i> 512/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shearer, Dara</i> 522/5	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Rattray, Daryl</i> 524/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Rawle Colin</i> 534/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Harliwich, Warren Duncan</i> 536/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Barney, Gordon</i> 539/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Jenkins, Edward</i> 542/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Beirne, Vanessa</i> 554/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Oakley, Brian William</i> 562/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Tansey, Matthew</i> 563/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/4	Disagree with the assertion that "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan" - surely the level to which air access is the dominant means of access can be influenced by this plan. Rather than accepting that air access will become the main means of access effort could be placed on maintaining and promoting foot access to the backcountry through the development of alternative access routes wherever possible.	Reword section 1.2.3 with something like "Aircraft provide an important means of accessing some parts of the Aoraki Mt Cook park, but wherever possible foot access is promoted as the preferred means of access."	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/5	This contains reference to statistics stating that overseas visitors amount to 64% of all visitors to the Park. It is not stated how this figure was obtained. It is not stated how long visitors spend in the park, on average. The majority of overseas visitors spend only a couple of days in the park and primarily in the 'Front country' setting. Visitors in the 'Backcountry' 'Remote' and 'Wilderness' settings are more likely to be of New Zealand origin, more likely to be repeat visitors to the park, and spend longer in each trip in the park. The plan as currently presented paints a picture of large overseas visitor numbers.  This skews the plan towards managing and catering to one-time international visitors and undervalues repeat	Obtain and describe specific statistics on the length of stay of visitors in the park based on activity type.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	visitors who over the course of a lifetime will account for tens and hundreds of visitor days each. Foreign visitors often spend only hours in the park.		
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/6	This section states that aircraft access in the park has previously been busier than it is today. With the large increase in visitor numbers as stated in the plan, it is difficult to believe that aircraft use has even been higher. Prior to the introduction of restricted landing zones, it may have been wider access, but it is improbable that actual flight numbers would have ever been higher. The proliferation of guiding activities revolving around frequent flights such as heli-hiking, glacier guiding, and scenic flights is undoubtedly a modern phenomenon, given the increasing numbers of wealthy tourists willing to pay for these luxury tourist products.	Amend statement: "Aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years."	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/7	This section states that aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreational access. This subtly presents a narrative that foot access is unviable and unsafe. Recreational users primarily use aircraft for access due to insufficient time, lack of fitness or competence or requirement to take large loads. The notion that glacial recession is making areas inaccessible is driven by a small group who fit in to one of the above categories. Access to the mountains on foot currently remains viable in all parts of the park. Decisions to increase aircraft access are in the interests of users without enough time, fitness, or competence to safely access these areas otherwise. This does not balance with the desired outcomes for tranquillity, natural quiet, climate change or safety and ultimately devalues Aoraki and his whanau.	Delete statement: "Aircraft are expected...surroundings"	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/8	First paragraph states: "sports climbing" is an activity. "Sport climbing" is the correct term to describe this.	Replace "sports climbing" with "sport climbing" in Section 1.2.3 Recreational Values	
<i>Lucas, Cole</i> 581/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Heath, Graeme</i> 583/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Heath, Ruth</i> 584/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Elliot, Will</i> 585/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Owen, Andrew</i> 586/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Faulks, Mark</i> 588/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hendrie, Malcolm John</i> 589/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hendrie, Jackie</i> 590/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hendrie, Ben</i> 591/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ford, Richard</i> 592/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Plunkett, John A.</i> 597/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Debenhom-Hardwick, Josie May</i> 598/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Waters, Andrew Ryan</i> 599/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/6	<p>1. Visitor management zones (see more detail in Key submission 9):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- support a zoning system for recreation values, however</li> <li>- the current framework does not clearly articulate why zones are to be changed from the current settings, or how zones are related to the tranquillity tool or proposed aircraft landing zones.</li> <li>- ROS settings have been removed from the current Plan - compared with these settings, the draft zones are confusing and vague</li> <li>- Backcountry-accessible and backcountry walk-in have been combined in the draft Plan. The Department needs to justify how the experiences of both groups are the same before combining them.</li> <li>- the language used for the visitor zones is more vague than the current Plan; the language is not measurable.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Adopt the high-level contextual changes (as outlined in Key submission 9)</p> <p>2. retain the ROS visitor management settings</p> <p>3. Remove the Tranquillity outcome section and discuss desired tranquillity levels as objectives in the visitor management zones(Appendix 2)</p> <p>4. Reword para 3 on page 45 to read: "Continued pressure for aircraft to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki is expected with justifications including that of continued glacial recession reducing alternative means of access to him and his surroundings. Ensuring the protection of natural and cultural values within the Park, including the protection of natural quiet and the fostering of foot access into the mountains where this is reasonable, will be a key issue for management and monitoring of future recreation opportunities."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Unless the Department can justify the need for vague language, then the current settings should be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a link between VMZs and aircraft management has largely been removed in the draft Plan - it needs to be brought back into Appendix 2.</li> </ul> <p>2. The statement "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access ... over the life of this Plan ..." is as much an encouragement of a shift towards "easier" access as it is a statement about environmental changes that have affected access in some parts of the Park. This should not be used to justify increased air access across the board.</p>		
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/6</p>	<p>The draft Plan diminishes backcountry use of The Park, and the role that backcountry users have played in the development of the Park. The draft plan does not appear to define the key visitors the plan provides for but it appears that its main focus is on front country visitors. The previous plan provided definitions for the different users (i.e. distinguishing between day visitors and backcountry adventurers (mountaineering, climbing and backcountry walking)).</p> <p>Mountaineering and Climbing in Aoraki / Mt Cook National Park is an important and historical part of New Zealand's identity and culture. It is important that the Plan does not prevent future potential mountaineers, climbers and explorers to use the Park to reach their potential.</p>	<p>CMC would like DOC to include user group definitions that highlight the multiple interest groups that visit the various regions of the Park.</p>	
<p><i>Qualtrough, Doug</i> 603/1</p>	<p>Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Stratton, Thomas Gordon</i> 605/1</p>	<p>Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Cassidy, David</i> 606/1</p>	<p>Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Paton, Joseph</i> 608/1</p>	<p>Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Hayman, Ian</i> 610/1</p>	<p>Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Ferguson, Vicki</i> 612/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Rule, Brad</i> 614/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Lapsley, Andrew</i> 619/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Young, Jason</i> 620/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Gonscak, Nicholas</i> 621/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McLennan, Geoff</i> 622/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Wilson, Brent</i> 623/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Young, Dave</i> 624/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Malcolm</i> 627/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Baylis, Ian Gordon</i> 634/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Baylis, Jackson</i> 635/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Baylis, Marie Louise</i> 636/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Miers, Roger</i> 641/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kirner, Stephen Charles</i> 647/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Scott, Cody</i> 652/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Jenkins, Malcolm</i> 656/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Jenkins, Raewyn L</i> 657/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Parsons, Richard &amp; Wendy</i> 659/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/9	Four wheel driving is not included as a recreation. This is an omission and request this to be added. Four-wheel driving is a customary recreation in the park, especially up the Godley River. Other more invasive motorised activities are noted, allowed for and encouraged ("boating, scenic flights and air access, heli-hiking, heli-skiing") especially at a commercial level whereas recreational (family/club) four-wheel driving is ignored. This omission is contrary to objective 1b (pg 40) "engaging more New Zealanders in their heritage".	Add four wheel driving as recreation activity.	
<i>McPhail, Tom</i> 662/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mouat, Lex</i> 670/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shelley, Craig H.</i> 677/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shelley, Calan G. H.</i> 678/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shelley, Tania M.</i> 679/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shelley, Aidan</i> 680/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>King, Michael</i> 683/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>King, Jane</i> 684/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mullan, Paul</i> 691/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Colin</i> 708/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wilson, Phil</i> 709/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Lund, Joel</i> 712/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/3	In the initial paragraph outlining recreation values, snow shoeing and glacier guiding ought to be acknowledged as important and long-standing activities in this setting. These activities are not adequately reflected under 'heli-hiking'.	Add 'glacier guiding' to the second sentence of this section: "These include opportunities for ..." (p.42) and to the third sentence in the second paragraph on page 45 beginning: "These ways include ..."	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/7	Visitors should be encouraged to move about the NP mainly under their own power (walking, cycling).	AMCNP needs some more tracks and marked routes.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/11	This section lacks historical background and context. Consequently it is light-weight and appears to undervalue the recreational aspects that are the major attraction for visitors to the park beyond superficial sightseeing. As these aspects are also those that tend to put most pressure on park resources and conservation values, they need more careful backgrounding and analysis as a prelude to revising the management policies and operational plans for specific Places . The current management plan for AMCNP (2004) contains good sections on Park Heritage and on Recreational and Tourism values that are still very relevant . These cover a broad range of activities including climbing/ mountaineering. Some cultural and historical info is introduced for each Place in Section 2. But most of this will be better reassembled into cogent wholes in Section 1.	It is strongly recommended that an expanded section in the new draft includes a more inclusive historical context and a more in-depth analysis of trends in recreational goals/preferences for visitors. As well as how recreation might be accommodated within AMCNP in the future, the alternatives should be briefly covered for activities that are less consistent with National Park values e.g. shift heli-skiing to conservation areas outside AMCNP . Remember : Toitu he kainga ; whatungarongaro he tangata...(People are transient , but the land endures) Maori proverb What a privilege to know the profound stillness and peace of the land...Jill Tremain (climber)	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/12	The wording for the 2nd sentence should be made more inclusive with a separation of the currently more contentious aerial access, especially heli-, that is not strictly an essential component of any of the pursuits.	Reword: "These include opportunities for day walks, tramping, climbing, biking, botanising & birdwatching, camping, boating and scenic flights. Air access into the higher alpine and glacial environments can assist more adventurous pursuits such as mountaineering, hunting and skiing."	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/13	, p42 Paragraph beginning "Aoraki also provides ....". This very out of place here.	Paragraph should be relegated to last in this section.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/14	p43 Paragraph beginning: "Aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years and at times has been much busier than it is today"	Provide supporting information for this statement: Were there times when the glaciers/snow fields had many more overflights or landings than at present? What are the stats? - including no. flights, no. passengers,%	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Really?	helicopters. Are we just referring to aircraft landings at the airport?	
<i>Ferguson, Hamish</i> 720/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thornton, Rachel</i> 722/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thornton, Andrew W.</i> 723/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thorburn, Darryl</i> 724/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/51	<p>Supporting back country recreational opportunity TIA supports the Plan proactively addressing the need to maintain access to backcountry huts and climbing areas. Securing access to these destinations is critical to support high alpine recreation in the Park. Aircraft landings may often be the only way to address access requirements, however TIA is aware that in some cases ground access can be secured by installing wires and other fixed means of support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TIA supports the landing zones provided to access the Grand Plateau, Onslow and Leibig Huts and Leibig Dome</li> </ul> <p>Where an area is not otherwise already subject to aircraft noise, TIA recommends that DOC explore opportunities for ground-based access as a first priority, but where this is not practicable air access should be provided</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TIA recommends that DOC explore whether ground based access be secured to the area of the old Gardiner Hut site. If this is not practicable we support the Pudding Rock landing zone.</li> </ul> <p>TIA submits that DOC's planning for accessing backcountry huts and climbing areas be informed by alpine guiding concessionaires, the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and recreational groups.</p> <p>Supporting front country recreational experiences: TIA commends the Plan's inclusion of several new front country experiences. Front country recreational opportunities are particularly important in the Park as most visitors do not venture into the back country areas.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review the provision of backcountry recreational experiences to reflect the matters raised.</li> <li>2. Retain all new front country recreational experiences as provided</li> <li>3. Ensure that planning for accessing backcountry huts and climbing areas be informed by alpine guiding concessionaires, the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and recreational groups.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	- TIA supports all new front country experiences noted in the Plan.		
<i>McPhail, Glen</i> 731/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Barnett, Frances</i> 734/1	Do not support the approach outlined in the plan which suggests aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreational users access. The wording of this section suggests that foot access is inviable and unsafe. This contrasts with the stated desires in the plan for carbon neutral activities within the park.	Delete the statement "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings."	
<i>Blackmore, Jennifer</i> 735/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Matravers, Michael</i> 736/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McPhail, Glen</i> 748/1	Oppose as this section doesn't include Four Wheel Driving.	Include Four Wheel Driving as an observed recreational activity with many families using the Godley Valley. Consider National and Local 4WD groups when implementing policies.	
<i>Southern Trail Blazers 4WD Club INC</i> 750/1	Oppose as this section doesn't include Four Wheel Driving.	Include Four Wheel Driving as an observed recreational activity with many families using the Godley Valley. Consider National and Local 4WD groups when implementing policies.	
<i>Homes, Lance</i> 751/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Plunkett, Craig</i> 753/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Overton, Tom</i> 755/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/5	The Draft Plan is generally flawed by a reluctance to commit to concrete outcomes, especially in the realm of recreational assets, such as huts and tracks. These assets typically last much longer than the life of the Management Plan. Investment in recreational assets, their location, their type and their potential are all matters that the public should have a say in. These opportunities are not operational matters. They should be developed prior to the formulation of the Draft Plan and subject to a full and considered public consultation process.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Smith, Nathan</i> 758/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Warren</i> 759/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Waimate 50 Committee (Motorsport)</i> 760/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/8	Identifies established aircraft access for recreation, wild animal control and servicing utilities and facilities.	Reword to add Filming as an established historic activity.	
<i>Cameron, Robert</i> 762/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dalgety, Fiona</i> 763/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dalgety, Georgie</i> 764/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cameron, John</i> 765/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hartridge, Phil</i> 767/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dalgety, Alex</i> 769/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Findlay, Will</i> 770/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/8	<p>It is stated "aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years and at times has been much busier than it is today." This unsupported claim should not be used to justify an expansion of aircraft activity.</p> <p>It is stated "aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings." This bleak view is essentially a self-fulfilling prophecy given that the Plan substantially facilitates an increase in aircraft activity. In the context</p>	<p>Shorten statement to "aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years."</p> <p>Rewrite statement: "as continuing glacial recession affects traditional means of access to Aoraki and his surroundings, new strategies to facilitate on-foot and self-powered access, in addition to limited aircraft access, are needed in order to foster ongoing recreation activities in the Park."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	of acknowledged climate change issues and national and DoC goals of sustainability, it is more appropriate that the Plan takes an aspirational view towards encouraging low-impact travel.		
<i>Ralph, Geoffrey</i> 772/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Wiseman, Peter</i> 776/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Weeks, Gary</i> 777/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Nirid, Robyn</i> 778/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Jane-Anne</i> 779/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Ben</i> 780/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Smith, Reegan</i> 781/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Kerin, Stacey</i> 782/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Selfe, Katrina</i> 783/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mackenzie, John</i> 784/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ingram, Paul</i> 785/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Coll, Chris</i> 787/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/10	Environmental changes that adversely affect access in some places should not be used to justify increased air access across the board.	Replace the statement "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan... monitoring of future recreation opportunities" with the new statement : "Continued pressure for aircraft to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki is expected with justifications including that of continued glacial recession reducing alternative means of access to him and	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		his surroundings. Ensuring the protection of natural and cultural values within the park, including the protection of natural quiet and the fostering of foot access into the mountains where this is reasonable, will be a key issue for management and monitoring of future recreation opportunities."	
<p><i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/5</p>	<p>This contains reference to statistics stating that overseas visitors amount to 64% of all visitors to the Park. It is not stated how this figure was obtained. It is not stated how long visitors spend in the park, on average. The majority of overseas visitors spend only a couple of days in the park and primarily in the 'Front country' setting. Visitors in the 'Backcountry' 'Remote' and 'Wilderness' settings are more likely to be of New Zealand origin, more likely to be repeat visitors to the park, and spend longer in each trip in the park.</p> <p>The plan as currently presented paints a picture of large overseas visitor numbers. This skews the plan towards managing and catering to one-time international visitors and undervalues repeat visitors who over the course of a lifetime will account for tens and hundreds of visitor days each. Obtain and describe specific statistics on the length of stay of visitors in the park based on activity type.</p> <p>First paragraph states the 'sports climbing' is an activity. 'Sport climbing' is the correct term to describe this.</p>	<p>Obtain and describe specific statistics on the length of stay of visitors in the park based on activity type.</p> <p>Replace 'sports climbing' with 'sport climbing'</p>	
<p><i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/6</p>	<p>This section states that aircraft access in the park has previously been busier than it is today. With the large increase in visitor numbers as stated in the plan, it is difficult to believe that aircraft use has even been higher. Prior to the introduction of restricted landing zones, there may have been wider access, but it is improbable that actual flight numbers would have ever been higher. This section states that aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreational access. This subtly presents a narrative that foot access is unviable and unsafe and is at odds with the stated desire for carbon neutral activities in the Park.</p> <p>Access to the mountains on foot currently remains viable in all parts of the park. Reference my own experiences of multiple trips up both the Hooker and Tasman valleys on foot.</p> <p>Decisions to increase aircraft access are in the interests</p>	<p>Amend statement as below or provide evidence to corroborate fact: Aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years. Remove: 'and at times has been much busier than it is today.' Delete statement: Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	of users without enough time, fitness, or competence to safely access these areas otherwise. This does not balance with the desired outcomes for tranquillity, natural quiet, carbon emissions or safety and ultimately devalues Aoraki and his whanau.		
<i>Hogan, Shane</i> 793/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Davison, Marcus</i> 794/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Davison, Linda</i> 795/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Davison, Rowan</i> 796/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Davison, Sophie</i> 797/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Britain, Chris</i> 798/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Belton, Alexis Daniel</i> 799/4	The section states that 64% of visitors to AMCNP are overseas visitors. The section does not provide a reference for this statistic, nor does it contain any information regarding length of stay.	Publish source of statistics, methodology and limitations. Acknowledge lack of statistics on duration of stay (if this is the case). Commit to collecting statistics on length and type of stay/activity in future.	
<i>Belton, Alexis Daniel</i> 799/5	Section states that aircraft access has at times been much busier than it is now. What is the evidence for this and does it relate to scenic flights, landings or both? While I acknowledge that glacial recession has led to an increase in aircraft access, access by foot, while more difficult, is still possible.	Delete the following statement: "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings."	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/10	The statement "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism.. management and monitoring of future recreation opportunities". Is contradictory and only partially carried forward into policy in favour of increased aircraft use. Ensuring protection of park values must take priority. This is not a future (will) issue, but the immediate one.	Amend visitor management and aircraft landing zones to promote natural quiet. Delete the Tranquillity methodology.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/6	The range of possible activities that nbcould be undertaken in the park is huge, but by selecting these specific activities, in particular air access, the draft is flavouring what is to come later in the plan. There is no need to mention any specific activities, as that would	Remove the second sentence from the first paragraph of 1.2.3 Recreational Values - "These include opportunities for walking, camping, boating, scenic flights and air access into the higher alpine and glacial environments for more adventurous pursuits such as heli-hiking, heli-skiing and	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	subtly (and possibly unintentionally) give other activities a lower priority.	hunting."	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/8	After several useful paragraphs detailing changing visitor numbers, there are then two very subjective paragraphs on Aircraft Access. The way these are written sounds like a tourist brochure and sounds like a defence of the air access industry. This is unnecessary and makes outcomes sound pre-determined by a bias towards more air access.	Remove the two paragraphs preceding the heading 'Soundscape and tranquillity outcomes'	
<i>Henry, Ryan</i> 812/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Young, Ian</i> 818/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/8	I would request the Department manages carefully all recreation activities of whatever nature within the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park. As I see it the Park has never been under such risk with the effects of tourism and climate change. Quite simply, Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park cannot be returned to its former magnificence and grandeur if it is exploited.	Amend plan as in submission.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/2	This section states that aircraft access in the park has previously been busier than it is today. With the large increase in visitor numbers as stated in the plan, it is difficult to believe that aircraft use has even been higher.	Amend statement " Aircraft access into Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park has been well established for many years and at times has been much busier than it is today." or provide evidence to corroborate fact.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/3	Do not support the approach outlined in the plan. This section states that aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreational access. Access to the mountains on foot currently remains viable in all parts of the park.	Delete statement "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access around Aoraki over the life of this Plan as continuing glacial recession reduces the alternative means of access to him and his surroundings."	
<i>Pointon, Richard</i> 832/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Whinham, Moira</i> 837/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>New Zealand Canyoning Association</i> 840/1	The NZ Canyoning Association (NZCA) considers that the sport of canyoning is an activity which encourages people to experience Conservation areas in a positive way, that it enhances their perception of the natural world and does so in a way that has minimal environmental impact.	Amend 1.2.3 Recreational values to 1. Include canyoning as an activity in the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park; subject to the normal criteria governing park users as per the National Parks Act 1980 and the Doc General Policy for Conservation areas and National Parks 2005.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>The alpine geography and geological features of the park give way to steep and spectacular water eroded canyons and gorges suitable for canyoning. Currently there is a relatively small amount of canyoning within the Aoraki National Park. However with the growth of the sport in NZ, and the proposed additions to the park in the draft plan, it is more than reasonable to assume that there will be further exploration of canyoning into the park boundaries in the very near future.</p> <p>The Sawyer Stream Canyon located near the Unwin Hut is an established canyon with a 2 star classification - meaning a canyon of National significance and features in the award winning "Canyoning in New Zealand" Guide Book. ( <a href="http://www.kiwicanyons.org/product/guide-book/">http:// www.kiwicanyons.org/product/guide-book/</a> ) .</p>	<p>2.Recognise the NZCA within the management plan as the relevant recreational group representing the canyoning community and as such, be invited to provide advice and stakeholder views in all consultations, on all matters regarding recreational canyoning activity within the park.</p>	
<i>Owen-Cooper, Anthony</i> 843/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Owen-Cooper, Beverly</i> 844/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Goldsack, Katrina</i> 845/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Goldsack, Joel</i> 846/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Goldsack, James</i> 847/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Goldsack, Ross</i> 848/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Duffy, Wayne</i> 849/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Squire, Brad</i> 850/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Lilly, David</i> 851/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Riddick, Tyrone</i> 852/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>van Dijk, Shani</i> 853/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Lilly, Leanne</i> 854/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cattermole, Peter</i> 855/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Atkinson, Chris and Mimi</i> 864/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Breden, Leigh</i> 866/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Bramhall, Sarah</i> 868/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain the text as written	
<i>Cheyne, Nat</i> 869/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	
<i>Cheyne, Talia</i> 870/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	
<i>Lister, Linda</i> 875/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	
<i>Bramhall, Jardin</i> 876/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	
<i>Lucas, Cole</i> 879/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	
<i>Gale, G</i> 883/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain the text as written	
<i>Craig, Andy</i> 884/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	
<i>Raath, Liske</i> 885/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain text as written	
<i>Fannin, Brendan</i> 886/1	Support the inclusion of boating in the recreational values for the Park.	Retain the text as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Soundscape and tranquillity outcomes</b>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/3	Very good to see "natural quiet" is highly values in the management plan.	Maintain all references to tranquillity, natural quiet and soundscapes. The mapping of soundscapes should be undertaken and	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		efforts to curtain noise in the park should be followed up on.	
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/3	Support the statement that aircraft activity can have adverse effects on Aoraki and the wider park. Support the plan's notion that tranquility is an important part of a persons experience in the park. These statements are incosistent with proposed management principles outlined later in the plan, suggesting increasing aircraft access.		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/7	For the tranquillity scale to have any meaning, each number needs to be associated with a clearly measurable quantity, e.g. sound level in dB, not to be exceeded more than X minutes per day. Remove the map on page 46, as it is meaningless, or clearly state how it integrates with the map of page 43.	Assign the tranquillity scale numbers to a clearly measurable quantity such as dB. Put in place a noise monitoring plan	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/7	Para 4, page 45: Support the stated purpose of the Park as being "to enable the public to receive inspiration, enjoyment, recreation and other benefits ... one of the most valued benefits is the ability to experience tranquil places."	Ensure that this purpose is reflected in the rest of the plan, especially with regard to aircraft.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/6	Good to see "natural quiet" is valued highly in the management plan., though the approach taken is virtually meaningless and lacks any real teeth in terms of addressing the loss of natural quiet within the park. The tranquillity scale is pure nonsense and totally subjective. What is needed is a robust plan in terms of actual numbers of overflights per day and an objective measure.	Maintain all references to tranquillity, natural quiet and soundscapes. Remove Map 5	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/29	Page 45, last paragraph: A reference to "sounds" was omitted from the paragraph's quotation from NPA section 4(2)(e).Natural quiet is part of the intrinsic worth of the park and enables the public to receive the benefits identified.	Amend the paragraph to include "sounds" in the first sentence to read: "One of the Park's purposes is to enable ...recreation and other benefits from the mountains, forests, sounds ..."	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/7	Oppose use of word 'Tranquillity'. You are specifically talking about the noise footprint within that Mount Cook National Park. Noise created by machines; mainly aircraft. Tranquillity (also spelled tranquillity) is the quality or state of being tranquil; that is, calm, serene, and worry-free. (Wikipedia) Tranquil (to me) is a state of mind (above). Helicopters passing overhead would disturb my tranquillity, as would moving through a crevasse field,	Reword, use 'noise' rather than 'tranquillity' Table 2 would then have 'Noise levels', rather than 'Tranquillity scale'. Replace 'soundscape' with 'noise footprint'	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>or walking down a gully with stones falling.</p> <p>‘Noise’ would be more understood by the many different nationalities visiting the park. If you said that an area had a very high noise level , this would be more readily understood,</p> <p>than saying this area had a very low tranquillity level .</p> <p>Using the word ‘tranquillity’ and ‘soundscape’ are just ways to confuse the issue. We are talking about ‘noise’ pure and simple.</p> <p>Who decides the noise levels (in your language 'desired tranquillity outcomes')? A New Zealand climber/tramper, a DOC bureaucrat, kaitiaki rūnaka, a tourism operator, a 'quick-fix' tourist (who wants a selfie on the glacier)?</p> <p>Apart from finding parking space this is the most important issue facing DOC in many areas. We need to keep to simple language and not cloud peoples’ understanding by using woolly words.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/84</p>	<p>NZAC appreciates the premise behind the tranquillity tool and the outcomes for tranquillity zoning. However it is hard to reconcile the draft Plan's stance of greatly expanded aircraft access and increased visitation rates through out the Park with the desired levels of tranquillity and tranquillity outcomes in the draft Plan. A number of concerns have been raised:</p> <p>1. While the Department has identified 'tranquillity' as a value to be preserved in the draft Plan, it lacks a clear methodology for how tranquillity is to be measured and mapped, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a lack of metrics through which sound or other aspects of tranquillity could be directly measured</li> <li>- no disclosure on whether tranquillity can be expected to change temporally (daily / seasonally)</li> <li>- whether the " anticipated future state of tranquillity" reflects the beginning or end of the Plan implementation of allowable landings</li> <li>- how the GPS-generated maps of flight paths informed the 'desired future outcome' map (Map 5) in the draft Plan.</li> <li>- how the locations/extent of landings and the desired tranquillity outcomes are related - which led to which.</li> </ul> <p>2. Tranquillity is not fully defined. The draft Plan states</p>	<p>1. Remove the tranquillity mapping tool until there is significant amendment to the tool, clarification of vague terminology, and public engagement in the methodology used to generate it.</p> <p>Otherwise:</p> <p>2. Provide a clearer definition of tranquillity and what contributes to it.</p> <p>3. Include 'improving tranquillity' as a goal for the draft Plan.</p> <p>4. Include an effective monitoring framework for desired tranquillity levels</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>that "tranquillity is a function of both the visible setting and the audible setting" - the Club agrees with this. However the Plan only addresses the "audible" setting.</p> <p>3. "Natural quiet" is a goal of the draft Plan, however it is not clear whether the draft Plan provides for any areas with a desired tranquillity rating of 10.</p> <p>4. The draft Plan has no room to 'improve' tranquillity levels over the life of the Plan. The Club believes this should be a goal of the Plan.</p> <p>5. The draft Plan lacks clarity on how the monitoring of tranquillity levels will be achieved and what it will entail.</p> <p>6. The links between VMZs and aircraft landing zones are unclear and confusing. The Club considers that the tranquillity mapping distracts from the VMZs.</p>		
<p><i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/4</p>	<p>The tranquillity maps in this section are unclear and this affects MCGG's ability to comment properly on the appropriateness of the tranquillity outcome areas.</p> <p>As a matter of general principle, concept of soundscape mapping and monitoring system in the park is supported. However, further detail is required in order to be able to comment on the appropriateness of the tranquillity outcomes:</p> <p>How has the level of tranquillity been selected? Why are some areas ranked as high and others low? Should this not be assessed in association with visitor surveys?</p> <p>Will there be the ability to adjust the tranquillity level up or down, based on visitor survey data?</p> <p>In the situation where some aircraft operators decide to operate aircraft with a lower soundscape footprint, will it be possible to apply for a relative increase in allocation?</p> <p>How does the Department propose to manage the influence of overflight activity on the soundscape and tranquillity mapping?</p>	<p>Improve detail associated with the tranquillity mapping, including how many landings each of the mapped tranquillity zones actually represents, and what factors drive tranquillity zone allocation and associated aircraft landing limits.</p> <p>Overlay surveys from park users to gauge their perception of tranquillity. Does it align with the ranking which has been applied?</p> <p>Do not rely on tranquillity measures as policy guidance until the system has been tested, understood and proven. Tranquillity monitoring and mapping should be run in parallel with existing systems (like visitor surveys) and only relied upon once the management system has been proven as effective.</p>	
<p><i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/5</p>	<p>Map 5, page 46. The tranquillity tracking and mapping appears to be logically applied from a process point of view. Less clear how these data points have been translated into 'desired tranquillity outcomes'. Map 5 apparently represents "the anticipated future state of tranquillity in the Park that the Plan sets out to achieve" (pg 47). There is no information about how 'desirability' has been determined/benchmarked or what time period over which this 'future' might be arrived at.</p> <p>The Westland/Tai Poutini NP Draft Plan refers to the</p>	<p>Increased transparency is needed in the Plan to make clear how 'desired tranquillity outcomes' have been determined. The Westland and Aoraki Plans should be consistent.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>"desired future state of natural soundscapes in the Park" (p58) whereas the AMCNP draft Plan uses the phrase "anticipated future state of tranquility" (p47). There is an important difference between 'desired' and 'anticipated'</p>		
<p><i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/9</p>	<p>Support the concept, although there must be more clarification/details</p>	<p>Retain</p>	
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/9</p>	<p>While the intent to quantify tranquillity or natural quiet is a potentially useful initiative it needs to be constrained in actual physical limits e.g. dB. It is unclear why the new tranquillity tool has been adopted in place of existing visitor management strategies (e.g. Destination Management Framework) and whether it is intended to replace them. Would suggest that the two could work together, but that the existing tools are superior to the untested tranquillity tool concept, having been developed more carefully and having clearer goals and outcomes.</p>	<p>Define how tranquillity will be measured. Develop monitoring plan. Develop policy to prohibit or limit noisy activities (e.g. suspend helicopter landings) following breaches of limits within monitored zone.</p>	
<p><i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/10</p>	<p>The Tranquillity Mapping Tool is extremely vague: apparently data was collected over the 2016/17 summer to generate maps showing tranquillity levels. Where can we see this? Why isn't it in the draft Plan? How useful is it actually, if participation was voluntary? And what are the criteria by which tranquillity was determined? There are far too many unanswered questions and it suggests that the method was not at all robust. Why does the very section describing tranquillity omit mention of the VMZ tool, and create a new map that shares very little with the VMZ map, without providing any overlay between the two.</p>	<p>Retain the first six paragraphs under "Soundscape and tranquillity outcomes".  Provide detailed information about how the Tranquillity Mapping Tool was actually used, including participation details and a map showing its results, or delete from the draft Plan altogether.</p>	
<p><i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/9</p>	<p>I am not in favour of allowing any further introduction of 'unnatural' anthropogenic noise sound caused by humans from powered aircraft (including over flights and landings) watercraft, vehicles and other human activities into the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park detailed in the Department's Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Amend plan to reflect submission.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Soundscape and tranquillity</b>		
<i>Winkler, Prof. Dr. Stefan</i> 329/2	Plan needs to address another factor potentially causing a negative experience on tranquillity - noise disturbance caused by increasing numbers of visitors walking the main tracks such as the Hooker Valley track. The use of information to identify appropriate consideration and respect for the environment should be included	Include a new subsection and/or policy to provide information to all visitors that they should respect the natural heritage by avoiding unnecessary noise pollution and disturbance to other visitors.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/4	Introduction of new planning concepts including zones. The Plan includes new planning zones that have been created using the concept of soundscapes and tranquillity ratings. However these are not clearly integrated with other established zoning methods (such as Visitor Management Zones). Their application adds confusion to established zoning methods, and as used at present, also undermines the purpose of national parks under the Act. It is important to note that assessing the impacts of activities such as aircraft traffic does not require the use of soundscapes or tranquillity ratings, albeit that they may be useful as a monitoring tool in the future. For example, the impacts of new aircraft access proposals could be directly assessed through the evaluation of flight paths, landing locations and frequencies, in relation to the status quo; yet this assessment is not provided. This is extremely relevant given that major changes in the management of aircraft are proposed. More direct forms of impact assessment need to be applied to these proposals to ascertain their acceptability against the statutory objectives.		
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/2	Significant omission as to the Draft's 'Tranquillity Mapping Tool' (TMT), and to noise regulation more generally raises still further questions as to the influence of third-party commercial aircraft operators on park management, as expressed in the Draft. Again, it is also unclear if DOC is concerned with the legality of having regard to such considerations. The magnitude of proposed landing numbers and associated movements, and of landing zones, amplifies this concern considerably. The Draft and supplementary document provide no significant detail on the TMT. Similarly, Draft provisions contain reference to ongoing noise monitoring, without providing meaningful further detail.	1. Apply park-wide moratorium on consideration of new concession applications for aircraft landings in the park, or upward variation of current concessions. Secure necessary regulatory change to apply moratorium if required. 2. Withdraw Draft and delay further public hearing pending publishing of: - the documents listed in Aircraft landing policies - General, above; along with - legal and policy advice concerning the appropriateness of use flight path controls in the park through section 29A(c) of the Civil Aviation Act; and - the external and independent peer review process for tranquillity and noise mapping, at a minimum including the steps listed in the attached 'Minimum Adequate TMT and	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Without that detail, no scrutiny or peer review of its robustness is possible. Given that tranquillity outcomes must be a primary policy goal for this process (refer statutory scheme discussed above), this is not an acceptable state of affairs.</p> <p>Given that the Draft explicitly links landing numbers with tranquillity outcomes, (see for example Policy 1.3.3.12), then setting landing numbers at this stage of plan development, ie without serious scrutiny of the TMT, is simply incongruous. The need to do so is also puzzling given the approach taken in the Draft Westland/Tai Potuni Plan, where a large existing fleet operates, and will continue to operate for the foreseeable future, in a regulatory environment as yet lacking landing caps (see Milestone 2.4.1.11 of that draft). In relation to in-flight aircraft noise, the Draft and supporting documents make mention of 'managing complex issues' in concert with the Civil Aviation Authority. But again no specific policy options or analysis are meaningfully discussed. Policy avenues that have been well-traversed by government agencies make no appearance. For example, the Draft omits to discuss flight path controls for tranquillity purposes through section 29A(c) of the Civil Aviation Act 1990 (ie public interest purposes as recorded in the Act).</p>	<p>Noise Control Methodology ' sheet presented at the bottom of this submission.</p> <p>3. If DOC is not able to deliver a process of a standard equal to or better than that presented in the 'Minimum Adequate TMT and Noise Control Methodology ', tranquillity zoning should be removed altogether in favour of Visitor Management Zoning.</p> <p>*Note the "Minimum adequate TMT and noise control methodology" document is provided t the end of this submission.</p>	
<i>Ramm, David</i> 481/2	<p>How can the plan decide what constitutes to my tolerable noise polution? The desired tranquility outcomes needs to be amended to become required tranquillity outcomes.</p>	<p>Amend the plan as in the submission.</p>	
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/1	<p>Natural landscapes and ecosystems have natural sounds: running water, falling rocks, avalanches, bird calls, insect noises etc. The world is becoming an increasingly noisy place, and one of the key values of National Parks is that people should be able to go there and enjoy quiet solitude for long periods of time, and be able to hear the sounds of nature in a way that is increasingly difficult in the rest of the world. You don't get the full experience of a National Park like Aoraki/ Mount Cook if you can see a magnificent mountain vista, but you can also constantly hear planes, helicopters, cars and people. In light of this I am pleased to see the thought that has gone into reflecting on and considering how to measure the soundscape (tranquillity) of the Park. However, having reflected on it you are then proposing making</p>	<p>Every visitor deserves the experience of high tranquillity in a National Park, and develop Management solutions to support this.</p> <p>Prescribe landing sites more tightly.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>large areas of the Park open to high numbers of aircraft flights and landings. Basically, the only quiet places will be the most remote places where few people visit. I would argue that visitors to the busy sites also deserve to have the experience of a quiet park.</p> <p>The desire for tranquillity is set out very articulately on page 45, but than contradict this with proposed management solutions.</p> <p>Do not support the suggestion of enormous landing zones, and think landing sites should be much more tightly prescribed as they are at present.</p> <p>At the moment your own information says that "approximately 4670 landings actually occurred in the Park last year (2017/18)". That is just 13 a day year - round. Or even if you allow that flying only happens on, say, 100 days a year, that is still only 46 flights a day in the whole park. That is noisy enough but you are going to increase it to 200 flights on the Tasman Glacier plus an unlimited number of heli-skiing flights plus all the other landing zones and flight limits you are allowing?!</p>		
<p><i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/10</p>	<p>The plan suggests glacier modelling shows a further "30 per cent loss of ice mass from Aoraki /Mt Cook by 2050" as a result of climate change. Concerned that the recession of glaciers and ice will drive the demand for access to the higher alpine environment by commercial operators. Increased flights with powered aircraft will adversely affect the Park's indigenous wildlife, on amenity, natural quiet and remoteness values. This activity is in direct conflict with the requirement to protect natural, cultural, heritage and intrinsic values within the park. Natural quiet is an important value. The quiet natural soundscape needs to be protected.</p> <p>The National Park guardians should be leading the way by reducing the use of fossil fuels - one of the causes of climate change - by limiting the numbers of powered flights in the Park. It could be setting a 'global example' of how to manage the adverse effects of climate change on biodiversity and the landscapes, instead of exacerbating the problem by allowing increased flights within the Park.</p>	<p>Oppose the increase of powered aircraft flights within the Park.</p> <p>Oppose powered aircraft flights to locations where they have been previously restricted.</p>	
<p><i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/5</p>	<p>The data used to represent desired tranquility outcomes is very limited and obtained on a voluntary basis.</p>	<p>Explain the reasoning behind the desired tranquility levels calculations. Obtain full consultation with affected user groups.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/12</p>	<p>Support the move to a soundscape mapping and monitoring system in the park however further detail is required in some areas in order to comment properly on the appropriateness of the tranquillity outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How has the level of tranquillity been selected, for example why are some areas ranked as high and others low, this should be assessed in association with visitor surveys.</li> <li>- Is there the ability to adjust the tranquillity level, either up or down, based on visitor feedback?</li> <li>- In the situation where some aircraft operators decide to operate aircraft with a lower soundscape footprint will there be the ability to apply for a relative increase in allocation?</li> <li>- How does the department propose to manage the influence of overflight activity on the soundscape and tranquillity mapping?</li> </ul>	<p>Improve detail associated with the TR mapping, including how many landings each of the mapped tranquillity zones actually represents, and what factors drive tranquillity zone allocation and associated aircraft landing limits.</p> <p>Overlay surveys from park users to gauge their perception of tranquillity, does it align with the ranking which has been applied. Do not rely on tranquillity measures as policy guidance until the system has been tested, understood and proven.</p> <p>Suggest that tranquillity monitoring and mapping is run in parallel with existing systems (like visitor surveys) and not be relied upon until the management system has been proven as effective.</p>	
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/4</p>	<p>Aircraft noise: DOC have made no effort to justify the proposed numbers of landings. There is a reasonable expectation by all visitors to NPs that they can enjoy the parks in peace and quiet. This clearly will not be the case for AMCNP especially for the Village, Tasman Valley (and surrounding ridges. The Tranquillity tool may yield useful data over time but any findings have been pre-empted by the largesse provided to aircraft operators in this draft Plan .</p>		
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/15</p>	<p>p47 Last sentence and Map 5. Who decided the 'desirable' tranquillity outcomes? Based on what criteria?</p>	<p>Clarify decision-making and criteria for desired tranquillity outcomes and have: Map 5a - current soundscape based on DOC research; Map 5b - soundscape to be worked towards in the future.</p>	
<p><i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/3</p>	<p>On the maps, it is different to make the distinction between areas of "low desired tranquillity" and the likely impacts of proposed landing zones. This implies that landing zones are being decided first, and then being used to determine the desired tranquillity of an area. The reverse order would be a more robust approach to policy development.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to provide transparency over how "desired tranquillity" has been calculated. Demonstrate that this has been done independently of the likely impact of landing sites.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/49</p>	<p>TIA supports the use of objective evidence to establish limits and accurately understand impact, both ecological and social, and therefore supports the concept of soundscapes and tranquillity modelling, and the science behind the tranquillity rating tool. TIA does not support the Tranquillity Outcome zones as</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete the Tranquillity Outcomes zones as presented in the Plan</li> <li>2. Review the implementation of the Tranquillity rating tool as a priority</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>presented in this Plan and submits that they are removed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is considerable confusion among tourism stakeholders as to how the proposed tranquillity outcome zones will actually work. It is critical that aircraft access as described in park plans is structured in a way that gives operators confidence and certainty to be able to plan and invest in their businesses and product mix.</li> <li>2. There are already three zoning tools to signal management of aircraft in the Park; the visitor management zones, aircraft access zones and aircraft landing zones and sites. It is important that the aircraft access zones stay well connected to the visitor management zones. At this stage, the Tranquillity Outcomes cause confusion and seem to add little value - they don't make practical sense</li> <li>3. Given that DOC does not have jurisdiction over activity in the air, it is not clear whether the tranquillity zones are a rule or a guidance for operators, and therefore what affect they will have on informing location of landing zones/sites, concession requirements and landing limits.</li> <li>4. There is no information on what the various tranquillity ratings actually mean in terms of aircraft use.</li> <li>5. It is very difficult to tell how the tranquillity outcomes interact with the visitor management zones, and whether one is subservient to the other.</li> <li>6. If the tranquillity outcomes are intended to influence flight paths, have the consequences of altered flight paths been considered - factors such as safety, efficiency of fuel usage, impact on other park users and viability in terms of weather?</li> </ol> <p>TIA submits that the implementation of the tranquillity rating tool into the Plan needs significant further thought and testing, and that this process must include working alongside aircraft operators to ensure any outcomes proposed for the Plan makes practical sense.</p> <p>TIA submits that the above work should be prioritised. It will add important evidence-based rigour to setting aircraft use limits in the Park, enable limits to reflect the reality of sound impacts in specific places, and enable evidence based changes to limits as circumstances change through the life of the Plan. These outcomes are all critical to supporting sustainable air access in our</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p data-bbox="264 113 421 140">national parks.</p>		
<p data-bbox="40 164 219 225"><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/8</p>	<p data-bbox="264 164 869 256">While the intent to quantify tranquillity or natural quiet is a potentially useful initiative it needs to be constrained in actual physical limits e.g. dB.</p> <p data-bbox="264 292 869 568">Aspects of the tranquillity map are completely disconnected with reality, in the context of the wider Plan. Other areas of the Plan would permit around 70,000 landings per annum (every few minutes in daylight) on the Tasman Glacier, a 10-fold increase on current limits. If this level of aircraft activity is corresponds to a "medium" level of tranquillity (Map 5) then one can have no faith whatsoever in the legitimacy of this planning tool.</p> <p data-bbox="264 571 869 914">Priority tranquil areas should be areas currently zoned remote, and the Hooker glacier. The entire Hooker should be zoned for “very high” tranquillity values. A large area of the area zoned for “high tranquillity” or “medium tranquillity” in Map 5 overlaps broad heliski areas in an orange (generally permitted) landing zone (Map 7.1) where unlimited daily landings for heliskiing are proposed (Section 2.3.3 policy 8). These outcomes are utterly incompatible and reflect a serious disjoint between the stated aims of preserving natural quiet/tranquillity and the actual effects of this Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="264 949 869 1193">It is unclear why the new tranquillity tool has been adopted in place of existing visitor management strategies (e.g. Destination Management Framework) and whether it is intended to replace them. I would suggest that the two could work together, but that the existing tools are superior to the untested tranquillity tool concept, having been developed more carefully and having clearer goals and outcomes.</p>	<p data-bbox="896 164 1339 191">Define how tranquillity will be measured.</p> <p data-bbox="896 226 1169 253">Develop monitoring plan.</p> <p data-bbox="896 288 1505 381">Develop policy to prohibit or limit noisy activities (e.g. suspend helicopter landings) following breaches of limits within monitored zone.</p> <p data-bbox="896 416 1464 443">Rezone the Hooker glacier to "very high" tranquillity.</p>	
<p data-bbox="40 1214 203 1307"><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/14</p>	<p data-bbox="264 1214 869 1275">The idea of tranquillity zones is supported in preference to the historical management of visitor dissatisfaction.</p> <p data-bbox="264 1310 869 1493">Tranquillity zones were developed following the installation of gps tracking devices on ‘some’ aircraft in the 2016/2017 summer. No discussion or information has been provided to determine the accuracy of this modelling against the known extent of aircraft operators within and overflying the park.</p>	<p data-bbox="896 1214 1482 1339">Provide more information about the accuracy of the modelling and the quantifiable number of over flights and/or aircraft landings that relates to each ‘tranquillity rating’.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>There is no specified number of aircraft flights/landings applied to each of the scales in Table 2 on page 47 of the draft Plan. What gives a Tranquillity Rating of 'Very Low' - is it more than 50 over flights/landings per day? Consequentially, what gives a Tranquillity Rating of 'Very High' - less than 5 over flights per day? There must be a quantifiable number of over flights and/or aircraft landings that relates to each 'tranquillity rating'.</p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/9</p>	<p>Has concerns about the Tranquillity Mapping Tool (TMT) and the desired Tranquillity Outcomes described in the Draft Plan. Submits that if the Visitor Management Zones are set correctly and if Aircraft Landing Sites are established in accordance with those settings, the TMT will be best utilised as a monitoring methodology. Submits that while the TMT is in its infancy, it should not be utilised to formulate parameters within the Plan, but rather to assess the effectiveness of the plan and drive improvements as necessary.</p>	<p>Supports in principle the concept and use of the Tranquillity Mapping Tool, but only as a method to monitor and drive enforcement of established Visitor Management settings.</p>	
<p><i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/7</p>	<p>see submission under Map 5 Desired tranquillity outcomes</p>	<p>Desired Tranquillity Outcomes needs full review.</p>	
<p><i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/3</p>	<p>I oppose the assessment of the tranquillity zones and front country assessment - this has been assessed in isolation and needs to be benchmarked to other areas to moderate the assessment. No identification of seasonal impacts.</p>	<p>Amend the assessment of the tranquility zones so that seasonality is considered, benchmarking is undertaken and smaller areas and blocks are considered e.g. Whitehorse Camp Area.</p>	
<p><i>Vass, David</i> 788/5</p>	<p>There is no proof that intrinsic values and priority of public enjoyment, will not be compromised by the increase in aircraft landings. Such sweeping changes as proposed must be based on a robust and transparent methodology, with appropriate monitoring and analysis of data available to the public. Over the life of this plan, the TMT may have potential to be developed further and may well become a useful tool into the future. For now it is unfit for purpose.</p>	<p>The new plan should retain the methodologies of the old and the tranquillity settings should be removed.</p>	
<p><i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/11</p>	<p>I am puzzled why the General Policy phrase "natural quiet" has been lost to the "Tranquillity Level". The area of the park with only Medium tranquillity is close to 50% of the park. This is not acceptable. On p 47 it is</p>	<p>Delete the Tranquillity Zones and limit aircraft landing sites and numbers so that the majority of visitors who do not use them or seek back country and remote experiences are not disadvantaged.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>stated that "Most people tend to increasingly benefit from tranquillity above 5 on the TR scale" what is the basis for this? What are the decibel levels for anthropogenic noise at each point of the scale? The reference to "desired tranquillity outcomes" in the last paragraph begs the question - desired by whom? There is no requirement for the Department to provide physical access via aircraft to the glaciers and peaks - the magnificence of the mountain and landscape can be enjoyed from many viewpoints. Scenic flights do not have to be provided for.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Objective 1</b>		
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/2	That a key goal be included to improve accessibility of gateway destinations and attractions within MCNP for people with disability or limited mobility.	Amend Objective 1 to include improved accessibility for people with disability or limited mobility.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/4	Support, although in order to encourage more people to enjoy the back country, foot access into the park needs to be fostered.	Retain this objective, and particularly Objective 1©	
<i>Sweney, Stella</i> 76/1	Support this objective.	Retain this objective with clear controls on numbers for both day visitor excursions and flight access for specified areas.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/21	Support Objective 1(d) but it should not exclude other New Zealanders to whom this area is most sacred and significant.	Amend Objective 1(d) to add the words " ... And other New Zealanders who consider the mountains sacred."	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/9	Support this objective	Retain this objective with sensible limits on numbers, particularly for day trips and flight access for specified areas.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/4	Support this, A diverse range of opportunities should be available for both NZ residents and international visitors. Numbers need to be managed sensibly to ensure long-term sustainability.	Retain this objective with sensible limits on numbers, particularly for day-trips and flight access for specified areas.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/8	Support objective, however to encourage more people to enjoy the back country foot access into the park needs to be fostered.	Keep Objective 1	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/30	the outdoor experiences objective should be expanded to express the significance of the park to the outdoor recreation whānui.	Amend Objective 1 to acknowledge the significance of the area to outdoor recreationalists	
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/5	Regarding Objective 1 c) Do not support encouraging more people to access the park with current access roads	Remove this objective from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and parking.		
<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i> 674/9	HNZPT supports visitor recreation in and around heritage sites; however it should be recognised that recreational activities have the potential to adversely affect heritage sites. In recognition of this HNZPT recommends an additional policy under this objective.	Recommend an additional policy: Work with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga and other organisations to manage the impacts of visitors and recreational activities on historic heritage values.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/6	As provider of commercial recreational activities and provider of facilities for access by other recreational visitors to the park, supports the objectives and the policies of this section of the draft Plan. Will continue to be a provider of a range of high quality commercial recreational opportunities and recreational visitor facilities, and wishes to see that conflict by those providing similar activities is avoided or minimised.	Retain the objectives and policies within this section of the Plan.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/15	TIA is generally supportive of the objectives of Section 1.2.3. However we are concerned that they provide insufficient acknowledgement of the importance of concessionaire-provided outdoor experiences in the Park, particularly high alpine recreational activity.	1. Amend Objective 1 to - include a statement to support the importance of concessionaire-provided outdoor experiences and particularly high alpine recreational opportunities within the Park, - distinctly refer to the important role of concessionaires in supporting the outdoor recreation experience of visitors to the Park. 2. Include a specific objective of working to improve access and opportunities for concessionaires providing outdoor experiences.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/10	Support the objectives and policies with a revision. Submits that the Objectives and Policies within 1.2.3 lack ambition and detail on what recreational infrastructure, such as huts and tracks, will be provided	The Objectives and Policies within 1.2.3 should contain concrete and measurable commitments to the Recreational Community, specifically with regards to the provision of huts and tracks.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/9	Support		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/12	The lack of reference to other park values, such as intrinsic values and natural quiet is symptomatic of the tourism bias in the plan.	Include reference to protecting intrinsic values, remote experience and natural quiet and the avoidance or minimise effects of visitors on these values.	
<i>Hāpai te Hauora Tapui Limited</i> 831/7	This plan consistently advocates for the "protection of indigenous natural, historic, and cultural values, including Ngāi Tahu values". This would show integrity if it also specified that Aoraki be smoke free because it would mean encompassing a world view that emphasises	Review Objective 1 to reflect and include the matters raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>the link between people and their natural environment as a fundamental starting point for wellbeing.</p> <p>Community and Public Health, a division of the Canterbury District Health Board, operate within the Canterbury and West Coast areas of these iwi boundaries. They worked with the Christchurch City Council and Cancer Society in 2009 to adopt and implement a plan to make all Christchurch parks, playgrounds, sports grounds and Council events smoke free.</p> <p>Since then, various spaces around the motu have seen the benefits of smoke free spaces- health gains for whānau, no exposure to second hand smoke, less litter, decreased fire risk.</p> <p>A smoke free maunga would promote Ngāi Tahu and Department of Conservation as a national leader in health and wellbeing, given the stalled progress in many other regions to create smoke free maunga policies.</p> <p>Hāpai Te Hauora advocate for Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park to be completely smoke free. This policy would contribute towards the health and prosperity of tangata whenua, tauiwi, and whenua. We feel it is not only aligned with the aims of the draft management plan, and the Department of Conservation's values but it also has the potential to position Department of Conservation and Aoraki as leaders in being the first region in the country to declare having a smoke free maunga.</p>		
<p><i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/9</p>	<p>Support this. A diverse range of opportunities should be available for both NZ residents and international visitors. Numbers need to be managed sensibly to ensure long-term sustainability.</p> <p>Excessive numbers in any part of the park will cause lasting environmental damage and a diminished user experience.</p>	<p>Retain this objective with sensible limits on numbers, particularly for day-trips and flight access for specified areas.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/9</p>	<p>Support this. A diverse range of opportunities should be available for both NZ residents and international visitors. Numbers need to be managed sensibly to ensure long-term sustainability.</p> <p>Excessive numbers in any part of the park will cause lasting environmental damage and a diminished user experience.</p>	<p>Retain this objective with sensible limits on numbers, particularly for day-trips and flight access for specified areas.</p>	
<p><i>Morrison, Marilyn</i> 887/1</p>	<p>Include recreational boating.</p>	<p>Recreational Values as they are, because they provide for the opportunity to experience all types of recreational</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		boating within the park.	
<i>Morrison, Peter</i> 888/1	Support - including recreational boating.	Recreational Values as they are, because they provide for the opportunity to experience all types of recreational boating within the park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 1</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/5	The Department's Statement of Intent does not fall from conservation legislation and is non-statutory in terms of the national park management plan. It is an irrelevant consideration and should not have a role in the plan.	Remove any reference to the Statement of Intent in the provisions of the plan.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/12	Support for Policy 1, 3 and 4		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/10	Support Policies 1 -6 and 8 - 10.		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/13	Reference to SOI outcomes and stretch goals are irrelevant in that they are not necessarily relevant to an individual park plan.	Delete reference to DoC's intermediate outcomes and stretch goals.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 2</b>		
<i>Sweny, Stella</i> 76/2	Clarification requested. Does DOC intend to compete with concessionaires or complement.	Rather than "in addition" state "to complement those provided by concessionaires".	
<i>Sweny, Stella</i> 76/3	Needs to recognise the heritage of climbers and the contribution of professional guides to mountain safety, search and rescue skills and conservation values.	Incorporate more from the 2005 plan in regards to this policy (regarding policy 2 b)	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/31	Policy 2(b): The statute contains no economic mandate and the policy should restrict its consideration to carrying capacity only.	Amend Policy 2(b) to read: "visitor investment processes that consider carrying capacity:"	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/13	Partially support Policy 2. Support Policy 2 a)i) and a)ii), but Policy 2 b would lead it open to commercialism and unlimited concessions.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/26	The Plan often refers to the provision of 'safe' outdoor recreation opportunities e.g. 'identify, provide and manage a range of safe outdoor recreation opportunities'. TIA is a strong advocate for safe and quality experiences, however we are aware that 'safe' is a highly subjective term which relates very much to a particular context and visitor expectation. Its use as described here does not add value to the Plan, rather it	Review the use of the word "safe" in Policy 2 and elsewhere in the Plan to reflect the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	could cause misleading expectations in decision makers and visitors alike.		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/14	Regarding Policy 2 a) There is no mention of being "consistent with protecting intrinsic values, including natural quiet".	Include reference to protecting intrinsic values, including natural quiet.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/15	Regarding Policy 2 b) This provision wrongly focuses on economics as opposed to protection. Provision of recreation opportunities should not be based on consideration of revenue opportunities.	Amend the Policy by removing the words "revenue opportunities"	
<i>Hāpai te Hauora Tapui Limited</i> 831/5	Policy 2(a)(i): This plan consistently advocates for the "protection of indigenous natural, historic, and cultural values, including Ngāi Tahu values". This would show integrity if it also specified that Aoraki be smoke free because it would mean encompassing a world view that emphasises the link between people and their natural environment as a fundamental starting point for wellbeing.	Amend Policy 2 to address the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 3</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/22	Policy 3(b): The policy should be inclusive to recognise other New Zealanders who consider the mountain sacred.	Amend Policy 3(b) by adding to the end of the sentence: "... and other New Zealanders who consider this area significant and sacred."	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/13	Policy 3 b) We find the Objectives and Policies rather nebulous. Would all DOC staff understand "add value to the visitor experience in the Park, including through opportunities to express the specific importance of the Park to Kāi Tahu whānui"? Would visitors understand this?	Reword . Use plain simple language that is understood by everyone. Also needs to be objective and measurable.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/16	Regarding Policy 3 b) The phrase "add value to the visitor experience" implies an economic value to the providers.	Amend phrase to "improves visitor experience".	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 4</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/33	Business groups' involvement should only occur after the korero identified in Policy 4.	Amend Policy 4 to read: " Work closely with kaitiaki rūnaka and recreation groups to explore opportunities ..."	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/17	Reference to other park values such as intrinsic values and natural quiet is omitted.	Include reference to protecting intrinsic values, remote experience and natural quiet.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 5</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/7	A great policy  "minimise adverse effects on tranquility, natural quiet, solitude and remoteness where these are an important expectation of visitor experience" - note that this is different from the policy	Retain policy 5	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/23	All concessionaires should be treated fairly and entitled to concession processes that do not differ due to culture, size or money..DOC should work constructively with concessionaires and alert them to any reasons that they are aware of that the concession may be declined before the process starts.	Amend Policy 5 to state that DOC will endeavour at all times to comply with the NPA 1980 where all concessionaires are treated fairly, on an even-handed basis, to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/14	This policy would make four wheel driving in the upper Godley a suitable recreational activity as there is little or no conflict with other tourist users and hunters, botanists, climbers, photographers will have access to this area.  Ask to consider that four wheel driving provides those who have limited physical access to the Aoraki Mt Cook National Park including elderly who have climbed/ hunted/ skied/ tramped in these areas in more able days, and family groups where children can be included and introduced to the values of the park and our amazing heritage and the less-able to see the effects of enormous physical environment.	consider four wheel driving in the park.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/18	Support Policy 5. However the mechanisms in the plan for visitor management and aircraft zones do not achieve this.	Retain Policy. Amend visitor settings/aircraft zones and allocations to achieve the policy.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 6</b>		
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/2	Support. There is no mention of providing information and skills to keep visitor safe while experiencing the Park.	Add to, or create a new policy outlining the Departments vision and responsibility for visitors safety and well being including informing of risks and competency requirement.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 7</b>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/5	Support Policy 7 as written.	Retain Policy 7 as written	
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/2	Support general direction, add to Policy 7 that it should emphasise avoiding aircraft noise in Hooker Valley	Policy 7 should emphasise avoiding aircraft noise in Hooker Valley	
<i>Nelson, Sandy</i> 321/3	Support Policy 7. Tranquillity, natural quiet, solitude and remoteness are impacted on by aircraft - any	Retain Policy 7.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	increase in flights needs to be minimal.		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/21	The words "Avoid, remedy or minimise adverse effects ..." do not provide clear guidance for administrators as is required by the Interpretation section - Policies on page 11. The current wording would give the Department unfettered discretion over its won decisions.	Amend Policy 7 to read: "Avoid, or minimise as far as practicable, adverse effects on the qualities ..."	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/9	This goes to the heart of the contradiction evident between "fostering sustainable recreation" and the statement that "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access ..." Policies 7 and 9 are excellent - our activities in the park should be exemplary of environmental sustainability. "Fostering sustainable recreation" should be the centrepiece of the whole management plan as far as recreation and how we interact with and treat the Park in the future.	Retain Policy 7 as written	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/12	What does this mean? If you have a defined 'noise footprint', operators who compromise this are penalised. There is enough smart technology for monitoring. All non-core activities that do not allow people to experience the natural quiet should be avoided. Delete heli-skiing and heli-hiking activity in the park to achieve Policy 7, by avoiding aircraft movements for non-core activities.	Delete non-core activities in the park to achieve Policy 7, by avoiding aircraft movements for non-core activities. Delete heli-skiing to achieve this policy.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/14			
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/7	Skyscape appreciation, either unaided, by telescope or with camera, is an emerging recreational past time and tourism attraction. The management of artificial light intrusion into the Park should be considered alongside the management of noise.	Retain Policies 1 to 10. Reword Policy 7 to include "natural light"	
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/2	The policy currently states "Avoid, remedy or minimise adverse effects on the qualities of tranquillity and natural quiet, solitude and remoteness WHERE these are important features and expectations of the visitor experience in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park." Suggest the word 'where' be replaced with 'because'. Once you have done that, then you should go back and consider the implications of that in a management sense. Every visitor deserves the experience of high tranquillity	Policy 7 replace the word 'where' with the word 'because' then consider the implications of that in a management sense.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	in a National Park, and I don't believe the draft management plan as it stands delivers that in terms of how much aircraft access it is going to allow to large areas of the Park.		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/5	Policy 7 is critical as the qualities of tranquillity and natural quiet, solitude and remoteness are all incredibly important for most areas of the park away from the village and road. These qualities are all under threat from increased helicopter usage in the park. Many other parts of the plan need review to be consistent with this policy.	Retain and increase the emphasis of 1.2.3 policy 7.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/8	Policy strongly supported. This is currently an expectation for visitors to the upper Hooker Valley under the current plan which does not allow air access.	Retain Policy 7 as written	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/3	Tranquillity, natural quiet, solitude and remoteness are part of the essence of why people enjoy national parks. These fundamental values need to be ensured in perpetuity. Increases in visitor numbers need to be offset by ensuring the park is a place of tranquillity, natural quiet, solitude and remoteness. There should not be any increases in helicopter concessions and flights.	Retain and ensure Policy 7	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/3	Reference is made to minimising the adverse effects on tranquillity and natural quiet "...where these are important features and expectations of the visitor experience" in the Park (p.62), without any specification about how this will be established or determined.	The Plan should make clear specification about where tranquillity and natural quiet are important features or an expectation among visitors, and how this has been / will be determined. It would be helpful if the tranquillity ratings were also included in the Visitor Management Zone prescriptions (Appendix 2).	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/6	Reference is made to minimising the adverse effects on tranquillity and natural quiet "...where these are important features and expectations of the visitor experience" in the Park. (p49) without any specification about how this will be established or determined.	The Plan should make clear specification about where tranquillity & natural quiet are important features or an expectation among visitors, and how this has been/will be determined. It would be helpful if the tranquillity ratings were also included in the Visitor Management Zone prescriptions (Appendix 2)	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/11	Revisit once further work is done on the TMT and Desired Tranquillity Outcomes is achieved.	Needs more work.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/11	Strongly support Policy 7.	Retain Policy 7.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/19	The phrase "where these are important features and expectations of the visitor experience" provides unacceptable exceptions as these qualities are expected in a national park.	Delete the above phrase from Policy 7.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/11	Support this policy, but it should refer explicitly to VMZ requirements.  There should be a Milestone every two years to ensure that the results of any other new policies regarding anything that may affect visitor experiences comply with this policy.	Amend Policy 7 to refer to the requirements of desired visitor experience for each of the Visitor Management Zones.  Add Milestone as per submission.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 8</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/24	Consultation must include local concessionaires and residents, especially where public access may be affected. One competitor, commercially, should not be given an advantage over another.	Amend Policy 8 to include local concessionaires and residents, especially where public access may be affected.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/34	the policy should ensure that public notification occurs for any non--departmental accommodation and/or recreation facilities proposal.	Amend Policy 8 to require public notification of all proposals for non-Departmental accommodation and/or recreation facilities.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 9</b>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/6	Support Policy 9 as written. "Fostering sustainable recreation" should be the centrepiece of the whole management plan as far as recreation goes.	Retain Policy 9 as written	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/10	This goes to the heart of the contradiction evident between "fostering sustainable recreation" and the statement that "Aircraft are expected to become the main mechanism for recreation access ..." Policies 7 and 9 are excellent - our activities in the park should be exemplary of environmental sustainability. "Fostering sustainable recreation" should be the centrepiece of the whole management plan as far as recreation and how we interact with and treat the Park in the future.	Retain Policy 9 as written	
<i>Leave No Trace New Zealand</i> 660/1	Strongly support Policy 9 which ensures that those holding a concession for operating within the park need to practice and promote the 'Leave No Trace' principles.	Retain text as written.	
<i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/4	SCDHB commends the plan's focus on sustainability and reducing waste. The inclusion of a smokefree policy will help to support this. Cigarette butts are the most commonly littered item in New Zealand, and many smokers don't consider cigarette waste the same as other	Include a smokefree policy and ban smoking in AMCNP.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>forms of littering. This is represented by a comment made by a respondent in a 2018 survey who said "[cigarette butts are] not really litter". Anecdotal evidence from the survey suggests that there was a disparity between smokers' attitudes towards littering and the environment, and what they did with their cigarette butts. In addition to this attitude, cigarette butts are slow to break down, and leach toxic chemicals into the environment. Discarded filters with remnant tobacco contain many chemicals that may be harmful to the environment. Cigarette butts are not biodegradable, and are made of a synthetic material called cellulose acetate. Cellulose acetate is photodegradable, meaning ultraviolet light eventually breaks it into smaller pieces, but it cannot decompose and may linger in the environment for 10 to 15 years. Because cigarettes are so frequently littered, and are viewed as distinct from other forms of waste, offering appropriate sites for disposal isn't necessarily a solution. Section 1.3.1 mentions requiring visitors to remove all waste. People are unlikely to comply with this in regards to cigarette butts, so banning smoking is the most effective way to eliminate this waste.</p>		
<p><i>Hāpai te Hauora Tapui Limited</i> 831/6</p>	<p>Community and Public Health, a division of the Canterbury District Health Board, operate within the Canterbury and West Coast areas of these iwi boundaries. They worked with the Christchurch City Council and Cancer Society in 2009 to adopt and implement a plan to make all Christchurch parks, playgrounds, sports grounds and Council events smoke free.</p> <p>Since then, various spaces around the motu have seen the benefits of smoke free spaces- health gains for whānau, no exposure to second hand smoke, less litter, decreased fire risk.</p> <p>A smoke free maunga would promote Ngāi Tahu and Department of Conservation as a national leader in health and wellbeing, given the stalled progress in many other regions to create smoke free maunga policies. Hāpai Te Hauora advocate for Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park to be completely smoke free. This policy would contribute towards the health and prosperity of tangata whenua, tauwi, and whenua. We feel it is not only aligned with the aims of the draft management plan,</p>	<p>Amend Policy 9 to reflect the issues raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and the Department of Conservation's values but it also has the potential to position Department of Conservation and Aoraki as leaders in being the first region in the country to declare having a smoke free maunga.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Policy 10</b>		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/8	A hut booking system is not practicable for the backcountry alpine huts, due to weather and timing flexibility required. The current system of a Park Intentions System, the Hut Occupancy Board at the visitors centre and the culture of trying to not arrive at a full hut but making room when it is full.	Reword policy 10 to read "monitor hut usage and make recommendations on the need to implement a booking system for front country, easily accessed huts only. These are huts that are primarily frequented by overnight users rather than by climbers, skiers and mountaineers.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/35	Policy should focus on the monitoring of hut usage only. The suggestion of the need for a booking system is a presumptuous response to a complex raft of issues, and may have negative consequences. In general, huts that are challenging and rewarding to reach on foot should not be made easier to access than at present, and hut booking systems should not be established for any huts except front country easy-access huts that are under heavy pressure. Care should be taken to encourage self-reliant recreation and to preserve the NZ backcountry culture of welcoming all comers to huts and providing shelter from the storm. The extreme changeability of weather in NZ requires a more flexible approach.	Amend Policy 10 to remove the reference to implementing a booking system, except in relation to front country easy-access huts that are under heavy pressure.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/6	Appreciate the need to manage bed space in busy huts, but concerned that booking systems inherently tend to favour tourist/sightseeing visitors over climbers, as tourists often plan trips months in advance whereas amateur climbers need to retain flexibility to take 'weather windows'. For example, the booking system at Mueller hut has made it very difficult for climbers to use the hut during late spring to summer. Concerned that with increasing ease of helicopter access bed space in high huts will be booked up in advance by overnight visitors leaving no space for climbers.	Reword 1.2.3 policy 10 to something like "Monitor hut usage and investigate options for managing overcrowding whilst enabling use by a range of different user types including backcountry recreationalists"	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/9	A hut booking system is not practical for the backcountry high alpine huts. Timing flexibility is an intrinsic requirement in order to work around the weather. The combination of the Park Intentions System, Hut Occupancy Board and the traditional backcountry	Reword Policy 10 to read: "Monitor hut usage and make recommendations on the need to implement a booking system for front country, easily accessed huts only. These are huts that are primarily frequented by overnight users rather than by climbers, skiers and mountaineers."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	culture are effective currently in managing overcrowding in these huts.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/64	Recommendations on Section 1.2.3 policy 10 should be considered on a hut by hut basis and take into account the reality of gains versus additional work for DOC. While some huts could benefit from a booking system, many are well supported by DOC's current system of letting visitors know hut occupancy rates.	Reword Policy 10 to reflect that the implementation of this policy includes consultation with alpine guiding concessionaires, the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and recreational groups.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/12	New proposed hut booking system is not practicable for the backcountry high alpine huts.	Retain the current hut system for the backcountry high alpine huts. (Refer to NZAC's submission.)	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.3 Recreational values Milestone 1</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/10	New Milestone: There is no provision for monitoring for crowding or recreation conflict specified in the Table. NZAC would like a milestone added that will require annual monitoring of visitor perceptions, using visitor surveys, with the goal of reducing poor perceptions.	Add a Milestone on visitor monitoring of perceptions of crowding and conflict with a goal of decreasing poor perceptions in accordance with this submission.	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/4	Supports the integration of historic and cultural interpretation into the visitor experience but queries the intended delivery mode of this interpretation. Does the milestone refer to interpretation signs, or all forms of interpretation (including personal)?	Plan needs to clarify the intention of this milestone	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/7	Supports integration of historic and cultural interpretation into the visitor experience but queries the intended delivery mode of this interpretation. Does the milestone refer to interpretation signs or all forms of interpretation (including personal)?	Plan needs to clarify the intention of this milestone.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/3	The milestones in the draft plan are underwhelming and show a lack of ambition to improve, rather than just manage, the experiences for the ever increasing numbers of visitors. Recreational opportunities should receive a much stronger focus. In particular mountaineering, ski-touring and related alpine pursuits need more explicit attention given their long history in the park and the outstanding opportunities. Valley walking/tramping also needs more encouragement	Provide a stronger focus for recreational opportunities in the Milestones.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/17	A objective is required to support the importance of concessionaire-provided outdoor experiences and particularly high alpine recreational opportunities within	Adjust the milestones to suitably enable the role of the concessionaires in achieving the objective.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>the Park (see submission point 15)</p> <p>A milestone needs to be included to give life to this objective.</p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/11</p>	<p>Do not support The inclusion of only one single Milestone in this section is inconsistent with the Departments legal requirement to foster Recreation. Whilst not legally operative, the Milestones in a National Park Management Plan are perceived as important and concrete commitments by the Department to the recreational community.</p>	<p>Should utilise the Milestones section to signal its enthusiasm for fostering Recreation on Public Conservation Land.</p>	
<p><i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/20</p>	<p>Milestones have no legal effect but these are perfunctory: Is there a current recreation plan or inventory? Is there a system for monitoring hut bookings? Is there a monitoring programme for assessing any adverse effects of visitors on park values?</p>	<p>Include meaningful milestones and include additional policies to ensure these actions have legal effect.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>1.2.4 Engagement Values</b></p>		
<p><i>Warner, James</i> 75/3</p>	<p>Add another policy as below.</p>	<p>Add Policy 10: "Recognise that hunting groups play a part in contributing to conservation. Work with these groups to work towards achieving conservation outcomes."</p>	
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/25</p>	<p>New policy: Add a new policy to manage the control of pests within the Park, using non-toxic forms of pest control so there is less danger to visitors and New Zealanders. Policy should address the following matters: - no toxic pest control to be used near any water - no 10880 drops in the Park, but trapping instead - tahr culls no undertaken near any water source. The meat should be saved to feed to feed those unable to afford meat, or made available to meat processing industry</p>	<p>Add a new Policy 10 to address the matters raised by the submitter</p>	
<p><i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/7</p>	<p>Retain the existing policies and add a new policy to recognise recreational hunting.</p>	<p>Add a new policy to state that: "Recognise that hunting is an important recreational use of Mount Cook National Park. DOC will support hunting in the park."</p>	
<p><i>Haugh, Andrew</i> 607/6</p>	<p>Increase Ranger profile amongst tourists, available to assist and engage with walkers. Highlight birds, plants, weather and mountains.</p>	<p>Increase the number of DOC Rangers out in the Park on the tracks and glaciers engaging with recreationists.</p>	
<p><i>South Canterbury District Health</i></p>	<p>New Zealanders are passionate about the environment, and want to protect our precious natural resources. The</p>	<p>Ban smoking in AMCNP.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Board</i> 742/9	<p>Ngā Kōrero Hauora o Ngā Taiohi Youth Wellbeing Survey found that young New Zealanders consider the natural environment an important priority.</p> <p>Forty one percent of respondents identified New Zealand's "clean, green nature" as one of the things they love about living here and many reported a desire to see more action on climate change and conservation.</p> <p>Concerns about climate change and damage to the environment were a significant cause of stress and anxiety for some participants.</p> <p>A Keep New Zealand Beautiful survey indicated that 99% of respondents saw New Zealand's clean, green image as extremely important or very important.</p> <p>New Zealand and international research shows high levels of support for smokefree outdoor environments, including support from smokers and ex-smokers, who want to reduce exposure for non-smokers (especially children) and decrease chances of relapse after quitting.</p> <p>Nearly three quarters (73%) of New Zealanders support banning smoking in outdoor areas where children are likely to go</p>		
<i>Carr, Anna</i> 808/7	Support raising the understanding of visitors to the park in regards to preservation of natural park values.	Interpretation should be resourced to ensure appropriate visitor behaviour to reduce negative impacts on the environment. The IV levy and Environmental Contributions from tourism could be distributed to assist with this.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/12	<p>Support all Objectives and Policies under this section, in particular Policy 7, which could be the only Policy in the entire draft Plan to refer to sustainability.</p> <p>Milestone 4 should also include development of particular programmes enhancing youth engagement.</p>	Reword Milestone 4 to include development of programmes enhancing youth engagement, also by Year 3. Retain all other Objectives, Policies, and Milestones	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/13	I support the Department's Objectives and Policies for 'Engagement Values.	Retain text as written.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/6	Support objectives and policies as written	Retain 1.2.4 Objectives and policies	
<i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/7	Policies, Objectives and Milestones: ProGuides endorses the policies objectives and milestones relating to the "New Zealanders Connect and Contribute to Conservation" section of the draft plan (Pages 51 & 52). Our members are committed to conservation values and will willingly work with Park authorities to increase awareness and positive behaviour	Amend section 1.2.4 Policies, objectives and milestones to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	of visitors.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Intro</b>		
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/5	There is no mention made of the disability sector being engaged or empowered through our environment	Amend the Engagement values section to provide open opportunities for all	
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/1	This section does not mention any hunting organisations or recreational hunters. By omission of these the plan is not recognising the value of game animals to the local community.	Reword to include the need to engage at all levels with local and national bodies in relation to recognising the valuable inputs GAC and other national hunting organisations, to achieve mutual outcomes. Include specific policy of how DOC will work with specific hunting groups to achieve mutual goals.	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/6	We support the statement in paragraph 4 that youth are the voice of the future and must be encouraged to access wild places ... Thar Lodge provides a base for the nationally recognised HUNTS Course to introduce new/young hunters to the wider environment in a safe, managed way. This should be recognised.	Include recognition of the role of NZDA to encouraging youth to access the wider natural environment as identified.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/4	Concern that opportunities for co-operative wild animal control by recreational hunters are not addressed in the plan.	Amend to include NZDA as one of the groups "interested in the general wellbeing and protection of Aoraki ..." Include opportunities for NZDA to cooperate in tahr management and wild animal control in the Park.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/2	Provision should be made for consultation with the outdoor community where new developments or redevelopments are proposed.	Include provision for consultation with the outdoor community when developing proposals for development or redevelopments in the Park.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/2	CMC would like to be acknowledged as an interested party with respect to the general wellbeing and protection of Aoraki and wider home of his whanau.	Amend the penultimate paragraph under the "Community engagement" heading to include "Canterbury Mountaineering Club" between "Federated Mountain Clubs" and "New Zealand Alpine Club"	
<i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/1	Amend section 1.2.4 to recognise the role Jet Boating NZ should play in identifying shared values, solutions and responsible use of motorised craft within the National Park. The Draft Plan recognises the role that special interest groups can play in the management of the Park. JBNZ is representative of people that are passionate and engaged with the intrinsic values of national parks. Amend other sections of the draft plan to recognise and record role JBNZ (e.g. policy 1.3.1.4)	Amend section 1.2.4 To recognise the role of JBNZ.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/15	Strongly support the statement that there will be a focus "on building positive and constructive relationships with		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>the community. The focus.. They value."</p> <p>Constructive relationships with four wheel drive groups and continued access to the Godley headwaters is a win for conservation. Maintaining four wheel drive access to the Ball Hut Road and Upper Godley enables climbers/hunters/ botanist/ family groups to enjoy, learn and help look after the places and assist with SAR, wilding and animal control.</p>		
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/18</p>	<p>Getting more community involvement is largely very beneficial. However, conservation of our indigenous biodiversity, not of game animals, is DOC's mandate. Policy 7 for hunting concessions has this conflict where conservation takes on a meaning that may be unsatisfactory for the alpine environment.</p>	<p>This Plan and DOC must make clear that eradication of all mammalian pest species is the long-term goal for AMCNP. This includes deer, pigs and thar. Partnerships with hunting groups have largely been ineffective at managing, let alone eliminating these damaging pests e.g. the current debacle with thar.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/55</p>	<p>TIA supports DOC taking a partnership approach to maintaining and improving back country hut facilities. TIA requests that DOC pay careful attention to submissions on the above matters including any requests for development of tracks, huts and other back country recreational opportunities and facilities. TIA submits that milestones with regard to new back country recreational opportunities and facilities be brought forward to earlier in the life of the Plan.</p>	<p>Retain the partnership approach to maintaining and improving back country facilities</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/12</p>	<p>There is a general lack of reference and regard of the importance of Outdoor Education throughout the Draft Plan. The Aoraki Mount Cook National Park is ideally placed to provide unique and stimulating learning experiences, self-directed learning opportunities, and outdoor pursuits for school-aged children. For many New Zealanders, a school field-trip or camp is the first time they visit a National Park. The Plan should make explicit reference to the opportunities and benefits of Outdoor Education, as well as making commitments as to how it would be supported by the Department. Notes that Aoraki Mount Cook National Park has a paid Learning Experiences Outside the Classroom (LEOTC) Coordinator that facilitates between 1,500 - 2,600 student visits per year. Submits that this should be celebrated and enshrined in the National Park Management Plan.</p>	<p>Support with revision</p>	
<p><i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/11</p>	<p>Support the Department's view of "recognising the importance of engaging with kaitiaki runaka and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu when developing relations with</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>others in conservation management, to ensure that Treaty of Waitangi responsibilities are upheld and to integrate matuaraka Kai Tahu into management decisions. Supporting Kai Tahu whanui in their desire to be involved with and active in the Park is also a key focus for the Department."</p>		
<p><i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/12</p>	<p>Support the Department to seek "to identify and promote new opportunities and partnerships to deliver greater conservation gains while respecting the mana of Aoraki and his wider whanau."</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/6</p>	<p>Community engagement: We endorse the majority of the section of the draft plan dealing with Community Engagement (page 50) but believe that tourism interests should be included in the community consultation section as parties who are "interested in the general wellbeing and protection of Aoraki" and with whom the draft commits that "the Department will work to identify shared values and develop solutions for managing risks and threats within the Park." (see last two paras)</p>	<p>Amend the Community engagement section of 1.2.4 to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/6</p>	<p>With DOC in recent years seeking greater community engagement in conservation, we have repeatedly submitted that more should be made of opportunities for co-operative wild animal control by recreational hunters. But once again we see a draft CMP in which such opportunities are not prominent or developed in detail. Only Policy 10 on p. 35 addresses the issue. The underlying attitude is perhaps revealed on p. 50, where NZDA is not even listed along with Forest &amp; Bird, FMC and NZ Alpine Club as one of the groups interested in "general wellbeing and protection". Furthermore, the numerous "opportunities" listed on p. 118 do not include the encouragement of hunting as a means of wild animal control. Existing initiatives like a goat control contract between DOC and NZDA's Hutt Valley branch should be acknowledged and encouraged. Hunters are willing and eager to become involved, and already have a strong track record nationwide of assisting with pest control and hut and facility maintenance. Hunters are fit and strong, highly experienced outdoors people with diverse practical skills and could become some of DOC's most competent and effective allies in the war against the</p>	<p>Review the plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	animal and plant species that we all agree are pests. Yet we have received the impression over a number of CMPs, both in draft and final form, that there is not the corporate will within DOC to make use of this resource.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Objective 1</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/36	The objective should be rewritten to be consistent with the wording in the General Policy with respect to "New Zealanders and businesses ..."	Amend Objective 1 to replace "New Zealanders and businesses ..." with the words "People and organisations ..."	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/16	The objective fit well with continued four-wheel access to the Ball Hut Road and Upper Godley as this would enable people to assist with SAR, wilding and animal pest control. This is supported by policies 3,4 and 5.	Four wheel access to the Ball Hut Road and Upper Godley.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/7	Supportive of the objectives and policies of this section of the draft Plan. The draft Plan objectives and policies are proposed to ensure preservation of and conservation within the national park are valued by New Zealanders and businesses.	Retain outcomes and policies of this section.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/13	Support objective		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/21	Objective 1 a) is outside the scope of the Department's control. DoC cannot ensure others see the world in a particular way.	Remove Objective 1 a) from the plan. The essential aspects are covered in b) to d).	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 1</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/6	The Department's Statement of Intent does not fall from conservation legislation and is non-statutory in terms of the national park management plan. It is an irrelevant consideration and should not have a role in the plan.	Remove any reference to the Statement of Intent in the provisions of this plan.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/12	Support policies.		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/22	References to the SOI should be deleted.	Delete reference to SOI from Policy 1.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 2</b>		

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/11	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain policies	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 3</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/12	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain the policies	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 4</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/13	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain the policies	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 5</b>		
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/8	We support the intent of this Section.	Retain Policy 5 b) Control landscape-scale risks and threats..	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/14	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain the policies	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 6</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/37	With no caveats, Policy 6 would not necessarily support preservation in perpetuity of the Park's intrinsic values. We question the usefulness of the policy. Engagement values are sufficient without it.	Remove Policy 6	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/15	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain the policies	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 7</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/1	We support the encouragement of recreation concession opportunities that provide sustainable or eco-friendly tourism initiatives.	Retain Policy 7 and note that glacier ice walking provides a perfect opportunity for this.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/38	The Park's intrinsic values are already under pressure. Rather than encouraging new concessions, existing concessions should be required to improve their practices. People should understand that new concession applications are unlikely to be granted. The policy should be rewritten to express this.	Reword Policy 7 to reflect the concerns identified	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/16	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain the policies	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/19	This Plan and DOC must make clear that eradication of all mammalian pest species is the long-term goal for AMCNP. This includes deer, pigs and thar. Partnerships with hunting groups have largely been ineffective at managing, let alone eliminating these damaging pests e.g. the current debacle with thar. Policy 7 for hunting concessions has this conflict where conservation takes on a meaning that may be unsatisfactory for the alpine environment.		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/14	Reword to add Filming to recreation or to create a separate policy that recognizes the role the film industry can play in conservation.	Reword policy.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/23	The intent is understood but there is a fine line between encouraging recreation concessions and allowing tourism (s6 Conservation Act). It is not appropriate to promote economic objectives in the plan.	Reword "Encourage applicants for concessions to consider eco-tourism and provision of cultural experiences" or similar.	
<b>Section: 1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 8</b>			
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/17	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain the policies	
<b>Section: 1.2.4 Engagement Values Policy 9</b>			
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/18	Policies 2-9: NZAC strongly supports Policies 2-9	Retain the policies	
<b>Section: 1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 1</b>			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/26	Is Ngāi Tahu managing the Park? If so, how does this work with their commercial interests? Not sure of the ramifications of the Milestone as written. The Plan needs to clearly define DOC's role and the Ngāi Tahu role when it talks about identifying opportunities for Ngāi Tahu to engage in management of the Park.	Amend Milestone 1, and/or elsewhere in 1.2.4 Engagement values, to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/8	The milestones confound AMCAVL. If AMCAVL (or other operators) wished to engage in the described practices (conservation initiatives, support programmes etc.), AMCAVL needs to know and believe	Retain the milestones of this section. However, reconsider the timing of the milestones to better align with other prerequisite policies and milestones in other sections of the draft Plan i.e. A Living Treaty Partnership Milestone 1.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>that it could be achieved in a timely manner and without undue complication or delay, while being consistent with the objectives and policies of the appropriate sections of the management plan.</p> <p>Believes that how the Milestones are set out in this section of the draft Plan have the potential to conflict with other policies and milestones within the draft Plan i.e. Milestone 1, A Living Treaty Partnership, and could impact on the delivery of the primary objective and policies of this section.</p> <p>So much of the draft Plan's vision, outcomes, objectives, policies and milestones are reliant on the development of the shared management framework (principles and mechanisms) with kaitiaki rūnaka and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.</p> <p>While AMCAVL is an advocate for accountability through specific measurable steps, it is imperative that all the parties who are accountable for the implementation of the management plan (including the shared management framework implementation) have a statutory basis for their role (refer to sections 41, 42 and 43 of NPA) and can and will appropriately administer their roles.</p> <p>Of opinion that the framework and mechanisms should be developed, prepared and implemented prior to some of the milestones set out in this section of the draft Plan.</p>	<p>Appreciates that there can be concurrent development of policy, systems, processes etc. pertaining to the respective parties involved, but considers it critical to get the foundation of the relationship right first.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 2</b>		
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/17	Milestone 2 would include the historic use of the old Ball Hut Road.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 3</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/39	Should refer to "people and organisations" rather than "community and business groups". See issue raised in submission point 36.	Rewrite Milestone 3 to replace "community and businesses" with "people and organisations"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 4</b>		
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/15	<p>We find the wording in objectives, policies and milestones, again vague. For example, "Identified education and conservation opportunities for youth engagement within Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park (Year 3)."</p> <p>What is the measure? How will DOC know when the milestone has been achieved? How many youth hours?</p> <p>By more clearly defining the milestone, the people</p>	<p>Have more meaningful policies and measurable milestones.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	responsible will have a better understanding of what is required. If milestones are not clearly defined and measurable they will be totally ineffective.		
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/18	Milestone 4 speaks of youth opportunities, there is opportunities for the older "grey brigade" who can also benefit from conservation and education opportunities and have the time. This needs to be acknowledged also.	Acknowledge opportunities for older people	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 6</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/27	Is Ngāi Tahu managing the Park? If so, how does this work with their commercial interests? Not sure of the ramifications of the Milestone as written. The Plan needs to clearly define DOC's role and the Ngāi Tahu role when it talks about identifying opportunities for Ngāi Tahu to engage in management of the Park.	Amend Milestone 6 to reflect the concerns raised and the role for Ngāi Tahu in the management of the Park.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/7	We support the principle of this Milestone, but the wording is open to misinterpretation, and the clause could lead to a conflict of interest for TRoNT if TRoNT commercial tourism operators are also in the Park.	Reword Milestone 6 to read: "Kaitiaki ruanaka are actively involved in management of the Park and have an active presence in the Park. Commercial conflict of interest has been considered."	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/24	Amend to be consistent with s 43 of the NPA and review partnership references to be consistent with legislation.	Amend Milestone 6 to "Kaitiaki rūnaka have an active presence within the Park".	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 7</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/40	Should be aiming for something more than increased numbers of partnerships. Should ensure that engagement is of sufficient benefit to national park values to warrant the Department resources used.	Rewrite Milestone 7 to require engagement to be of demonstrable benefit to national park values, over and above the Department's completion of its core work on its own.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 8</b>		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/17	High quality visitor experiences is a value-laden term. There may be large numbers of tourists prepared to pay high \$ to thoroughly enjoy heli-pursuits. But simple demand and profit should not be driving policies for AMCNP.	Simple demand and profit should not be driving policies for AMCNP.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/56	TIA submits that milestones with regard to new back country recreational opportunities and facilities be brought forward to earlier in the life of the Plan.	Review Milestone 8 to achieve the outcomes sought earlier in the life of the Plan.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.2.4 Engagement Values Milestone 9</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/41	Should refer to "people and organisations" rather than "community and business groups". See issue raised in submission point 36.	Rewrite Milestone 9 to replace "community and businesses" with "people and organisations"	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/19	Support- great opportunity to involve the wider kiwi community.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/57	A submits that milestones with regard to new back country recreational opportunities and facilities be brought forward to earlier in the life of the Plan.	Review Milestone 9 to achieve the outcomes sought earlier in the life of the Plan.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3 He Kapaua Kei Ruka I a Aoraki whakataukī</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/42	The assertion made in the whakataukī that "... People of importance or rank should be able to choose how engagement with them occurs due to the mana and respect they hold within their communities - you cannot simply demand a meeting with a rakatira." is a questionable assertion and inappropriate for a NZ national park management plan.	Reword or replace the whakataukī tin light of the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements</b>		
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/7	Oppose as it fails to make any specific provisions for people with disabilities	Amend policies in 1.3.1 to include specific provision for accessibility for people with disabilities	
<i>Paardekooper, Luke</i> 22/6	Make an easy process for suppliers to get concessions	No specific decision sought	
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/3	Support general direction. Retain policies 8-21. Add to policy 13 a) v) to strengthen it.	add to policy 13 a) v) "facilitating foot access into areas where use has declined due to natural processes and a changing landscape" could be strengthened by adding "especially if it would reduce impacts from aerial access"	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/13	New policy that facilitates an alternative to the Murchison Hut ius needed, given it is likely to be removed because of ground instability.	Add new policy in accordance with the submission.	
<i>Tobeck, Leigh</i> 465/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/19	The Introduction refers to policies and milestones in sections 1.3.1 to 1.3.17. The Milestones are in section 1.3.18	Change 1.3.17 to read 1.3.18.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/32	New policy: A policy is needed that facilitates a replacement for the Murchison Hut if the hut is to be removed, noting the reported ground stability.	Include a new policy in accordance with the matters raised in the submission.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/33	New policy: 1. NZCA supports consultation undertaken by the Department on recent proposals to remove or relocate huts in the Park. A policy is needed for such consultation.  2. The draft plan should be explicit about the management of all its huts.	1. Add a new policy to read: "Any consideration for the removal of a hut will involve: (i) consultation with user groups (ii) the opportunity for hut retention using a partnership approach."  2. Amend the plan to include explicit management policies for all huts.	
<i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/5	A key role for DOC should be to focus on supporting and improving the alpine hut network. That would be a more environmentally savvy approach, rather than making one-off day visitors a priority.	DOC should focus on supporting and improving the alpine hut network.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/8	Policies - general: With the exception of Policy 1.3.15(1)(a), most policies focus on avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects of authorised activities in the national park. Given the high protection status of national parks, this is inappropriate. Adverse effects should be avoided.	Remove the words "remedy and mitigate" from the draft plan.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/17	1. Policies in 1.3.1 need to provide for stronger and proactive regulation if the national park's intrinsic worth and indigenous species are to be preserved in perpetuity. 2. Milestones need to provide much more certainty and clarity if the objectives set out in 1.2.1 are to be achieved and GPNP 4.1(c) is to be complied with. 3. Milestones need to reflect the urgency of the indigenous biodiversity crisis	Make the following changes in relation to section 1.3.1: 1. Refocus the plan's core purpose from enabling development to perpetual preservation of native species and habitats in all places across the Park 2. Rewrite the overarching management objectives so they are underpinned by preservation and integration 3. Rewrite policies definitively to achieve preservation purposes 4. Rewrite milestones to convey the necessary sense of urgency	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/2	The plan refers to a possible review of the conditions of the concessionaire system, but does not specifically mention the need for industry consultation. It must be amended to include this	Amend the plan to include the need for industry consultation in any review of the concessionaire system	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/21	Authorisations policies 22-30: TIA submits that the structure of the Plan should provide a reference to the general overview of the concession application and decision making process plus detail provisions that specifically relate to the National Park. The specific concession sections will provide detailed	Amend Policies 22-30 to address the matters raised by the submitter Delete Policy 23(c)(i)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>guidance to applicants and operators which are then supplemented by the DOC general concession process, which is publicly available. This will provide a good balance between detail provided in the Plan, and flexibility to update the general process which sits exterior to the Plan - but which is common to all documents.</p> <p>This structure must be more explicit in the criteria and their weighting and what factors must be strictly complied with before concessions are granted in the National Park. Some example criteria are provided suggested .</p> <p>It is also important that where relevant, criteria is accompanied by a system of higher/lower weighting or which are 'absolutes' within each criteria itself.</p> <p>TIA does not support the use of "operator experience" as a criterion in Policy 23(c) - this appears to block new operators from being able to gain a concession in a national park.</p>		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/26	<p>It is well known that Ngai Tahu has extensive tourism interests, and it is highly likely they have, or will seek to develop business interests in the park over time. This raises the question of conflict of interest if they have input to decision-making on concessions.</p>	<p>Include a protocol to avoid conflict of interest where mana whenua are applicants or concessionaires.</p>	
<i>Carr, Anna</i> 808/5	<p>Resourcing data monitoring at potential and existing 'hotspot' sites in the park is needed for the gathering of longitudinal data. Environmental Impact Assessment is lacking.</p>	<p>Implement data monitoring options as in the submission.</p>	
<i>NZ Transport Agency</i> 815/6	<p>Implement a new policy under Natural Hazards "Policy 12 - Provide for emergency works necessary to be undertaken in maintaining the operational capability of State Highway 80. This includes all works necessary within the road reserve and all relevant land adjoining the State Highway in order to address any threat, impediment or damage to the Highway."</p>	<p>Amend plan as in submission.</p>	
<i>Sundberg, Linda</i> 820/14	<p>Support the General policy requirements for authorisations and activities, including the General Management Objective and Policies, within Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park as set out in the Draft Plan, with provision that it will not affect the current tranquillity of the National Park, including the Mount Cook Station Conservation Area.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wratt, Gillian</i> 826/3	Do not support no distinction between tourist landings and those, say, for climber drop-offs on the Grand Plateau, will extend tourism in the park. Climbers and other recreationalists will be competing with tourists for flights, tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase	Decision not stated	
<i>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc - Nelson-Tasman Branch</i> 827/2	DOC should prioritise the preservation of the National Park natural values over providing for development driven by growing tourism demand.	DOC should put in place plans to control tourist numbers to a level that ensures no further deleterious effects on the park or village and facilities.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/7	Policies general: - Support Policies 1 - 11 - Support Policies 14 - 22 - Support Policies 24 - 31.	Retain Policies 1-11, 14-22 and 24-31 as written	
<i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/4	Authorisation policies - Policies 22 - 30: We endorse the general provisions set out in the Authorisations section of the draft plan on Page 58, but we submit that the administrative overhead of requiring a concession for short casual visits is cumbersome and creates inequality. We believe that the cost of providing for international visitors should be covered by allocation of the bulk of the Border Levy to the Department to be used specifically to deal with the pressures of international visitors. This recommendation relates to casual use and to the Front Country Zone only. We believe that where visitors use specific facilities in other zones, such as accommodation huts, a charge is appropriate, and a differential charge for international visitors is also appropriate.	Amend 1.3.1 Policies 22 - 30 to address the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Objective 1</b>		
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/6	Objective does not meet the purpose of the NPA. There is no mention of preservation.. Clause (b) does not meet the definition of integrated management as intended by the GPNP, which requires integrated objectives and policies for both preservation and for public enjoyment outcomes. It is Forest & Bird's view that the draft Plan misses opportunities for integrated management which results in ambiguities and inconsistencies throughout the plan.	1. Retain the general management objective of the current plan with the addition of an integrated management objective. 2. Integrate preservation policies into all general management policies. 3. Comply with the NPA and GPNP by: - clearly identifying national park values upfront in the introduction - clearly identify national park values to be preserved at places within the park - set out outcomes consistent with values at places	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- maintain a separation between recreation to be fostered and tourism to be allowed</li> <li>- set out integrated general management policies for authorised activities subject to preservation of national park values</li> <li>- ensure the plan provides for management in accordance with the purpose and principles set out in section 4 of the NPA and the direction according to section 43</li> <li>- utilise available mechanisms to ensure preservation outcomes are achieved such as the use of specially protected areas and those set out in the CA section 17ZG.</li> </ul>	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/25	References to the SOI should be deleted.	Delete reference to SOI from Objective 1 a).	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/13	This objective, for management of the Park to be integrated with Westland Tai Poutini National Park, is encouraging. However, the air access policies contained in the draft Plan do not in the slightest refer to corresponding policies in the draft Westland Tai Poutini NPMP. This should be remedied.	Audit the entire Plan, particularly sections relating to aircraft access, against this Objective and revise to ensure thorough integration with objectives, policies, and milestones in the Westland Tai Poutini NP Management Plan.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 1</b>		
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/3	CSIFG opposes the restriction or closure of public access, especially as it relates to other policy (1.3.2 Policy 2) that enables the expansion of the Park boundaries to include the Godley and Tasman riverbeds.	Delete or amend Policy 1 to remove any restriction of public access.	
<i>Clark, Glenn</i> 51/2	Support the intention to liaise with user groups to identify opportunities to maintain the roads, tracks and routes we are permitted to use.		
<i>Canterbury Land Rover Owners Club Inc.</i> 55/2	Support the intention to liaise with user groups to help maintain the four-wheel drive access up ther Godley river valley.		
<i>Canterbury Combined 4WD Clubs Group</i> 63/2	We support the intention to liaise with user groups to help maintain 4WD access up the Godley River Valley		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/14	I strongly disagree that the unfoirmed road up the Godley Valley be "stopped or closed". However I would support the addition of this unformed legal road to the park if: public 4wd access remains open and guaranteed as far as Separation Stream. The public 4wd access is designated as a 4wd route or similar. The legal public	Retain guaranteed 4wd access as far as Separation Stream.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	road through Lillybank Station remains unchanged and is not put into jeopardy.		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/8	By law, access to our National Parks is allowed and free at all times. This point could be interpreted as being illegal, especially c) and d)	Clearly define 'public safety' and 'cultural safety', and show examples in which cases access to the park could be closed.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/28	Further explanation of what "Restrict or close access to Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park ..." means is required. As written this gives little understanding or certainty to those who live and have their businesses in the Park. The NZ public, who own these Parks, are also entitled under the NPA to have free access to the Park.	Amend Policy 1 to provide explanation of the circumstances for restricting or closing access to the Park, particularly for 1(a), (b) and (d).	
<i>Dickerhof, Nina</i> 315/5	Regarding Policy 1 d) "cultural safety" - this wording seems too general and suggests that access to the Park could be closed or restricted for a variety of reasons that could fall under "cultural safety"	Define cultural safety or remove this from the plan	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/12	Cultural safety is far too broad to be of any meaningful use in this section. We live in a pluralistic society, the National Park is for everyone, therefore it is ludicrous to close a bit because a particular group find it culturally dangerous for an area to be open to the public.	1. Delete Policy 1(d); OR 2. Define the term "cultural safety" in more detail and give examples of how it might be used.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/43	Where park access is to be restricted, except in emergency situations, stakeholder groups should be consulted. Potential causes for closure should be consistent with the NZ Act or General Policy.	Amend Policy 1 to express the concerns raised.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/8	The term 'public safety' is used loosely in the plan (e.g. page 54) and would appear to require additional specificity to a) improve effectiveness in implementation, and b) demonstrate consistency with other objectives of the Plan. For example, many activities enjoyed by the public in the park are not inherently 'safe'.	1. Include a clear definition for the term 'public safety' 2. Ensure that references to 'public safety' and related term are well integrated with the objectives of the Plan, and national parks more generally, and do not introduce contradictions or conflicting requirements. Also used in 1.3.1 Policy 8, 10, 1.3.13 Policy 2, and 1.3.14 Policy 1.	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/12	Policy 1(d): The Draft's approach to the partnership principle under the Treaty of Waitangi is questionable and, in places, likely to be unlawful: There are both legal and policy issues with the enforcement or advancement of this policy. For example, this may offend sections 42 and 21(1)(c) or (d)	Delete Policy 1(d)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>of the Human Rights Act, and may be ultra-vires the Conservation Act. The Draft presents simply no engagement with these core rule-of-law issues. A superficial reference to section 4 of the Conservation Act, is, in this context, wholly inadequate.</p> <p>Policies of this nature would not be appropriate even if the term applied to any group's 'cultural safety' (the meaning that term being so ambivalent). But the Draft policy far less appropriate than that. It relates to closures for reasons associated with only one spiritual worldview - that of Maori. In a country that affirms a right to manifest any religious belief through practice (section 15 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act), this is wholly inappropriate policy.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/20</p>	<p>Except in an emergency, where Park access is to be restricted or closed, stakeholder groups, including NZAC, should be consulted.</p> <p>Potential causes for closure should be consistent with the Act and General Policy, and clarified in the draft Plan.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 1 in accordance with the submission.</p>	
<p><i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/5</p>	<p>Policy 1 d)</p> <p>The policy to restrict access to the Park in a variety of circumstances is outlined in Policy 1 (a-d). Policy 1(d) refers to "cultural safety", which is ambiguous, and differs from the otherwise identical Policy 1 in the WTPNP Draft Plan, in which the clause used is "the preservation of mana whenua values" (p.69).</p> <p>The two NP Plans ought to be consistent in this regard. Submits that the more appropriate phrase is the one used in the WTPNP Draft Plan.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 1d) to phrase used in WTPNP: "the preservation of mana whenua values"</p>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/13</p>	<p>Does not object to restrictions or closures being imposed for the valid reasons stated in the policy, but does not believe that all have an appropriate legislative mechanism to do so.</p> <p>The National Parks Act 1980 enables the public to have right of entry subject to provisions of the Act that impose conditions or restrictions for the preservation of the native plants and animals or for the welfare in general of the parks (section 4 (2)(e) and section 43 (b) NPA 1980).</p> <p>General Policy for National Parks 2005 Natural Hazard policy enables closure of a national park or any part of a national park when it is considered (by the Department)</p>	<p>Add a Milestone to initiate investigation and application of a statutory mechanism to enable restriction or closure of access by the public to the national park or part of the national park for cultural reasons/safety, much in the same way the Fisheries Act 1996 enables temporary closure for the use and management practices of tangata whenua.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>that imminent danger to people and property cannot be reasonably avoided by any other means (section 7, policy 7(h) GPNP 2005).</p> <p>It would be responsible and appropriate to investigate changes to enable ALL the reasons stated in Policy 1 to be validated in a statutory mechanism.</p>		
<p><i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/8</p>	<p>Policy 1(d) The policy to restrict access to the Park in a variety of circumstances is outlined in Policy 1 (a-d). Policy 1(d) refers to "cultural safety", which is ambiguous, and differs from the otherwise identical Policy 1 in the WTPNP Draft Plan, in which the clause used is "the preservation of mana whenua values" (p.69).</p>	<p>The two NP Plans ought to be consistent in this regard. MCGG submits that the more appropriate phrase is the one used in the WTPNP Draft Plan.</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/9</p>	<p>Policy 1c. The power to restrict access to the Park should be far more clearly defined than for nebulous reasons of "public safety."</p> <p>In some regions, DoC has in recent years overstretched its mandate and adopted an apparent policy of closing tracks (e.g. Copland Track) in bad weather conditions without following the statutory processes of notification and sign-off from the Minister. While this is clearly done in a well-meaning attempt to save inept visitors from themselves, it is a strategy that is arguably beyond the legal powers of DoC.</p> <p>Restricting access should be a last-resort in situations of certain life-threatening peril to visitors (e.g. a large actively unstable landslide above a hut or bridge, or likely large aftershocks following a sizeable earthquake) rather than a routine practice to be used every time poor weather or avalanche conditions arise.</p>	<p>Delete policy from Plan.</p> <p>Define "public safety" where it is used elsewhere in the Plan.</p> <p>Minister still able to notify closed areas of National Park in appropriate exceptional circumstances.</p>	
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/11</p>	<p>Policy 1c)</p> <p>The power to restrict access to the Park should be far more clearly defined than for nebulous reasons of 'public safety.' In some regions, DoC has in recent years overstretched its mandate and adopted an apparent policy of closing tracks (e.g. Copland Track) in bad weather conditions without following the statutory processes of notification and sign-off from the Minister. While this is clearly done in a well-meaning attempt to save inept visitors from themselves, it is a strategy that is arguably beyond the legal powers of DoC. Restricting access should be a last-resort in situations of certain life-threatening peril to visitors (e.g. a large actively unstable landslide above a hut or bridge, or likely large</p>	<p>Delete policy 1c)</p> <p>Define 'public safety' where it is used elsewhere in the Plan.</p> <p>Minister still able to notify closed areas of National Park in appropriate exceptional circumstances.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	aftershocks following a sizeable earthquake) rather than a routine practice to be used every time poor weather or avalanche conditions arise.		
<i>NZ Transport Agency</i> 815/4	Regarding restricting or closing access to the Park; as State Highway does not constitute part of the National Park it is suggested that significant discussions are undertaken between the Transport Agency and the Department of Conservation.	Discuss with NZTA regarding restricting or closing access to the Park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 2</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/44	Policy 2 should set higher expectations than "encouragement" for compliance with Care Codes. Ordinary visitors to the Park should be expected to comply with care codes.	Reword Policy 2 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/27	Support Policy 2.	Require this through park bylaws and include a policy to make this a condition for all concessions.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 3</b>		
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/4	CSIFG opposes the restriction or closure of public access, especially as it relates to other policy that enables the expansion of Park boundaries which is proposed to include the Godley and Tasman riverbeds.	Delete or amend Policy 3 to reflect the concerns raised above.	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/1	Mackenzie District Council would welcome discussions with the Department of Conservation regarding the management of identified roads. With regards to the management of riverbeds, those are owned by the Crown and administered by Land Information New Zealand. Mackenzie District Council does not have jurisdiction to manage activities on riverbeds.	Delete Policy 3.a) iii)	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/29	Policy 3(b): Please explain as this could have a material effect on local companies	Amend Policy 3(b) by adding "consult with local companies as well as permanent residents and seek their agreement or compensate fairly, for any time business is closed off."	
<i>Rogers, Ian</i> 276/2	Regarding 3 b) Oppose the stopping of the legal road up the Godley valley. This would enable future DOC managers to close the road to the detriment of the public.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/7	Support the inclusion of the Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the national park.	Retain 1.3.1 policy 3	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/21	Policy 3(b): We strongly disagree that the unformed road up the Godley Valley be "stopped or closed". See also	Amend Policy 3(b) to reflect the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	submission on 1.3.2 Additions to national park, Policy 1.		
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/20	Under policy 3 this is alluded but reiterate that the public are often the eyes spotting issues and assisting the under resourced Department to see or deal with them. E.g. the silver birch trees beside Red Lion Hut in the Godley, or endangered birds disturbed after a weather event or a safety issue. Maintaining access enables this.		
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/13	Strongly disagree that the unformed road up the Godley Valley be "stopped or closed."	Refer to NZAC's submission on 1.3.2 Additions to national park, Policy 1.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/28	Regarding Policy 3 a) i) Partially support.	Amend by rewording Policy 3 a) i) to: "encouraging the public to voluntarily manage their use of these roads and riverbeds consistent with protection of park values"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 4</b>		
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/2	Support pack it out methods		
<i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/8	Support removal of human waste (solid). Needs to be practical environmentally friendly, plus education as to how to contain the waste successfully.	Needs to be practical environmentally friendly, plus education as to how to contain the waste successfully. Other methods of containment may need to be investigated.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/15	Support "pack-it-out" proposal, for disposal of rubbish, but consider too restrictive for disposal of human waste.	Amend Policy to apply only to rubbish disposal	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/22	Policy should include other recreational groups that also use the national park and provide them the opportunity to be involved in developing a "pack-it-out" method for refuse and human waste. Policy 4(d) is superfluous and should be deleted. Already covered by Policy 31(c)(i) , (p59).	1. Amend Policy 4 to read: "Work with the New Zealand Alpine Club, the climbing community, Federated Mountain Clubs, the tramping clubs and the public to ..." 2. Delete Policy 4(d)	
<i>Zmijewski, Ben</i> 356/2	I support this objective of packing out human waste.	Retain this policy.	
<i>Dunn, Hamish</i> 421/6	Support the need for all parties entering the mountains to carry out all their waste and would endorse all efforts by the National Park Management to develop a cheap and effective means of storing and carrying out human waste.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/9	The management of human waste is identified as a key issue for park management. However the term 'human waste' lacks a clear definition. Improving this is critical for the policies and objectives referring to it. This in turn	1. Include a clear definition for the term 'human waste'. Used in various policies/outcomes/text.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	will affect the design of implementation methods to achieve the objectives being referred to.		
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/10	<p>Policy 4(d): Policy 1.3.1.4.d ought to be strengthened to explicitly signal an active process to amend the Bylaws to impose zero tolerance and substantial penalties for defecation outside toilet facilities provided in the Nohoaka Place at least. It is not acceptable that such an acute issue is unaddressed in the Draft.</p> <p>Similarly, there is room to discuss significant increases in penalties for concession breaches, and in enforcement effort.</p> <p>In relation to references through the draft on review of bylaws - submitter considers that the Draft should collate these references as it is important to make obvious intended changes to laws carrying enforceable penalties.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend Policy 1.3.1.4.d to explicitly signal the active amendment of the Bylaws to impose zero tolerance and substantial penalties for defecation in defined areas.</li> <li>2. Insert comment as to review under section 46(1) of policies and bylaws as to concession breaches in enforcement effort.</li> </ol>	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/16	<p>The management of shit (again, using plain language) is a big problem for DOC. A number of foreign tourists and probably some New Zealand tourists do not know how to shit in the woods.</p> <p>NZ alpine courses require participants to carry out their own human waste - why should it be any different for a commercial tourism operator or a tourist?</p>	<p>Recommendation : DOC speak with major airlines bringing tourists to New Zealand to show a video on how to shit-in-the-woods (there is a book with this title). We are sure there is sufficient talent to create a video that will be very memorable. It should make people think about their responsibility when they are about to make a deposit. Again, keep it simple.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pack out human waste on glaciers in popular areas; whether guided, or not.</li> <li>2. Pack out human waste in high usage areas, even if it could be buried in soil.</li> </ol>	
<i>Rattenbury, Rosalind Andrea</i> 545/2	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/8	<p>Policy 4 and 7: As a recreational climber I already practice a pack it out approach to refuse and human waste where facilities do not exist. I support this policy and feel that helicopter removal of excrement from huts is not a sustainable solution.</p>	Retain 1.3.1 policy 4 and policy 7	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/22	1. NZAC supports this policy, but needs to involve a range of other people, including outdoor activity clubs, local government, other institutions that work in the Park, and vehicle hire firms.	1. Retain the policy, but amend by adding "other outdoor activity clubs, local government, other institutions that work in the National Park, and vehicle hire firms" after "... the climbing community ..."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>2. Policies 4-7 Waste management:            NZAC submits that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the term "human waste" needs to be defined</li> <li>- the term "disposal facilities" needs to be defined in the context of human waste.</li> </ul>	<p>2. Change "pack-it-out" to "pack-out"            3. Provide definitions in the Glossary for:            "human waste"            "disposal facilities" in the context of human waste.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i>            600/86</p>	<p>NZAC supports the 'pack-out' method for removing human waste from the Park.            The Club identifies that a similar method introduced in the Westland Tai Poutini draft Plan has not been integrated with the draft Aoraki/Mount Cook NPMP.            The Club seeks a co-ordinated approach across these two draft Plans as a behaviour change can only be achieved if it is promoted under a national approach.</p>	<p>Amend the draft Plan to ensure a coordinated and consistent approach to the pack-out method across both Aoraki/Mount Cook and Westland Tai Poutini draft NPMPs</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i>            730/10</p>	<p>Completely support this proposal. Previous initiatives (poo pots) were not as successful as would be desired, perhaps due to practical issues (size of poo pot, weight concerns for selfsupported travellers). Widely offering self-contained bags (known in North America as 'wag bags' or 're-stop') at a free, subsidised or cheap rate, and strategically positioning weatherproof receptacles for them around the park (to be monitored and emptied as required) could be a cheaper option than increasing the provision of toilets in the backcountry.</p>	<p>Retain, pending investigation of methodology used internationally (see Bugaboo Mts, Canada, or Yosemite National Park, for existing models).</p>	
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i>            771/12</p>	<p>Completely support this proposal. Previous initiatives (poo pots) were not as successful as would be desired, perhaps due to practical issues (size of poo pot, weight concerns for self-supported travellers). Widely offering self-contained bags (known in North America as 'wag bags' or 're-stop') at a free, subsidised or cheap rate, and strategically positioning weatherproof receptacles for them around the park (to be monitored and emptied as required) could be a cheaper option than increasing the provision of toilets in the backcountry.</p>	<p>Retain, pending investigation of methodology used internationally (see Bugaboo Mts, Canada, or Yosemite National Park, for existing models).</p>	
<p><i>McFarlane, Johnny</i>            775/6</p>	<p>Support the trial of alternative methods of waste disposal. This needs to be equally supported by suitable waste water treatment facilities upgrades at Mt Cook Village to allow this to happen.</p>	<p>Would like to see more detail on how this will be undertaken - including downstream waste management to support the pack out policy.</p>	
<p><i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i>            792/8</p>	<p>Support the approach outlined in the plan for waste management. It is commendable to take leadership on the pack-in pack-out approach to waste. Hopefully a</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	cultural change can be initiated so that it is normalised for future generations.		
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/14	Excellent to see attention brought to the importance of packing out human waste. However, Policy 4b refers to "undertaking a trial "pack-it-out" programme." A trial has already been undertaken. The Department began trialling Poo Pots in the area at least ten years ago. Conclusions from this trial indicated that: 1) There needs to be clear guidance on where appropriate bags, such as corn starch bags or chemical bags, can be purchased, and they need to be widely available. 2) Containers or dry bags to contain the used bags need to be robust and reliable.	Revise Policy 4 to acknowledge the results of use of Poo Pots over the last decade, and to include items 1 and 2 in submission.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/4	Support the approach outlined in the plan for waste management.	Retain policy.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/61	Support the introduction of pack-out methods. There is a need for affordable, low carbon solution for waste management.	Retain Policy 4.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 5</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/30	Options to minimise the risk of water contamination should include - ensuring no rotting carcasses from deer culling are permitted near waterways - no spraying near waterways - no poison, 1080 or other, near waterways	Amend Policy 5 to address the concerns raised	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/23	Policies 4-7 Waste management: NZAC submits that - the term "human waste" needs to be defined - the term "disposal facilities" needs to be defined in the context of human waste.	Provide definitions in the Glossary for: "human waste" "disposal facilities" in the context of human waste.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 6</b>		
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/2	MDC supports the overall concept of a litter-free park, it considers that this Policy should go further and require waste reduction as a broader concept e.g. rather than focus on removing litter, consider measures to reduce waste in the first place. MDC strongly urges more detailed consideration of this Policy and in particular, how Council and its ratepayers would be affected.	Broaden to waste reduction and consider how MDC would be affected by this Policy.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/24	Policies 4-7 Waste management: NZAC submits that - the term "human waste" needs to be defined - the term "disposal facilities" needs to be defined in the context of human waste.	Provide definitions in the Glossary for: "human waste" "disposal facilities" in the context of human waste.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/8	We strongly disagree with this policy. As the nearest neighbour to the Aoraki/Mount Cook NP, we would be the first available refuse disposal site for people using the Park. We are not able to cope with the disposal of non-paying visitors refuse.	Delete Policy 6	
<b>Section: 1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 7</b>			
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/16	Consider the "pack-it-out" proposal for human waste is too restrictive. Should include another clause to allow exceptions on a case-by-case basis subject to DOC approval.	Amend Policy 7(c) to include a new clause to allow exceptions to the pack-out of human waste subject to DOC approval.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/23	Use of the word "sites" in Policy 7(c) is vague and could apply to anything from a site used intermittently to a campground. IF the intent is to list criteria for determining the need for human waste facilities, then Policy (c) should be amended to state this clearly . If the 'pack-out' waste policy is to work, then suitable disposal sites need to be installed in the Park and the village.	Amend Policy 7(c) to read: "c) requiring the pack-out of waste at sites used regularly for outdoor camping, where toilets are not provided: ..." Add a new clause € to read: "e) ensuring that suitable human waste receptacles are available for the disposal of 'packed out' human waste in all hut toilets in the Park, and at designated places in the village."	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/34	Using back-flights for human waste removal from alpine areas. The Recreational Access survey conducted by NZAC indicated reasonably high levels of support for the idea of back-flighting out solid waste to help prevent overflows or to reduce maintenance costs. The system would most likely operate using existing products for pack-it-out options, but with a centralised collection point for semi-regular back flights when opportunities were available. In some places hut-based collection points could improve options for camp-based activities in the surrounding area.	Investigate further.	
<i>Otago Tramping and Mountaineering Club</i> 520/1	Policy 7(c): Have concerns with "requiring the pack-out of human waste at sites where toilets are no provided". Not convinced that this should be applied uniformly over the entire Park (see also Policy 4). Support the application of a human waste policy to alpine areas, but must make provision for a network of depositories in other areas and where climbing parties can leave human waste for	Review Policy 4 and Policy 7(c) to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	removal. Support the ethic of "pack it in pack it out" for ordinary litter which should be strictly enforced.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/25	Policies 4-7 Waste management: NZAC submits that - the term "human waste" needs to be defined - the term "disposal facilities" needs to be defined in the context of human waste.	Provide definitions in the Glossary for: "human waste" "disposal facilities" in the context of human waste.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 8</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/24	Wording of Policy 8 is too vague. Consider means to think about it, not necessarily to do anything. This doesn't match the interpretation for a policy. Given the high risk from natural hazards and climate change, the policy should clearly state what it is intended to do.	Amend Policy 8 to read: "Assess the risk from natural hazards and the effects of climate change when locating, building ..."	
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc.</i> 541/12	Believe that DOC should take a more precautionary approach when considering the cumulative effects of climate change and increased visitor pressure on landscapes and indigenous plants and wildlife in the Park. Only two references to the precautionary approach can be found in the draft Plan. These are in relation to the safety aspects of structures, utilities and facilities, and the replacement of bolts and fixed anchors in a climbing development area. Once native species are lost, they are gone, forever.	Consider the effects of climate change more widely in the plan	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/11	While there is obvious need to site facilities in areas of minimal inherent risk, this needs context: the Park is prone to earthquakes, and frequent, massive catastrophic rock, snow and ice avalanches, along with slower processes of glacier down-wasting. White Horse Hill is predicted to be subject to future rock collapse from the Footstool; essentially nowhere is safe. Decision making tools for the construction of new facilities or maintenance of existing facilities must unfortunately accept some risk. The decision to remove Gardiner Hut, for example, was knee-jerk - the hut substantially survived a major rockfall event due to its strategic location. The inherent risk of accessing Gardiner Hut surely exceeded the risk associated with briefly occupying it; a future hut at this site should probably pass the litmus test of Policy 8 & 9 in this context.	Rewrite to include context discussed above.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/13	Policy 8 & 9: While there is obvious need to site facilities in areas of minimal inherent risk, this needs context: the Park is prone to earthquakes, and frequent, massive catastrophic rock, snow and ice avalanches, along with slower processes of glacier down-wasting. White Horse Hill is predicted to be subject to future rock collapse from the Footstool; essentially nowhere is safe. Decision making tools for the construction of new facilities or maintenance of existing facilities must unfortunately accept some risk. The decision to remove Gardiner Hut, for example, was knee-jerk - the hut substantially survived a major rockfall event due to its strategic location. The inherent risk of accessing Gardiner Hut surely exceeded the risk associated with briefly occupying it; a future hut at this site should probably pass the litmus test of Policy 8 & 9 in this context.	Rewrite to include context.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 9</b>		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/40	Oppose the restriction in (a) on hang gliders and paragliders landing in the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. Oppose the requirement in (b) to notify Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight	Reword to remove these requirements in Policy 9	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/31	The policy wording is a very loose statement in an area so near the Alpine Fault. This needs perimeters and explanation, particularly with substantial new builds.	Amend Policy 9 to provide clarity	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/76	The Plan should better recognise the importance of structures, utilities and facilities in supporting outdoor recreation experiences in the Park, and should have regard for this when assessing applications to build, create or retain these things. TIA submits that Section 1.3.1 Policy 9 be amended to include consultation with the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and relevant concessionaires.	Amend Policy 9 to include consultation with the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and relevant concessionaires.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/12	While there is obvious need to site facilities in areas of minimal inherent risk, this needs context: the Park is prone to earthquakes, and frequent, massive catastrophic rock, snow and ice avalanches, along with slower processes of glacier down-wasting. White Horse Hill is predicted to be subject to future	Rewrite to include context discussed above.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>rock collapse from the Footstool; essentially nowhere is safe.</p> <p>Decision making tools for the construction of new facilities or maintenance of existing facilities must unfortunately accept some risk.</p> <p>The decision to remove Gardiner Hut, for example, was knee-jerk - the hut substantially survived a major rockfall event due to its strategic location. The inherent risk of accessing Gardiner Hut surely exceeded the risk associated with briefly occupying it; a future hut at this site should probably pass the litmus test of Policy 8 &amp; 9 in this context.</p>		
<p><i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/15</p>	<p>The wording "where the threat from natural hazards cannot be safely remedied or mitigated" will result in huge amounts of subjectivity.</p>	<p>Revise Policy 9 to say "where the risk from natural hazards cannot be reduced to a level appropriate to the location and relevant user group" or words to a similar effect.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 10</b>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/32</p>	<p>This policy begs the question , how does DOC allow or not allow "the natural processes of avalanche ..."</p>	<p>Amend Policy 10 to provide clarity of intent</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 11</b>		
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/45</p>	<p>Support Policy 11</p>	<p>Retain policy</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 12</b>		
<p><i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/1</p>	<p>Support idea of booking system in Policy 12, but it needs to be enforced, and booking allocations should be monitored.</p>	<p>Retain Policy 12</p>	
<p><i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/1</p>	<p>Highly supportive of measures to ensure that visitor numbers do not themselves detract from the experience of visitors to the park. However point e) (removal of facilities) would exacerbate the problem of demand exceeding capacity.</p>	<p>Be more specific about what is being proposed</p>	
<p><i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/9</p>	<p>12 b) Generally huts in the mountains need to be available and a bookig system is not practicable. Huts in the mountains are there to provide shelter and the need for shelter is not necessarily predictable.</p>	<p>Change policy 12b to include the words "except at backcountry huts other than Mueller Hut" after the word "evident" in the second line.</p>	
<p><i>The Vintage Car Club of NZ, South Canterbury Branch</i> 73/1</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 12 d) We are concerned that if the Park and Ride system is established that we would no</p>	<p>We are trusting that there would be some kind of exemption incorporated into the plan for our type of activity (South</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
73/1	longer be able to complete our commemoration run to the Hermitage door. We are trusting that there would be some kind of exemption incorporated into the plan for our type of activity (South Canterbury Brach of the Vintage Car Club of NZ).	Canterbury Brach of the Vintage Car Club of NZ)	
<i>Sweney, Stella</i> 76/4	Support need to manage huts by booking system.	Booking systems also need to recognise the difference between ownership of huts - club, concessionaire, DOC	
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/1	Policy 12(d): Support the use of a public transport, restricted parking system within the designated urban area of the park. Reduced traffic hazard, air pollution, noise, diminished intrinsic values, reduced land to be taken for parking, less visual impact on the immediate village environment.	Add a new clause to Policy 12 to read: 12 E: "Significantly reduced private vehicle / bus use in the area of the designated urban area."	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/3	Support this policy, from a civil defence perspective, understanding the numbers of people within the Park at any one time will be helpful in the event of an emergency.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/5	Riverbeds are owned by the Crown and administered by Land Information New Zealand. Mackenzie District Council does not have jurisdiction to manage activities on riverbeds.	Delete "Mackenzie District Council" from the policy.	
<i>Stent, Elisabeth</i> 173/1	Support restricting the number of visitors (and vehicles) to the Park	Retain text as written.	
<i>White, Mike</i> 179/1	Regarding Policy 12 d) Support Parking facilities could be based on the model used at Zion NP in the USA where shuttle buses are utilised during peak season and parking is otherwise available to users. Parking permits could be issued by accom providers at Mt Cook Village to permit vehicle access to accom only, shuttle service used for all other movement to activities/track ends etc once at your accom. Electric vehicles should be utilised for public transport	Amend with: User pays should not apply to NZ citizens accessing the park or visitors with accom booked inside the park. Foreign Day-trippers/casual users should pay a fee to access the transport service. Consideration to a legislative change to allow charging foreign tourists for park access needs to be made.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/1	Policy 12(b): Should be reworded so it doesn't affect commercial accomodation providers	Delete Policy 12(b) and reword to exempt commercial accomodation leases/authorisations	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/30	Policy 12(b): Any accommodation authorisation should have no restrictions for filling rooms.	Delete Policy 12(b)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
233/30			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/33	Oppose Policy 12(b). DOC cannot restrict accommodation and patronage of facilities for the public of NZ. This clashes with the NPA and the purpose of keeping it open for the public. This is also anti-competitive and would come to the attention of the Commerce Commission. DOC cannot be permitted to have control over the financial ability of accommodation businesses	Either: Delete Policy 12(b); or Amend Policy 12(b) to exempt commercial accommodation providers, cafe and activity leases.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/34	Oppose Policy 12(d). This is tantamount to DOC destroying patronage of businesses such as stand-alone cafes in the Park, and also restricts access to the public which goes against the NPA.	Amend Policy 12(d) to exempt concessionaires.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/35	Policy 12(f) is too vague and reads as though DOC may turn away day visitors. All businesses have the legitimate expectation that DOC will allow free access to the public.	Amend Policy 12(f) to include the following: - clarify when DOC will tell people to go to other places rather than Aoraki - ensure free access is always available to the NZ public.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/36	Policy 12(g) requires clarification as to what DOC intends to do.	Amend Policy 12(g) to provide the clarification sought.	
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/1	Regarding Policy 12 a) establishing a booking system for hut accommodation is supported. Believe this should include all huts	Amend Policy 12 a) to mention Liebig, Onslow and Murchison in the Murchison Valley, Red Stag, Eade Memorial and Godley in the Godley River, plus all those owned or proposed by the various climbing and tramping clubs within the Park, including key huts outside the Park in the Jollie and the Dobson, plus the Lodges at White Horse Hill.	
<i>Nelson, Sandy</i> 321/4	Regarding Policy 12 b) Support restricting occupancy of accommodation and related facilities.	Retain Policy 12 b).	
<i>Nelson, Sandy</i> 321/5	Regarding Policy 12 d) User pays parking goes against the ethos of our National Parks. The Draft Plan proposes a compulsory Park and Ride for peak times. Why then would DOC charge during non-peak times other than as a money-making scheme?	Remove references to User pays parking from Policy 12 d).	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/25	A major earthquake in the national park will have a catastrophic effect on visitors and the Mt Cook community. An emergency response plan is urgently required to deal with the immediate effects of a major earthquake on visitors, recreational users, park facilities etc. Where there is a risk to people, places taonga from	Add a new policy under 1.3.1 General management - Natural hazards to read: "12.Develop an emergency response plan to manage the immediate consequences of an earthquake on Mt Cook village, park facilities and visitors to national park." Renumber subsequent policies.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	an identified natural hazard in a national park, the Department should develop a hazard risk management plan (Policy 7(c) GPNP 2005)		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/47	Policy 12 (a) and (b) are too narrow in their approach to provide optimal outcomes where accommodation and related facilities are under pressure. The policy should consider factors such as the cultural profile, the purpose the hut serves, and natural environmental constraints. See comments included in the "Matters relating to the draft generally / Public hut booking systems"	Amend the policy to include consideration of the issues raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/48	Policy 12(c): In reference to Policy 13, inexperienced visitors should not be encouraged into the back country in the first place.	Amend policy 12(c) to consider the additional points raised in relation to Policy 13(g)	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/10	Support new hut infrastructure within the Park. As international models show managed and accessible huts will reduce waste and promote the region with the least impact. Obviously this may require cost sharing arrangements. Support establishing new huts in either Malte Brun range (more than one could be possible) and potential replacement of Gardiner in the Hooker Valley.		
<i>Backhouse, Luke</i> 559/1	Oppose the pre booking system.	Continue the status quo of not requiring pre booking for facilities.	
<i>Smith, Gert</i> 560/1	(Note: Made as a general statement (not linked to a policy). Fees/bookings are in policy 12 and policy 31d): As a New Zealand citizen, we should not be charged for any facilities or sceneries that is available on public land if it is for any of the occupants hobbies	Oppose pre-booking system	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/9	Policy 12 a) appreciate the need to manage visitor numbers but concerned that booking systems tend to favour tourist / sightseeing visitors over backcountry users because tourists tend to book further in advance whilst climbers, ski tourers, etc plan trips at short notice to take advantage of weather windows. If a booking system is put in place for facilities such as the Whitehorse Hill campground then I think it is essential that facilities such as the CMC and NZAC lodges remain available to members at short notice to meet the needs of climbers.	Reword 1.3.1. policy 12.a) to something like "establishing or extending the use of a booking system, including for accommodation and related facilities. Booking and occupancy of club facilities such as Wyn Irwin, Unwin Lodge and Thar Lodge should remain the responsibility of the respective clubs."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/9	<p>Policy 12</p> <p>Partially support the approach outlined in the plan. This policy outlines the need for a hut booking system. This is not feasible or safe for alpine huts where climbing and weather factors do not allow for reasonable planning of when a stay in a hut will be required. There is no significant need for this policy for any alpine huts except for Mueller Hut. This policy also risks creating a culture where those booking a hut in advance will somehow have an absolute right to occupy it.</p> <p>While this might reduce overcrowding and promote sustainable usage of huts, in an alpine environment there should be no impetus to exclude another party from using a hut.</p> <p>Would support a bylaw to enable DOC to manage huts and other accommodation facilities.</p> <p>Policy d) Support the approach outlined in the plan to manage parking in the Park. Restricting parking allows for control of visitor numbers, reduced impacts of road damage, reduced traffic, and ultimately reduced carbon emissions.</p>	<p>amend Policy 12 a)</p> <p>"Such a booking system must have exceptions for alpine huts and other huts where adequate notice and planning of visits is not feasible and the safety of all parties involved must be maintained"</p>	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/26	<p>Huts in the mountains are there to provide shelter, and the need for shelter is not necessarily predictable. So a booking system is not practical, other than those circumstances that prevail at times at Mueller Hut.</p>	<p>Change Policy 12 to include the words "except at backcountry huts other than Mueller Hut" after the word "evident" in the second line.</p>	
<i>Shaw, Dr Vivienne &amp; Dr Christopher T</i> 655/2	<p>Regarding Policy 12 a) Support the proposal for backcountry huts to be added to the booking system, we would support a measure ensuring that the cost of staying at these huts is covered by the backcountry hut pass. Propose differential charges for New Zealanders versus overseas visitors for the use of these huts.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to include mention of backcountry hut pass as usable in booking the huts in the park, and include possibility of differing charges for New Zealanders and overseas tourists.</p>	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/4	<p>Fully support managing the numbers of visitor numbers coming into the Park. I support restricting occupancy of accommodation and related facilities. We need to learn from overseas national parks' experiences- once the intrinsic nature of our national parks is gone, it is lost forever.</p> <p>Policy 12d User pays parking goes against the ethos of our National Parks.</p>	<p>Retain Policy 12b</p> <p>Delete reference to user-pays parking from Policy 12d.</p>	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS</i>	<p>The Draft Plan mentions options for managing visitor use where demand exceeds capacity and makes specific reference to 'facilities'. Interpreted this as excluding temporary tracks formed on the glacier by commercial</p>	<p>The Plan ought to make it clear that facilities in this context refers to permanent facilities</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED</i> 688/6	guiding companies (the General Policy definition for facilities includes 'tracks').		
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/13	Regarding Policy 12 a) Submit that a hut booking system is inappropriate for alpine huts. Due to uncertainty of weather there must be the ability for one's plans to change. Reinstate the intentions system so climbers can self-manage hut overcrowding by having a reasonable estimate on other climbers in the area.	Reinstate the intentions system.	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/9	The Draft Plan mentions options for managing visitor use where demand exceeds capacity and makes specific reference to 'facilities'. MCGG has interpreted this as excluding temporary tracks formed on the glacier by commercial guiding companies (the General Policy definition for facilities includes 'tracks').	The Plan ought to make it clear that facilities in this context refers to permanent facilities	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/13	Booking systems for huts and other facilities are acceptable in the context of current issues, but these should be designed solely to prevent overcrowding (rather than favour those making far-advance bookings, or commercial occupancy). Booking systems must prioritise traditional use of the respective facilities; specifically, mountaineers (guided and unguided), trampers, hunters, and skiers should be catered to over and above the needs of heli-hikers, sightseers, and those undertaking overnight catered hut trips.  Substantial portions of any facility should be excluded from a booking system, i.e. remain first-in-first serve, or else be explicitly prioritised for those holding membership of a bona fide outdoors club, or able to clearly demonstrate participation in the above traditional activities. Provision for mountaineers, skiers and hunters to make last minute arrangements for trips (e.g. to take advantage of a brief weather window) must be maintained.	Retain policies subject to discussion above.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/15	Policy 12 d, See later for a discussion on the merits of a Park and Ride scheme.	Retain	
<i>Barnett, Frances</i> 734/2	Regarding Policy 12 a) Partially support the use of a booking system, though it may reduce overcrowding in an alpine environment, there should be no impetus to exclude a party from accessing a hut should conditions	Amend policy 12 a) to include the statement: "Such a booking system must have exceptions for alpine huts and other huts where adequate notice and planning of visits is not feasible and the safety of all parties involved must be	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	change and it be required.	maintained."	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/6	<p>Visitor and recreation facilities</p> <p>The Draft Plan is generally flawed by a reluctance to commit to concrete outcomes, especially in the realm of recreational assets, such as huts and tracks. These assets typically last much longer than the life of the Management Plan. Investment in recreational assets, their location, their type and their potential are all matters that the public should have a say in. These opportunities are not operational matters. They should be developed prior to the formulation of the Draft Plan and subject to a full and considered public consultation process.</p>		
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/14	<p>Policy 12 a) and b) and Policy 15.</p> <p>Booking systems for huts and other facilities are acceptable in the context of current issues, but these should be designed solely to prevent overcrowding (rather than favour those making far advance bookings, or commercial occupancy). Booking systems must prioritise traditional use of the respective facilities; specifically, mountaineers (guided and unguided), trampers, hunters, and skiers should be catered to over and above the needs of heli-hikers, sightseers, and those undertaking overnight catered hut trips. Substantial portions of any facility should be excluded from a booking system, i.e. remain first-in-first serve, or else be explicitly prioritised for those holding membership of a bona fide outdoors club, or able to clearly demonstrate participation in the above traditional activities. Provision for mountaineers, skiers and hunters to make last minute arrangements for trips (e.g. to take advantage of a brief weather window) must be maintained.</p> <p>Submission on Park and Ride see under Section 2.1.2 Discussion box</p>	<p>Retain policies subject to provision to traditional users and last minute arrangements.</p> <p>Policy 12 d) retain.</p>	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/7	<p>This policy outlines the need for a hut booking system. This is not feasible or safe for alpine huts where climbing and weather factors do not allow for reasonable planning of when a stay in a hut will be required. This policy also risks creating a culture where those booking a hut in advance will somehow have an absolute right to occupy it. While this might reduce</p>	<p>Amend policy 1.3.1 12 a) "Such a booking system must have exceptions for alpine huts and other huts where adequate notice and planning of visits is not feasible and the safety of all parties involved must be maintained"</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>overcrowding and promote sustainable usage of huts, in an alpine environment there should be no impetus to exclude another party from using a hut. I am in support of bylaw to enable DOC to manage huts and other accommodation facilities.</p> <p>Support the approach outlined in the plan to manage parking in the Park. Restricting parking allows for control of visitor numbers, reduced impacts of road damage, reduced traffic, and ultimately reduced carbon emissions.</p>		
<i>Belton, Alexis Daniel</i> 799/6	<p>Regarding Policy 12 a) booking systems are not desirable or safe in alpine environments where weather and a large number of unknowns make it impossible to plan in advance. Also guiding companies could systematically book huts out in advance (and absorbing the cost by passing it on to clients) to the exclusion of recreational users.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 12 a) to exclude alpine and remote huts where it is not feasible to require parties to book in advance and where doing so could negatively impact the safety of parties.</p>	
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/4	<p>Oppose Policy 12 a) and b). First come first served is a fairer system.</p>	<p>Remove the implementation of a booking system for accommodation and related facilities.</p>	
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/5	<p>Partially support Policy 12 d) Support restricted on site parking, but oppose any suggestion of a public transport service.</p>	<p>Do not establish the public transport service.</p>	
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/6	<p>Regarding Policy 12 e) Removing facilities can cause unintended sequences by creating new pressure points.</p>	<p>Recommend reopening the old Wakefield track to provide extended walking opportunity close to the village.</p>	
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/7	<p>Regarding Policy 12 f) support the development of loop tracks within the park.</p>	<p>Retain policy.</p>	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/16	<p>Regarding Policy 12 d) Vehicle access should be maintained for those intending to access Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park overnight and longer.</p>	<p>Revise Policy 12 d) so that restricted parking only applies to day users, not overnight users.</p>	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/8	<p>Policy 12(b) requires clarification on "... restrict occupancy of accommodation ..." For what purpose and under what circumstances?</p>	<p>Amend Policy 12(b) to provide the clarification as sought.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 13</b>		
<i>Cole, Andy</i> 11/1	<p>Concern that policy indicates a preference for funding and resources to go to short term tourist at expense of back country hut facilities. The hut system is a vital component of relationship kiwis have with the park and must be maintained.</p> <p>Should include policy towards continued improvement</p>	<p>Reword Policy 13(a)(iv) to replace "consolidation" with "ongoing maintenance and improvement"</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/1	It is culturally acceptable in NZ for people of all levels of experience to have full access to a National Park. Restricting the building of new facilities based on the possibility of it attracting inexperienced visitors is contrary to cultural norms in NZ.	Delete (g)	
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/1	Policy 13(a)(iv) indicates a preference for funding and resources to go to the short term tourist at the expense of the hut system in the back country. The hut system is a vital component of the ongoing relationship that kiwis have with the Park and must be maintained.	Reword Policy 13(a)(iv) to replace the word "consolidation" with "ongoing maintenance and improvement"	
<i>Geerling, Gideon</i> 31/1	Policy 13(iv): While management controls need to be applied in the front country, the backcountry, especially the huts, should not be neglected. The high alpine huts are a vital part of NZ-ers' cultural history.	Reword the latter part of (iv) to read: " ... and continue ... and improve our backcountry	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/2	It is unclear as to what is meant by "readily available" for public use.	Change wording to "the hut is readily available for public use and where accessible by foot, is available for public booking" or similar	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/10	13 i) ii) This is the cornerstone of our hut system. Public huts only. Please keep it this way.	Retain policy 13 i) ii)	
<i>Sweney, Stella</i> 76/5	Regarding Policy 13 f) If a hut can be booked by members of the public when they are on a guided trip does this equate to "publicly available"?	The definition of publicly available should include where the public can book a guided trip that includes a bunk when using a hut.	
<i>Armour, Chloe</i> 159/5	Do not support any loss of hut facilities in the Park.	Do not remove any hut facilities, only add.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/26	Policy 13(a)(iv): Oppose the focus on managing use and demand in the front country and the consolidation of back country facilities	Reword Policy 13(a)(iv) to replace the word "consolidation" with "ongoing maintenance and improvement".	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/37	Policy 13(a)(iv): Not clear what is meant by this policy. Huts established in the backcountry are vitally important. The focus for back country huts should be to "maintain existing huts and replace existing huts as necessary, due to wear and tear."	Amend Policy 13(a)(iv) to replace the word "consolidation" with "ongoing maintenance and repair"	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/38	Policy 31(b): Concessionaires and permanent residents should be added to the consultation list.	Amend Policy 13(b) to reflect the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/3	Policy 13(a)(iv) - do not support	Increase support for maintaining and improving the current alpine hut network	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/10	Policy 13(a)(iv): While managing use and demand in front country is important, so is the ongoing maintenance and support of the backcountry hut network. Facilitation of community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives could go a long way in supporting the alpine hut network.	Reword Policy 13(a)(iv) to read: "... and continue to maintain, protect and improve our backcountry hut network, with allocation given for community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives to support this."	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/11	Policy 13(a)(v): This policy should be encouraged and supported by maintaining and improving the alpine hut network.	Retain Policy 13(a)(v) as written	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/12	Policy 13(a)(vi): Support this, but the proposal to increase landing zones and frequency of flights is totally inconsistent with this.	Retain Policy 13(a)(vi) and make sure the rest of the plan is consistent with this.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/13	Policy 13(f): If members of the public can book hut spaces through a guided trip, then this should be included in the definition of "public".	Reword the definition of "publicly available" to include situations where the public can book a guided trip that includes a bunk in a hut.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/14	Policy 13(g): Support policy. Inexperienced visitors should not be encouraged to attempt Ball Pass route unguided. Route should not appear easier and more attracted to unguided visitors by way of improved facilities, marked route or information.	Retain Policy 13(g)	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/15	Policy 13(i)(ii) and (iii): 13(i)(ii) - Need clarification of the word "public". and "readily available": - a concessionaire-owned hut (e.g. Caroline Hut) is available for public use - any hut with a booking system (e.g. Mueller Hut) will change the definition of what might be considered "readily available". - the Hermitage is available to public use at a nightly rate. GPNP definition for "public accommodation" should be changed to "Place to live ... available to the public, possibly through a booking system ..."	Reword Policy 13(i)(ii) to define "public use" to include members of the public who choose to go guided, and the use of an always accessible part of a hut or shelter.  Reword Policy(i)(iii) to read: "huts are designed to be relocatable."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	13(i)(iii) - "easy removal" is unrealistic in a mountain environment. It is important that future huts are designed for relocation in our mountain environment to ensure their longevity.		
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/3	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) While management controls need to be applied to the front country, where large numbers creating significant impacts, the backcountry, especially the huts, should not be neglected. The high alpine huts are a vital part of NZ-ers' cultural heritage.	Reword the latter part of Policy 13 a) iv) to read "and continue to maintain, protect and improve our backcountry hut network, allowing for club or concessionaire-led initiatives."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/4	Regarding Policy 13 g) Care needs to be taken particularly on the Ball Pass Crossing. If the crossing appears easier or more attractive to general backpackers (by way of opening up Caroline Hut to unguided users), or more clearly marking the route, then there will likely be an increase in SAR call-outs.	Retain this policy.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/5	Regarding Policy 13 a) vi) The proposal to increase size of and number of landing zones and frequency of flights is totally inconsistent with this.	Retain this policy, but make sure the rest of the plan is consistent with this.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/6	Regarding Policy 13 i) ii) Please recognise that with a concessionaire-owned facility, it is available to the public just like the Hennitage is) through a booking system; and through the free availability of an emergency shelter.	Define "public use" to include members of the public who opt to use a guide; and the use of an always accessible shelter for emergencies. Change the definition of "public accomodation" to: a lodge or shelter available to the public, possibly through a booking system, or in the case of an emergency shelter freely available at all times.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/7	Regarding Policy 13 i) iii) Easy removal of huts is unrealistic in a mountain environment. Having had experience of moving two mountain huts, it is certainly not easy, but do-able, if using a portal design.	Reword Policy 13 i) iii) to read "huts are designed to be relocatable."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/5	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) Managing use and demand in the front country is important, so too is the ongoing maintenance and support of the backcountry hut network. It is vitally important that this heritage and its alpine facilities be retained, supported and allocation be given for further improvement and expansion in the future as demand increases It.	Reword the latter part of 13 a) iv) to read "and continue to maintain, protect and improve our backcountry hut network, with allocation given for community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives to support this"	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/6	Regarding Policy 13 a) v) This should be encouraged and can be directly supported by maintaining and improving the alpine hut network.	Retain Policy 13 a) v)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/7	Regarding Policy 13 a) vi) The proposal to increase landing zones and frequency of flights is totally inconsistent with this policy.	Retain this policy, but make sure the rest of the plan is consistent with this.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/8	Regarding Policy 13 b) f) If members of the public can book hut spaces through a guided trip, then this should be included in the definition of "public" .	Reword the definition of "publicly available" to include situations where the public can book a guided trip that includes a bunk in a hut.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/9	Regarding Policy 13 g) Care needs to be taken with visitors on the Ball Pass Crossing. If this route appears easier and more attractive to unguided visitors, by way of improved facilities, a marked route or information provided by DOC staff, it would likely increase the number of accidents and associated rescues.	Retain Policy 13 g)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/10	Regarding Policy 13 i) ii) Clarification of the word "public" is required. It needs to be recognised that a concessionaire-owned hut (eg. Caroline Hut) is available for public use both through a guided activity and provision of an emergency shelter. Any hut with a booking system (such as Mueller Hut) will change the definition of what might be considered "readily available".	Reword Policy 13 i) ii) to define "public use" to include members of the public who choose to go guided and the use of an always accessible part of the hut or shelter.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/11	Regarding Policy 13 i) iii) "Easy removal" is unrealistic in a mountain environment. Alpine Recreation has experience in shifting two mountain huts - it is certainly not easy, but at least possible, with a portal design.	Reword Policy 13 i) iii) to state "huts are designed to be relocatable"	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/1	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) While managing use and the increasing demand in the front country is important, so too is the ongoing maintenance and support of the backcountry hut network. It is vitally important that this heritage and its alpine facilities be retained, supported and allocation be given for further improvement and expansion in the future as demand increases.	Reword the latter part of 13 a) iv) to "and continue to maintain, protect and improve our backcountry hut network, with allocation given for community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives to support this."	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/2	Regarding Policy 13 a) v) This should be encouraged and can be directly supported by maintaining and Improving the alpine hut network.	Retain this policy.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/3	Regarding Policy 13 a) vi) The proposal to increase landing zones and frequency of flights is totally inconsistent with this. People who have booked on a guided trip are members of the public too. This should be included in the definition of "public".	Retain this policy but make sure the rest of the plan is consistent with this.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/4	Regarding Policy 13 f) People who have booked on a guided trip are members of the public too. This should be included in the definition of "public".	Reword the definition of "publicly available" to include situations where the public can book a guided trip that includes a bunk in a hut.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/5	Regarding Policy 13 i) ii) Clarification of the word "public" is required. The current wording treats members of the public who have chosen to enter the park as part of a guided activity as no longer members of the public.	Reword Policy 13 i) ii) to define "public use" to include members of the public who choose to go guided.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/46	Use of the phrase "publicly available" and other similar phrases should be clear that they do not imply absolute public availability. Despite the implied openness from these phrases, in reality there are many constraints to availability of these facilities that need to be acknowledged.	Review the use of terms relating to public availability of facilities in policies relating to "Visitors and recreation facilities" (Policies 13 - 21) to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/49	Definition of the terms "reconstruction", "relocation" in relation to public recreation facilities is needed. Significant maintenance and site shifts should not be defined as reconstruction and/or relocation and this could put the facilities' future at risk.	Include a definition for "relocation" and "reconstruction" in relation to public facilities.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/50	Policy 13(a): Policy 13(a)(iv) - it is unclear what "consolidation of existing back country facilities" means. This should not lead to a decrease in opportunities for back country recreationists. The policy should be amended to " a focus on managing supply and use in the front country". Policy 13(a)(v) should be amended to read: "facilitating basic foot access ..." A general management policy allowing for the establishment of cable or walk wire access and basic marked walking routes would be helpful. Should include a further point: "maintaining the visibility and recognition of alpinists and their history."	Reword Policy 13(a) to address the points raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/51	Policy 13(g): Inexperienced visitors should not be inappropriately 'encouraged' into the back country in the first place	Reword Policy 13(g) to address the concern raised	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/52	Policy 13(i)(iii): This policy clause should not apply to existing facilities that receive routine maintenance and work that supports their retention. See submission point 49 in relation to Policy 13 generally re the reconstruction and/or relocation of facilities.	Amend Policy 13(i)(iii) to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/1	Regarding 13 a) iv) Oppose the consolidation of back country facilities. The options (for ownership structure, facilities and access) should reflect the diversity of individual ability and experiences sought by the public who wish to visit this valuable area	Reword policy to support a diversity of facilities in the back country.	
<i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/2	Regarding 13 g) - Support. The park should be available to all levels of experience. Risk can be mitigated through the promotion of safe routes. It can also be mitigated by teaching the inexperienced through club memberships and commercial training and guiding.	Retain. Access should not be restricted but managed.	
<i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/3	Regarding 13 i) ii) - Oppose the wording as it could be interpreted as all huts should be owned and maintained by DOC	Reword policy to provide huts that are available to the public through government, club and commercial ownership and maintenance	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/13	Strongly disagree with 13(a)(iv) the focus on managing use and demand in the front country and the consolidation of existing backcountry facilities. This is inconsistent with later criteria on facilitating foot access and encouraging sustainable recreation. I understand consolidation of backcountry facilities refers to DOC wanting to get rid of backcountry huts. Removing backcountry huts will hinder foot access and sustainable carbon recreation opportunities and is a safety concern in extreme weather. I hope that, sooner rather than later, DOC will someday be able to lobby to avoid paying the 8% of investment value of huts back as it makes it seemingly impossible for DOC to sustainably provide the service of backcountry huts to the New Zealand public. 'Consolidation of facilities' is a depressing term we should try to avoid.	Remove text "consolidating backcountry facilities" and replace with an intention to add intermediate huts to make backcountry huts more accessible. See my mention of Erik Bradshaw's affordable, transportable huts later in this submission. I believe that DOC should not be allowed to use a lack of funding as reasoning to allow terms such as 'consolidation of backcountry facilities'.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/16	To pursue ski mountaineering and mountaineering at a high level it is near impossible to maintain a fulltime job. It would be very sad to see DOC shift to allowing the construction of privately owned huts to replace their own huts. As the fees required to stay would most likely price out most keen young adventures. To be worthwhile operating I would assume these huts would also have to be bookable, which would also have the negative effect of pushing out most spontaneous kiwi adventurers. If private huts are built they must include a sizeable, unbookable public area where fees are comparable to DOC huts.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/1	Policy 13(a)(iv): The alpine hut system has played a crucial role in the establishment of our mountain culture, yet there is no specific policy for the ongoing upkeep and management of these. If an objective is "engaging more New Zealanders in their heritage", then to enable this in the alpine environments, a continuing tradition of alpine huts is required. We seek the future viability of these alpine huts to be investigated over the life of the plan in order to future proof these essential assets for high alpine recreation in the Park.	1. Include a specific policy that makes a commitment to the ongoing maintenance and management of the alpine hut network in the Park. 2. Include a specific policy to be included in 2.3 Haupapa Place for the investigation of consolidation/redevelopment of the Tasman névés huts.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/2	Consolidation of back country facilities is not desirable, and all backcountry facilities should be maintained.	‘... and the maintenance of existing back country facilities.’ All facilities provide different recreational opportunities in the back country and should be maintained.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/3	I support facilitating foot access, including into areas where use has declined due to natural processes.	Facilitate foot access.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/12	General management policy 13(a)(iv) seeks ‘iv) a focus on managing use and demand in the front country and the consolidation of existing backcountry facilities’. This statement is too vague for inclusion in a plan. In particular, it is not clear what the term ‘consolidation’ refers to.	1. Remove policy 13(a)(iv) and strengthen commitments to maintain existing backcountry facilities (including through relocation where needed), thereby assisting with policy 13(a)(v).	
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/1	Policy 13(v): It would be great to see places like the Wakefield Track reinstated (as the avalanche hazard gets less and less every year due to lighter and shorter winters). Or the Ball Pass route. As the Hooker side becomes increasingly eroded out, maintaining some sort of route that provides a loop from the Tasman to the Hooker. There could be a great loop put in for the more adventurous from Red Tarns and out Sawyers Stream, down the spur above Unwin Lodge. There is a rough route that exists there already, but it would provide alternatives to those who want more than the Hooker Valley or streams of people on the way to Mueller.	Retain Policy 13(v)	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/9	Support the intent of this Section.	Retain Policy 13 e) adverse effects on natural light cycles..	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/10	Policy 13 a) v) very pleased to see inclusion of this policy as this has been neglected under the current plan and retaining/enabling foot access should be a priority wherever possible. If possible I think more emphasis should be placed on this policy.	Retain 1.3.1 policy 13.a)v) Increase emphasis on 1.3.1 policy 13.a)v) by making it a top level policy rather than a sub-sub policy.	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/9	Regarding Policy 13 i) ii) Support that any future huts are readily available for public use. No further private huts should be allowed within the national park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/10	Policy 13 a) vi) "Encouraging sustainable, carbon neutral opportunities" Support the approach outlined and esp. this policy. This issue cannot be stated enough. It is a great irony that aircraft use in the park is touted to be increased, despite that fact that it is not carbon neutral and will only accelerate climate change.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/27	The provisions of Policy 13 should apply to services, including aircraft access, as well as facilities.  Support Policy 13(i)(ii) which is consistent with General Policy which provides for huts being " ... available for use by the public"	Amend Policy 13 by adding "and services" after "... public recreation facilities" in the first paragraph. Retain Policy 13(i)(ii)	
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/1	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) Alpine huts should be maintained and a holistic policy towards continued improvement of the entire hut network should be included in the plan.	Amend the plan to maintain alpine huts.	
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/2	Regarding Policy 13 v) Support this as maintaining an alpine hut network is an important element of facilitating foot access to alpine areas.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/1	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) Alpine huts should be maintained and a holistic policy towards continued improvement of the entire hut network should be included in the plan.	Amend the plan to maintain alpine huts.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/2	Regarding Policy 13 v) Support this as maintaining an alpine hut network is an important element of facilitating foot access to alpine areas.	Retain text as written	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/1	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) Alpine huts should be maintained and a holistic policy towards continued improvement of the entire hut network should be included in the plan.	Amend the plan to maintain alpine huts.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/2	Regarding Policy 13 v) Support this as maintaining an alpine hut network is an important element of facilitating foot access to alpine areas.	Retain text as written	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/1	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) Alpine huts should be maintained and a holistic policy towards continued improvement of the entire hut network should be included in the plan.	Amend the plan to maintain alpine huts.	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/2	Regarding Policy 13 v) Support this as maintaining an alpine hut network is an important element of facilitating foot access to alpine areas.	Retain text as written	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/1	Policy states iv) `a focus on managing use and demand in the front country and the consolidation of existing backcountry facilities;` This policy seems to indicate a preference for funding and resources to go to the short term tourist at the expense of the hut system (being the only backcountry facilities). The hut system is a vital component of the ongoing relationship kiwis have with the park and thus must be maintained and a policy towards continued improvement should be included in the plan.	Reword this policy 1.3.1. 13 iv) to replace the word 'consolidation' with the words 'ongoing maintenance and improvement'	
<i>Wood, Nicholas</i> 685/2	Regarding Policy 13 f) Clarification is needed on what is meant by "publicly available"	Reword Policy 13 f) to "the facility is publicly available, whether directly by the public, or through bookings through concessionaires offering guided tours".	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/7	The policy could be strengthened with the inclusion of the term 'unguided'. Without this, the policy could be interpreted as limiting commercial guiding opportunities. We note the Westland plan uses the words "unskilled".	Amend Policy 13(g) to read: "adverse effects on visitor safety of encouraging inexperienced and unguided visitors..". Recommend that this Plan uses wording consistent with the WTPNP Draft Plan.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Carla</i> 698/1	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) Support maintaining and improving the backcountry hut network.	Reword to include ".. and continue to maintain, protect and improve our backcountry hut network, with allocation given for community-led or business-led initiatives to support this."	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/10	The policy could be strengthened with the inclusion of the term 'unguided'. Without this, the policy could be interpreted as limiting commercial guiding opportunities. We note the Westland plan uses the words "unskilled".	Amend Policy 13(g) to read: "adverse effects on visitor safety of encouraging inexperienced and unguided visitors... ". Recommend that this Plan uses wording consistent with the WTPNP Draft Plan.	
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/5	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) The department needs to strengthen protection of the backcountry hut network. I	Reword the latter part of 13 a) iv) to read "and continue to maintain, protect and improve backcountry facilities"	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	interpret "consolidation" as meaning facility removal in some cases.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/54	TIA considers that the plan lacks ambition for enabling backcountry recreational use. This lack of ambition does not align well with the high recreational value offered by the Park, or with the importance of enabling sustainable recreation by the increasing numbers of domestic and international people visiting the Park. - TIA submits that the Plan should articulate a commitment to the importance and continued use of existing high alpine huts, including Tasman and Kelman huts, - TIA submits that Section 1.3.1 policy 13 includes taking into account the importance of high alpine guiding and instruction activities in the Park, and that consultation statements include concessionaires and recreational groups.	Review and amend Policy 13 to reflect the concerns raised, including: 1. Amend Policy 13(a)(iv) to articulate a commitment to the importance and continued use of existing alpine huts 2. Amend Policy 13 to acknowledge the importance of high alpine guiding and instruction activities in the Park, 3. Amend Policy 13(b) to specifically include consultation with concessionaires and recreational groups.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/13	Policy 13 a) iv) Submits that there does not need to be a policy of focusing on consolidating backcountry facilities. The rationale for doing so has not been presented. The word 'consolidation' should be replaced by 'maintenance'. Policy 13 a) vi) Submits that this sub-policy should be relocated into the 'Authorisations' section. Policy 13 b) consultation with the Public is important and necessary. Policy 13 i) iii) submits that the word 'removal' should be replaced with 'relocate'.	Do not support Policy 13 a) iv) Support Policy 13 a) vi) with relocation within the plan. Support Policy 13 b) Support Policy 13 i) iii) with revision.	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/9	Support the approach outlined in the plan, specifically '13 a) vi) encouraging sustainable, carbon neutral recreation opportunities'. This issue cannot be stated enough. It is a great irony that aircraft use in the park is touted to be increased, despite that fact that it is not carbon neutral and will only accelerate climate change.		
<i>Belton, Alexis Daniel</i> 799/7	Regarding Policy 13 a) vi) Support the approach outlined in the plan.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/5	Support the approach outlined in the plan, specifically Policy 13 a) vi) encouraging sustainable, carbon neutral recreation opportunities.	Retain policy.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/1	Regarding Policy 13 a) iv) The alpine hut system is a vital component of the ongoing relationship kiwis have with the park and vital for the recreational benefit and enjoyment of these areas and engagement in the mountain cultural heritage.	Alpine huts should be maintained (as historic places?) and a holistic policy towards continued improvement of the entire hut network should be included in the plan.	
<i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/2	Regarding Policy 13 a) v) Support facilitating foot access. This is important but needs to be considered holistically though hut networks and trail development and maintenance.	Retain policy, an alpine hut network is an important element of facilitating foot access into areas (for example Malte Brun Range).	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/9	Policy 13(a)(iv) requires clarification on "... consolidation of existing backcountry facilities ..." More details are required on when and why.	Amend Policy 13(b)(iv) to provide the clarification as sought.	
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/10	Policy 13(a)(iv): Aoraki Mount Cook National Park has a rich mountaineering history, which includes a great network of backcountry/alpine huts. These facilities provide unique opportunities for visitors to appreciate the alpine environment and the natural, cultural and historical values of their surrounding environments. While managing use and demand in the front country is important, so too is the ongoing maintenance and support of the backcountry hut network. It is vitally important that this heritage and its alpine facilities be retained, supported and allocation be given for further improvement and expansion in the future as demand increases. It would be a huge loss to New Zealand's alpine trekking, climbing and ski touring community (and many generations to come) if these huts are neglected or removed without replacement. Facilitation of community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives could go a long way in supporting the alpine hut network and allocation for this should be given.	Reword the latter part of Policy 1.3.1 13. a) iv) to read "... and continue to maintain, protect and improve our backcountry hut network, with allocation given for community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives to support this"	
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/11	Policy 13(a)(v): This should be STRONGLY encouraged and can be directly supported by maintaining and improving the alpine hut network. Especially areas that are now affected by glacial recession and dangerous moraine walls, e.g.. Hooker Glacier access, Tasman Glacier access.	Retain this policy 13(a)(v) as written	
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/12	Policy 13(a)(vi): The proposal to increase landing zones and frequency of flights is totally inconsistent with this.	Retain this policy, but make sure the rest of the plan is consistent with this.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/13	New sub-clause (f) ; "(f) the facility is publicly available" If members of the public can book hut spaces through a guided trip, then this should be included in the definition of "public".	Reword the definition of "publicly available" to include situations where the public can book a guided trip that includes a bunk in a hut.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/10	Policy 13(a)(iv): Aoraki Mount Cook National Park has a rich mountaineering history, which includes a great network of backcountry/alpine huts. These facilities provide unique opportunities for visitors to appreciate the alpine environment and the natural, cultural and historical values of their surrounding environments. While managing use and demand in the front country is important, so too is the ongoing maintenance and support of the backcountry hut network. It is vitally important that this heritage and its alpine facilities be retained, supported and allocation be given for further improvement and expansion in the future as demand increases. It would be a huge loss to New Zealand's alpine trekking, climbing and ski touring community (and many generations to come) if these huts are neglected or removed without replacement. Facilitation of community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives could go a long way in supporting the alpine hut network and allocation for this should be given.	1. Reword the latter part of Policy 1.3.1 13. a) iv) to read "... and continue to maintain, protect and improve our backcountry hut network, with allocation given for community-led or concessionaire-led initiatives to support this" 2. Include a specific policy that makes reference to the alpine hut network in the Park and a commitment to the ongoing maintenance/management of these (with where required the NZAC and CMC respectively)	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/11	Policy 13(a)(v): This should be STRONGLY encouraged and can be directly supported by maintaining and improving the alpine hut network. Especially areas that are now affected by glacial recession and dangerous moraine walls, e.g.. Hooker Glacier access, Tasman Glacier access.	Retain this policy 13(a)(v) as written	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/12	Policy 13(a)(vi): The proposal to increase landing zones and frequency of flights is totally inconsistent with this.	Retain this policy, but make sure the rest of the plan is consistent with this.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/13	New policy sub-clause 9f): "(f) the facility is publicly available" If members of the public can book hut spaces through a guided trip, then this should be included in the definition of "public".	Reword the definition of "publicly available" to include situations where the public can book a guided trip that includes a bunk in a hut.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/14	<p>Policy 13(g) - Generally supports policy clause with following concerns: Care needs to be taken with visitors on the Ball Pass Crossing. The route has gained significant popularity in the past 20 years, especially since the deterioration of the Copland Pass route. Inexperienced visitors should not be encouraged to attempt the Ball Pass route unguided. If this route appears easier and more attractive to unguided visitors, by way of improved facilities, a marked route or information provided by DOC staff, it would likely increase the number of accidents and associated rescues.</p>	Retain Policy 13(g) as written	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/15	<p>Policy 13(i)(ii): Clarification of the word "public" is required. It needs to be recognised that a concessionaire-owned hut (e.g.. Caroline Hut) is available for public use both through a guided activity and provision of an emergency shelter. Any hut with a booking system (such as Mueller Hut) will change the definition of what might be considered "readily available". Note that the Hermitage is also available for "public use" albeit at a much higher nightly rate!</p> <p>According to the General Policy for National Parks 2005 public accommodation is defined as: "Place to live or lodge in that is open to or shared by all people." This should be changed to: "...a lodge or shelter available to the public, possibly through a booking system, or in the case of an emergency shelter freely available at all times."</p> <p>Policy 13(i)(iii): "Easy removal" is unrealistic in a mountain environment. Alpine Recreation has experience in shifting two mountain huts - it is certainly not easy, but at least possible, with a portal design. With glacial recession and the geologically young nature of our mountains, it's important that future huts be designed for relocation to ensure their longevity.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 1.3.1 13. i) ii) to define "public use" to include members of the public who choose to go guided and the use of an always accessible part of the hut or shelter.</p> <p>Reword Policy 1.3.1 13. i) iii) to read: "huts are designed to be relocatable"</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 14</b>		
<i>Ord, Gregory</i> 54/1	Do not support the CMC lodge (Wynn Irwin) be made available for use by the public when not in use by club members. It is not a hotel, not staffed 24/7. It can only	This clause should be removed from the management plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	be used by trusted groups to protect from theft, misuse and vandalism.		
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/4	Do not support the approach to management of the club lodges. Club lodges should be retained in their current locations. "Formal authorisations" is not defined, and suggests a loophole is being kept open to take these lodges away. Do not agree that the lodges should be available to the public when not in use by club members. Clubs should not have to fulfil any duties for the Park in order to stay where they are.	Delete 14 a),b),c),d),e). Also reword the statement of "Retain the club lodges identified in Table 3 and on Map 9 within the Park through formal authorisations" to instead read "Retain the club lodges identified in Table 3 and on Map 9 within the Park in their current locations."	
<i>Armour, Chloe</i> 159/1	Do not support the suggestion (14d) of opening lodges so they can be used by public when not in use by members - the lodges are available to be used by the climbing and mountaineering communities, If they were opened up to non members we would have to start booking months in advance with no idea if weather or conditions would be suitable.	Remove policy 14 d)	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/8	Support retention of Wyn Irwin Lodge in its current location, form, and management. Throughout the Plan, 'formal authorisations' are discussed, but no clarification is provided regarding what this means or involves.	Reword policy 14 to read Retain the club lodges identified in Table 3 and on Map 9 within the Park through formal authorisations, and subject to: a) the club having a direct association with and undertaking activities in the Park; b) the building being maintained to Departmental standards for buildings; c) occupancy being maximised where practicable and consistent with the purpose of the lodge and a); d) the lodge being available for use by the public non-members where practicable, when not in use by club members and consistent with the purpose of the lodge and a); e) consistency with 2.1.3 Policy 16.'	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/39	Policy 14(d): The public should not have rights to be accommodated in a club regardless of the club members wishes. They have historic places in the Park and club members are responsible for their upkeep and have paid for them with no financial support from DOC. Enforcing club members to accommodate the public is a form of communist takeover and should no be permitted	Delete Policy 14(d), or amend the policy to read: "(d) the lodge being available for use by the public at the discretion of club members."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/16	Policy 14(c) and (d): Do not support club lodges becoming backpacker lodges or overrun with overseas tourists. It is not their role to cater for overflow tourism. They facilitate access to the national park for New Zealanders who may otherwise not be able to afford accommodation elsewhere. There are huge social and environmental gains from bringing together groups of like-minded people, who have a real connection with our national parks. Unwin Lodge already allows non-member use - this should be left to the club to decide.	Remove conditions (c) and (d)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/8	Regarding Policy 14 c) and d) Unwin Lodge already allows non-member use and often has school groups, but the decision whether to allow non-member use should be left to NZAC, who have done much to maintain an historic connection with the park and its rich heritage from pioneer mountaineers. Likewise the CMC Hut, Wyn Irwin, and the deerstalkers' Thar Lodge. It is not their role to cater for overflow tourism.	Remove Policy 14 c) and d) from the plan.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/12	Regarding Policy 14 c) and d) Unwin Lodge already allows non-member use and often has school groups, but the decision whether to allow non-member use should be left to NZAC, who have done much to maintain a historic connection with the park and its rich heritage from pioneer mountaineers. Likewise the CMC Hut, Wyn Irwin, and the deerstalkers' Thar Lodge. It is not their role to cater for overflow tourism.	Remove Policy 14 c) and d) from the plan.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/6	Regarding Policy 14 c) and d) The presence of these clubs should be encouraged, because they facilitate access to the national park for New Zealanders who may otherwise not be able to afford the accommodation elsewhere. They should not be forced to become backpacker lodges overrun with overseas tourists.	Remove policy 14 c) and d) from the plan.	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/2	Support Canterbury Mountaineering Club's submission (submitter 602) re Wyn Irwin Hut.	Support Canterbury Mountaineering Club's submission regarding the use of Wynn Irwin being available for Club members and for non-members where practicable, when not in use by club members and consistent with the purpose of the lodge. Clarify what is meant by "formal authorisations" and "departmental standards."	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Assn,</i>	Regarding 14 c) Oppose this; club members need to have unfettered access to the tarhr lodge	Amend to state: club members have unfettered access to the tahr lodge	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Nelson Branch</i> 306/1			
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Assn, Nelson Branch</i> 306/2	Support the retention of the Tahr Lodge, Steffan Memorial, Red Stag and Eade Memorial Huts.	Add the above huts to Policy 14.	
<i>Kirkwood, Rod</i> 307/4	Regarding 14 c) and d) Oppose any restrictions that DOC is trying to impose on Unwin Lodge	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/2	Support the proposal to retain the club lodges through formal authorisations.	Amend plan to state Tenure for the owners of the Club lodges needs to be formalised by a long term undertaking that gives them some security, avoiding constant review and defensive reaction to threatened changes.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/26	The club lodges have a long standing historic relationship with the national park, and provide affordable accommodation in the vicinity of the village	Retain Policy 14	
<i>Perry, John</i> 346/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Young, Robin</i> 353/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Broadbent, James</i> 355/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>McIntosh, Dr Pat</i> 358/3	Regarding Unwin Lodge I am concerned about the idea that the "use should be maximised" as If the hut becomes too busy or too often booked out in advance by casual visitors then it becomes useless for the prime function of a climbing base.	Propose removing 14 c)	
<i>McKinnon, John</i> 359/3	Support that the Unwin Lodge should give priority to NZAC members.	Include a mention that gives priority to NZAC members.	
<i>Phillips, Hazel</i> 370/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.		
<i>Keeling, Anna &amp; family</i> 371/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Muir, Steven</i> 373/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Ellis, Michael</i> 394/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Hopper, Jason</i> 403/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Laurie, Davie</i> 410/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Robson, Ben</i> 416/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Dunn, Hamish</i> 421/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Latty, Nicholas William</i> 423/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/53	Draft policies 14(b), (c), and (d) should not be included in the operative plan. Requiring maximum and general public occupancy would mean that they would and could no longer be fit for purpose. The huts' ongoing operation in their present and long-standing formats, including accommodation for non-club and mountain users, is	Remove Policy 14(b), (c), and (d).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	consonant with General Policies 8(1)(c)(iv) and 9(a).		
<i>Harris, John</i> 427/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Parlane, Tony</i> 428/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Stevens, Carole</i> 430/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Hornblow, Quinn</i> 432/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Shearer, Nicholas, Thornton</i> 433/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Scoz, Matteo</i> 435/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Peady, Dr. Cliff</i> 438/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Camm, Adrian</i> 441/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>West, Sam</i> 442/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Jessop, Daniel</i> 446/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	occupancy.		
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/2	<p>Policy 14(c) and (d): Club Lodges: these are there to support the mountaineering and outdoor communities. The CMC, NZAC and NZDA exist because of passionate kiwis, and these organisations and their buildings in the Park represent hundreds of volunteer hours since they began. They are there for the benefit of their members, and their families and friends, providing a welcoming, low key place to meet and stay. They should not have to have full occupancy every night, with overseas tourists. The current Unwin wardens are very proactive at attracting all sorts of folks in the outdoor community during the quieter months with all manner of workshops – photography, yoga, cooking, medical...plus they have also catered for school groups, that provide grass roots experiences for kiwi kids.</p> <p>Alongside this climbers plans change. They may amend their plans due to weather, or stay longer if the weather is good. Over the years the custodians of these places have been very understanding and accommodating (no pun intended) to the mountain community. To enforce some policy that means occupancy must be maximised is highly detrimental to New Zealand’s mountain community and culture.</p> <p>The current Unwin wardens are very proactive at attracting all sorts of folks in the outdoor community during the quieter months with all manner of workshops - photography, yoga, cooking, medical - plus they have also catered for school groups, that provide grass roots experiences for kiwi kids.</p> <p>Alongside this climbers plans change. They may amend their plans due to weather, or stay longer if the weather is good. Over the years the custodians of these places have been very understanding and accommodating (no pun intended) to the mountain community. To enforce some policy that means occupancy must be maximised is highly detrimental to New Zealand’s mountain community and culture.</p>	Amend Policy 14(c) and (d) to include wording that acknowledges the Members of the respective organisations who have Club Lodges in the Park (NZAC, CMC, NZDA) have priority over general public.	
<i>Cullen, Ross</i> 456/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Yong, Colin</i> 457/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Gumbrell, Matthew</i> 468/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Allan, Tony</i> 470/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Parkes, Ross &amp; Carol</i> 478/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Pearson, Richard</i> 480/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Miller, Aubrey</i> 487/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/5	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Bilek, Forrest</i> 501/1	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Major, Christine</i> 504/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Johnston, Wendy</i> 505/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Groves, Nick</i> 506/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/6	I support Unwin, Tahr and Wyn Urwin Lodges being retained. I do not support the lodges being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Green, Philip</i> 513/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Janse, Bridget</i> 518/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Gray, Stuart</i> 521/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Shearer, Dara</i> 522/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Rattenbury, Mark</i> 525/2	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Chinn, Paul</i> 526/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Gunson, Leah</i> 527/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>John, Rhys &amp; Walker, Jennifer</i> 529/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Dimozantos, Megan</i> 540/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/6	Support huts (Wyn Irwin & Thar Lodges) in White horse and Unwin Hut being retained as club huts and valued as vital historical elements. Do not wish 'freely available to public' to supersede club use or values - i.e.. NOT in favour of being turned into Backpackers accommodation. Clubs should have final say on who is invited to stay.	amend 14 d) Clubs should have final say	
<i>McCallum, John &amp; Thorpe, Anna</i> 544/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Fraser, Lisa</i> 551/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Niven, Shona</i> 555/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy. I also support the retention of the Tahr Lodge and Wynn Irwin Hut, they should remain in their current locations.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/11	If booking systems are implemented for camping at Whitehorse hill camp ground (as seems likely) then the club huts will be the only facilities which meet the accommodation needs of climbers/ski tourers/hunters	Delete 1.3.1 policy 14.c) and d)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>within the park. Booking systems inherently favour visitors such as tourists who plan trips months in advance, rather than visitors such as climbers who, by the nature of the activities they plan to undertake, need to make plans at short notice to take advantage of weather windows.</p> <p>Oppose to forcing clubs to maximise occupancy by requiring non-member/public use as this will make it more difficult for members to arrive at short notice. It will also make the huts more difficult to maintain as usage by non-members is more likely to result in damage to facilities. The amount of bedspace at the huts is very small in relation to the hermitage, camp ground and other accommodation within the village so enabling public access has little benefit.</p>		
<i>MacQueen, Richard</i> 569/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Hanich, Quentin</i> 570/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/25	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. Does not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	remove 14 d)	
<i>Rivett, Martyn</i> 573/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Wardle, Rob &amp; Kate</i> 574/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/11	Do not support the approach outlined in the plan. This states that occupancy must be maximised in club facilities. It contains direct reference to allowing public use of these facilities. It is facetious to consider that there is any right for public use of these facilities, which were constructed using club resources, time, sweat and toil many years ago and have always been for the use of	Deleted Policy 14 c), d) and e)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	club members. These facilities directly promote and allow for regular visits to the park by recreational users, particularly those in the 'Backcountry', 'Remote' and 'Wilderness' settings. Currently there are few facilities for accommodation that are suitable for the needs of these groups. If this is included in the plan, it opens these facilities to simply becoming another accommodation provider in the park - if public access is mandated in the plan, then clubs must provide it, and it opens a dangerous door to eroding club member access.		
<i>Cocks, John</i> 580/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Laurenson, Peter</i> 582/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Wesley, Dr Graham</i> 595/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/28	NZAC supports Policy 14 except for clauses (c) and (d) Unwin Lodge was built with funding from members - so they have expectation of use of lodge. The Department should recognise the need for reliable member occupancy and work constructively with the Club for a mutually acceptable outcome.	Delete Policy 14(c) Amend Policy 14(d) to read: "the lodge being available for use by non-members when practicable and not in use by members, and consistent with the purpose of the lodge... "	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/3	Throughout the Plan, 'formal authorisations' are discussed, but no clarification is provided regarding what this means or involves.  The purpose of Wyn Irwin when CMC built the lodge was to provide a base for outdoor recreationalists who were part of the club; specifically mountaineers, climbers, skiers, backcountry walkers and outdoor education groups. Since its construction, Wyn Irwin Lodge has been used specifically for this purpose, as described in the CMC's policy regarding its club lodges. The suggestion in the Plan that Wyn Irwin should be used as accommodation for the general public would not be consistent with club policy or its original purpose for	Amend Policy 14 c) & d) as follows: Reword c) to say: "occupancy being maximised where practicable and consistent with the purpose of the lodge and a);" Reword d) to say: "the lodge being available for use by non-members where practicable, when not in use by club members and consistent with the purpose of the lodge and a); and"  Clarify what "formal authorisations" entails and make this clear in the Plan.  Do not require concessions for the use and maintenance of Wyn Irwin Lodge.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>being in the Park.</p> <p>Non-members may stay at CMC Lodges provided that they are mountaineers, skiers, climbers, outdoor education groups and/or backcountry walkers. Therefore, non-members staying at Wyn Irwin must be undertaking mountaineering, skiing, climbing and/or backcountry walking activities within the Park. In addition to the above, Wyn Irwin was also built to provide a base for members undertaking the activities described above as well as providing accommodation for older CMC club members who are unable to venture into the backcountry.</p> <p>It should be noted that the CMC makes Wyn Irwin available for non-member groups such as outdoor education groups and schools looking to use the lodge as a base for their courses and introduce the next generation of New Zealanders to safely experience the mountains and backcountry areas of the Park. The CMC offers the accommodation at Wyn Irwin for these groups at reduced cost to make these courses accessible as accommodation elsewhere in the Park would be too expensive or not available (i.e. full).</p> <p>The current plan contemplates a concession being required for club lodges, and it is not clear if DOC is seeking through the Draft Plan to invoke this as a requirement. We note that Wyn Irwin has been in its current place for 60 years and has not changed in footprint or design in that time. Use of the lodge has remained largely constant throughout its existence. While we accept that DOC will from time to time review its concession arrangements, the CMC oppose any concession requirements on Wyn Irwin Lodge. Imposing concessions for the use and maintenance of Wyn Irwin lodge would likely create a financial burden that the CMC would oppose.</p>	<p>Clarify what ‘departmental standards’ are in respect to buildings, and consult with the CMC in regards to the practicality of achieving these standards and their appropriateness.</p>	
<p><i>Haugh, Andrew</i> 607/3</p>	<p>Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.</p>	<p>Remove or reword Policy 14 c)</p>	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Haugh, Andrew</i> 607/7	Retain the Recreation Club huts in their current locations. These are important facilities for regular outdoor users providing affordable accommodation, especially younger people and families.	Keep the status quo regarding club huts.	
<i>Buchanan, Sean</i> 609/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Sirguy, Dr Pascal</i> 625/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Nock, Volker, Miharuru &amp; Felix</i> 626/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/2	Regarding Policy 14 d) Oppose: Club lodges should not have to be available to the public. Lodges should be available to the members only. The clubs have provided the lodges and maintained them without public funds.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Jerram, Tom</i> 629/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Bell, Colin</i> 630/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Hann, Nick</i> 631/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 633/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Liddle, Edward Leonard</i> 639/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Scott, Gary</i> 644/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Moran, George</i> 645/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Walden, Dr Annie</i> 650/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Diller, Beatrice</i> 651/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Parker, Jeremy</i> 672/1	Oppose removal of the club huts at whitehorse hill. These huts are well used and provide a base for both their own members and the wider community who can and do access these facilities.	Retain existing club huts.	
<i>Woch, Paulina</i> 675/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Gallagher, Robert</i> 676/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Bell, Carlo</i> 681/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Sequeira, Liliana</i> 682/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Marriott, Peter</i> 690/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/3	Unwin Lodge and other club lodges need to be retained 'as is'. These lodges provide important facilities for their members, and it is over to the clubs themselves to decide who uses their facilities and on what basis through suitable booking systems.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c) and d) stating "the clubs themselves to decide who uses their facilities and on what basis through suitable booking systems."	
<i>Laing, Michele</i> 695/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Rivett, Christina</i> 696/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Abaffy, Clare</i> 701/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Preston, David</i> 702/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Wilkinson, Clare</i> 706/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Grant, Hayden</i> 707/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/9	The draft NPMP threatens retention of Tahr Lodge, a publicly available facility built and managed by the NZ Deerstalkers' Association. Tahr Lodge has significant historic and cultural value for the hunters of New Zealand.	NZPHGA supports the NZDA's wish to retain the status quo	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Brothers, Penelope Jane</i> 715/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Costello, James</i> 721/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Granger, Paula</i> 727/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/65	There are existing huts and lodges in the park which are owned by clubs or concessionaries. The Plan proposes several changes to the way these are managed. These facilities offer important support to recreational users, and often have historical significance to these groups. Decisions which affect these facilities must include careful consultation with the owners, recreational user groups and where relevant with concessionaries.	Amend Policy 14 to recognise the importance of these facilities to their current owners and to include consultation on decisions with the owners, recreational user groups and where relevant concessionaries.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/16	The term "authorisation" requires definition; point 14c lacks clarity and 14d is arguably inappropriate - the huts were built and are maintained with Club labour and money, and have existed for decades in tandem with public facilities. To the extent that the clubs are enabled to offer public facilities, it is likely they will do so (for revenue etc.), but ought not be explicitly required to.	Define "authorisation." Define "maximised" Delete 14d.	
<i>Desborough, Dr Graham John</i> 737/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Edwards, Gareth</i> 740/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Troup, Christina</i> 745/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hay, Ron</i> 746/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Allison, Celia</i> 749/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/14	Supports the retention of Club lodges and commends their existence as recreational assets		
<i>Came, Sharron</i> 766/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/15	The term 'authorisation' requires definition; point 14c lacks clarity and 14d is arguable inappropriate -the huts were built and are maintained with Club labour and money, and have existed for decades in tandem with public facilities. To the extent that the clubs are enabled to offer public facilities, it is likely they will do so (for revenue etc.), but ought not be explicitly required to.	Define 'authorisation.' Define 'maximised' Delete 14d.	
<i>Andrew, Jennifer</i> 786/3	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Gawith, David</i> 791/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/10	Do not support the approach outlined in the plan. This states that occupancy must be maximised in club facilities. It contains direct reference to allowing public use of these facilities. It is facetious to consider that there is any right for public use of these facilities, which	Delete 1.3.1 Section 14 c), d) and e)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>were constructed using club resources, time, sweat and toil many years ago and have always been for the use of club members.</p> <p>These facilities directly promote and allow for regular visits to the park by recreational users, particularly those in the 'Backcountry', 'Remote' and 'Wilderness' settings. Currently there are few facilities for accommodation that are suitable for the needs of these groups. If this is included in the plan, it opens these facilities to simply becoming another accommodation provider in the park - if public access is mandated in the plan, then clubs must provide it, and it opens a dangerous door to eroding club member access.</p>		
<i>Owen, David</i> 800/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Speck, Walter &amp; Zita</i> 801/2	Regarding Policy 14 c) and d) The presence and traditional use as club huts should be retained. They are part of the history of the MCNP. Management and bookings should be under the jurisdiction and administration of the relevant clubs.	Delete policy 14 c) and d) from the plan.	
<i>Ellis, David</i> 803/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Association, Hutt Valley Branch Inc.</i> 804/3	Regarding Club lodges and huts - No change to user access should be made unless the owners of those facilities agree. It is unreasonable to expect clubs to provide and maintain facilities for increasing public demand or move their facilities essentially to make way for ever increasing tourists.	Amend the plan to state no changes unless there is agreement from the affected club owners.	
<i>Liddel, Gerrard</i> 805/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/1	Generally support Policy 14. Regarding c) and d) these seem too restrictive	No decision stated.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/17	Clubs should be able to manage occupancy of their own assets however they see fit, whilst still adhering to the Department's requirements for building standards.	Remove Policies 14 c) and 14 d)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/6	Do not support the approach outlined in the plan: If this is included in the plan, it opens these facilities to simply becoming another accommodation provider in the park.	Delete Policy 14 c), d) and e).	
<i>Grinsted, Jack</i> 825/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Grinsted, Jack</i> 825/5	Support Wyn Urwin Hut (Canterbury Mountaineering Club) being retained. also support free 24hr vehicle access to this hut for club members.	Retain Wyn Urwin hut, Implement free 24hr access to this hut for club members.	
<i>Wratt, Gillian</i> 826/6	Regarding Policy 14 c) and 14 d): Do not support the apparent lack of priority for club members and their guests compared to the public in the use of Unwin Lodge in order to maximise occupancy.	No decision stated.	
<i>Freyens, Ben</i> 835/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Jessop, Keith</i> 836/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 838/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Tompkins, Jean</i> 839/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Waters, Jay</i> 859/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Waters, Dana Lee</i> 860/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hopper, Megan</i> 865/4	Support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Remove or reword Policy 14 c)	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/16	Policy 14(c) and (d): Unwin Lodge already allows non-member use and often has school groups, but the decision whether to allow non-member use should be left to NZAC, who have done much to maintain an historic connection with the park and its rich heritage from pioneer mountaineers. Likewise the CMC Hut, Wyn Irwin, and the deerstalkers' Thar Lodge. The presence of these clubs should be encouraged, because they facilitate access to the national park for New Zealanders who may otherwise not be able to afford the accommodation elsewhere. They should not be forced to become backpacker lodges overrun with overseas tourists. PLEASE aim for quality not quantity tourism in the whole plan! There is an established culture with these clubs, where volunteers have contributed many hours and resources to build their assets, where there are huge social and environmental gains from bringing together groups of like-minded people, who have a real connection with our national parks and who understand the etiquette of pitching in to do chores to keep the huts running smoothly. All this would be undermined if club huts have to aim for maximum occupancy. It is not their role to cater for overflow tourism.	Remove conditions (c) and (d)	
<i>Pengelly, Stuart</i> 882/5	I support Unwin Lodge being retained. I do not support the lodge being used by the public at the expense of Club members and their guests in order to maximise occupancy.	Review Policy 14 to address the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 15</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/2	All park huts should have a booking system in place. There needs to be greater restriction on guided parties using huts. The combined guided groups in a hut should not exceed 70% of bed space.	Reword policy to support the implementation of a hut booking system and to restrict hut use on any night by the total combined guided groups to no more than 70% of total bed space (with exception of Caroline hut)	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/40	NZers should be given booking priority. The influx of overseas tourists has made it a challenge for Kiwis to access these huts.	Amend Policy 15 to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/27	Manage booking systems to avoid the 'first come first served' rush by holding back sites and spaces and progressively making campsites and bunk spaces available during the year. Overseas visitors are welcome to enjoy the national park, but not to the extent that diminishes opportunities for New Zealanders to use and enjoy their own backcountry.	Amend policy 15 to include a new sentence to read: "Bookings will be allocated so that at least 30% of the campsites and bunk spaces are available up to one month in advance."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/54	Club huts, other than those huts listed in Table 3, should be managed according to advice provided for club lodges listed in Table 3. See submission point 53 relating to Policy 14.	Rewrite Policy 15 to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/15	It is a pity that it is impossible to stay in Mueller hut due it being booked weeks in advance by foreign tourists. This fate must be avoided for other huts at all costs. First in first served must absolutely be maintained to support the user groups that use foot access and to support New Zealand adventurers who wish to plan their adventures at short notice to align with weather windows. I would be very hesitant to allow any guiding operations the ability to book huts as this would be damaging to New Zealand's (ski and) mountaineering culture.		
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/4	I support huts and campsites being available on a first come first served basis only, the only exceptions being Mueller and Hooker Huts for which bookings can be made. Mueller is primarily a tourist hut, and Hooker will be a very accessible walk in.	First come first served is the only appropriate basis for the Aoraki alpine huts. There should be no more huts put on a booking system, including Liebig.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/24	Most backcountry huts in New Zealand are available of a first-come-first-served basis. Moving away from this arrangement has several implications. One of them is the ability for huts to become prebooked potentially excluding access. This is likely to affect travellers in more remote and higher alpine areas who require more flexibility in their travel timelines. Longer stay trips also become a different proposition if it was possible for other people to book out a hut that existing group was already occupying, and this would have consequences for the concept of responding to, and making use of weather windows. The question of an appropriate access system is also influenced by the availability of air access. Where this is available to a hut, the situation can arise where travellers on foot arrive later only to find that the available bunk space has been taken by an air	1. In general, restrict hut bookings arrangements to high use front-country huts only. 2. Facilitate further discussion on the merits of hut booking systems at aircraft accessible huts, such as the ability to book for a maximum of one day in advance, up to the known capacity at the time, based on intentions and/or the radio schedule. 3. Encourage people to be self-reliant and be prepared to camp or bivvy.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>access party earlier the same day. In this situation the opportunity to have booked that night could be seen as an improvement to the current situation. This ability could available for example, for maximum of one day in advance for huts that are aircraft accessible, up to the known capacity at the time, based on the previous night's radio schedule (where radio is available). Although travellers could also arrive unannounced this might have the effect of facilitating better information sharing on the likely hut occupancy on a given day, and this may have a bearing on the dates or destinations chosen by air access parties.</p>		
<p><i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/3</p>	<p>Yes - as per Mueller; no to everywhere else.</p>	<p>Retain Policy 15</p>	
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/8</p>	<p>CMC does not believe that huts should be bookable as this goes against NZ tramping and mountaineering tradition. No-one should be turned away as this can pose a safety concern for backcountry users and is seen by CMC as an erosion of traditional Kiwi recreational values.</p>	<p>Huts should not be bookable.</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/14</p>	<p>Booking systems for huts and other facilities are acceptable in the context of current issues, but these should be designed solely to prevent overcrowding (rather than favour those making faradvance bookings, or commercial occupancy). Booking systems must prioritise traditional use of the respective facilities; specifically, mountaineers (guided and unguided), trampers, hunters, and skiers should be catered to over and above the needs of heli-hikers, sightseers, and those undertaking overnight catered hut trips. Substantial portions of any facility should be excluded from a booking system, i.e. remain first-in-first serve, or else be explicitly prioritised for those holding membership of a bona fide outdoors club, or able to clearly demonstrate participation in the above traditional activities. Provision for mountaineers, skiers and hunters to make last minute arrangements for trips (e.g. to take advantage of a brief weather window) must be maintained.</p>	<p>Retain policies subject to discussion above.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 16</b></p>		
<p><i>Wilkie, Nick</i> 3/1</p>	<p>Support use of Caroline Hut by Alpine Recreation for guided mountaineering courses. The guides are eco-friendly and they are an asset to tourism in the area with</p>	<p>Grant concession to Alpine Recreation for occupation and use of Caroline Hut beyond 2020.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	their knowledge of tourism in the surrounding area including Hooker Valley and the history of summiting Mount Cook.		
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/10	Support review of concession conditions for Caroline Hut.	Either gift Caroline hut to DOC to operate, or remove from the Park.	
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/9	Support the review of the Caroline Hut concession conditions.	retain Policy 16	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/8	Support the review of Caroline Hut concession conditions. Private huts within the Park are a travesty.	Caroline Hut should be either gifted to DOC to operate as a public hut, or it should be removed.	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/8	Support the review of the concession conditions on the private Caroline Hut.	Either gift Caroline Hut to DOC to operate as a public hut, or require it to be removed by the concessionaire.	
<i>Mansel, David</i> 24/1	Support for Caroline hut and associated level of amenity in AMCNP.	Continue the current concession for Caroline Hut to enable guided public access through Alpine recreation.	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/2	We feel that Caroline Hut should be opened to the public like any other hut in the Park	Caroline Hut is open in full to the public on expiration of its current concession in 2020.	
<i>Geerling, Gideon</i> 30/1	<p>Allow Caroline Hut to continue operating as now:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a "public" hut would entice many people who are not properly equipped and do not have the necessary experience</li> <li>- there is not enough space to accommodate unguided users at the same time as guided users</li> <li>- facilities such as water and toilets do not have the capacity for full constant use of the hut</li> <li>- the hut provides opportunities for Ngāi Tahu and local groups to undertake a free trip in the area.</li> <li>- if the hut is made available to unguided users this will seriously undermine the viability of Alpine Recreation's operating business</li> <li>- without the backup of the hut, and the presence of the guides in the area, this part of the park would be seldom visited</li> </ul>	Amend Policy 16 to allow Caroline Hut to continue operating as now.	
<i>Beikirch, Henriette</i> 34/1	<p>If the Caroline Hut was to be turned into an open public hut, this would encourage more inexperienced parties to attempt the (Ball Pass) route and potentially get themselves into trouble - Ball Pass needs to be treated as mountaineering requiring route finding skills (unlike the Mueller Hut route).</p> <p>The current system of a hut available to the public by booking a guided package, and an emergency shelter</p>	Retain the status quo of concessionaire-owned and operated hut with freely available emergency shelter.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	always unlocked and freely available, should be retained		
<i>McCartney, John</i> 38/4	Caroline Hut - Support the review of concession conditions Private huts within the NP are a travesty to the egalitarian nature of Kiwi back country culture. Caroline Hut should be gifted to DOC to operate as a public hut, or it should be removed by the concessionaire.		
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/6	Support review of Caroline Hut concession conditions.  Caroline hut should be gifted to DOC to operate as a public hut, or it should be removed by the concessionaire	Retain policy to review the future use of the hut	
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/2	Intention of policy unclear, particularly (c). Guided activities provide visitors with high-quality experiences. Caroline Hut provides an exceptional visitor experience and is therefore an integral part of the solution to managing increasing visitor numbers to the Park. Provide for visitors to get confidence they need to engage with the outdoors - this aligns with the outputs and outcomes enabled by the plan. All operations that are operated by concessionaires are open to the public.	Delete Policy 16(c)	
<i>Feild, Melissa</i> 52/2	Support keeping Caroline hut as it currently is (bookable as part of a guiding service with emergency shelter for public use, rather than having the entire hut open to the general public)	Reword policy C	
<i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/10	Support the news that the concession conditions on the private Caroline Hut are to be reviewed.	Caroline Hut should be gifted over to DOC or operate as a public hut, or it should be removed by the concessionaire.	
<i>Bosshard, K</i> 57/4	The existence and ownership of Caroline Hut is a travesty. Nobody should be excluded from this hut or from camping in its vicinity. Mount Cook National Park should acquire Caroline Hut and treat it like any other in the Park.	Mount Cook National Park should acquire Caroline Hut and treat it like any other in the Park	
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/10	Support the news that the concession conditions on the private Caroline Hut are to be reviewed.	Caroline Hut should be gifted over to DOC or operate as a public hut, or it should be removed by the concessionaire.	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/3	Specifically 16. c) It would be regrettable for the unique experience available in this hut to be lost.	Delete policy 16 c) or reword to "opportunities for use of the hut by members of the public as part of a bookable guided package"	
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/3	Retain Caroline Hut in its current form	Delete policy 16 c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/11	On expiry of the current concession, Caroline Hut should be made permanently open and available for use by the public.	Retain policy 16 but remove a) b) c) and insert "Caroline Hut becomes permanently open and available for use by the public, and linked to the DOC service standards and fee structure	
<i>Sweney, Stella</i> 76/6	The hut is in a topuni area: recognition needs to be given to the relationship the concessionaire has built with Ngai Tahu. Backpackers seeking to access bunks at Caroline Hut with the current access route would be to invite significant safety issues. Caroline Hut is always available to the public - by booking to make the trip with a guide.	Recognition needs to be given to the relationship the concessionaire has built with Ngai Tahu.	
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/4	Oppose - Caroline Hut should not be opened to public use. The Ball Pass route and glacier approaches to the Pass and exit to the Hooker are not a suitable "round trip back packing route". The concessionaire has invested considerable capital in maintaining and servicing the hut, which is effectively available for public use.	Retain Caroline hut as currently managed. The hut should not be available to general public use.	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/7	Caroline hut is a long standing asset to the Park for less experienced visitors from both New Zealand and overseas. It should be retained as it has been operated responsibly by the concessionnaires for nearly three decades. The hut is too small to operate in any other way and if opened to the public would result in much larger numbers of inexperienced visitors attempting the demanding Ball Pass crossing without experienced guides	Delete Policy 16.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/9	Once the concession for Caroline Hut expires in 2020 two options should be considered: a) Removal of the hut at the concessionaire's cost b) Transfer of ownership of the hut to DOC, and hut to be unlocked and freely available for public access at all times	Assess transfer of ownership of Caroline Hut to DOC, NZAC or other organization, for use by general public	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/4	Caroline Hut is in keeping with the values of the National park, facilitates access into the mountains without the need for aircraft, and supports environmentally sustainable tourism. See attached supporting document for Caroline Hut.	The concession for Caroline Hut should be renewed to continue supporting this unique, high quality visitor experience within Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/5	Policy 16(c): Caroline Hut is too small to support the likely demand from both guided and unguided groups. The water supply is limited and the current rate and patterns of use has been sustainable and manageable.	Retain the hut as currently managed	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/17	The current use and occupation of Caroline Hut provides sustainable, low-impact, foot accessed opportunities for both guided and unguided members of the public. Alpine Recreation provides ongoing support of Kāi Tahu's Aoraki Bound programme with 4 students sponsored for a free guided crossing each year. Local high school students from Mackenzie College are sponsored a Ball Crossing each year. Our guides are trained in route finding, and group sizes controlled to minimise impacts and create greater public understanding and respect for important values of this special area.	Retain Policies 16(a) and (b) Reword Policy 16(c) to read: "opportunities for use of the hut by the public through a bookable guided package, with an openly accessible emergency shelter."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/9	Regarding Policy 16 c) The current use and occupation of Caroline Hut is providing a safe, enjoyable, unique and low-impact experience to many guided members of the public.	Include in the plan an indication of a willingness to discuss public-private partnerships as a model for ownership of mountain huts,so that these facilities to not dissappear altogether in the future due to lack of public funding.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/13	Support Policy 16 a) and 16 b) The current use and occupation of Caroline Hut provides sustainable, low-impact, foot accessed opportunities to both guided and unguided members of the public (note that guided users are also members of the public). It is a unique facility within the National Park. Alpine Recreation provides ongoing support of Kai Tahu's Aoraki Bound program.	Retain Policy 16 a) and 16 b)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/14	Regarding Policy 16 c) Support in part.	Reword Policy 16 c) to state "opportunities for use of the hut by the public through a bookable guided package, with an openly accessible emergency shelter."	
<i>Jauregui, Christopher</i> 278/1	Regarding 16 c) The current system of a hut, which is already available to the public by booking a guided package and in an emergency, has freely available shelter that is always open and unlocked, should be retained.	Remove 16 c) Retain status quo of concessionaire-owned and operated hut	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/7	The current use and occupation of Caroline Hut should be allowed to continue. It provides high quality, low-impact, foot accessed opportunities to both guided and unguided members of the public (note that guided users are also members of the public).	Retain Policies 16 a) and b).	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/8	Regarding Policy 16 c) The current use and occupation of Caroline Hut should be allowed to continue. It provides high quality, low-impact, foot accessed opportunities to both guided and unguided members of	Reword Policy 16 c) "to opportunities for use of the hut by the public through a bookable guided package, with an openly accessible emergency shelter."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the public (note that guided users are also members of the public).		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/28	Do not support this policy as written. As a general principle, the club is opposed to the use of a hut for the exclusive use of a concessionaire in a national park. The draft policy offers little direction to decision makers beyond offering some vague assessment criteria. With the expiry of the current concession in 2020 there is an opportunity for Caroline Hut to revert to a public hut.	Reword Policy 16 to read: " Upon expiry of the current concession, Caroline Hut will be managed by the Department as a public hut."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/55	Caroline Hut, privately owned at present, should be permanently open and available, and should be usable by the public at the same cost as public huts of a similar standard. It should not be in private ownership beyond concession expiry in 2020.	Amend Policy 16 as identified.	
<i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/4	Oppose the specific clause on Caroline hut. The review of the lease is a process that should be separate from the Mt Cook Management Plan.	Remove clause 16	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/5	Caroline Hut is run in a sympathetic way towards national park principles (unlike this plan). Therefore I strongly recommend that the concession is renewed.	Caroline Hut is part of a successful local concession, with those involved being active supporters of the park and its principles. This deserves respect and support from all. Were the hut to be claimed by the park as a public hut the outcome for the park would be a reduced visitor experience for all, as the park does a poor job of looking after our public huts.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/25	Private huts are generally not consistent with the purpose of national parks. This is a separate issue from the commercial uses of public assets and space which is generally acceptable and be advantageous for local communities and as a form of assistance for park users to access various experiences (i.e 'tourism?'). The Plan includes provisions for the assess use and occupation of the Caroline Hut upon the expiry of the current concession in 2020. Assuming the hut is going to stay, it would make sense to make it available to the general public. The location is extremely good in relation to the iconic Ball Pass route for transalpine tramping and ski-touring, and there are a range of other activities (e.g. climbing) that occur in this area and are compatible with the management setting and desirable outcomes. Currently the Plan envisages that a booking system would be available. However, there are no details provided of what the arrangement(s) might be.	1. After expiry of the current concession ensure Caroline Hut available to the public. 2. Reassess whether a booking system is the best way to provide for public access. In this process, provide details of what the arrangement(s) might be, and ensure there is consultation with community around these.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/4	<p>Caroline Hut Concession; Alpine Recreation has maintained a low profile existence with Caroline Hut over the years. All the guiding companies have their ‘niches’, and Ball Pass has been it for Alpine Rec. They are a small business, often catering to NZ clients, and provide a really fantastic kiwi experience, for kiwis.</p> <p>The hut would quickly become overrun if it was open to the public (not being large enough) and would require a booking system to manage it.</p> <p>To not renew their concession would potentially spell the end of the company and along with it many kiwi’s gateway into the mountains.</p>	Amend Policy 16 to include a statement that allows Alpine Recreation to maintain guardianship of Caroline Hut.	
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/9	It is an anomaly having a private hut in the Park, it goes against wider Parks policy, and Caroline Hut owner or users are not entitled to exclusive use of that part of the park. The shelter was intended to be available to people and should remain available. Private ownership of the hut should also come to an end and the hut either removed or given to the park as a public hut.	Caroline Hut become a public hut or remove it.	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/8	<p>Support Caroline Hut being made open to the public at expiry of lease.</p> <p>This would be a very big and helpful step forward in what is already becoming a very popular route. If it is allowed to remain in private stewardship, then other similar sites should be available for other commercial entities.</p> <p>Support establishing new huts in either Malte Brun range (more than one could be possible) and potential replacement of Gardiner in the Hooker Valley.</p>		
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/4	Oppose the opening of Caroline Hut to the public. It is a private facility and members of the public should be allowed to use it ONLY with the express consent of the owner as it fits with their activities.	I think the Emergency shelter should be available for over night stays for a fee or another simple shelter could be built in the area.	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/8	Support the news that the concession conditions on the private Caroline Hut are to be reviewed. Private Huts within the National Park are a travesty to the egalitarian nature of Kiwi backcountry culture. Caroline Hut should be gifted over to DOC to operate as a public hut, or it should be removed by the concessionaire. Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged (not discouraged as the draft suggests) so	Amend the plan to state that camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut is encouraged not discouraged. Retain the intention to reassess the use and occupation of the Caroline Hut upon the expiry of the current concession in 2020.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	that campers will use the toilet facilities provided. The concessionaire should not be encouraged to treat this part of the park as their own.		
<i>Wesley, Dr Graham</i> 595/5	Support making the Caroline hut open to the public once the current consent expires in 2020.	Retain text as written.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/29	With the agreement of the current concessionaire, Caroline Hut should be made permanently open and available for use by the public, and linked to the Department's service standards and fee structure. Locked doors do not belong in our national parks.	Delete Policy 16 clauses (a)-(c) and insert in their place: "Caroline Hut becomes permanently open and available for use by the public, and linked to the Department's service standards and fee structure,"	
<i>Wood, Nicholas</i> 685/3	Regarding Policy 16 c) Oppose any change to the current operating model for Caroline Hut as it would make it harder for less experienced members of the public to enjoy multi-day stays in the National Park.	Reword Policy 16 c) to "continued opportunities for use of the hut by members of the public through concessionaire-guided groups in line with the current operating model."	
<i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/4	Oppose Policy 16 regarding Caroline Hut: It is a small hut, and could not function as a base for guided parties, if its modus operandi was changed.	Amend policy to keep the status quo.	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/12	Oppose private huts in the park. Support the policy to reassess the use and occupation of the private hut.	Submit that the existing private hut be bought or gifted to the park when it's current concession expires.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Carla</i> 698/2	Oppose Policy 16 c). There is a public shelter already available to the public at all times.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/66	There are existing huts and lodges in the park which are owned by clubs or concessionaires. The Plan proposes several changes to the way these are managed. These facilities offer important support to recreational users, and often have historical significance to these groups. Decisions which affect these facilities must include careful consultation with the owners, recreational user groups and where relevant with concessionaires.	Amend Policy 14 to recognise the importance of these facilities to their current owners and to include consultation on decisions with the owners, recreational user groups and where relevant concessionaires.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/17	Caroline Hut should become purchased by DoC and become available to the public upon expiry of its concession.	Retain	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/15	Submits that Caroline Hut needs to have credible public access that does not require the purchase of a guided trip or instruction in order to book a bed.	Support with clarification	
<i>Speck, Walter &amp; Zita</i> 801/3	Regarding Policy 16 c) The policies should aim to support and encourage professional guiding operators within the park, especially if they promote walking,	Extend concession to operate Caroline Hut as a hut used by a professional guiding operation as in the past.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	trekking, climbing, skiing etc.		
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/3	Support. For consistency extend to all non-Department huts, lodges and infrastructure. Add clause to recognise past contribution (or otherwise) of the concessionaire's activity in meeting the objectives of the AMCNP mgt plan. Also of the concessionaires of existing / traditional rights.	i) Change the wording from "Reassess use and occupation of non-Department buildings and other infrastructure upon the expiry of the current concession / permits to ensure:  ii) Insert as clause c) "recognition of hut's/concessionaires past contribution in meeting the objectives of the AMCNP mgt plan and traditional rights."	
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/6	The future of Caroline Hut If this hut were made fully open to the public and not supported by a guiding operation, it would simply be commercially unviable for Alpine Recreation to maintain. The hut in its current configuration is too small to support the likely demand from both guided and unguided groups. As there are no streams in the vicinity, water supply is limited by the available catchment area of the roof and in particularly dry seasons runs quite low. The current rate and pattern of use has been sustainable and manageable with flights for restocking and toilet waste removal only required on one day per year. All other access is on foot. If Caroline Hut were owned and managed by DOC it would not be maintained to the same standard. The current model has been working well and it would be good to retain this facility and associated service for the benefit of future generations.	Reassess the occupation of the Caroline Hut to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/6	The future of Caroline Hut If this hut were made fully open to the public and not supported by a guiding operation, it would simply be commercially unviable for Alpine Recreation to maintain. The hut in its current configuration is too small to support the likely demand from both guided and unguided groups. As there are no streams in the vicinity, water supply is limited by the available catchment area of the roof and in particularly dry seasons runs quite low. The current rate and pattern of use has been sustainable and manageable with flights for restocking and toilet waste removal only required on one day per year. All other access is on foot. If Caroline Hut were owned and managed by DOC it would not be maintained to the same standard. The current model has been working well and it would be good to retain this facility and associated service for	Reassess the occupation of the Caroline Hut to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the benefit of future generations.		
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/17	<p>The current use and occupation of Caroline Hut provides sustainable, low-impact, foot accessed opportunities to both guided and unguided members of the public (note that guided users are also members of the public). A public emergency shelter is accessible at all times and is well utilised by unguided groups (often also in non-emergency situations).</p> <p>Alpine Recreation provides ongoing support of Kāi Tahu's Aoraki Bound program (4 students are sponsored to do a free of charge guided Ball Pass Crossing each year), in turn their guides benefit from an increased awareness of natural and cultural values which they pass on to their clients in the form of high-quality interpretation. Similarly, local high school students from Mackenzie College are also sponsored a Ball Pass Crossing each year, thereby passing on natural, cultural and historic values to the wider community.</p> <p>The unique flora, fauna and geology of the area are respected through our guides being trained and knowledgeable in route finding, along with strictly controlled group sizes (no more than 4 clients per guide with a maximum of 2 groups using the hut at any given time), thus minimising impact and creating a greater public understanding and respect for the important values of this special area.</p>	<p>Retain Policies 16(a) and (b) as written</p> <p>Reword Policy 1.3.1 16) c) to read: "opportunities for use of the hut by the public through a bookable guided package, with an openly accessible emergency shelter."</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 17</b>		
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/11	Ensure that commercial concessionaires in the Park honour the owners of huts by adhering to a booking process and payment.	Amend Policy 17 to address the concerns raised	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/56	Ensure that monitoring hut use for visitor experience occurs against criteria derived from national park values and existing visitor management zoning.	Amend Policy 17 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/30	Policy should include possible methods of implementation	Amend Policy 17 by adding the words: " ... By methods that include conditions on landing concessions for the purpose of visitor monitoring and revenue collection."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 18</b>		
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/10	Support policy 18 to discourage camping next to huts, or if allowed that it is monitored to ensure waste removed and potential impacts recorded and reported.	Retain as worded	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 19</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/3	Strongly support this policy	Retain policy 19	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/3	Support the creation of additional camping zones and an area for campervans	Retain Policy 19 (c) and (d)	
<i>Ord, Gregory</i> 54/2	Removing / relocating day-use car parking from the White Horse Hill Campground to an alternative site may be needed but it should not be applicable for Wynn Irwin visitors. Mountaineers have lots of gear and need to be able to easily unload it adjacent to Wynn Irwin Hut.	White Horse Hill park and ride should not be applicable to Wynn Irwin hut visitors / users	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/4	I would support limits to day use parking and campervans during the peak season via a permit system.	Change wording to "investigate options for the future management of vehicle-accessible camping within the park in the context of wider camping opportunities and wider solutions to parking concerns, including those provided outside the park"	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/12	Considerations for Whitehorse Campground could also include size restrictions on campervans, where much parking space is used up for the benefit of few.	Add new policy in accordance with the submission.	
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/5	Partially support the ideas for management of vehicle accessible camping. Although some parking is always needed for people wishing to access the backcountry. If day-use carparking is removed, I am concerned there would e no way for the classic kiwi tramper or mountaineer to access the park.	Delete 19 a). Retain 19 b), c), d). Add :parking for guests of the Tahr and Wyn Irwin club lodges will be retained as a separate are where members can park.	
<i>New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.</i> 148/2	Regarding policy 19 d) this policy appears to reduce options, which would be counterproductive to the cross sector collaboration currently underway.	Delete policy 19 d)	
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/2	White Horse Hill campground and car park should NOT be expanded. It was never envisaged that this front country, highly visual area would effectively be a car park that people could camp in. It should be removed. Car camping / caravans should be outside the park boundary. Access to Hooker Valley tracks should be by public transport.	Remove camping from White Horse Hill.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/10	Regarding Policy 19 b) managing the White Horse Hill Campground under a concession, is not appropriate since there should be no privatisation or	Remove Policy 19 b)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	commercialisation of any facility in a National Park.		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/41	Day parking should not be removed from White Horse Hill. For safety reasons there should be car access to this area to access the Hooker day walk. Those with limited walking ability would be prohibited access through such a rule. Campervans often rely on toilet blocks at camping areas or use the outdoors. Campervan areas must have a toilet block to help keep the environment clean and protect waterways.	1. Delete Policy 19(a) 2. Amend 19(c) and (d) by adding the words "Toilet blocks in these areas available."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/57	Submission lists a number of considerations to be taken into account in the investigation of options for future camping in the Park: - overnight use is more demanding o the environment than day use - General Policy supports development of facilities outside the Park rather than inside - NZ recreationists make regular use of White Horse Hill - some campervans size means they take up a disproportionate space - the benefit of a parking fee may be offset by need for extra staffing and infrastructure.	Review Policy to take the identified considerations into account	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/6	Campervans should be provided with their own separate overnight parking.	Support d)	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/29	There is also the option to move the camping facilities to the park boundary. This arrangement is not uncommon in other countries. It would help with the congestion and carparking issues at the recreational road-end, which is also used for access to existing club huts. It would also help address observations made in the Plan concerning the negative impacts of the campground on the environment in that location. Many of these arise because of the higher impact associated with overnighing when compared to day visits or use of areas for car parking.		
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/5	Absolutely! This needs urgent attention. I support d) keeping WHH for tents and campervans elsewhere	Retain Policy 19. Support (d)	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/18	Support Policy 19 d: Idea to segregate campervans and tents.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/12	Policy 19 d) Support the idea of restricting camping at White Horse Hill to tents only.		
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/7	Policy 19 d) Support camping at White horse Hill as tents only		
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/5	Regarding 19b. Oppose the the use of an external concessionaire to manage ( for a profit) parking and camping within the AMCNP in the future.	No decision stated.	
<i>Tsuchiya, Sadao</i> 576/1	Regarding Policy 19 a) I oppose "remove/relocate day-use carparking from the White Horse Hill Campground" for all users. Tour buses/vans with DOC concession should be exception. Park users who start walking/climbing before shuttle services start running require carpark at the site for fair access right to the park.	Amend the plan to state that tour buses/vans with DOC concession are exempt from the policy. As well as park users who require access at earlier times than the park and ride allows for.	
<i>Tsuchiya, Sadao</i> 576/2	Regarding Policy 19 b) I oppose the motion to operate the campsite under a concession. It will result 1) a concession holder can make profit out of the money which is supposed to be used for improvement of campsite or conservation purposes, 2) higher cost for users, and 3) lower budget for maintenance.	Delete Policy 19 b)	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/12	<p>Partially support the approach outlined in the plan. The White Horse Hill Campground is over-run with campervans, poor hygiene and non-paying campers. DOC does not have the resources to adequately manage the campground and it distracts from other areas on need in the Park.</p> <p>A concession to manage the campground would likely improve the management of the campground and the surrounding environment. Supports restricting camping to tents only.</p> <p>Amend policy to contain explicit reference to exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership. These exemptions must allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the White Horse Hill area for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park.</p>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/31	Considerations for White Horse Hill Campground could also include size restrictions on campervans, where much parking space is used up for the benefit of few.	Amend Policy 19 to include the additional consideration as requested.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/9	We strongly support this policy to investigate future options for management of vehicle accessible camping within the Park	Retain this policy as written	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/4	Oppose Policy 19: camping- either needs to be restricted to tents or moved completely outside the Park due to the impact this has on the environment. No further camping areas should be developed.	Amend the plan to at the very least state that camping should be restricted to tents. Campervans should not be able to stay in the park overnight.	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/5	Policy 19d Support White Horse Hill camping being tents only. This would allow for more day-use parking and take the area back to its more traditional use which better fits with the area.	Retain Policy 19-d	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/18	White Horse Hill is ideally located as a tenting campsite, being one of the most sheltered accessible sites. It is appropriate that day use parking and campervan parking/camping be prioritised elsewhere. I fully support policy 19d, which may eliminate a substantial portion of the current issues at that site. I do not support the campsite being run under a concession, which would likely rob DoC of revenue, increase the cost to the public of the excellent experience of camping at the site, and alter the culture/vibe of the campground.	Delete 19b. Retain 19a, c, d.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/16	Policy 19 b) Submits that there does not need to be a policy that would allow the management of a DoC Camping ground to be outsourced to a concessionaire. The rationale for doing so has not been presented.	Do not support Policy 19 b)	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/16	White Horse Hill is ideally located as a tenting campsite, being one of the most sheltered accessible sites. It is appropriate that day use parking and campervan parking/camping be prioritised elsewhere. I fully support policy 19d, which may eliminate a substantial portion of the current issues at that site. I do not support the campsite being run under a concession, which would likely rob DoC of revenue, increase the cost to the public of the excellent experience of camping at the site, and alter the	Delete 19 b). Retain 19 a), c), and d).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	culture/vibe of the campground.		
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/11	<p>Partially support the approach outlined in the plan. The White Horse Hill Campground is over-run with campervans, poor hygiene and non-paying campers. DOC does not have the resources to adequately manage the campground and it distracts from other areas on need in the Park. A concession to manage the campground would likely improve the management of the campground and the surrounding environment. In support of restricting camping to tents only.</p> <p>See submission under 2.1.3. Policy 15: There must be an exemption to allow New Zealand residents regular access to this recreational area for the purposes of both day and overnight trips. This exemption must include private vehicle access and overnight parking.</p>	Amend Policy 19 to contain explicit reference to exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership. These exemptions must allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the White Horse Hill area for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park.	
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/2	Regarding Policy 19 a) I Oppose this.	There are many practical and technological options for managing remaining traffic without going this far, such as a shuttle service.	
<i>Eden, Chris</i> 809/3	Regarding Policy 19 b), c), and d) I support exploring and implementing these.	Combine these into a concessionaire operated basic tents only campsite with an overflow area further down the valley or perhaps encouraging campers to return to Glentanner when WHH is full. Further suggest WHH be 'walk in' sites only and be redesigned to make each site very specific.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/18	Support the policy of restricting camping at White Horse Hill to tents only. However, I do not like the idea of the campground being managed under a concession.	Retain Policy 19 d) and remove Policy 19 b)	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/7	<p>Partially support the approach outlined in the plan. Support Policy 19 b) and d)</p> <p>A concession to manage the campground would likely improve the management of the campground and the surrounding environment. Support of restricting camping to tents only.</p>	Retain policy 19 b) and d).	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 20</b>		
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/3	Support Policy 20	Retain Policy 20	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/58	<p>Submission lists a number of considerations to be taken into account in the investigation of options for future camping in the Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- overnight use is more demanding o the environment</li> </ul>	Review Policy 20 to take the identified considerations into account.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>than day use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- General Policy supports development of facilities outside the Park rather than inside</li> <li>- NZ recreationists make regular use of White Horse Hill</li> <li>- some campervans size means they take up a disproportionate space</li> <li>- the benefit of a parking fee may be offset by need for extra staffing and infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/19	Camping is and should remain unrestricted by law in National Parks, with the specific and existing exclusion of areas within 200 m of a road or 500 m of a Great Walk.	Remove Policy	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/17	Camping is and should remain unrestricted by law in National Parks, with the specific and existing exclusion of areas within 200 m of a road or 500 m of a Great Walk.	Remove policy.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 21</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/59	<p>Submission lists a number of considerations to be taken into account in the investigation of options for future camping in the Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- overnight use is more demanding o the environment than day use</li> <li>- General Policy supports development of facilities outside the Park rather than inside</li> <li>- NZ recreationists make regular use of White Horse Hill</li> <li>- some campervans size means they take up a disproportionate space</li> <li>- the benefit of a parking fee may be offset by need for extra staffing and infrastructure.</li> </ul>	Review Policy 21 to take the identified considerations into account.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/7	Park charges should be accountable, and go through a public review process.	Any increases in park charges need to be publically reviewed.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/17	<p>We understand from asymmetric charging on the Great Walks that new Zealanders’ are now being able to book. Asymmetric charging needs to be applied to all charges in this park.</p> <p>Money is a good way of modifying behaviour. We would not want to see New Zealanders’ greatly disadvantaged by the greater foreign tourist numbers.</p>	Recommendation: User pays needs to be employed more widely; car parks, camping.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 22</b>		
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/6	Regarding Policy 22 b) Support maintaining and ensuring all requirements to continue to hold this status	Retain this policy.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	is paramount in the reputation and cultural and commercial value of the reserve.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 23</b>		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/28	Policy 23(c)(v): Oppose the current situation where there is a monopoly at the airport. There are no policies to open up the airport to other aircraft users.	Reword Policy 23(c)(v) to read: "Other land around the current airport lease will be made available to other concessionaires."	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/42	Granting of concessions should be made available through a public process open to all. It is unclear what is meant by the granting of concessions "in consultation with " Ngāi Tahu who are commercial operators and concession holders. This could be seen as competitive advantage.	Amend Policy 23(a) to ensure that the granting of concessions is fair to all applicants.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/43	It is apparent that the Department has acted unreasonably on occasions in processing concession applications, which violates the NPA.	Amend Policy 23 by adding a new assessment criteria (c)(viii) to read: "The Department will act at all times in a fair and reasonable manner with all concessionaires."	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/44	Policy 23(c)(v): Oppose the current situation where there is a monopoly at the airport. There are no policies to open this up to other aircraft users.	Reword Policy 23(c)(v) to state: "Other land around the current airport lease will be made available to other concessionaires."	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/29	The proposed policy presumes that a concession should be granted. It also applies sweeping criteria that gives the Department unfettered discretion with its decision making. The policy should adopt a neutral stance on the outcomes while providing guidance to decision makers. Support common expiry dates for concessionaires, but concessions need to be granted for a specific duration to avoid the expectation of operating in perpetuity. Instead of listing criteria, proposed allocation process should set out how concessions will be granted	Delete Policy 23 and replace with: "23(a) An application for a new or replacement concession will: a) be assessed using an allocation process, developed in consultation with kaitiaki rūnaka and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu; b) if granted, only be for a period of up to 15 years, and the expiry date will be aligned with other similar concessions; and c) the activity will be consistent with the tranquillity outcomes for each area; and 23(b) Any person applying for a concession will be required to demonstrate: a) they have skills and experience to undertake the activity; b) how any adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on the park's natural values, outcomes and other visitors would be avoided or minimised as far as practicable; and c) compliance with any relevant Care Codes and hut use policies."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/61	A limited supply or opportunity should be determined by multi-disciplinary technical assessment of effects on the Park's intrinsic values. What kinds of activities should also be matters to consider	Amend Policy 23 to express the matters raised.	
<i>Campbell, Robert</i> 507/5	Agree with Policy 23 c) i) Operator experience- commercial experience is essential in this environment (2-3 degree glacial lake with huge icebergs) to ensure a safe operating experience. V) Avoiding the creation of monopoly situations - allowing a monopoly in a NP has a detrimental impact on the general public through a lack of innovation, choice, price hikes and opportunities. This is true in any commercial sector.	Retain policy 23 and esp. 23 c) i) and ii)	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/10	Policy should include the requirement for consultation with existing concessionaires who have developed businesses and invested in existing infrastructure. TRoNT commercial operators may also be present in AMCNP and excluding existing concessionaires could lead to conflict of interest.	Reword Policy 23(a) to read: "a) using an allocation process with serious consideration towards avoiding a conflict of interest, develop in consultation with kaitiaki rūnaka and TRoNT and existing concessionaires."	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/8	Policy 23 a) It is inappropriate for the Plan to include a policy on granting commercial concessions based on "an allocation process developed in partnership with.. Te Rūnanga o Ngai Tahu" (p.58). As a major competitor in the South Island tourism sector, and a potential tourism investor at Aoraki/Mount Cook tourism, Ngai Tahu is in a direct commercial relationship with the Department and, therefore, in a conflicted position in helping develop allocation processes that will affect its business competitors. In its current form Policy 23(a) creates the potential for commercial conflict issues and, as a building block for a monopoly, directly contradicts Policy 23©v ('avoiding the creation of monopoly situations').  Policy 23 c)vi) "Specific criteria..Plan" is missing in WTPNP draft plan. For completeness and consistency this clause should be added to WTP.	Policy 23(a) should be amended along the lines of Policy 3 on p.119 in the WTPNP Draft Plan: "Should grant concessions..using an allocation process.." Both plans should use the same criteria (and do not currently).  Include Policy 23 c)vi) in the WTP draft Plan.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/9	(See also more general comment under 1.3.1.Policy 25) Policy 23 c) sets out the assessment criteria for consideration and granting concessions for limited supply situations or opportunities.	Consider a way in which existing and potential stakeholders and operators within the national park can be provided with a level of certainty about timelines, detail and process for the multiple layers of consideration that will eventuate from	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Considers that the criteria have the potential to impact negatively, unintended or not, on existing concession holders and/or existing operators.</p> <p>The application and interpretation of the criteria is crucial. In the instance of the commercial limited supply aircraft landing opportunities, the existing concession holder for the landings in the national park (within the proposed Haupapa Place) and the current operators who undertake the landings, are not one and the same. The implications of this situation could be disadvantageous to both parties when interpreting the assessment criteria for the limited supply opportunity.</p> <p>Of opinion that this situation should not impact on future options for the existing concession holder to obtain landings during an allocation process. Nor should it impact on future options for any current operator undertaking landings to obtain a concession.</p> <p>The current criteria speaks to operator experience and compliance of any existing concession(s), among other criteria. How will the criteria be interpreted for the situation where the operator and concession holder are different? For clarification, and to reduce ambiguity, the criteria should be amended.</p>	<p>some of the policies provided in these sections of the draft Plan. A communication plan for these parties is one suggestion.</p> <p>Communication and engagement with all stakeholders is imperative throughout the development of new process/system/procedure, through to the consideration stage of a process.</p> <p>Develop objectives and policies that relate to keeping the decision makers accountable and all affected parties informed.</p> <p>Policy 23 c) – review and amend the assessment criteria with the following or something similar: i) existing authorised concession(s) holder; ii) compliance with any existing concessions; iii) operator experience; iv) operator performance; Continue with the remaining criteria.</p>	
<p><i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/8</p>	<p>Support Policy 23 c) i. operator experience &amp; v. avoiding creation of monopoly situations.</p> <p>Operator experience is absolutely essential to ensure a safe experience in this extremely dangerous environment. Competition is essential in any market especially in a National Park of the significance of Aoraki/Mt Cook. This is true in any commercial industry sector.</p> <p>A monopoly situation within a national park should only ever be permissible when there is absolutely unequivocal evidence to suggest the environmental impacts/effects will be so severe there is no other option available to the Department other than to restrict any other concessionaires to preserve the integrity of the area. This is absolutely not one of those situations.</p>	<p>Retain these provisions.</p>	
<p><i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/11</p>	<p>Policy 23 a) It is inappropriate for the Plan to include a policy on granting commercial concessions based on "an allocation process developed in partnership with ...Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu" (p.58). As a major competitor in the South Island tourism sector, and a potential tourism investor at Aoraki/Mount Cook tourism, Ngai Tahu is in a direct commercial relationship with the Department</p>	<p>Policy 23(a) should be amended along the lines of Policy 3 on p.119 in the WTPNP Draft Plan: "Should grant concessions... using an allocation process... ". Both plans should use the same criteria (and do not currently).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>and, therefore, in a conflicted position in helping develop allocation processes that will affect its business competitors.</p> <p>In its current form Policy 23(a) creates the potential for commercial conflict issues and, as a building block for a monopoly, directly contradicts Policy 23©v ('avoiding the creation of monopoly situations')</p>		
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/20</p>	<p>The draft Plans takes an overly simplistic approach to allocating limited supply concessions. The suggested Policy 23 fails to address most of the serious risks involved - risks which pertain to DOC and businesses alike.</p> <p>A Limited Supply Concession Agreement was signed by the Ministry of Tourism, DOC and TIA in August 2008. While the Agreement was developed over a decade ago, the issues it aimed to address still exist and many of its solutions remain valid. It should provide the basis for discussion of any limited supply allocation policy.</p> <p>TIA submits that the policy will be complex and will need to apply nationally, and that it is better suited to sit outside the Plan and be referenced by the Plan.</p> <p>The redrafting of the policy on allocating limited supply concessions must involve consultation with TIA.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 23 to address the matters raised by the submitter, and particularly to address the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Re-draft the policy to address the issues raised in the Ministry of Tourism, DOC, TIA Limited Supply Concession Agreement.</li> <li>2. Consider whether the policy would be better suited to sit outside the Plan and be referenced by the Plan.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/1</p>	<p>In general, TTL supports an allocation process being derived for the allocation of aircraft landing rights as despite a significant under-utilisation of aircraft landing rights in Aoraki Mt Cook National Park by AMCAL, the Department of Conservation has refused to break this historical and monopolistic aircraft landing right scenario and authorise other aircraft operators landing rights (in accordance with plan limits) in the Park.</p> <p>Providing an equitable allocation process that affords other aircraft operators including THL with an opportunity to secure some limited landing rights is therefore supported.</p> <p>However, TTL has significant concerns with the Department of Conservation's approach to aircraft landing management and the implementation of any proposed allocation process. It is extremely inequitable to exclude affected parties from the formation of the allocation process with this proposed Policy approach particularly when most aircraft operators have</p>	<p>Policy 23 should be amended to specify the exact allocation process to be utilised not just the assessment criteria. This amendment requires further public consultation.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>historically had great difficulty in obtaining aircraft landing rights due to the monopoly situation held by AMCAL and authorised by the Department of Conservation.</p> <p>Not only is the lack of detail and ability to submit on the future allocation process considered to be unfair to existing aviation concessionaires such as THL but the submitter has valid concerns in regards to the Department of Conservation's ability to come up with an effective allocation process, based on its experience with the Fiordland allocation process.</p>		
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/7	Regarding Policy 23 c) i) Support operator experience must be a consideration as the lake as high levels of danger due to icebergs.	Retain Policy 23 c)	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/8	Regarding 23 c) v) Support avoiding the creation of a monopoly system.	Retain Policy 23 c) v)	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/15	Support		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/10	Request additional assessment criteria : "23(c)(viii) - ensuring the Health & safety of the concessionaires' clients during the clients visit to the Park.	Reword Policy to Include extra point 23.c.viii "ensuring the Health & Safety of the concessionaires' client during the clients visit to the park."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 24</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/30	The proposed policy is vague and woolly. The policy should be reworded to state clearly its intent	Reword Policy 24 to read: " No authorisations will be granted where they are ..."	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/16	Support with the addition of an exception. Exception: unless any effects are considered minor and/or can be effectively mitigated.	Support with change	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/19	Support Policy. Being consistent with the General Policy for National Parks, and the CMS is part of the purpose of this Plan.	Revise Policy 24 d) to include reference to the National Parks Act 1980.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 25</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers</i>	Clarification of clause (c) is sought.	Amend policy to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Property Ltd</i> 254/45			
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/10	Carbon emissions should be a part of the environmental impact assessment during the concession application process.		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/10	<p>Some of the Policies and Milestones within these sections of the draft Plan pertain to other processes (Limited Supply Situation/Opportunities) or management plans (iwi) being developed and/or applied during consideration of authorisations, over and above the new mechanisms/principles (shared management framework from the 'A Living Treaty Partnership' section) to be developed for shared active management with Kāi Tahu.</p> <p>Multiple agency, and/or organisational layers for development of process, systems and procedures, and consideration of authorisations can create an apprehensive environment for existing and potential stakeholders of the national park.</p> <p>it is imperative that those parties who are accountable for implementation polices of the management plan, when it comes into effect, are confident that they can deliver on the objectives and policies set out in the draft Plan in a timely, open and transparent manner.</p> <p>This applies to</p> <p>1.3.1. General Management Policy 23, Policy 25, 1.3.3. Aircraft Policy 2 1.3.14 Structures, Utilities and Facilities Policy 1 e)</p>	<p>Consider a way in which existing and potential stakeholders and operators within the national park can be provided with a level of certainty about timelines, detail and process for the multiple layers of consideration that will eventuate from some of the policies provided in these sections of the draft Plan. A communication plan for these parties is one suggestion. Communication and engagement with all stakeholders is imperative throughout the development of new process/system/procedure, through to the consideration stage of a process.</p> <p>Develop objectives and policies that relate to keeping the decision makers accountable and all affected parties informed.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 26</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/46	Support clauses (a), (b) and (c) , but it is unclear what the first paragraph entails	Amend the opening paragraph of Policy 26 to provide clarity of its intent	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/62	Authorisations should include concession conditions that recognise and protect NZ alpine history and culture. Policy 26 should include conditions in all concessions to provide information and interpretative material on NZ alpine recreational history and culture.	Amend Policy 26 to include the matters raised.	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS</i>	Supportive of the general policy that concessionaires should provide interpretive material on the natural, cultural and historic values of the Park, and that the respectful use of Kai Tahu cultural information should	If Policy 26(a) remains, an alternative clause might be: "where the inclusion of Kai Tahu cultural interpretation is sought by the concessionaire, and deemed appropriate by.."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/9	<p>be encouraged. Concerned about the degree of prescription in the Draft Policy 26(a), which appears to create an opportunity for kaitiaki runaka to determine whether or not cultural interpretation is necessary for any given concessionaire. Read in conjunction with Policy 30 (p.59), submits that these policies impact unreasonably on concessionaire autonomy, potentially influencing brand and operator activity.</p> <p>The Park would be better served by a more generic statement about the respectful use of cultural information, as per the WTPNP Draft Plan (Policy 11, p.70): "Should include conditions, where relevant..., to recognise and protect mana whenua values and encourage respectful use of the mountains and mana whenua cultural information".</p>		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/14	<p>The policy states that all concessions should have a condition to provide information and interpretive material on the natural, cultural and historic values of the Park.</p> <p>While the policy begins with a 'should', giving some level of discretion in decision making, AMCAVL understands the intention behind this proposed policy and the strong expectation of outcome.</p> <p>Some of the concessions within the Park are for either utilities or in more common cases, staff accommodation for concessionaires within the Village. It seems impractical to impose a condition on concessions where there will be no use of the material in reality, irrespective of the volume of these concessions versus those this condition would be appropriate for.</p> <p>While it may be simpler to impose a general condition on all concessions, the policy provides an opportunity for non-compliance with concession conditions. Although this may seem insignificant it could be perceived to foster a culture of noncompliance and difficult enforcement.</p>	<p>Review and reconsider the wording of this policy to reflect the importance of the interpretive material in an appropriate setting, or more deliberately leave it out of concessions where it is not appropriate. Reword as an example; "Where appropriate, a concession condition that provides information and interpretive material on the natural, cultural and historic values of the Park, and highlight the status of the Park as part of the Te Wahipounamu South West New Zealand World Heritage Area will be applied, and ensuring that.."</p>	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/12	<p>Policy 26 a) Supports the general policy that concessionaires should provide interpretive material on the natural, cultural and historic values of the Park, and that the respectful use of Kai Tahu cultural information should be encouraged. MCGG is, however, concerned about the degree of prescription in the Draft Policy 26(a), which appears to create an opportunity for kaitiaki runaka to determine whether or not cultural</p>	<p>The Park would be better served by a more generic statement about the respectful use of cultural information, as per the WTPNP Draft Plan (Policy 11, p.70): "Should include conditions, where relevant..., to recognise and protect mana whenua values and encourage respectful use of the mountains and mana whenua cultural information"</p> <p>If Policy 26(a) remains, MCGG submits that an alternative clause might be: "where the inclusion of Kai Tahu cultural</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	interpretation is necessary for any given concessionaire. Read in conjunction with Policy 30 (p.59), MCGG submits that these policies impact unreasonably on concessionaire autonomy, potentially influencing brand and operator activity.	interpretation is sought by the concessionaire, and deemed appropriate by.. ."	
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/4	Support Policy. Not explicit to whom the information and interpretive material be provided to.	Reword to clarify audience.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 27</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/4	Policy needs to go further and restrict the total combined guiding groups occupancy of a hut to 70%. This would be better managed by a booking system.	Reword Policy 27 to say that hut occupancy by the total combined guided groups should not exceed 70% on any one night.	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/4	Do not support guiding concessions being limited to 50% occupancy. The alpine hut system should be self-regulating on a first-come-basis. Being crowded occasionally in storm situations is part of our mountain culture.	Remove 1.3.1 Policy 27	
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/3	Do not support. Concessionaire-operated activities can provide managed access for visitors to have high-quality experiences that are commensurate with the outcomes of the plan.	delete Policy 27	
<i>Feild, Melissa</i> 52/1	A policy that specifies an upper limit on concessionaire hut bunk spaces needs to be revisited as it discriminates against members of the public who choose to go guided.	Delete policy 27	
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/1	Oppose for huts used for climbing/skitouring objectives - accurate booking of accommodation in the high alpine environment requires trips running to schedule which is often not achievable for a variety of reasons (weather, access problems, variable route conditions)	Delete policy 27	
<i>Sweney, Stella</i> 76/7	Where there are 10 or more bunks in a hut this is an option.	Avoid making a blanket rule. Considerations need to given to demand for use, size of each hut, winter and summer use, ease of access.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/11	Support Policy 27 in part. 50% is too high for any one concessionaire.	Support, but change wording to "no more than 20%".	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/18			

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/19	Guided groups are also members of the public and should not be discriminated against because they have chosen to go guided. This policy is difficult to implement without a booking system, and impossible to enforce without a warden.	Remove Policy 27 Facilitate to building of additional or replacement huts to increase capacity.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/13	Oppose Policy 27. Difficult to work without a booking system, because one concessionaire does not know what another concessionaire's plans are. Also in high alpine huts severe weather can dictate that everybody is inside for extended periods of time.	Remove Policy 27 from the plan. Facilitate the building of additional or replacement huts to increase capacity if overcrowding becomes a problem.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/15	Oppose Policy 27. Guided groups are also members of the public and should not be discriminated against because they have chosen to go guided. This is difficult to implement without a booking system and impossible to enforce without a warden. It is impossible for one concessionaire to know what another concessionaire's plans are. The nature of NZ weather can also confine hut users inside for longer than their expected stay.	Remove Policy 27 from the plan.	
<i>Jauregui, Christopher</i> 278/2	Oppose Policy 27. Concessionaire-operated activities can provide managed access for visitors to have high-quality experiences in the national park that are commensurate with the outcomes of the Plan. A booking system for all huts that are not governed by concessionaire arrangements should help manage demand and supply.	Delete Policy 27.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/9	Guided groups are also members of the public and should not be discriminated against because they have chosen to go guided. It is impossible for one concessionaire to know what another concessionaire's plans are. The nature of NZ weather can also confine high alpine hut users inside for longer than their expected stay.	Remove Policy 27 as the concern is covered elsewhere in the plan with the proposal of introducing a booking system if overcrowding becomes a problem. Facilitate the building of additional or replacement huts to increase capacity.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/31	the word "should" implies that the department will retain some discretion over applying the condition. This is unnecessary. The intent of the proposed policy is clear, and the wording needs to reflect it.	Amend Policy 27 to read: "Will include a condition on all guiding concessions ..."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/63	It is difficult to predict occupation of huts as self-reliant recreationists may arrive at any time.	Amend Policy 27 to remove the words "unless otherwise occupied"	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/2	There is a shift in mountain user demographic that has a stronger link with guided trips. To restrict guided occupancy to less than 50% bunk space is discriminating. Guides are often proactive as default custodians of the huts, in coming prepared to camp outside in busy periods, and keeping harmonious hut relations. To penalise the guiding industry is biting the hand that feeds.	Remove Policy 27	
<i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/9	Oppose "Should include a condition in all guiding concessions for Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park requiring no more than 50% of available bunk space in a hut to be occupied by the concessionaire and clients (unless otherwise unoccupied)."	Delete Policy 27 from the plan.	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/9	Do not support 50% occupancy limit in huts by concessionaires. Some huts have very small numbers of bunks and concessionaires may move in ('unless unoccupied') to find numbers have changed		
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/2	The total occupancy of any hut should be no more than 50% of available bunk space by all concessionaires, the current wording might be taken to mean no single concessionaire may take up more than 50% of the bunks. This could lead to a situation in which multiple guiding parties can fill the entire hut and leave no room for public.	Reword Policy 27. Should include a condition in all guiding concessions for Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park requiring no more than 50% of available bunk space in a hut to be occupied by any concessionaires and clients of (unless otherwise unoccupied).	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/34	Monitoring hut occupancy is important for planning and determining income from fees. Having a condition on concessionaires that use Club huts would assist the NZAC monitoring hut usage.	Amend Policy 27 to read: "Should include conditions in all guiding concessions for Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park requiring no more than 50% available bunk space in a hut to be occupied (unless otherwise unoccupied) and annual reporting of bed nights in huts with details as specified."	
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/3	Oppose this as restricting occupancy to only 50% use by guides is discriminating against those people who choose to go with a guide.	Delete this policy from the plan.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/3	Oppose this as restricting occupancy to only 50% use by guides is discriminating against those people who choose to go with a guide.	Delete this policy from the plan.	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/3	Oppose this as restricting occupancy to only 50% use by guides is discriminating against those people who choose to go with a guide.	Delete this policy from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/3	Oppose this as restricting occupancy to only 50% use by guides is discriminating against those people who choose to go with a guide.	Delete this policy from the plan.	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/6	Policy 27 Do not agree that commercial guiding concessions could have up to 50% of available bunk space in a hut, particularly for huts that can be reached by tramping.	Consider a lower percentage	
<i>Wood, Nicholas</i> 685/4	Oppose this policy. It is unworkable in practice as if multiple concessionaires were accepting bookings for the same hut. Any occupancy concerns could be met through a DOC central booking system.	Delete this policy from the plan.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Carla</i> 698/3	Oppose Policy 27 as this would further restrict numbers in alpine huts.	Remove Policy 27 from the plan.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/63	TIA supports the view of the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association (Sub 443) that that this policy is not necessary as hut use is well managed, particularly in the high alpine huts.	Delete Policy 27	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/20	I support the initiative to limit concessionaire occupancy of huts. I would suggest that the limit should be combined between concessionaires in simultaneous occupancy of the hut. If this the intent of the Plan already then this section should be rewritten for clarity.	Reword: "requiring any concessionaires and their clients to occupy no more than a combined 50% of available bunk space in a hut (unless otherwise unoccupied)."	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/18	Support the initiative to limit concessionaire occupancy of huts. Would suggest that the limit should be combined between concessionaires in simultaneous occupancy of the hut. If this the intent of the Plan already then this section should be rewritten for clarity.	Reword: "requiring any concessionaires and their clients to occupy no more than a combined 50% of available bunk space in a hut (unless otherwise unoccupied)."	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/29	Allowing concessionaires to occupy more than 50% of a hut if no-one else is there or has booked does not allow for visitors who have taken longer to reach a hut than anticipated or cannot proceed due to weather conditions etc.	Amend Policy 27 by removing the phrase "unless otherwise unoccupied".	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Association, Hutt Valley Branch Inc.</i> 804/4	The way the section is written, 2 guides could occupy 100% of the hut bunks leaving nothing for anyone else. The conservation act mandate often forgotten by the department is to "foster recreation", there is no mandate to foster commercial activity.	Amend policy to: "Guides must leave at least 50% of hut bunks for other non-commercial users unless those bunks are unoccupied by others. Where there are competing users for the remaining 50% of bunks the non-commercial users have priority".	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/20	As part of backcountry and remote zone recreationalists being flexible in order to stay safe in response to weather and other conditions, the occupancy of a hut can change at short notice. Concessionaires should take up a maximum of 50% of bunk space at all times.	Remove "(unless otherwise unoccupied)" from Policy 27.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/18	<p>Guided groups are also members of the public and should not be discriminated against because they have chosen to go guided. This is difficult to implement without a booking system and impossible to enforce without a warden. It is impossible for one concessionaire to know what another concessionaire's plans are. The nature of NZ weather can also confine hut users inside for longer than their expected stay. NZ guides often act as defacto "wardens", being the first to clean and tidy a hut, setting an example for other hut users (this is also part of the NZMGA training and assessment scheme). Guides are experienced professionals and often provide information on conditions and route advice to other hut users, increasing their safety, but also assistng in rescues when required. The presence of guides in huts should therefore be encouraged.</p> <p>This concern is already covered in Policy 12(a) with the proposal of introducing a booking system if overcrowding becomes a problem.</p>	<p>1.Remove Policy 27 2. Facilitate the building of additional or replacement huts to increase capacity. Eg. A new cantilever style hut near the existing Tasman Saddle Hut to replace Kelman and the existing Tasman Saddle Hut.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 28</b>		
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/3	This should exclude bodily fluids. It is unreasonable to expect companies to remove client's urine from the park.	Reword Policy 28. "Should include a condition in all concessions operating in the Park to remove all refuse and SOLID human waste generated by that activity where not disposed of in an approved waste receptacle."	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/35	<p>1. NZAC requests an authorisation stating that a condition on landing concessions requires provision of information about visitors and landings for the purpose of visitor monitoring and revenue collection. There is also a need to establish methods of improving the monitoring of toilet usage and revenue from toilet use..</p> <p>2. The Note 9 definition of the term "waste receptacle" only refers to facilities provided by the Department. Toilets at Club huts are public toilets and therefore are "waste receptacles" too.</p> <p>3. With the development of "pack-out" method for</p>	<p>1. Include a new authorisation policy to read: "Should include a condition in all landing concessions that requires provision of information about visitors and landings for the purpose of visitor monitoring and revenue collection."</p> <p>2.Revise Note 9 to separately define waste receptacles for human waste, rubbish and bulk waste in accordance with the submission.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	human waste, facilities for the deposition of pack-out containers, or the contents of such containers, will be needed. The plan should define such a facility. Refer to submission on Glossary.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 29</b>		
<i>Leave No Trace New Zealand</i> 660/2	Support Policy 29 which ensures that those holding a concession for operating within the park need to practice and promote the leave no trace principles.	Retain policy but amend formatting of the words "leave-no-trace" to "Leave No Trace".	
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/5	Support this policy.	Change wording from "Should require all new concession applicants to abide by the Care Code" to "Should require all concessionaires to abide by the Care Code".	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.1 General Policy Requirements Policy 31</b>		
<i>Paardekooper, Luke</i> 22/4	Hut fees should be managed so that: - children and teenagers are encouraged to take part in outdoor activities and stay in huts - school children free; actual cost for Nzers; overseas visitors pay more	Amend Bylaws to provide for the matters raised	
<i>Harris, Shayne</i> 28/1	I oppose the term "prohibit" in Policy 31(b) as the term would not allow for any jet boat access to certain areas.	Reword Policy 31(b) by replacing "prohibit" with "restrict"	
<i>Turner, Patrick</i> 29/1	Oppose the removal of access/use for powered personal watercraft, hovercraft or seaplanes in Policy 31(b)(i); or the use of powered watercraft except on Tasman Lake and Mueller Glacier terminal lake as in Policy 31(b)(ii).	Remove Policy 31(b)	
<i>McKay, Cameron</i> 33/1	Oppose having no motorised access in the national park, i.e. jetboats. See amendment as potentially setting precedent and putting access in other national parks at risk.	Retain current bylaws	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/5	Highly supportive of a ban on motorised personal watercraft - the noise is really disruptive of the atmosphere		
<i>Sweney, Stella</i> 76/9	Regarding Policy 31 e) There is a need to ensure: limited number of vehicles in each area, to be fully self-contained, strong penalties for inappropriate waste disposal, strong enforcement.	Work with the NZMCA on definitions for self-contained. Be very specific in the by-law. Ensure strong enforcement.	
<i>Perry, Mike</i> 78/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Stothers, Grant</i> 79/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kunac, Scott</i> 80/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McQuilkin, K John</i> 82/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Rolleston, James</i> 83/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Bates, Duncan</i> 84/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hindmarsh, John</i> 85/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Barker, Nathan</i> 86/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ferguson, Mark</i> 87/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Edwards, Paul</i> 88/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Owen, Jordan</i> 89/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Workman, Clive</i> 90/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Miller, Bruce</i> 91/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Davies, Mitch</i> 92/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Workman, Jan</i> 93/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Warren, Mark</i> 94/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Groundwater, Murray</i> 95/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hardie, Andrew</i> 96/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McCaskey, Richard</i> 97/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>McTaggart, Norman</i> 98/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Shaw, Dallas</i> 99/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Tapley, Mark</i> 100/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Thompson, Nathan</i> 101/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Vincent, Mark</i> 102/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Quinn, John</i> 103/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Watts, Henry</i> 105/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Staley, Sam</i> 106/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Patterson, Graeme</i> 107/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Patterson, Kate</i> 108/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Heileson, Lindsey</i> 109/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McCook, William</i> 110/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Christmas, Blair</i> 111/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Dunn, Todd</i> 112/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Faulkner, Neale</i> 113/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kean, Tony</i> 114/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Haugh, Stewart</i> 115/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Bromley, Cheryl</i> 116/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Staley, Gregor</i> 117/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Staley, Brad</i> 118/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Haycock, Alan</i> 119/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Sewell, Paul</i> 120/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ridder, Scott</i> 121/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Souter, John</i> 122/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Vincent, Christopher</i> 123/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Pearce, Kerry</i> 124/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cowdy, Sam</i> 125/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Price, Stephen</i> 126/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Bushell, Michael</i> 127/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Acton-Adams, Simon</i> 128/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Munro, Brad</i> 129/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Jackson, Peter</i> 131/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hardie, Mathew</i> 132/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kelly, Mark</i> 133/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Morris, Andrew</i> 134/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cruickshank, Timothy</i> 135/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Chilton, Elly</i> 136/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hargreaves, Tom</i> 138/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Smith, Joshua</i> 140/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Johnson, Richard</i> 142/1	Policy 31(b)(i)(ii)(iii) Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(i)(ii)(iii)	
<i>O'Sullivan, Maurice</i> 143/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>O'Sullivan, Phillip</i> 144/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Laing, Jabin</i> 145/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Smith, Paul</i> 149/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Devine, Rory</i> 153/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Morris, Charles</i> 154/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Mead, John</i> 155/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Schaumann, Geoffrey</i> 156/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Lawrence, Alastair</i> 157/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Souness, Quintin</i> 158/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 166/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McGregor, Gary</i> 168/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Stent, Elisabeth</i> 173/4	Support the prohibition of powered watercraft used for entertainment on the waters of the Park, due to noise pollution.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKenzie, Tony</i> 177/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McKenzie, Anna</i> 178/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McQuilkin, Gerard</i> 180/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ottaway, Ian</i> 183/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cutts, Mikhala</i> 184/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cutts, Jason</i> 185/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Allan, D.A.</i> 186/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Roberts, Chris</i> 187/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Mills, Toby</i> 188/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Abermethy, Justine</i> 189/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Robertson, B G</i> 190/1	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McBreen, Paul</i> 191/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cummerfield, Karl</i> 192/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McKay, Alan</i> 194/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Clarke, Ash</i> 195/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Anderson, Richard Grant</i> 196/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Trott, Robert</i> 197/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cooney, Sean</i> 198/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Colthorpe, John</i> 199/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Sullivan, Nick</i> 202/2	Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Matheson, Cam</i> 203/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Brueton, Robbie</i> 205/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Coldicott, Jessica</i> 206/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Coldicott, Tim</i> 207/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Steel, Stephen</i> 208/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Street, Bruce</i> 210/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Richens, Steve</i> 211/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>O'Donoghue, Patrick</i> 212/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Lat, Mandy</i> 213/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Luke, Jeffrey</i> 214/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McBain, Murray</i> 215/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Capstick, John</i> 216/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Jennings, A.K and Anthill, J</i> 217/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Mullan, Robyn</i> 220/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Trott, Dale</i> 221/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cambie, Rowan</i> 223/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Watson, Ray</i> 224/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Kriletich, Mike</i> 226/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cross, Paul</i> 229/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Elliot, Hamish</i> 230/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/29	Support Policy 31E	Retain as written	
<i>Morrison, Alex</i> 234/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Horrell, Clark</i> 235/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is as contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>O'Brien, George</i> 236/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>McKenzie, Douglas</i> 238/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Neal, Emma</i> 241/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Neal, Gill</i> 242/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Neal, Hugh</i> 243/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Christmas, Holly</i> 249/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Agnew, Paul</i> 251/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/47	Policy 31(b)(ii)-(iii); Should not allow powered watercraft on Mueller Lake except for existing concessionaire for safety rescue as it is a quiet zone.	Amend Policy 31(b)(ii) and (iii) to restrict powered watercraft operating on Mueller lake to reflect the Quiet Zone	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/48	Policy 31(d): More clarity is required to explain what is meant by "changing charges and fees from time to time" and whether this applies to public or concessionaires.	Amend Policy 31(d) to provide more clarity.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/50	Support Policy 31(e)	Retain as written	
<i>Ayson, Derek</i> 255/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Scott, Konrad</i> 256/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McGregor, Warren</i> 257/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Thomas, Richard</i> 260/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McPhee, Geoff</i> 261/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Webster, Brent</i> 262/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cerny, Martin</i> 263/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cairns, Josh</i> 264/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hardie, Tony</i> 265/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Lapsley, Jim</i> 266/1	Regarding Policy 31(b)(ii) - Jetboats have a lesser effect on the Park than hiking, 4WDs, and aircraft yet these are all permitted activities.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Herbert, Kerry</i> 268/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/20	Policy 31(e): Need to ensure - limits to vehicle numbers in each area, - vehicles are self-contained - strong penalties for inappropriate waste disposal - strong enforcement of bylaw	Work closely with NZMCA on definition for "self-contained". Ensure bylaw very specific and strongly enforced.	
<i>Whitaker, Matt</i> 270/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/16	Regarding Policy 31 e) Need to ensure that there is a limit to the number of vehicles in each area, vehicles be self-contained, there be strong penalties for inappropriate waste disposal, and strong enforcement.	Recommend working closely with NZMCA on definitions for self-contained. Ensure the by-laws are very specific and are strongly enforced.	
<i>Thornfield, Sharyn</i> 273/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Brady, Dean</i> 274/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Shane, Mark</i> 277/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cox, Tyrone</i> 279/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hymon, Chris</i> 280/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Shane, Angela</i> 281/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Scott, Lynn</i> 282/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kirkcaldie, Andrew</i> 283/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Holden, M</i> 285/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hardie, Janine</i> 286/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/10	Regarding Policy 31 e) Need to ensure that there is a limit to the number of vehicles in each area, vehicles be self-contained, there be strong penalties for inappropriate waste disposal and strong enforcement.	Recommend working closely with NZMCA on definitions for self-contained. Ensure the bylaws are very specific and are strongly enforced.	
<i>Hardie, Ron</i> 288/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Matheson, Cam</i> 289/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McConnell, Jason</i> 290/1	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: I oppose this policy, I purchased a vehicle for recreational use as well as hunting opportunities these rivers and waterways give access to.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Street, Emily</i> 291/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Street, J</i> 292/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Frederickson, Pam</i> 293/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Francis, Jonny</i> 294/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hamilton, Mike</i> 296/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Morrison, Fraser</i> 302/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Grant, Ben</i> 303/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Turner, Paul</i> 304/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Whitford, Neil</i> 308/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Mantell, Garry</i> 311/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Baker, Roger</i> 312/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Bramhall, Sarah</i> 313/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Richers, Matt</i> 314/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Hau, Nick</i> 316/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Lucas, Jeremy</i> 320/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Denize, Brendan</i> 322/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Robertson, Paul</i> 324/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Denize, Trudy</i> 326/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Miller, Cameron</i> 333/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Simpson, Greg</i> 335/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>O'Malley, Ben</i> 337/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Winskill, Nicholas</i> 342/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Rusbatch, Simon</i> 343/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hurst, Jarrod</i> 344/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hamilton, Nathan</i> 348/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Hamilton, Frazer</i> 349/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hamilton, Jasmine</i> 350/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Millard, James</i> 352/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Owen, Chris</i> 354/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hurst, Hamish</i> 360/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Vernel, Paul</i> 361/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Opposed to the closing of the Godley river to powered craft. Not as opposed to the closing of the Tasman river as it is closer in my mind to the true National Park.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Newton, Chris</i> 362/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Christensen, Kaj</i> 363/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McCallum, Brent</i> 365/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Terry, Dwayne</i> 366/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Grafton, Wayne</i> 368/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Sáez, Paulina</i> 369/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tuirirangi, Cory Matenga</i> 372/1	Regarding Policy 31(b)(ii) - Oppose the restriction on powered watercraft in the draft plan. Access by powered boat is a right for all NZ'ers.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii) and any other policies that restrict powered boat access in the Park.	
<i>King, Willilam</i> 374/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McKenzie, Craig</i> 375/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Preston, Roger</i> 376/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Williamson, S. M.</i> 377/1	Regarding Policy 31(b)(ii) - Oppose the intention to prohibit powered watercraft within the Park. The jetboat was invented in the Mackenzie Country and has historically been used on the highcountry rivers. I have also used them to rescue people and control Canada Geese.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kiesanowaski, Phillip (Patron Jet Boating N.Z.)</i> 378/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Blacklock, Quintin</i> 379/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Stokes, Andrew</i> 381/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Walker, Warren</i> 382/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Court, Cameron James</i> 383/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Beattie, Mark</i> 384/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Richardson, Hamish</i> 385/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Woods, Rob</i> 387/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Dann, Brett</i> 388/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Spring, Luke</i> 389/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McLachlan, Jason</i> 390/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Dornbusch, Sandy</i> 391/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Dornbusch, Mark</i> 392/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	
<i>Dornbusch, Rhys</i> 393/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Edwards, Matthew</i> 395/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Osborne, Graham</i> 396/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Irwin, Josh</i> 397/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Anderson, Hayden</i> 398/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Smith, M.</i> 399/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Sutherland, Jason</i> 400/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Smith, Rowan</i> 401/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Atkinson, CGH</i> 402/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Beets, Bart Reinoud</i> 404/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Horncastle, Rhys</i> 405/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Bills, Lance Arthur</i> 406/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Moore, Bill</i> 407/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Stenson, Bruce</i> 408/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McKenzie, Eddie</i> 409/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Newell, Tim</i> 411/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Belcher, Brent</i> 412/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Clarkson, Maria</i> 414/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cromie, Nigel</i> 415/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Clarkson, Nick</i> 417/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kendrick, Justin (and family)</i> 419/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Johnstone, Hanlin</i> 420/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Dunn, Hamish</i> 421/5	Regarding Policy 31(b)(ii) - Support this as powered craft contribute to noise pollution and I believe a more satisfying experience for tourists would be to have paddle craft only. If there is a safety issue then motors could be carried and used only in emergency circumstances.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Anderson, Wayne</i> 422/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/64	Policy 30 needs to be amended to address the situation where evidence shows adverse effects are occurring.	Amend Policy 30 to read: "If evidence shows adverse effects are occurring, halt the activity until technical assessments are complete and recommendations can be made; these may include additional restrictions or cessation of the activity."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/65	FMC supports the concept of a bylaw on waste removal, particularly in relation to mountaineering on the Park's névés, but questions (i) whether a blanket approach for all parts of the Park is appropriate; and (ii) whether the community is ready to accept such a bylaw.	Review the wording of Policy 31(c)(i) in light of the concerns raised.	
<i>Earnshaw, Brent</i> 425/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Elliot, Murray</i> 426/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Wilson, Terry Malcolm</i> 429/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Shearer, Nicholas, Thornton</i> 433/6	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Walker, Marc</i> 436/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>French, Len</i> 437/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Goodland, Bruce</i> 444/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Tuirirangi, Cory</i> 445/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Herring, Charlene</i> 448/1	Regarding Bylaw 31 ii) Support this bylaw. Restricting powered watercraft will enhance the sense of wildness in the national park.	Retain Bylaw 31 ii)	
<i>Presto, John</i> 451/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Edmonds, Toni</i> 453/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Edmonds, David</i> 454/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Edmonds, Theo</i> 455/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Steele, Peter David</i> 458/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Baylis, Simon Paul</i> 461/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McCabe, Alister &amp; Haidee</i> 463/7	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Wicken, Ed</i> 467/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Foote, Richard</i> 469/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Taylor, James</i> 472/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Robertson, Evelyn</i> 474/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Polaschek, Nikki</i> 476/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Forge, Gareth</i> 477/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Wilson, Scott Patrick</i> 479/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Wright, Hamish</i> 482/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Goldingham, John</i> 483/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Brady, Andrew Michael</i> 485/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Clearwater, Ronald</i> 490/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Scott, Andrew</i> 492/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Aitkan, Graham</i> 495/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cameron, Simon J.</i> 497/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Lilybank Station Holdings Limited</i> 499/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Green, Angie</i> 500/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Campbell, Robert</i> 507/2	Support this bylaw, but jet boats must also be included within this bylaw, and this should also include commercial vessels as well as personal vessels. Jet boats are extremely loud noisy vessels that have no place within a NP.	Suggest to reword: b) prohibit: i) the use of powered personal or commercial watercraft (such as jet boats, jet skis), hovercraft or seaplanes on or within the waters of Aoraki/Mount Cook NP..	
<i>Meredith, Allen</i> 509/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Clark, Shaun</i> 510/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Keen, Malcolm</i> 512/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/8	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: I support the prohibition of motorised craft on or within waters in the National Park, apart from those with concessions for safety and rescue. The natural quiet and tranquillity will not be protected by the presence of personal powered craft including jet skis, hovercraft, seaplanes and other powered watercraft. The prohibition needs to be consistent on or within the waters of all National Parks.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Shearer, Dara</i> 522/6	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ratray, Daryl</i> 524/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Rawle Colin</i> 534/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Harliwich, Warren Duncan</i> 536/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Barney, Gordon</i> 539/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/14	For the reason of natural quiet and tranquillity, Mackenzie Guardians support the prohibition of powered personal watercraft (such as jet skis), hovercraft, seaplanes and powered watercraft on or within the waters of Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park.	Support prohibiting powered watercraft on or within the waters of Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park.	
<i>Jenkins, Edward</i> 542/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Beirne, Vanessa</i> 554/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Oakley, Brian William</i> 562/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Tansey, Matthew</i> 563/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/4	Policy 31 c) i) It is unreasonable to expect National Park users in the 'Remote' areas of the park to pack and carry all human waste created by them, out. I do not think this reflects the current impacts of human waste in the 'Remote' areas.	Reword Policy 31 c) "require: i) visitors to the Park to remove all refuse generated by them where not disposed of in an approved waste receptacle. ii) visitors to the Park to remove all human waste generated by them where not disposed of in an approved waste receptacle or correctly buried in biodegradable packaging in	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		remote areas of the park."	
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/6	Regarding Policy 31 b) Support i) and ii). Do not support iii) and iiiii). I do not support use of any motorised vehicles on water bodies with the Aoraki Mt Cook National Park, not even for concession holders. Noise from motorised water vehicles is noise regardless of who is making it. Motorised vehicles of all kinds spoil the natural quiet - one of the valued benefits of National parks. Motorised watercraft also contribute to global warming.	Remove Policy 31 b iii) and iiiii) from the plan.	
<i>Lucas, Cole</i> 581/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Heath, Graeme</i> 583/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Heath, Ruth</i> 584/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Elliot, Will</i> 585/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Owen, Andrew</i> 586/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Faulks, Mark</i> 588/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hendrie, Malcolm John</i> 589/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hendrie, Jackie</i> 590/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hendrie, Ben</i> 591/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ford, Richard</i> 592/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Plunkett, John A.</i> 597/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Debenhom-Hardwick, Josie May</i> 598/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Waters, Andrew Ryan</i> 599/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Qualtrough, Doug</i> 603/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Stratton, Thomas Gordon</i> 605/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cassidy, David</i> 606/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Paton, Joseph</i> 608/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Hayman, Ian</i> 610/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/11	We oppose the possibility of a concession that allows jet skis, sea planes or hovercraft on the Tasman and Mueller Lakes. We believe the existing wording could allow this to happen.  The bylaws should be applicable within the existing AMCNP boundaries only and should not be applicable to any future additions that may be proposed for the Park.	Reword Policy 31(b)(ii) to read: "b) prohibit: ... Ii) the use of commercial powered watercraft (such as jet skis), hovercraft or seaplanes on or within the waters of AMCNP except on Tasman Lake and Mueller Glacier where an existing concession is already in use."	
<i>Ferguson, Vicki</i> 612/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Rule, Brad</i> 614/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/4	Regarding Policy 31 d) Support this but a suitable period of time should be given to notify concessionaires of any price increases for budgeting purposes.	Amend plan to notify concessionaires ahead of any price changes.	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/4	Regarding Policy 31 d) Support this but a suitable period of time should be given to notify concessionaires of any price increases for budgeting purposes.	Amend plan to notify concessionaires ahead of any price changes.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Lapsley, Andrew</i> 619/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Young, Jason</i> 620/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Gonscak, Nicholas</i> 621/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McLennan, Geoff</i> 622/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Wilson, Brent</i> 623/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Young, Dave</i> 624/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Smith, Malcolm</i> 627/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Baylis, Ian Gordon</i> 634/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Baylis, Jackson</i> 635/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Baylis, Marie Louise</i> 636/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Miers, Roger</i> 641/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kirner, Stephen Charles</i> 647/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/3</p>	<p>Delete Policy 31b) i), ii) and iii) A general prohibition on motorised water craft should be deleted</p> <p>The General Policy for National Parks (Policy 12 b) requires an effect-based analysis. The draft plan fails to identify, with supporting evidence, any adverse or other effects from the use of motorised water craft. The proposed prohibition on motorised water craft fails to identify the different characteristics of different parts of the Park justifying different management. Jet boating has minor or no adverse effects on the Park's values.</p> <p>The General Policy for National Parks (Policy 8.6 e) allows a NMP to provide for powered watercraft where it is consistent with the outcome for the place. There is no evidence that demonstrates that the use of jet boats is inconsistent with the planned outcomes for Aoraki/Mount Cook.</p> <p>The Canterbury CMS, policy 3.5.1 allows for DOC to restrict the use of water craft where adverse effects may occur to public lands and waters. The draft AMC NPMP fails to identify and establish adverse effects from the use of motorised water craft, justifying a prohibition.</p> <p>Effects of Jet boats according to JBNZ submission: The draft Plan addresses tranquillity expectations through a ranking system that identifies on a scale how tranquil an area is expected to be. The upper reach of the Tasman River is rated medium, the upper reach of the Godley River is rated high. The draft plan fails to analyse the frequency and characteristics of jet boat noise. There is no record or data to inform the basis for which they are prohibited in the park. Jet boats unavoidably make anthropogenic noise that affects tranquillity, however jet boat noise tends to be for a short duration and intermittent. The controls for aircraft are explained. The proposed restrictions on motorised water craft are more restrictive than those for aircraft without analyses of the effects.</p> <p>Ecological effects: According to JBNZ the effects of jet boats on fauna and flora in braided river systems are minor or less than minor. In the absence of any meaningful analysis it is difficult</p>	<p>Delete Policy 31b) i), ii) and iii)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	to understand is this is a concern in the draft plan. JBNZ relies on a number of studies that demonstrate the effects of jet boats are minor and provided references to those in their submission.		
<i>Scott, Cody</i> 652/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Jenkins, Malcolm</i> 656/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Jenkins, Raewyn L</i> 657/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Parsons, Richard &amp; Wendy</i> 659/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/21	Bylaws; strongly disagree with policy 31 b) i) and 31 b) ii). This bylaw favours commercialism of the park and the activities that can be undertaken. The ordinary family or club can not participate where paying tourist can. I request that organised boating - with permission if necessary- be permitted. This prohibition is against recreational and engagement values mentioned in 1.2.3. and 1.2.4	Organised boating _ with permission if necessary- be permitted	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McPhail, Tom</i> 662/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Mouat, Lex</i> 670/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/7	Policy 31b and c (or b)i and b)ii ??) Support tight restrictions on use of powered watercraft in the Park.	Retain Policy 31b and c	
<i>Shelley, Craig H.</i> 677/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Shelley, Calan G. H.</i> 678/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Shelley, Tania M.</i> 679/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Shelley, Aidan</i> 680/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>King, Michael</i> 683/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>King, Jane</i> 684/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/10	Bylaws 31b(ii & iii) imply that watercraft are permitted on the Mueller Glacier terminal lake, yet Policy 3 (section 1.3.16, p.77) states: "Should not grant concessions for commercial watercraft activity on any waterbodies in the Park other than Tasman Lake". Bylaws 31(d) The process through which fair and reasonable charges and fee changes will be determined is not made clear.	The policies relating to watercraft on Lake Mueller are confusing and need to be clarified in the new Plan. The new Plan should outline the process for determining the need to change charges and fees.	
<i>Mullan, Paul</i> 691/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/15	Bylaws: Support this approach	Retain the existing policies as drafted.	
<i>Smith, Colin</i> 708/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Wilson, Phil</i> 709/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Lund, Joel</i> 712/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/2	Support but jet boats and commercial vessels should also be included. Jet boats are extremely loud & intrusive vessels that have relevance on rivers but not within a National Park. These vessels have the ability to absolutely destroy any possibility of tranquility (even in a low tranquility area such as the Tasman Valley) due to jet boats sound echoing within the natural acoustics formed by the topography of the Tasman Valley.	Amend 31 b) i) to include jet boats as well as jet skis, in the brackets, and to include commercial vessels as well as personal vessels.	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/13	Bylaws 31b(ii & iii) imply that watercraft are permitted on the Mueller Glacier terminal lake, yet Policy 3 (section 1.3.16, p.77) states: "Should not grant concessions for commercial watercraft activity on any waterbodies in the Park other than Tasman Lake".	The policies relating to watercraft on Lake Mueller are confusing and need to be clarified in the new Plan	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/14	The process through which fair and reasonable charges and fee changes will be determined is not made clear	The new Plan should outline the process for determining the need to change charges and fees	
<i>Ferguson, Hamish</i> 720/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Thornton, Rachel</i> 722/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.</p>		
<p><i>Thornton, Andrew W.</i> 723/2</p>	<p>Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)</p>	
<p><i>Thorburn, Darryl</i> 724/2</p>	<p>Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)</p>	
<p><i>McPhail, Glen</i> 731/2</p>	<p>Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)</p>	
<p><i>Blackmore, Jennifer</i> 735/2</p>	<p>Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)</p>	
<p><i>Matravers, Michael</i> 736/2</p>	<p>Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Homes, Lance</i> 751/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/2	Regarding Policy 31 b) i) Support, but need to add jetboats specifically.	Amend this statement to also mention prohibiting jetboats.	
<i>Plunkett, Craig</i> 753/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Overton, Tom</i> 755/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Smith, Nathan</i> 758/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Smith, Warren</i> 759/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Waimate 50 Committee (Motorsport)</i> 760/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Cameron, Robert</i> 762/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Dalgety, Fiona</i> 763/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Dalgety, Georgie</i> 764/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cameron, John</i> 765/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hartridge, Phil</i> 767/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Dalgety, Alex</i> 769/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Findlay, Will</i> 770/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ralph, Geoffrey</i> 772/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Wiseman, Peter</i> 776/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Weeks, Gary</i> 777/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Nirid, Robyn</i> 778/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Smith, Jane-Anne</i> 779/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Smith, Ben</i> 780/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Smith, Reegan</i> 781/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Kerin, Stacey</i> 782/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Selfe, Katrina</i> 783/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Mackenzie, John</i> 784/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Ingram, Paul</i> 785/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Coll, Chris</i> 787/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hogan, Shane</i> 793/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Davison, Marcus</i> 794/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Davison, Linda</i> 795/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Davison, Rowan</i> 796/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Davison, Sophie</i> 797/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Britain, Chris</i> 798/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/30	Omits intrinsic values such as natural quiet	Amend Policy 30 to Include intrinsic values.	
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/6	Regarding Policy 31 b) ii) Support, Is there occasion where the Department may grant a permit to an organisation for the purpose of research?	Add "/ permit" to end of sentence	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/21	The wording of this policy is very weak. If adverse effects are occurring, consideration of options is not enough. Further restrictions should be implemented.	Revise Policy 30 to conclude with "consider and implement options to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects." Or words to a similar effect.	
<i>Henry, Ryan</i> 812/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Young, Ian</i> 818/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/7	Support the prohibition of powered watercraft on waters within the National Park.	Retain Bylaw 31 b) ii)	
<i>Pointon, Richard</i> 832/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Whinham, Moira</i> 837/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Owen-Cooper, Anthony</i> 843/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Owen-Cooper, Beverly</i> 844/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Goldsack, Katrina</i> 845/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Goldsack, Joel</i> 846/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Goldsack, James</i> 847/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Goldsack, Ross</i> 848/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Duffy, Wayne</i> 849/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Squire, Brad</i> 850/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Lilly, David</i> 851/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Riddick, Tyrone</i> 852/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>van Dijk, Shani</i> 853/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Lilly, Leanne</i> 854/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cattermole, Peter</i> 855/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Atkinson, Chris and Mimi</i> 864/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Breden, Leigh</i> 866/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Bramhall, Sarah</i> 868/2	Policy 31(b)(ii): - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Cheyne, Nat</i> 869/2	Policy 31(b)(ii): Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.		
<i>Cheyne, Talia</i> 870/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Lister, Linda</i> 875/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Bramhall, Jardin</i> 876/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Lucas, Cole</i> 879/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/19	Need to ensure that there is a limit to the number of vehicles in each area, vehicles be self-contained, there be strong penalties for inappropriate waste disposal, encouragement of visitors to collect their own recycling, rubbish, compost and dispose in Tekapo or Twizel for e.g.. And strong enforcement.	Recommend working closely with NZMCA (Caravan Assoc) on definitions for "self-contained" Ensure the by-laws are very specific and are strongly enforced.	
<i>Gale, G</i> 883/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	additions.		
<i>Craig, Andy</i> 884/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws: Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Raath, Liske</i> 885/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Fannin, Brendan</i> 886/2	Policy 31(b)(ii) - Bylaws Policy is contrary to the recreational values in section 1.2.3 which supports recreational boating. Use of powered watercraft is consistent with the outcomes in Haupapa and Pae Tawhiti Places for the Godley and Tasman rivers, and for the proposed Park additions.	Delete Policy 31(b)(ii)	
<i>Morrison, Marilyn</i> 887/2	Doesn't allow for recreational boating which is contrary to the recreational values of NP. Use of powered watercraft for the Godley and Tasman rivers . I.e Haupapa Place and Pae Tahwiti Place and proposed Park Additions is consistent with 1.2.3 Rec values.	Bylaw 31 (iii)	
<i>Morrison, Peter</i> 888/2	Doesn't allow for recreational boating which is contrary to the recreational values of NP. Use of powered watercraft for the Godley and Tasman rivers . I.e Haupapa Place and Pae Tahwiti Place and proposed Park Additions is consistent with 1.2.3 Rec values.	Bylaw 31 (iii) Doesn't allow for recreational boating which is contrary to the recreational values of NP. Use of powered watercraft for the Godley and Tasman rivers . I.e Haupapa Place and Pae Tahwiti Place and proposed Park Additions is consistent with 1.2.3 Rec values.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.2 Additions to national parks</b>		
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/6	The Godley Valley is one of the most sought after hunting destinations in the world. Including the Godley in the Park would make access very difficult as the plan already talks about restricting vehicle access to the Park. It is not in the same catchment and removing it and	Remove from all parts of the plan the addition of the Godley as stated. Or add in that it should also be considered to remove the current part of the Godley as an equal option. If the addition remains, there needs to be a statement on how existing access can be maintained for vehicles and	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	giving it a different status under the guardianship of users, in conjunction with DOC, would be a far easier and cost effective exercise.	existing huts can be retained.	
<i>Holer, Fred</i> 219/3	Oppose the enlargement of the Mount Cook National Park borders. My reason for this is that myself and 3 shareholders own a private hut on Mt Cook Station land close to Andrews Creek. Access to our hut would be stopped by the National Park no vehicle access.		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/32	The addition of the Tasman, Hooker and Godley riverbeds in the park would increase the diversity of natural ecosystems and simplify the management of these areas.	Retain Policies 1 and 2 and the proposed additions listed in Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3	
<i>Herring, Charlene</i> 448/2	Support Policies 1-5. Areas adjacent to the national park are vital to the integrity of the national park and restricting intrusive usage is appropriate.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/8	I do not support any further additions to Aoraki Mt Cook NP.	Because the AMCNP is poorly managing the park to support recreation and only allow tourism, and seems unable to properly manage what it already has. Eg Hut maintenance, and natural quiet values.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/28	Support all proposed additions to the national park and UNESCO status for all new additions.	Retain all additions as proposed.	
<i>Rayward, Tim &amp; Penny</i> 704/3	Regarding Policy 2 b) Oppose the below area from being added to the park. Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation area. This area needs to remain as Public Conservation Land to allow for greater flexibility of use.	Delete this area from the potential additions to the park.	
<i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/2	Additions to the Park have implications for the Himalayan Thar Control Plan(HTCP). The additions to the Park include land currently in Tahr Management Units 3 & 5, which have different target densities to Management Unit 4, which largely comprises the National parks.	Consequent amendment of some provisions of the HTCP will be required, either changes to management unit boundaries, or management unit target tahr populations or both.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/21	Fully support the additions to the park, subject to continued 4WD access as far as Separation Stream in the Godley.	Retain	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Environment Canterbury</i> 743/5	Support proposals to extend the extent of the National Park for the integrated management of species, ecosystems and cultural significance of the area.		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/31	Strongly support the additions to the National Park.	Retain policies	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/22	Support the proposed additions to the Park.	Retain all Policies under 1.3.2.	
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/5	Support addition of all the proposed areas to the NP, and that DOC supports UNESCO World heritage Status for the additions.	Retain text as written.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/11	Policies 1 - 5: Support policies as written	Retain Policies 1 - 5 as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.2 Additions to national parks Intro</b>		
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/3	Regarding the closure of unformed public roads and the addition of riverbed and Conservation land to the Park: we wish to register our concerns about this proposal, pending further information as to process.	No decision sought until further information as to process is revealed	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/60	General Policy 8.6(d) should apply to any waterbodies added to the Park as part of this plan review.	Take the concerns raised into consideration in relation to additions to national parks.	
<i>Otago Tramping and Mountaineering Club</i> 520/3	Introduction and Policies 1-3: Support the proposed additions to the National Park Support adding these new areas to the Te Wāhipounamu South West New Zealand World Heritage Area	Retain 1.3.2 Additions to national parks as written.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.2 Additions to national parks Policy 1</b>		
<i>Bruerton, Steve</i> 19/2	Oppose closing the legal road up the Godley Valley	Amend Policy 1 to reflect the issue raised.	
<i>McKay, Cameron</i> 33/2	Oppose restricting vehicle access in the Godley	Maintain current access	
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/5	It is not clear how the closure of the roads listed in Table 4.1 would affect public access. CSIFG is opposed to Policy 1 if it limits or restricts public access	Amend Policy 1 to reflect the concerns raised above.	
<i>Price, Alistair</i> 49/2	I am opposed to the closure or stoppage of this unformed legal road as outlined in table 1.3.2 regarding additions to National Parks. The current status of the road has worked well, does not prevent or hinder any	I am opposed to changing the status of the unformed legal road by stopping or closing it and including it in the National Park	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	outcomes proposed under this draft management plan. My major concern would be that removing the legal status from this road will allow for access to be closed by stealth and without consultation in the future.		
<i>Clark, Glenn</i> 51/3	I am opposed to the closure or stoppage of this unformed legal road as outlined in table 1.3.2 regarding additions to National Parks. The current status of the road has worked well, does not prevent or hinder any outcomes proposed under this draft management plan. My major concern would be that removing the legal status from this road will allow for access to be closed by stealth and without consultation in the future.	I am opposed to changing the status of the unformed legal road by stopping or closing it and including it in the National Park	
<i>Canterbury Land Rover Owners Club Inc.</i> 55/3	I am opposed to the closure or stoppage of this unformed legal road as outlined in table 1.3.2 regarding additions to National Parks. The current status of the road has worked well, does not prevent or hinder any outcomes proposed under this draft management plan. My major concern would be that removing the legal status from this road will allow for access to be closed by stealth and without consultation in the future.		
<i>McLachlan, W</i> 59/2	I am opposed to the closure or stoppage of this unformed legal road as outlined in table 1.3.2 regarding additions to National Parks. The current status of the road has worked well, does not prevent or hinder any outcomes proposed under this draft management plan. My major concern would be that removing the legal status from this road will allow for access to be closed by stealth and without consultation in the future.		
<i>Appleton, Dr Clive</i> 62/3	Unformed roads should remain as legal roads providing access, no evidence in draft plan to present them as a problem	Delete policy 1, and if not at least establish a registration process for access through a combination locked gate as is in place in the St James conservation area	
<i>Canterbury Combined 4WD Clubs Group</i> 63/3	Opposed to the closure or stoppage of this unformed legal road as outlined in table 1.3.2 regarding additions to National Parks. The current status of the road has worked well, does not prevent or hinder any outcomes proposed under this draft management plan. Our major concern would be that removing the legal status from this road will allow for access to be closed by stealth and without consultation in the future.		
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/13	Would like to see the unformed legal roads be formally identified and 4wd access to be allowed to continue.	The unformed legal roads in the Godley Valley and Liebig Range be formally identified and 4wd access be allowed to continue.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Canterbury Recreational 4WD Club</i> 299/1	Oppose to changing the status of the unformed legal road in the Godley River valley by stopping or closing it and including it in the National Park.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Sheppard, Mike</i> 300/1	I am opposed to changing the status of the unformed legal road in the Godley River valley by stopping or closing it and including it in the National Park.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Bradshaw, Simon James</i> 317/1	Oppose the closing of the unformed roads- they provide access for recreational users.	Delete Policy 1	
<i>Perry, John</i> 346/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Young, Robin</i> 353/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Broadbent, James</i> 355/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>McKinnon, John</i> 359/4	Regarding the Godley access, I do not support closure of this legal road.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Phillips, Hazel</i> 370/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Keeling, Anna &amp; family</i> 371/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Muir, Steven</i> 373/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Ellis, Michael</i> 394/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Hopper, Jason</i> 403/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Laurie, Davie</i> 410/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	secured.		
<i>Robson, Ben</i> 416/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Dunn, Hamish</i> 421/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Latty, Nicholas William</i> 423/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/66	FMC supports Policy 1	Retain Policy 1	
<i>Harris, John</i> 427/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Parlane, Tony</i> 428/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Stevens, Carole</i> 430/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Hornblow, Quinn</i> 432/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Shearer, Nicholas, Thornton</i> 433/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Scoz, Matteo</i> 435/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Peady, Dr. Cliff</i> 438/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Camm, Adrian</i> 441/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>West, Sam</i> 442/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Jessop, Daniel</i> 446/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/30	The addition of unformed roads, stream & riverbed to the Park may be desirable if it helps integrate across all of the relevant objectives.		
<i>Cullen, Ross</i> 456/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Yong, Colin</i> 457/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Gumbrell, Matthew</i> 468/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Allan, Tony</i> 470/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Parkes, Ross &amp; Carol</i> 478/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Pearson, Richard</i> 480/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Miller, Aubrey</i> 487/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/6	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Bilek, Forrest</i> 501/2	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Major, Christine</i> 504/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Johnston, Wendy</i> 505/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Groves, Nick</i> 506/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/7	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Green, Philip</i> 513/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/5	Question the necessity of legal road closure. The GAC favours retention of legal road status, which would provide greater security of vehicle access than the draft plan which only as limited life.	Remove the unformed legal road in the Godley Valley from Policy 1 and Table 4.1	
<i>Janse, Bridget</i> 518/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Gray, Stuart</i> 521/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Shearer, Dara</i> 522/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Chinn, Paul</i> 526/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Gunson, Leah</i> 527/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>John, Rhys &amp; Walker, Jennifer</i> 529/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Jolly, James N.</i> 530/2	Stop or close unformed legal roads e.g. Godley. Oppose as this "road" provides access with minimum disturbance to high country for climbers and hunters who have huts up-valley	Delete policy and maintain consistency with Tasman Valley Road which the policy retains.	
<i>Dimozantos, Megan</i> 540/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>McCallum, John &amp; Thorpe, Anna</i> 544/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Fraser, Lisa</i> 551/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley.	
<i>Niven, Shona</i> 555/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>MacQueen, Richard</i> 569/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Hanich, Quentin</i> 570/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/5	The unformed legal road in the Godley River valley is closely linked to public access and future opportunity for access into this area. It's physical location and current use should exclude it from potential additions to the park and the prevention of access for 4wd vehicles. Does not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Delete Policy 1	
<i>Rivett, Martyn</i> 573/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Wardle, Rob &amp; Kate</i> 574/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Cocks, John</i> 580/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Laurenson, Peter</i> 582/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Wesley, Dr Graham</i> 595/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/37	<p>Strongly disagree that the unformed road up the Godley Valley be "stopped or closed".</p> <p>Would conditionally support the addition of this road to the Park if</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- public 4WD access remains open and guaranteed as far as Separation Stream</li> <li>- public 4WD access is designated as "4WD route" or similar</li> <li>- the legal public road through Lilybank Station remains unchanged and is not put into jeopardy.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete from Table 4.1 the words "unformed legal road in the Godley Valley" and remove this road from Map 6; or</li> <li>2. Amend Table 4.1 in accordance with this submission</li> </ol>	
<i>Haugh, Andrew</i> 607/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Buchanan, Sean</i> 609/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Sirguy, Dr Pascal</i> 625/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Nock, Volker, Miharu &amp; Felix</i> 626/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Jerram, Tom</i> 629/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Bell, Colin</i> 630/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Hann, Nick</i> 631/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 633/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Liddle, Edward Leonard</i> 639/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Scott, Gary</i> 644/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Moran, George</i> 645/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Walden, Dr Annie</i> 650/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Diller, Beatrice</i> 651/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Woch, Paulina</i> 675/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Gallagher, Robert</i> 676/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Bell, Carlo</i> 681/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Sequeira, Liliana</i> 682/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/6	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Laing, Michele</i> 695/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Abaffy, Clare</i> 701/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Preston, David</i> 702/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Rayward, Tim &amp; Penny</i> 704/1	Oppose adding this area to the National Park: Unformed legal road in the Godley river valley This road allows for access by 4WD to the Upper reaches of the Godley valley and is extremely important for recreationists, climbers hunters etc.	Delete this potential addition from the plan.	
<i>Wilkinson, Clare</i> 706/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Grant, Hayden</i> 707/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/4	Question necessity of closing unformed legal road providing access to the Godley Valley.	Retain legal road status to provide greater security of vehicle access than provided by 1.3.15 Vehicles Policy 8 and Table 5, page 77, because the NPMP has limited life.	
<i>Brothers, Penelope Jane</i> 715/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Costello, James</i> 721/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Granger, Paula</i> 727/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Desborough, Dr Graham John</i> 737/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Troup, Christina</i> 745/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Hay, Ron</i> 746/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	secured.		
<i>McPhail, Glen</i> 748/4	Oppose the addition of the unformed legal road in the godley river valley. The current usage of the godley valley should remain. Removing access will mean far less people get to enjoy this amazing valley.	Continue to allow vehicle access up the Godley Valley and beyond separation stream as there is a formed track right up the valley.	
<i>Allison, Celia</i> 749/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Southern Trail Blazers 4WD Club INC</i> 750/3	Oppose the addition of the unformed legal road in the godley river valley. The current usage of the godley valley should remain. Removing access will mean far less people get to enjoy this amazing valley.	Continue to allow vehicle access up the Godley Valley and beyond separation stream as there is a formed track right up the valley.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/17	Support the policies (1-5) with the acknowledgement that the purpose of the additions is to reduce public use of roads. One off concessions allowing access may be considered acknowledging historic use if effects can be mitigated.		
<i>Came, Sharron</i> 766/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Andrew, Jennifer</i> 786/4	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Gawith, David</i> 791/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Owen, David</i> 800/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Ellis, David</i> 803/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Liddell, Gerrard</i> 805/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Grinsted, Jack</i> 825/6	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley.	
<i>Wratt, Gillian</i> 826/5	Do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Freyens, Ben</i> 835/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Jessop, Keith</i> 836/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 838/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Tompkins, Jean</i> 839/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Waters, Jay</i> 859/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Waters, Dana Lee</i> 860/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Hopper, Megan</i> 865/5	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Remove this or amend plan to include alternative legal vehicle access up the Godley	
<i>Pengelly, Stuart</i> 882/6	I do not support the closure of the legal road up the Godley River unless alternative legal vehicle access is secured.	Review Policy 1 to address the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.2 Additions to national parks Policy 2</b>		
<i>NZ Jet Boating</i> 20/1	Would oppose Tasman and Godley rivers being restricted from access by boating up and down rivers.	Amend Policy 2(a) and Map 6 to reflect the issue raised.	
<i>McKay, Cameron</i> 33/3	Oppose any addition of the Godley and Tasman river beds.  I strongly oppose any road end access being limited to public transport. Change will keep New Zealanders out of the Park in favour of tourists.	Maintain current access	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/6	CSIFG is opposed to the addition of the proposed waterways to the Park if they are captured by other policy or objectives that direct sports fish to be eradicated or public access to be affected.	Amend Policy 2 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Appleton, Dr Clive</i> 62/4	Support the inclusion of the two river bed/valleys into the national park to enable better ecological restoration, protection and management of these areas		
<i>Perry, Mike</i> 78/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Stothers, Grant</i> 79/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Kunac, Scott</i> 80/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McQuilkin, K John</i> 82/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Rolleston, James</i> 83/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Bates, Duncan</i> 84/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hindmarsh, John</i> 85/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Barker, Nathan</i> 86/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ferguson, Mark</i> 87/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Edwards, Paul</i> 88/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Owen, Jordan</i> 89/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Workman, Clive</i> 90/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Miller, Bruce</i> 91/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Davies, Mitch</i> 92/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Workman, Jan</i> 93/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Warren, Mark</i> 94/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Groundwater, Murray</i> 95/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Hardie, Andrew</i> 96/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McCaskey, Richard</i> 97/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McTaggart, Norman</i> 98/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Shaw, Dallas</i> 99/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Tapley, Mark</i> 100/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Thompson, Nathan</i> 101/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Vincent, Mark</i> 102/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Quinn, John</i> 103/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Watts, Henry</i> 105/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Staley, Sam</i> 106/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Patterson, Graeme</i> 107/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Patterson, Kate</i> 108/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Heileson, Lindsey</i> 109/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McCook, William</i> 110/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Christmas, Blair</i> 111/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Dunn, Todd</i> 112/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Faulkner, Neale</i> 113/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Kean, Tony</i> 114/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Haugh, Stewart</i> 115/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Bromley, Cheryl</i> 116/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Staley, Gregor</i> 117/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Staley, Brad</i> 118/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Haycock, Alan</i> 119/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Sewell, Paul</i> 120/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Ridder, Scott</i> 121/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Souter, John</i> 122/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Vincent, Christopher</i> 123/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Pearce, Kerry</i> 124/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cowdy, Sam</i> 125/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Price, Stephen</i> 126/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Bushell, Michael</i> 127/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Acton-Adams, Simon</i> 128/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Munro, Brad</i> 129/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Jackson, Peter</i> 131/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hardie, Mathew</i> 132/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Kelly, Mark</i> 133/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Morris, Andrew</i> 134/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cruickshank, Timothy</i> 135/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Chilton, Elly</i> 136/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hargreaves, Tom</i> 138/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Joshua</i> 140/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>O'Sullivan, Maurice</i> 143/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>O'Sullivan, Phillip</i> 144/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Laing, Jabin</i> 145/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Paul</i> 149/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Devine, Rory</i> 153/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Morris, Charles</i> 154/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Mead, John</i> 155/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Schaumann, Geoffrey</i> 156/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lawrence, Alastair</i> 157/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Souness, Quintin</i> 158/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/4	The statutory process for adding land to a National Park is undertaken under section 7 of the National Parks Act 1980. Policies 1-4 do not identify the relevant statutory processes to be undertaken.	Amend policies 1-4 with reference the processes which may be undertaken. Ex "Seek to add the following areas to Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park under Section 7 of the National Parks Act 1980"	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 166/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McGregor, Gary</i> 168/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McKenzie, Tony</i> 177/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McKenzie, Anna</i> 178/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McQuilkin, Gerard</i> 180/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/12	Support the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and Godley Valley to the National Park provided DOC has the resources to administer the area.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Ottaway, Ian</i> 183/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cutts, Mikhala</i> 184/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cutts, Jason</i> 185/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Allan, D.A.</i> 186/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Roberts, Chris</i> 187/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Mills, Toby</i> 188/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Abernethy, Justine</i> 189/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Robertson, B G</i> 190/2	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McBreen, Paul</i> 191/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Cummerfield, Karl</i> 192/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McKay, Alan</i> 194/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Clarke, Ash</i> 195/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Anderson, Richard Grant</i> 196/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Trott, Robert</i> 197/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cooney, Sean</i> 198/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Colthorpe, John</i> 199/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Sullivan, Nick</i> 202/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Matheson, Cam</i> 203/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Brueton, Robbie</i> 205/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Coldicott, Jessica</i> 206/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Coldicott, Tim</i> 207/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Steel, Stephen</i> 208/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Street, Bruce</i> 210/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Richens, Steve</i> 211/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>O'Donoghue, Patrick</i> 212/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lat, Mandy</i> 213/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Luke, Jeffrey</i> 214/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>McBain, Murray</i> 215/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Capstick, John</i> 216/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Jennings, A.K and Anthill, J</i> 217/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Mullan, Robyn</i> 220/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Trott, Dale</i> 221/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/12	Support all, especially Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area and Birch Hill Stream catchment.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Cambie, Rowan</i> 223/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Watson, Ray</i> 224/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Kriletich, Mike</i> 226/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Snoyink, Jules</i> 228/6	Support all proposed land to be added to the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Cross, Paul</i> 229/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Elliot, Hamish</i> 230/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Morrison, Alex</i> 234/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Horrell, Clark</i> 235/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>O'Brien, George</i> 236/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McKenzie, Douglas</i> 238/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Neal, Emma</i> 241/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Neal, Gill</i> 242/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Neal, Hugh</i> 243/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Christmas, Holly</i> 249/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Agnew, Paul</i> 251/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ayson, Derek</i> 255/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Scott, Konrad</i> 256/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McGregor, Warren</i> 257/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Thomas, Richard</i> 260/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>McPhee, Geoff</i> 261/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Webster, Brent</i> 262/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cerny, Martin</i> 263/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cairns, Josh</i> 264/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hardie, Tony</i> 265/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Herbert, Kerry</i> 268/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Whitaker, Matt</i> 270/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Thornfield, Sharyn</i> 273/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Brady, Dean</i> 274/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Shane, Mark</i> 277/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cox, Tyrone</i> 279/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hymon, Chris</i> 280/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Shane, Angela</i> 281/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Scott, Lynn</i> 282/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Kirkcaldie, Andrew</i> 283/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Holden, M</i> 285/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hardie, Janine</i> 286/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hardie, Ron</i> 288/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Matheson, Cam</i> 289/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Street, Emily</i> 291/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Street, J</i> 292/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Frederickson, Pam</i> 293/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Francis, Jonny</i> 294/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hamilton, Mike</i> 296/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Morrison, Fraser</i> 302/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Grant, Ben</i> 303/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Turner, Paul</i> 304/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Whitford, Neil</i> 308/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Mantell, Garry</i> 311/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Baker, Roger</i> 312/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Bramhall, Sarah</i> 313/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Richers, Matt</i> 314/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hau, Nick</i> 316/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lucas, Jeremy</i> 320/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Denize, Brendan</i> 322/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Robertson, Paul</i> 324/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Denize, Trudy</i> 326/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Miller, Cameron</i> 333/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Barnett, Alice - Genesis Energy Ltd, Environmental Lead, Planning and Policy</i> 334/1	Regarding 2 b) Additions to National Park includes the Godley River. Lake Tekapo, including the delta of the Godley River, is utilised for the operation of the Tekapo Power Scheme. Given the national importance of the Tekapo Power Scheme, Genesis has significant interest in any proposal that may impact on the Tekapo Power Scheme.	Genesis requests to be included in the list of parties to be consulted in Policy 5 of 1.3.2 Additions to national park. Genesis requests that the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the Tekapo Power Scheme is recognised and provided for in the draft Plan should any land or riverbed be included in the Park that may impact on the Tekapo Power Scheme.	
<i>Simpson, Greg</i> 335/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>O'Malley, Ben</i> 337/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Winskill, Nicholas</i> 342/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Rusbach, Simon</i> 343/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hurst, Jarrod</i> 344/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hamilton, Nathan</i> 348/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hamilton, Frazer</i> 349/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hamilton, Jasmine</i> 350/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Millard, James</i> 352/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Owen, Chris</i> 354/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hurst, Hamish</i> 360/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Vernel, Paul</i> 361/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Newton, Chris</i> 362/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Christensen, Kaj</i> 363/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McCallum, Brent</i> 365/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Terry, Dwayne</i> 366/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Grafton, Wayne</i> 368/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Sáez, Paulina</i> 369/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>King, Willilam</i> 374/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McKenzie, Craig</i> 375/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Preston, Roger</i> 376/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Kiesanowaski, Phillip (Patron Jet Boating N.Z.)</i> 378/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Blacklock, Quintin</i> 379/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Stokes, Andrew</i> 381/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Walker, Warren</i> 382/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Court, Cameron James</i> 383/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Beattie, Mark</i> 384/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Richardson, Hamish</i> 385/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Woods, Rob</i> 387/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Dann, Brett</i> 388/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Spring, Luke</i> 389/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McLachlan, Jason</i> 390/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Dornbusch, Sandy</i> 391/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Dornbusch, Mark</i> 392/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Dornbusch, Rhys</i> 393/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Edwards, Matthew</i> 395/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Osborne, Graham</i> 396/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Irwin, Josh</i> 397/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Anderson, Hayden</i> 398/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Smith, M.</i> 399/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Sutherland, Jason</i> 400/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Rowan</i> 401/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Atkinson, CGH</i> 402/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Beets, Bart Reinoud</i> 404/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Horncastle, Rhys</i> 405/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Bills, Lance Arthur</i> 406/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Moore, Bill</i> 407/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Steenon, Bruce</i> 408/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McKenzie, Eddie</i> 409/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Newell, Tim</i> 411/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Belcher, Brent</i> 412/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Clarkson, Maria</i> 414/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cromie, Nigel</i> 415/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Clarkson, Nick</i> 417/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Kendrick, Justin (and family)</i> 419/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Johnstone, Hanlin</i> 420/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Anderson, Wayne</i> 422/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/67	FMC supports Policy 2	Retain Policy 2	
<i>Earnshaw, Brent</i> 425/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Elliot, Murray</i> 426/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Wilson, Terry Malcolm</i> 429/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Shearer, Nicholas Thornton</i> 433/7	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Walker, Marc</i> 436/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>French, Len</i> 437/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Goodland, Bruce</i> 444/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Tuirirangi, Cory</i> 445/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/32	Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area. Table 4.3 list areas for potential addition to the Park. However, there no accompanying explanation for why these have been identified. One of the areas is the Liebig Range / Upper Jollie / Cass Conservation Area. This is currently used for tramping, climbing, hunting, ski touring, heli-skiing and ski-mountaineering. These activities are relatively well suited to the area and have good road access and other infrastructure to support them. If included within the park it would be important to support continuation of the above activities, and potential for the continued growth of self-powered travel modes such as ski-touring that include opportunities for iconic traverse style backcountry routes to and from areas that are currently within the National Park. With regards to mechanised vehicle access modes which have higher impacts, one option would be to maintain these at similar levels to current outside of the National Park, whilst encouraging recreational users to explore self-powered access modes to experience these areas and help minimise impacts. Conversely, the area may be best managed under its current management setting. Heli-	1. Provide an explanation for the identification of any proposed additions to the park including the values that would be better protected, and details on any changes in management that were envisaged. 2. Maintain mechanised vehicle access at similar levels to current and encourage recreational users to explore self-powered access modes to experience these areas. 3. Recognise the potential for continued growth of self-powered travel modes such as ski-touring into and out of the Park from adjacent areas including opportunities for iconic traverse style backcountry routes between the two areas. 4. Ensure continuation of heli-skiing opportunities in the Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>skiing currently occurs in this area, and it is well suited to this activity. Heli-skiing is also more appropriate here than the National Park. It may be sensible to ensure the continuation of heli-skiing opportunities in that area in preference to other areas. For inclusivity, it is also import to ensure that the provisions for 'heli-skiing' are inclusive of non-commercial recreationalists wanting the access the same locations by helicopter.</p>		
<p><i>Presto, John</i> 451/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Edmonds, Toni</i> 453/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Edmonds, David</i> 454/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Edmonds, Theo</i> 455/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Steele, Peter David</i> 458/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and rivers.		
<i>Baylis, Simon Paul</i> 461/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McCabe, Alister &amp; Haidee</i> 463/8	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Toback, Leigh</i> 465/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6© to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Wicken, Ed</i> 467/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Foote, Richard</i> 469/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Taylor, James</i> 472/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Robertson, Evelyn</i> 474/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Polaschek, Nikki</i> 476/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Forge, Gareth</i> 477/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Wilson, Scott Patrick</i> 479/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Wright, Hamish</i> 482/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Goldingham, John</i> 483/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Brady, Andrew Michael</i> 485/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Clearwater, Ronald</i> 490/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Scott, Andrew</i> 492/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Aitken, Graham</i> 495/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Gould, Marion &amp; David</i> 496/1	Oppose the addition of Upper Jollie, Cass, Mt Cook Station. Transferring the overcrowding of National Park to the other side where there are no facilities to cope i.e. parking, toilets, rubbish. Shingle road with frequent washouts. Increased traffic and people affect quality of life for landowners, management of station and has major effects on our privacy and security. Brings more people up to the eastern side of the Tasman so the areas that you want to protect will get more exposure and less protection. Shingle clearance needs to be maintained in Jollie River to keep the river flow going under the bridge. Takes away the recreational hunting grounds in the	Delete these additions from the policy.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Jollie Valley and therefore promotes poaching on neighbouring private land. Overseas tahr hunters provide a valued source of income and overseas funds for locals</p>		
<p><i>Cameron, Simon J.</i> 497/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Green, Angie</i> 500/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Ross, Fraser</i> 508/3</p>	<p>I do support the addition of some important river systems and their beds into the boundaries of the park, esp the inclusion of the Tasman and Godley rivers. Request that these rivers be closed to jet skis and jet boats</p>		
<p><i>Meredith, Allen</i> 509/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Clark, Shaun</i> 510/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	
<p><i>Keen, Malcolm</i> 512/3</p>	<p>Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to</p>	<p>Delete Policy 2(a)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/2	I support all potential additions to the Aoraki Mt Cook National Park. With the rapid loss of native biodiversity on private land, there is a need to expand National Parks by including adjacent land with high native biodiversity, landscape, natural, cultural and heritage values.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hall, Susan &amp; Dunn, Kevin</i> 517/8	We support the potential additions to the National Park.	Include the eleven potential additions to the Park, especially the critically under protected braided river habitats, and seek UNESCO World Heritage status for all new additions.	
<i>Shearer, Dara</i> 522/7	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ratray, Daryl</i> 524/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Rawle Colin</i> 534/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Harliwich, Warren Duncan</i> 536/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Barney, Gordon</i> 539/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Jenkins, Edward</i> 542/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 549/3	All additions to the park are fully supported. Seeking UNESCO status for the new additions is also supported.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Beirne, Vanessa</i> 554/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Oakley, Brian William</i> 562/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Tansey, Matthew</i> 563/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lucas, Cole</i> 581/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Heath, Graeme</i> 583/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Heath, Ruth</i> 584/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Elliot, Will</i> 585/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Owen, Andrew</i> 586/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Faulks, Mark</i> 588/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hendrie, Malcolm John</i> 589/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hendrie, Jackie</i> 590/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hendrie, Ben</i> 591/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ford, Richard</i> 592/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Plunkett, John A.</i> 597/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Debenhom-Hardwick, Josie May</i> 598/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Waters, Andrew Ryan</i> 599/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Qualtrough, Doug</i> 603/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Stratton, Thomas Gordon</i> 605/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cassidy, David</i> 606/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Paton, Joseph</i> 608/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hayman, Ian</i> 610/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ferguson, Vicki</i> 612/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Rule, Brad</i> 614/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lapsley, Andrew</i> 619/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Young, Jason</i> 620/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Gonscak, Nicholas</i> 621/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McLennan, Geoff</i> 622/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Wilson, Brent</i> 623/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Young, Dave</i> 624/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Malcolm</i> 627/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Baylis, Ian Gordon</i> 634/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Baylis, Jackson</i> 635/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Baylis, Marie Louise</i> 636/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 637/4	Support the addition of all proposed areas, especially the critically under protected braided river habitat to the National Park and support seeking UNESCO World Heritage Status for all new additions.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Miers, Roger</i> 641/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Kirner, Stephen Charles</i> 647/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Scott, Cody</i> 652/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Jenkins, Malcolm</i> 656/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Jenkins, Raewyn L</i> 657/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Parsons, Richard &amp; Wendy</i> 659/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McPhail, Tom</i> 662/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Mouat, Lex</i> 670/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/8	These are valuable additions to the Park. The braided rivers have huge biodiversity values. Including them in the Park would afford them more status and protection. I would like to see all watercraft banned from these rivers due to their potential impact on breeding riverbed birds.	Retain Policy 2	
<i>Shelley, Craig H.</i> 677/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Shelley, Calan G. H.</i> 678/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Shelley, Tania M.</i> 679/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Shelley, Aidan</i> 680/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>King, Michael</i> 683/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>King, Jane</i> 684/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Mullan, Paul</i> 691/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/16	Generally supportive of the objectives, policies and milestones of this section of the draft Plan. Does not support the inclusion of Birch Hill Flat Conservation area (see under table 4.3).	Remove the reference and inclusion of the Birch Hill Flat Conservation Area as an addition to the national park.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/19	Forest and Bird support the addition of the identified Tasman and Godley sections of braided river to the national park.	Retain Policy 2	
<i>Rayward, Tim &amp; Penny</i> 704/2	Regarding Policy 2 a) Oppose to the areas below being added to the park: Godley River braided riverbed and Valley floor to Lake Tekapo. Hooker River and Tasman River braided riverbed and valley floors to Lake Pukaki. These need to remain outside of the AMCNP to allow for continued use by recreational jet boating and other activity.	Remove these from the potential additions to the park or or the AMCNP plan needs to allow for activity such as jet boating.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Smith, Colin</i> 708/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Wilson, Phil</i> 709/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lund, Joel</i> 712/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ferguson, Hamish</i> 720/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Thornton, Rachel</i> 722/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Thornton, Andrew W.</i> 723/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Thorburn, Darryl</i> 724/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>McPhail, Glen</i> 731/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Blackmore, Jennifer</i> 735/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Matravers, Michael</i> 736/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Homes, Lance</i> 751/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Plunkett, Craig</i> 753/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Overton, Tom</i> 755/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Nathan</i> 758/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Warren</i> 759/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Waimate 50 Committee (Motorsport)</i> 760/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cameron, Robert</i> 762/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Dalgety, Fiona</i> 763/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Dalgety, Georgie</i> 764/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cameron, John</i> 765/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hartridge, Phil</i> 767/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Dalgety, Alex</i> 769/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Findlay, Will</i> 770/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ralph, Geoffrey</i> 772/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wiseman, Peter</i> 776/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Weeks, Gary</i> 777/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Nirid, Robyn</i> 778/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Jane-Anne</i> 779/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Ben</i> 780/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Smith, Reegan</i> 781/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Kerin, Stacey</i> 782/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Selfe, Katrina</i> 783/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Mackenzie, John</i> 784/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Ingram, Paul</i> 785/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Coll, Chris</i> 787/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hogan, Shane</i> 793/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Davison, Marcus</i> 794/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Davison, Linda</i> 795/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Davison, Rowan</i> 796/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Davison, Sophie</i> 797/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Britain, Chris</i> 798/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Henry, Ryan</i> 812/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Young, Ian</i> 818/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/5	Support all the proposed additions to the national park and particularly support adding the braided river habitat to the park.	Retain the proposals to add in all the areas promoted in the plan.	
<i>Pointon, Richard</i> 832/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Whinham, Moira</i> 837/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Owen-Cooper, Anthony</i> 843/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Owen-Cooper, Beverly</i> 844/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Goldsack, Katrina</i> 845/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Goldsack, Joel</i> 846/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Goldsack, James</i> 847/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Goldsack, Ross</i> 848/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Duffy, Wayne</i> 849/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	
<i>Squire, Brad</i> 850/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lilly, David</i> 851/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Riddick, Tyrone</i> 852/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>van Dijk, Shani</i> 853/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lilly, Leanne</i> 854/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cattermole, Peter</i> 855/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Atkinson, Chris and Mimi</i> 864/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Breden, Leigh</i> 866/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Bramhall, Sarah</i> 868/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cheyne, Nat</i> 869/3	Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Cheyne, Talia</i> 870/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lister, Linda</i> 875/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Bramhall, Jardin</i> 876/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Lucas, Cole</i> 879/3	Policy 2(a) Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to	Delete Policy 2(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.		
<i>Gale, G</i> 883/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Craig, Andy</i> 884/3	Policy 2(a): Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Raath, Liske</i> 885/3	Policy 2(a) Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Fannin, Brendan</i> 886/3	Policy 2(a) Oppose addition of Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the Park. Currently under the RMA and the Mackenzie District Plan it is a matter of national significance under s.6(c) to maintain and enhance public access to and along lakes and rivers.	Delete Policy 2(a)	
<i>Morrison, Marilyn</i> 887/3	Currently 3x rivers are managed by the Mackenzie District Plan (as delegated authority of Maritime NZ). It is an appropriate mechanism for river control and falls under the RMA as a matter of National Importance under S6d.	Policy 2 (a)	
<i>Morrison, Peter</i> 888/3	Currently 3x rivers are managed by the Mackenzie District Plan (as delegated authority of Maritime NZ). It is an appropriate mechanism for river control and falls under the RMA as a matter of National Importance under S6d.	Policy 2 (a) Currently 3x rivers are managed by the Mackenzie District Plan (as delegated authority of Maritime NZ). It is an appropriate mechanism for river control and falls under the RMA as a matter of National Importance under S6d.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section: 1.3.2 Additions to national parks Policy 3</b>			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/68	FMC supports Policy 3	Retain Policy 3	
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/3	I support seeking UNESCO World Heritage Status for all the new additional land to the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/4	Support this policy seeking UNESCO World Heritage status for new additional land to the Park.		
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/9	World Heritage Status is appropriate for these areas.	Retain Policy 3	
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/4	Support Policy 3 to seek UNESCO World Heritage status for all new additions to the park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/6	Support seeking UNESCO World Heritage Status for all new additions.	Retain Policy 3.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/8	All additions to the park are fully supported. Seeking UNESCO status for the new additions is also supported	Retain policy as written	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/8	To better protect the unique ecosystems of the Hooker and Tasman braided river valleys, and the Godley braided riverbed and valley floor, I support their inclusion in the national park. I also support the proposal to seek UNESCO Te Wahi Pounamu World Heritage Status for new additions to the National Park.	I support seeking UNESCO World Heritage Status for all new additions.	
<b>Section: 1.3.2 Additions to national parks Policy 4</b>			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/69	FMC supports Policy 4	Retain Policy 4	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/10	UNESCO and The International Astronomical Union are working together to include astronomical heritage into World Heritage protection. There is local work happening to consider options for the inclusion of astronomy or natural night skies into the values of the World Heritage Area. <a href="https://www3.astronomicalheritage.net/">https://www3.astronomicalheritage.net/</a> <a href="https://www3.astronomicalheritage.net/index.php/show-entirety?identity=53&amp;idsubentity=1">https://www3.astronomicalheritage.net/index.php/show-entirety?identity=53&amp;idsubentity=1</a>	Add a new policy: "Seek the addition of astronomical heritage criteria to the inscription for the Te Wahipounamu South West New Zealand World Heritage Area."	
<b>Section: 1.3.2 Additions to national parks Policy 5</b>			

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/7	CSIFG has an interest and a statutory responsibility for the management of the sports fish and game bird resource. CSIFG considers it important to be included as a relevant stakeholder to undertake consultation with.	Add CSIFG to the list of stakeholders to be consulted with.	
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/7	Policy 5 refers to engagement with statutory bodies but the GAC is not listen in this table no recognised hunting groups or Public Access groups.	Reword Policy 5 to include GAC.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/70	FMC supports Policy 5	Retain Policy 5	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.2 Additions to national parks Table 4.1 / Table 4.2 / Table 4.3</b>		
<i>Harris, Shayne</i> 28/2	The addition of the Godley River and riverbed in total to the national park would effectively close off access by boat and/or 4WD to this magnificent area. Would also effectively ban a large number of NZers from their own national park who currently have access for hunting/fishing and recreation. I oppose this amendment as the use of this plan as a template for other NPs would put a large number of other boat and 4wd accessible areas at risk of being completely closed to access and this is not acceptable.	Remove the streams and rivers in Table 4.2 and the unformed legal roads in Table 4.1 from the Additions to National Parks policies	
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/8	CSIFG is opposed to the addition of roads or waterways to the park if this triggers the eradication of sports fish or limits/restricts public access to these areas.	Amend Table 4.2 to reflect the concerns raised for Policies 1, 2 and 5	
<i>Marsden, Jason</i> 43/4	Opposed to the changing of the status of the unformed legal road in the Godley valley by stopping or closing it and including it in the national park.	Delete the unformed road in the Godley River valley from Table 4.1	
<i>Wilson, Wayne</i> 44/4	Opposed to the changing of the status of the unformed legal road in the Godley valley by stopping or closing it and including it in the national park.	Delete the unformed legal road in the Godley River valley from Table 4.1	
<i>McMillan, Ken</i> 45/4	Oppose to changing the status of the unformed legal road by stopping or closing it and including it in the National Park.	Remove the unformed legal road in the Godley valley from Table 4.1	
<i>Houghton, Justin</i> 46/4	Oppose changing the status of the unformed legal road by stopping or closing it and including it within the Park.	Remove the unformed legal road in the Godley River valley from Table 4.1	
<i>Radley, John</i> 47/5	Oppose changing the status of the unformed legal road by stopping or closing it and including it within the Park.	Delete the unformed legal road in the Godley River valley from Table 4.1	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Warner, James</i> 75/4	Support additions in part, except Mount Cook Station Area and that area north to Jollie Saddle. Do not support addition of whole Godley river bed unless DOC provides practical 4wd access to the upper Godley Valley and side tributaries. The Mt Cook Station CA and Jollie River is easily accessible for tahr hunters.	Delete "Mount Cook Station Area" from Table 4.3. Amend "Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area" so that it is only the land north of Jollie Saddle. Ensure measures are put in place so that the Godley river bed can only be added to AMCNP subject to practical 4wd access being made available.	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/4	The Plan proposes the addition of the Hooker and Tasman braided rivers/valley to Lake Pukaki and the Godley river/valley to Lake Tekapo to the National Park. Other areas such as the Liebig Range, Upper Jollie, Cass Conservation Area and the Mt Cook Conservation Area are proposed as further additions, plus other smaller areas	Support the inclusion of all these additions into the Park and application for World Heritage status for these areas.	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/9	Support addition of Godley Valley to the Park and World Heritage Area, provided the Department of Conservation has sufficient resources to administer this area.	Add Godley Valley to the Park and World Heritage Area, provided the Department of Conservation has sufficient resources to administer this area.	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/10	Support the addition of the Liebig Range to the Park and World Heritage Area, provided the Department of Conservation has sufficient resources to administer this area.	Add Liebig Range to the Park and World Heritage Area, provided the Department of Conservation has sufficient resources to administer this area.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/11	Oppose any restriction on access to the Godley for the purpose of hunting	Retain 4WD track as far as Red Stag hut.	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/8	Do not support all additions: - Do not support the addition of the Godley River bed because it will prevent 4wd access for hunting tahr to control those tahr numbers. - Do not support addition of the Mt Cook Station CA and Jollie River. These places are easily accessible and popular for tahr hunters. Adding this land to the Park will mean higher taxpayer costs if DOC kills tahr and lower tahr numbers for hunters.	Delete the Godley River bed, Mt Cook Station CA and the Jollie area from the list	
<i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc,</i> 541/3	Seek the inclusion of the proposed 11 additions to the Park but recognize that these additions are not adequate to provide for protection of the geomorphic sequence down-valley from Park ecosystems.	Support all potential additions to the National Park, but seek further additions be allowed for, particularly of natural areas acquired for protection within the delineation of the Mackenzie Dark Sky Reserve.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/12	Support the inclusion of the Godley and Tasman riverbeds into the national park.	Retain section 1.3.2 and associated policies etc.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/36</p>	<p>Generally support Policies 2,3,4,and 5 with significant reservation as to the inclusion of the Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area (Policy 2(b), Table 4.3). Support upgrade from current stewardship land status, but concerned that area may become subjected to greater development pressure if it becomes included into national park.</p>	<p>Maintain Policies 2,3,4 and 5 as written</p> <p>Either delete the identified area of public conservation land from Table 4.3, or review the inclusion of that area of public conservation land in light of submission.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/38</p>	<p>Strongly disagree that the unformed road up the Godley Valley be "stopped or closed".</p> <p>Would conditionally support the addition of this road to the Park if</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- public 4WD access remains open and guaranteed as far as Separation Stream</li> <li>- public 4WD access is designated as "4WD route" or similar</li> <li>- the legal public road through Lilybank Station remains unchanged and is not put into jeopardy.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Delete from Table 4.1 the words "unformed legal road in the Godley Valley" and remove this road from Map 6; or</li> <li>2. Amend Table 4.1 in accordance with this submission</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/35</p>	<p>The CMC supports the proposed addition of the areas to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided that the Department has the sufficient resources to administer these areas. The addition of these areas should not be contingent upon additional or new funding being obtained from increased helicopter use or other concession activities within the existing Park or the proposed additional areas.</p> <p>The Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys are important to CMC members as they provide alternative entrances to the existing Park. These special areas also provide fantastic opportunities for climbing, mountaineering, backcountry walking and back country skiing. The Godley Valley is of particular importance to the CMC and its members as a number of first ascents of the peaks at the head of Valley were undertaken by CMC members, including founding member, William Kennedy.</p> <p>The CMC advocate for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range (i.e. Cass Valley) and the Godley Valley to allow for 4WD access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. The CMC suggests that these roads are formally identified and maintained to provide safer access to and from these areas and also</p>	<p>Include additional areas to the Park and the World Heritage Area. This is under the proviso that the Department is able to administer these areas and not be reliant on new or additional funding from concessions in the Park or the proposed areas to do so.</p> <p>Retain existing access and use of the Cass River and Godley River Valleys (including 4WD access) as it currently occurs.</p> <p>Formally identify and maintain these roads to provide safer access to and from these areas and also to reduce adverse impacts from vehicles in these areas.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>to reduce adverse impacts from vehicles in these areas. 4WD access is required for these areas not only to provide access to these areas but also for the New Zealand Deerstalkers Association and the New Zealand Alpine Club as well as other groups, to administer their Huts in these areas.</p>		
<p><i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/2</p>	<p>Support the addition of the riverbeds to the park (1.3.2. Policy 2) Support the intent to manage the freshwater resources in an integrated fashion to maintain the National Park in its natural state and in accordance with the objectives set out in, inter alia, the National Parks Act and the General Policy for National Parks 2005 (policy 6 j). The values of the stream and riverbeds in table 4.2 and the values of the public conservation land and waters in table 4.3. are consistent with the values sought to be protected in the draft. Given the current use of the Godley River in accordance with the current speed uplifting and the potential to use the Tasman River by obtaining a speed uplifting, the addition of these rivers and riverbeds into the NP is opposed if the proposed approach to motorised craft in the draft is not changed. - It is unreasonable and unfair to deprive our members the use of rivers they have boated on and enjoyed for many years by adding to the park. - There is no evidence or analyses of the effects of motorised craft on the lower sections of the rivers. -There is no attempt in the draft to rate the tranquillity of lower sections of the Tasman and Godley Rivers. Meaning that interested parties can not predict how those reaches might be managed and understand the justification for prohibiting motorised craft.</p>	<p>Retain section 1.3.2 (addition to the park) subject to the relief sought removing prohibitions on jet boating in the National Park.</p>	
<p><i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/22</p>	<p>While there is consideration of changes to the land status of the Upper Godley Valley and the historic Ball hut road, the current customary use should be maintained. Exclusion of public using the Ball Hut road would deny ordinary kiwi recreational users the chance to visit the site of this historic hut site. Removing access to the upper Godley road would deny ordinary kiwi recreational users the chance to explore these untamed areas away from tourist glare, and be able to enjoy these special places with family and friends in a non commercial /concession space.</p>	<p>maintain customary use when status is changed.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	These two areas have been customary places to visit for the past 50 years.		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/17	Does not support the inclusion of the Birch Hill Flat Conservation Area. Understands that this conservation land would be added to the national park for the purpose of creating and developing a park entrance at this site and to be administered under the new national park management plan provisions. Does not support the Birch Hill park entrance concept.	Remove the reference and inclusion of the Birch Hill Flat Conservation Area as an addition to the national park.	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/20	Forest & Bird support the addition of the identified Tasman and Godley sections of braided river to the national park.	Retain Table 4.2 and Map 6 as provided in the plan.	
<i>Air Safaris &amp; Services (NZ) Ltd</i> 703/1	<p>OPPOSE the areas listed in Policy 2 (a) to be included in AMCNP.</p> <p>1. Unformed legal road in the Godley river valley. This road allows for access by 4WD to the Upper reaches of the Godley valley and is extremely important for recreationists, climbers hunters etc.</p> <p>2. Godley River braided riverbed and Valley floor to Lake Tekapo. This needs to remain outside of the AMCNP to allow for continued use by recreational jet boating and other activity. This river is extremely popular for jet boating by a wide range of NZers. Jet boating is uniquely kiwi activity with long history/heritage in the area. At current usage levels we don't believe this activity causes any issues. The top part of the Godley Valley is enough to remain in the AMCNP. Don't see any reason why it is necessary to try to include larger areas of our braided river systems like the lower Godley Valley.</p> <p>3. Hooker River and Tasman River braided riverbed and valley floors to Lake Pukaki. This needs to remain outside of the AMCNP to allow for continued use by recreational jet boating and other activity.</p> <p>Oppose Policy 2 b): - Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation area. This area needs to remain as Public Conservation Land to allow for greater flexibility of use. These are important recreational areas for Nzers.</p>	<p>DELETE 1.3.2 Policy 2. or the AMCNP plan needs to allow for activity such as jet boating etc (non-commercial) in these areas.</p> <p>DELETE Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area from Table 4.3</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/58	TIA supports the additions to the Park as proposed.	Retain as written	
<i>Speck, Walter &amp; Zita</i> 801/1	Oppose the addition of Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area to the National Park. Reasons are to maintain natural, geographic boundaries of the NP. Proposed extension creates unnatural boundaries. Conservation areas which are currently popular for hunting, trekking, mountaineering, heliskiing, ski touring will have access restrictions. Public access and usage is better served under 'normal' DoC administered land, outside of National Park status.	Remove these potential additions from the plan.	
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/3	Support all the potential additions to the park in Table 4.2.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/7	All additions to the park are fully supported. Seeking UNESCO status for the new additions is also supported	Retain Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 as written	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/6	To better protect the unique ecosystems of the Hooker and Tasman braided river valleys, and the Godley braided riverbed and valley floor, I support their inclusion in the national park. I also support the proposal to seek UNESCO Te Wahi Pounamu World Heritage Status for new additions to the National Park.	I support the addition of all proposed areas, especially the braided river habitat to the National Park and support seeking UNESCO World Heritage Status for all new additions.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft</b>		
<i>Gilmour, Milo</i> 5/1	Change the management plan to allow helicopter landings in some places where huts used to be, specifically Pudding Rock and Betham Valley. Most of the flight path to either location could be done via the Tasman valley. Crossing the Cook Range between Pibrac and Nazomi would not have a negative effect on tourists in the lower Hooker. Both these valleys are valuable climbing destinations, and access to them should be maintained so that current and future generations of climbers can enjoy and learn from the routes in these areas.	Change the management plan to allow helicopter landings in some places where huts used to be. Specifically Pudding Rock and Betham Valley.	
<i>Cole, Andy</i> 11/2	Policies do not appear to mention SAR use of aircraft or hut maintenance	No specific change requested	
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/2	Policies do not appear to mention SAR use of aircraft or hut maintenance	No specific decision requested	
<i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/2	The adoption of huge 'landing zones' instead of landing 'sites' within the park should not be allowed.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Bosshard, K</i> 57/2	I ask that the landing of planes and helicopters in the whole of the National Park can only take place in very few specific landing sites as is the case now. (Oppose landing zones)	The landing of planes and helicopters in the whole of the National Park can only take place in very few specific landing sites as is the case now	
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/2	The adoption of huge 'landing zones' instead of landing 'sites' within the park should not be allowed.		
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/4	Support general direction except where it supports helicopter landings at Pudding Rock	Prohibit landings at Pudding Rock	
<i>Myers, Sylvie</i> 70/1	Oppose any increase in the allowance for aircraft landings in the National Park, it would destroy the value and attraction of our National Park which is their wilderness and tranquility.	Rewrite the provisions to reduce allowed landing numbers and zones to, or below, current levels	
<i>Schoon, Julia</i> 74/1	Against increase in helicopter flights due to the noise pollution increase.	Please reconsider any increase in helicopter flights.	
<i>Barraclough, Dr Robin</i> 130/2	DOC should look to phase out the use of all aircraft in national parks completely in a bid to make activities in them carbon neutral.	Phase out the use of all aircraft in national parks completely	
<i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/4	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/5	Generally support this section. Tranquillity to be maintained and enhanced through aircraft restrictions as stated.	Support as written	
<i>Garton, Simon</i> 162/3	Oppose current level of aircraft concessions.	Reduce the contribution of aircraft to climate change and glacier recession by reducing aircraft numbers operating in the park	
<i>Letford, Frankie</i> 167/1	Oppose increase in helicopters. A gondola would be a better option for handling increasing tourist numbers.	Helicopters should be reduced to just a few per day.	
<i>Stent, Elisabeth</i> 173/3	Oppose any increase in powered aircraft in the Park. Noise pollution is unbearable.	Change the plan to not allow any increase in aircraft.	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/5	Oppose the additional flights to areas where aircraft have been previously restricted in order to maintain natural quiet and wildlife habitat; that is first priority aims under the Conservation Act. This will seriously increase noise pollution and significantly reduce the	Do not increase number of flights in areas where they have previously been restricted.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	natural ambience of the Park.		
<i>Snoyink, Jules</i> 228/2	Opposed to more aircraft landings in the Park. There is enough noise pollution already.	Scale back the numbers on powered flights, especially where flights have previously been restricted.	
<i>Mee, Donald</i> 239/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/6	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Gardiner, Ian</i> 253/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Low, Tyrone</i> 259/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Mark, Dr Alastair</i> 267/2	Limitations to Aircraft numbers/flights rather than landings.	Propose that there should be at least 3 classifications of regions of all National Parks in New Zealand (i) Wilderness Areas; where aircraft activity be limited to Search & Rescue and pest control. Beyond that aircraft flights should be prohibited. (ii) Limited aircraft activities, where there should be a cap on the numbers of flights over this region, with a time period of no flights. (iii) Less Restrictive; where a greater number of flights be permitted, but also within limited time periods, eg 9am - 16:00. This would ensure periods of tranquillity even in areas of popular tourist activity	
<i>Rainey, Heath</i> 275/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.		
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/5	Increasing use of aircraft within AMCNP will degrade the experience of many user groups and reduce tranquility values. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and aircraft access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Support Canterbury Mountaineering Club's submission which opposes an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones - CMC seeks existing aircraft provisions in current operative Plan retained.	
<i>Kirkwood, Rod</i> 307/1	Oppose the 10 - fold increase in landings and widespread extension of landing sites.	Lower the number of landings and extension of landing sites	
<i>King, Bill</i> 310/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 318/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/6	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Stevenson, Dr. Anthony</i> 330/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Wilson, Dan</i> 331/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.		
<i>Sutherland, Scott</i> 332/2	Oppose the significant increases in the permitted number of landings within the Park.	Amend the plan to state landing numbers should not be increased or allowed beyond current limits, in particular in the Tasman Valley and Grand Plateau.	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/6	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Perry, John</i> 346/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Young, Robin</i> 353/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Broadbent, James</i> 355/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Zmijewski, Ben</i> 356/1	Oppose the approach considered by the draft plan. I do not think that extra aircraft access will help to aid with other objectives such as ecosystem priorities.	Delete any policy aiming to increase the frequency of flights within Aoraki National Park.	
<i>Zmijewski, Ben</i> 356/3	Oppose the creating of aircraft landing zones. Giving heli pilots free reign as to where they are able to land will promote serious environmental degradation that will be almost impossible to monitor.	Remove any policies relating to the creation of landing zones.	
<i>Sinton, Rowan</i> 357/1	Oppose the approach of the draft plan in regard to aircraft because I believe that the use of aircraft in the park should be de-emphasised.	Re-draft the aircraft policy 1.3.3 to significantly reduce the reliance on scenic and recreational flights and instead encourage more sustainable and natural forms of enjoyment of the park.	
<i>McIntosh, Dr Pat</i> 358/1	Do not support ANY increase in aerial activity within the Park except where needed for safety, infrastructure management and pest control.	Remove mention of any increase in aerial activity within the Park except where needed for safety, infrastructure management and pest control.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McKinnon, John</i> 359/1	Do not support a 10x increase in flight access. There is a need to allow increased tourist access but not to this extent.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Pickford, Alison</i> 364/4	Oppose any increase in air access. Air travel can destroy tranquility.	Air access to remain at current level.	
<i>Elliot, John</i> 367/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Phillips, Hazel</i> 370/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Keeling, Anna &amp; family</i> 371/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Muir, Steven</i> 373/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Poetschke, Alexandra</i> 386/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Ellis, Michael</i> 394/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Hopper, Jason</i> 403/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.		
<i>Laurie, Davie</i> 410/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Eatson, Michael</i> 413/1	Oppose the increased heli access (particularly the Hooker) but also the landing strip the length of the divide on the western side.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Robson, Ben</i> 416/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Dunn, Hamish</i> 421/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Latty, Nicholas William</i> 423/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/75	General comments: Draft aircraft policy would treat flights and landings more liberally than the present plan does.	Amend Aircraft policies to remain with the present operational plan's guidance on aircraft	
<i>Harris, John</i> 427/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Parlane, Tony</i> 428/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Stevens, Carole</i> 430/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.		
<i>Hornblow, Quinn</i> 432/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Shearer, Nicholas, Thornton</i> 433/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Scoz, Matteo</i> 435/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Peady, Dr. Cliff</i> 438/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/18	I would like to ask DOC: At what point will you stop the unsustainable expansion of air access, landings and scenic flights? How much glacial retreat will we have to put up with until you realise more landings are not the answer? Please think beyond the timeline of the plan reviews. To me it seems DOC is under financial pressure and is 'stuck between a rock and a hard place'. There must be a point where disingenuous planning has to stop. Relying on mass air access to fund operations is not in the interest of all user groups and in that sense the current draft conflicts with the National Parks Act. Lastly, there has been recent talk about New Zealand's suicide rate and issues with mental health. More funding for DOC to be put towards the development/maintenance of MCNP's foot access, huts and conservation would be beneficial for mental health of those who visit. It is obvious that time in nature and wilderness is beneficial for mental health.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Camm, Adrian</i> 441/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>West, Sam</i> 442/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Jessop, Daniel</i> 446/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Herring, Charlene</i> 448/3	Restricting the impact of aircraft and drones is vital to enjoyment of the natural environment of the park.	Retain policies.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/9	Policy needs to take much more consideration of aircraft overflights and landings on park users. Walking up the Murchison valley was a relatively tranquil experience in 2017, but walking down the Tasman we were subject to considerable ongoing aircraft noise, both fixed wing and helo.	Rewrite to give more consideration to natural quiet values, consistent with National park principles. On p45 the draft plan says 'One of the most valued benefits is the ability to experience tranquil places.' This park plan plans to completely trash that. Overall landing rights in the park should be reduced to one third what is currently allocated.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/20	Heli-skiing is best provided for in the design of generally applicable landing zones, as used elsewhere in the plan, in preference to using an activity-specific method. As a result, concessions for landings would be held by the commercial aircraft operators and be available to all, and heli-skiing concessionaires would retain their access through this arrangement. At present, the concept of heli-skiing is not directly defined in the Plan, and including a definition would be useful to improve clarity. The definition needs to be inclusive of guided commercial heliskiing activities and non-commercial recreationalists wanting the access the same locations by helicopter. In relation to the design of aircraft access zones, this would mean the heli-skiing is treated no differently to other activities, and would include multiple run heli-skiing outings, and single drops followed by a pick up later. This would also mean that all users are aware of the locations where they could expect to encounter helicopter/aircraft landings, thereby	Include a definition for the term 'heli-skiing' that is inclusive of non-commercial recreationalists wanting the access the same locations by helicopter. In relation to the design of new landing zones (as above): No new landing zones are required in the upper Tasman valley. On the western side of the Malte Brun range establish new landing zones only where moraine walls have made foot access difficult, and at the location of any new hut (as is proposed). Examples of potentially suitable locations include benches in the Beetham and Reay Valleys. On the eastern side of the Malte Brun range establish new landing zones to include some heli-ski runs from suitable start points. Establish these through further consultation with the affected park users and the wider community. On the Leibig Range consider establishment of one or more large landing zones. As above, establish the exact boundaries through further consultation with the affected park users and the wider community.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>improving certainty for all. Take into account the following when identifying locations suitable for heliskiing. In the Tasman valley being in the heart of the park, heli-skiing from the main ridgeline seems inappropriate. It has a relatively high chance of causing negative impacts on other users such as ski tourers, ski-mountaineers and climbers. The area is a world-class destination for these activities, and they are currently experiencing strong growth (across both amateur and commercially-assisted i.e. guided activities). In the Malte Brun range heli-skiing from the main ridgeline seems less appropriate in the Tasman valley for reasons as above, and potentially more acceptable on the eastern side in the Murchison, with exception of the Upper Murchison and Mannering glaciers (which are iconic ski touring destinations). However there is currently a lack of landing sites in the Malte Brun Range, and more difficult access due to glacial recession and the growth of moraine walls in the lower valleys. This suggests that some new aircraft landing zones would be, arguably, more appropriate, especially if it was to provide access for all. In practical terms, heli-skiing can be readily accommodated in the design of these aircraft access areas. This only requires identifying a set number of zones for helicopter landings along the range, to include those that are good for heli-skiing i.e. a set list of 'heli-runs'. Then all users have certainty of the locations, and logically they could also be the start point for ski-tours and other forms of mountaineering. The question then becomes the number of runs, where, and how high on major ridgelines to allow. On the western side of the Malte Brun range the establishment of new landing zones seems justifiable (with reference to the National Parks Act) only where moraine walls have made foot access so difficult that access is effectively precluded, and perhaps also to include the location of any new hut (as is proposed). Examples of potentially suitable locations include benches in the Beetham and Reay Valleys. On the eastern side of the Malte Brun range is arguably more suitable for the aircraft access zones that include heli-ski runs from suitable start points. On the western side of the Malte Brun range establish new landing zones only where moraine walls have made foot access difficult, and at the location of any new hut (as is proposed). Examples of potentially suitable locations</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	include benches in the Beetham and Reay Valleys. On the eastern side of the Malte Brun range establish new landing zones to include some heli-ski runs from suitable start points. Establishing the number of runs, where, and how high on major ridgelines could be accomplished through further consultation with the affected park users and the wider community. The Leibig Range being on the flank of park, heli-skiing from the main ridgeline seems more appropriate, and less likely to cause negative impacts on other users such as climbers. It may be appropriate to establish a single large aircraft landing zone, available to all, in this location.		
<i>Cullen, Ross</i> 456/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Yong, Colin</i> 457/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/5	Against the statutory background of the National Parks Act, which at its core emphasizes preservation, one would have expected DOC policy analysis, including modelling and clearly stated assumptions, comparing a high-volume landing model with alternatives, for example lower-volume models featuring higher concession revenue per landing. Responses to Official Information Act (OIA) requests confirm that DOC has not undertaken analysis of this character.	Delay setting of landing numbers pending publishing of: • legal advice concerning the lawful boundaries for policy analysis on concession-revenue optimisation as discussed at left; • legal advice concerning the legality of taking third-party commercial aircraft matters into consideration in national park management processes; • a fully articulated tranquillity and noise modelling programme along with a fully articulated monitoring programme; and • a public commitment to formally review of landing numbers under section 46(1) of the National Parks Act after five years.	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/1	The pre-draft context of the Draft AMCNPMP (Draft) raises serious questions as to the influence of third-party commercial aircraft operators on park management. A number of issues are raised in relation to this:	1. Apply park-wide moratorium on consideration of new concession applications for aircraft landings in the park, or upward variation of current concessions. Secure necessary regulatory change to apply moratorium if required.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>1. Sections 4(1), 4(2) and 43 of the National Parks Act (Act) are among the explicit pointers that the statutory regime directed to a core emphasis of preservation of national parks in perpetuity, with use and enjoyment to be catered to only to the extent consistent with that core preservation purpose. Given the statutory context, one would have expected the Draft to have been accompanied with policy analysis, modelling and clearly stated assumptions comparing how various alternative scenarios for aircraft landing volumes would optimise for the core preservation end.</p> <p>2. Draft landing limits contemplate a rate approximately an order of magnitude higher than in about 2008 in the Upper Tasman. Landings at that time were around 7,000 annually; the Draft contemplates up to about 73,000.</p> <p>3. Yet concerningly, OIA responses also show that landing numbers for a number of locations were inserted into the Draft only after the date of an aircraft concessionaire meeting late in the pre-draft process. Policy 1.3.3.12, which mentions only upward revision of landing numbers as a result of monitoring outcomes, was also inserted after that meeting.</p> <p>4. More broadly, it is irresponsible for DOC to force the wider discussion on tourist-volume pressure, and DOC's proper role in advocating a position on that matter within the government sector, to occur at the level of detailed local policy-setting.</p> <p>5. If the public are to have confidence in this process, it is imperative that issues of drafting influence, drafting legality, and robustness of policy analysis be addressed before aircraft policy is set.</p>	<p>2. Withdraw Draft and delay further public hearing pending publishing of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- legal advice concerning the lawful boundaries for policy analysis on concession-revenue optimisation for preservation ends, as discussed at left;</li> <li>- full policy analysis and modelling as discussed at left;</li> <li>- legal advice concerning the legality of taking the interests of third-party commercial aircraft concessionaires into consideration in national park management processes;</li> <li>- a fully articulated tranquillity and noise modelling programme (see submission point on Aircraft Noise Regulation and Tranquillity - General, below), along with a fully articulated monitoring programme; and</li> <li>- a public commitment to formally review of landing numbers under section 46(1) of the Act after five years.</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Gumbrell, Matthew</i> 468/1</p>	<p>Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.</p>	<p>Delete this from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Allan, Tony</i> 470/1</p>	<p>Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.</p>	<p>Delete this from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Saggers, Eric</i> 473/3</p>	<p>Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an</p>	<p>Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.		
<i>Parke, Ross &amp; Carol</i> 478/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Pearson, Richard</i> 480/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Ramm, David</i> 481/1	Do not support increased use of aircraft in the park other than park management, government obligations and search and rescue purposes.	I would prefer the aircraft levels be reduced.	
<i>Torok, Tomas</i> 484/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Miller, Aubrey</i> 487/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Kilvington, Dr Margaret</i> 494/1	Opposed to any increase in air traffic (flights and landings) throughout the park. Would like the Department to undertake a review of current access with a view to further rationalisation and potential reduction. Reasons: - Aoraki NP is a supremely important treasure for NZ. Intrusion of aircraft (audible or visible) would impact on experience of those for whom access by foot is preferred. - High levels of access already impact and undermine important values. Aircraft, jet boats and four wheel drive vehicles destroy peace and impact the sense of isolation and naturalness. Considerable aircraft activity to support both scenic recreation and climbing access	1) Amend the draft plan to eliminate any extensions to air traffic levels (flights and landings) beyond those currently permitted; and 2) The plan needs to signal the intention to review existing levels of air traffic with a view to rationalisation, reduction and greater control.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>already exists throughout the park. Concerned that this activity is at times in breach of concession restrictions with landings occurring in unauthorised areas (lack of compliance).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Doc policies to date that deal with applications for concessions for mechanised access may have been appropriate for past levels of demand but now need to be reviewed at a more strategic level.</li> <li>- Difficulty in understanding the changes and vagueness in relation to tranquillity zones. Difficult to reconcile the tranquillity zones with the heliski and aircraft landing zones. Could not find maps that described proposed flight paths. Overlap between heliski zone and high tranquillity areas (surely not?). The vagueness creates uncertainty and is un-reassuring.</li> <li>- Questionable rationale for increased air traffic in the Topic paper that suggest the impact of any extension is minimal because there is already so much going on. The current high levels of air access are already undermining values. There needs to be a stronger reasoning for determining the appropriate level of air activity beyond what the concessionaire would like and what they were told in the past they could have. Necessary to stand up for further erosion of the remoteness and wilderness of park.</li> <li>- Aoraki/Mt Cook is a flagship park in Aotearoa and there would be a gross inconsistency in further fostering of fossil fuel-based recreation in an area renowned for pristine wilderness.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>		
<i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/7	I support all landing zones and the number of landings per day.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Bilek, Forrest</i> 501/4	I oppose the increases in aircraft landing zones and allocated landings and the separate category for heli-ski landing zones that will impact enormously on the carbon emissions of the park, and the tranquillity that the park provides us as an ecosystem service. This, combined with no distinction between tourist landings and those for recreationalists using flights as a means of access rather than enjoyment will extend tourism in the park and cause recreationalists to compete with tourists for flights.	No specific decision sought.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Watson, Elinor</i> 502/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Major, Christine</i> 504/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Johnston, Wendy</i> 505/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Groves, Nick</i> 506/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Green, Philip</i> 513/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/6	I oppose the proposal to increase powered aircraft traffic and landing zones within Aoraki / Mount Cook National Park, especially to areas previously restricted. The only exceptions are aircraft landings for wild animal and pest control by DOC, and rescue activities.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Johnson, Linda</i> 516/1	Oppose increase in flights and landings in the Park. Oppose new landing zones. Keep flights and landing zones as they are now.	Amend the plan to keep flights and landing zones as they are now	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Janse, Bridget</i> 518/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>McCrone, Ash</i> 519/2	The adoption of huge 'Landing Zones' instead of landing 'sites' within the park should not be allowed. Specified landing sites should be maintained to enable users to plan and obtain quietness and greater remoteness as they wish by being as far away from those sites as they choose.	Retain landing sites, do not change to landing zones.	
<i>Gray, Stuart</i> 521/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Shearer, Dara</i> 522/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Rattenbury, Mark</i> 525/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Chinn, Paul</i> 526/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Gunson, Leah</i> 527/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Morris, Colin J.</i> 528/2	Oppose the Draft plan proposal to increase air traffic activity and landing zones within the Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park. One of the joys of climbing in Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park is the opportunity to escape the noise and hub-hub of civilisation and to enjoy the	Remove this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	sounds of the mountains, moving glaciers, the rush of water and the wind. The constant drone of aircraft ruins this experience.		
<i>John, Rhys &amp; Walker, Jennifer</i> 529/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Gosling, Hannah</i> 531/1	I believe the Plan should not encourage ease of access to backcountry and remote areas through motorised means and, while I note that Appendix 2 of the plan states that backcountry accessibility should be "walk-in focused", I feel the aircraft access sections of the Plan contradict this.	Amend the plan to not encourage ease of access to backcountry and remote areas through motorised means.	
<i>Wolf, Lorenz</i> 532/1	I believe the Plan should not encourage ease of access to backcountry and remote areas through motorised means and, while I note that Appendix 2 of the plan states that backcountry accessibility should be "walk-in focused", I feel the aircraft access sections of the Plan contradict this.	Amend the plan to not encourage ease of access to backcountry and remote areas through motorised means.	
<i>Shinnamon, Anu</i> 535/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>McKay, Alan</i> 538/1	I wish to submit that flights already can seriously interfere with enjoyment of the wilderness in Mt. Cook National Park, I think that they should not be increased from smaller landing areas to wide zones, or increased 10x to 10,000, but only increase half-as-much as currently and landing areas could be increased also by 50% but remain as specific areas.	Amend the plan to lessen the increase in landings, retain the established landing areas and remove the implementation of landing zones.	
<i>Dimozantos, Megan</i> 540/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>McCallum, John &amp; Thorpe, Anna</i> 544/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.		
<i>Rattenbury, Rosalind Andrea</i> 545/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Fishman, Tana</i> 546/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Fishman, Charles</i> 547/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 549/5	I feel that the proposed landing zones and approaching aircraft within the park to be problematic. The presence of aircraft and their noise, visual disturbance, both in flight and parked next to a hut undermines the parks intrinsic worth. I feel that the effects of aircraft on wildlife in the park needs to be properly understood.	All concessions for taking off from or landing at Mount Cook Aerodrome (or anywhere else) should be subject to flight movement provisions that improve aural tranquillity and disruption of the environments that they land in.	
<i>Fraser, Lisa</i> 551/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Hudson, Joshua</i> 553/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Niven, Shona</i> 555/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Daws, Peter</i> 556/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Mason, Sam</i> 558/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Novis, Phil</i> 564/1	Oppose any increase to aircraft activity in the Park, and favour a decrease.	Decrease the aircraft activity in the park.	
<i>Ross, Mary</i> 565/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>McKinlay, Andrew</i> 567/1	Do not support the Greatly increased aircraft activity in enlarged areas throughout the Parks, including in high-value climbing terrain and previously remote, aircraft-free locations.	I submit, that, with a few small exceptions, the existing landing sites in the Parks are retained and the maximum number of landings in the parks are kept at or below current levels. In addition I submit that a distinction between user activities for aircraft access (private and guided	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		recreationists and nonrecreationists, such as scenic landings) is important and should be retained.	
<i>McKinlay, Andrew</i> 567/2	Oppose the continued treatment of heliskiing as a unique activity with separate access and landing zones.	I submit that heli-skiing operations be considered in the same way as other aircraft access and recreation for private and commercial visitors. This would improve consistency within the overall management framework while making it easier for the public to understand acceptable use and expected use in AMC.	
<i>MacQueen, Richard</i> 569/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Hanich, Quentin</i> 570/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Rivett, Martyn</i> 573/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Wardle, Rob &amp; Kate</i> 574/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/2	The adoption of huge 'Landing Zones' instead of landing 'sites' within the park should not be allowed. Landing 'Zones' will mean it becomes impossible to seek different levels or remoteness within those areas of the park, as one will never know where the next helicopter is going to land.	Keep the status quo of specific landing sites.	
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/7	Oppose the increase in aircraft activity in the park	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/9	I oppose the introduction of more powered aircraft into existing access areas and oppose access into any new areas being suggested.	Remove this from the plan and keep the status quo.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Cocks, John</i> 580/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Laurenson, Peter</i> 582/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Horn, Dr Chryst</i> 594/1	oppose any increase in air traffic (flights and landings) throughout the park and I strongly object to allowing NEW landing sites (as would appear to be the case at Pudding Rock, for example)	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Wesley, Dr Graham</i> 595/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Sherratt, Duncan</i> 596/2	Opposed to heli-skiing retaining a large zone. Significant user conflicts between ski tourers and heli skiers.	Lower the zone available for heli skiing to lessen user conflicts.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/45			
<i>Haugh, Andrew</i> 607/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Buchanan, Sean</i> 609/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Sirguy, Dr Pascal</i> 625/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Nock, Volker, Miharu &amp; Felix</i> 626/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan. Amend the plan to prohibit any aircraft in the park except for emergency or maintenance flights.	
<i>Jerram, Tom</i> 629/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Bell, Colin</i> 630/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Hann, Nick</i> 631/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Layburn, Stephen</i> 632/2	<p>Concerned about the overflights and aircraft landings zones. Appreciates the delicate balancing act that DOC must undertake to manage all of the pressures affecting the National Park, the huge increase proposed by the draft Plan in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (by a factor of 10), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings, has the potential to impact enormously.</p> <p>And, as NZAC has submitted, the sheer weight of numbers when combined with the lack of a distinction between tourist landings and those, say, for climber drop-offs on the Grand Plateau, will inevitably extend tourism in the National Park. Climbers and other recreationalists will be competing with tourist for flights, tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.</p> <p>The approach seems to lack a firm anchor based on a objective survey of the levels of visitor numbers that can sensibly be absorbed by such delicate landscape- whilst retaining their unique character.</p>	Doesn't support increases (in landing zones, numbers and overflights)	
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 633/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.		
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 637/5	Oppose the addition of flights to places where they were previously restricted so natural quiet can be maintained and native fauna is protected.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Liddle, Edward Leonard</i> 639/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Rhynd, Keeley</i> 642/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Scott, Gary</i> 644/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Moran, George</i> 645/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Lousley, Donald</i> 648/1	Oppose the implementation of landing zones in the park.	Amend the plan to keep specific landing areas and to limit non essential aircraft access if over use persists over the next several to ten years.	
<i>Lousley, Donald</i> 648/2	To address the needs of climbers/ski mountaineers to gain access to those huts where glacier down-melting is making foot access near impossible and fraught with rock fall hazards, then I'd like to see some sort of planning here re landings that correlate to bunk numbers per night.	Amend plan as in submission.	
<i>Walden, Dr Annie</i> 650/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Diller, Beatrice</i> 651/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Currant, Paul</i> 654/1	Oppose aircraft use in the National Park.	I would like to see DOC freeze the proposed new concessions for tourist flights onto and over the glaciers of Mt Cook and Westland national parks. I would also like to see a freeze on more development on the ground in these areas as well. Eventually DOC should look to phase out the use of all aircraft in national parks completely in a bid to make activities in them Carbon neutral.	
<i>McGregor, Lucy</i> 658/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Holehan, Mary</i> 663/1	Oppose helicopters in the national park. The experience is a feeling of being away from it all, not seeing man made construction/objects in this unique environment - this is what drives people to our national parks.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/2	Policies does not appear to mention SAR use of aircraft or hut maintenance.		
<i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Roy, Kathryn</i> 666/1	I believe the Plan should not encourage ease of access to backcountry and remote areas through motorised means.	Backcountry accessibility should be "walk-in focused". Do not encourage aircraft access in the park.	
<i>Inta, Frida</i> 667/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Wesley, Richard (&amp; family)</i> 668/1	Oppose the increase in area and landings for aircraft. The preservation of the park should be the highest priority for the plan.	Remove this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Rowden, Murray</i> 669/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Adank, Charlotte</i> 671/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Parker, Jeremy</i> 672/3	Oppose any increase in flights and landing sites. The days when maximums would be reached would be the days with good weather when other park users will be most impacted by the aircraft.	Flights should be kept near current levels and locations. If increases are included in the final plan it should be a slow incremental process with a mechanism to wind back numbers should it prove intrusive for park users.	
<i>Woch, Paulina</i> 675/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Gallagher, Robert</i> 676/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Bell, Carlo</i> 681/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Sequeira, Liliana</i> 682/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Mitchell, Josh</i> 687/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and commitments.		
<i>Boyd, Vance</i> 689/1	Oppose the restriction on private aircraft landings, a total of 10 per year for only Onslow and Liebig huts. There are over 1200 private aviators in NZ , who should have just as much right of access as commercial operators.	Review the plan to provide a reasonable number of landing sites and a reasonable number of landings for private aviators.	
<i>Marriott, Peter</i> 690/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/1	Oppose increases in aircraft landings and zones. The sheer numbers proposed will have a huge impact.	The numbers of landings and landing zones need to be drastically reduced, with specific numbers set and known (and adhered to) by all flight operators.	
<i>Costello, Margaret</i> 694/2	The plan refers to climate change, but there is little evidence of any leadership being shown in the area of decreasing carbon emissions. The big issue here is aircraft usage and there is no indication of any attempt to phase this down.	Support a reduction in the number of flights and permitted landing areas.	
<i>Laing, Michele</i> 695/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Rivett, Christina</i> 696/1	Oppose an increase in flights in the park. An increase in the numbers of flights would sabotage the enjoyment of exactly what the park was made a National Park to be.	Decision not stated	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/1	Oppose increase in aircraft landings in the Park.	Amend the plan to ban flight access or landings in the park between 1400 and 3800m altitude. This would help in limiting the aircraft in the park.	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/2	Oppose landing zones as climbers can be harrassed by helicopters full of tourists anywhere and it destroys the remote mountain experience.	Return to limited specific landing sites	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/6	Aircraft landings should remain linked to user activity. The overwhelming number of tourists compared to recreational hunters and climbers means that commercial tourism could use up all the landings and in turn make climbers unable to fly to Plateau hut or hunters unable to fly to Liebig hut.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Neilson, David</i> 699/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings.	Decision not stated	
<i>Abaffy, Clare</i> 701/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Preston, David</i> 702/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Garden, Tom</i> 705/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Wilkinson, Clare</i> 706/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Grant, Hayden</i> 707/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/7	Aerial access can be critical for commercial carcass recovery (WARO), to enable hunting in difficult terrain, or to address logistical issues, particularly time constraints preventing hunters reaching remote areas. Landing zone regulations restrict aerial access. There are no "Green zones" (apart from the airport) that permit unrestricted landings, however the draft NPMP recognises the Wild Animal Control Act enables aircraft to land anywhere in the park for wild animal control purposes, subject to requiring a concession	Consider limited recreational hunter aerial access to parts of the Godley Valley for tahr control purposes.	
<i>Brothers, Penelope Jane</i> 715/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/5	Excessive aircraft movements merely for sightseeing should be discouraged.	DOC should have an active policy on sightseeing flights that includes changing relevant legislation to better protect the airspace over national parks below say 3000m.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/6	Aircraft landings to further outdoors pursuits should be closely regulated but not discouraged, except for heli-skiing (helicopters essentially doing circuits on the glaciers).	Aircraft landings to further outdoors pursuits should be closely regulated but not discouraged Heli-skiing should be phased out in AMCNP and moved to other areas.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/20	<p>p62-66 The policies applying to the Orange zone (landings on a permitted basis) are opaque despite the Plan acknowledging that disturbance of tranquillity levels is a serious concern in AMCNP.</p> <p>Map 7.1 and the plan for Haupapa Place (section 2.3) indicate almost all this zone and approximately 40% of the Park projected area will be allocated to very large numbers of virtually unregulated heli-ski landings (meaning helicopters with ski pads?). The majority of these flights are presumed to originate from/to Mt Cook airport or nearby locations down valley but flights from the West Coast may also be involved. There is no indication of what rationale/criteria were used by DOC to make these proposals and whether this is an increase in the currently allocated area for landings . Certainly it is a very large increase over the area originally allocated in the current Plan (2004).</p> <p>Furthermore there is no indication of landings allocated to fixed wing ski-planes, and no analysis/justification for the proposals in Section 2 for the maximum permitted numbers of landings on per day and per year basis.</p> <p>Acceptable tranquillity level is highly subjective, despite being able to measure actual noise levels. The regular roar of choppers overhead might be tolerable to bustling short-term tour groups or to skiers intent on their downhill progress but less so to independent visitors such as trampers, climbers and cross-country skiers more interested in the hard-earned peace of their surroundings.</p>		
<i>Costello, James</i> 721/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Granger, Paula</i> 727/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/50	<p>The draft Plan has largely removed the link between aircraft landings and a certain activity occurring on the ground. It is TIA's understanding that the current Plan does not do this and largely specifies aircraft landings with an associated activity use:</p> <p>In relation to the impact of an aircraft landing itself, this proposed change makes sense.</p> <p>There are, however, potential negative consequences of making non-activity specific landings the default setting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An area which was designated for landings for climbing or ski-touring could now involve sightseers - this may impact significantly on the experience of climbers who valued that place as a remote and important climb</li> <li>2. A limited landing opportunity that is vital for undertaking an activity which cannot occur elsewhere in the Park may be used up by other recreationalists who could have used other landing sites.</li> <li>3. Whether or not a landing is activity specific can have a strong effect on the recreational use of an area. Park plans should contain both activity specified and non-specified landing sites - depending on what achieves the best visitation outcomes for the area and for the Park as a whole.</li> </ol>	Review the Plan to consider whether the landing opportunities in the Plan should be activity specific or not, and adjusts the Plan accordingly.	
<i>Jefferies, Bruce</i> 729/2	Oppose massive increase in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (up to a 10-fold increase), while retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings.	Rework the plan to reflect the provisions and intent of the World Heritage Convention, National Park Act (1980) and General Policy for National Parks (2006)	
<i>Jefferies, Bruce</i> 729/3	Oppose the complete lack of distinction between tourist landings and those, for example, climber drop-offs on the Grand Plateau, will inevitably extend general tourism use and impacts. New Zealand climbers and other recreationalists will, consequently, be competing with tourists (many from overseas) for flights, tranquillity (which in many observer's perspective are already significantly compromised) will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Rework the plan to reflect the provisions and intent of the World Heritage Convention, National Park Act (1980) and General Policy for National Parks (2006)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/22	I generally support the concept of Red and Orange landing zones and the provisions that define them. However the Orange Zone is too broad and permissive to excess aircraft activity in a large area of the Park's alpine terrain.	Rezone Orange Zone to encompass only the lower Fox and Franz Josef glacier valleys (the current icefalls) and current permitted landing sites. All other areas to be Red Zone.	
<i>Hargreaves, Lynley</i> 732/1	Oppose the increase in flights/landings in the park.	The department should keep flights to below the current level, or reduce them by 30 percent.	
<i>Hargreaves, Lynley</i> 732/2	The switch to landing zones represents a huge shift, and essentially a free for all where commercial tourism flights will be able to access the vast majority of remote backcountry alpine locations	Remove landing zones from the plan. Landing sites should remain.	
<i>Desborough, Dr Graham John</i> 737/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/23	<p>While allocation processes are supported for the Limited Supply Concession opportunities for aircraft landings, this process needs to be identified now so that there is an opportunity for the public to comment on it.</p> <p>With certainty that the aircraft landing numbers provide for the current level of demand + some room for anticipated growth including at sites in land proposed to be incorporated into the National Park in the future the submitter supports the approach to landing zones and sites put forward in the draft Management Plan.</p> <p>Improvement is needed in the provisions to remove ambiguity over the 'different' types of guiding and how a tranquillity rating is quantified.</p>	Improve the provisions to remove ambiguity over the 'different' types of guiding and how a tranquillity rating is quantified.	
<i>DeRoy, Mary</i> 739/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Edwards, Gareth</i> 740/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	be diminished and overflights will increase.		
<i>Moyle, Nicholas</i> 741/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Troup, Christina</i> 745/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Hay, Ron</i> 746/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Allison, Celia</i> 749/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/10	Oppose daily limits on aircraft landings and instead have a yearly limit. This system would better benefit tourists and help operators to meet demand due to the possible weather conditions in the park. There would need to be a robust safety plan that all operators follow during the peak times	Reword policies to include a per annum clause instead of daily.	
<i>Came, Sharron</i> 766/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Ellis, Ben</i> 768/3	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Andrew, Jennifer</i> 786/1	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Vass, David</i> 788/1	Oppose increase in aircraft landings in the Park.	Amend plan to keep current maximum levels regarding landings.	
<i>Vass, David</i> 788/2	The 'zone' concept, on such large scale, should be ditched and the plan revert back to specific sites identified as appropriate	Amend the plan to keep landings sites in place of landing zones.	
<i>Vass, David</i> 788/3	Purposes of landing - Not differentiating between the purposes for landing removes an important management tool. It does not seem right, and nor does it seem the intent of GP, the NP Act etc, that the rights of commercial operators catering for a whistle-stop tourist, be given the same weight as a regular user of the park.	No decision stated.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Gawith, David</i> 791/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Owen, David</i> 800/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/32	This section does not implement GP 10.6(b) "The landing, hovering and taking off of aircraft should be authorised only where: i) it is consistent with the outcomes plan for a place; and ii) adverse effects on national park values, including natural quiet, can be minimised."	Rewrite this section and all Place outcomes, objectives and policies based on GP Policy 10.6.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/33	The desired tranquillity outcome maps are misguided - aircraft use should meet natural quiet, not the other way	Delete tranquillity maps and reduce the size of the landing zones and numbers of flights (revert to current plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	around. The aircraft topic paper reveals that the current allocation of landings has not been reached therefore it is difficult to understand why a quantum increase is being provided for rather than reducing the base level when there are existing problems with aircraft noise.	provisions which have been well-tested).	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/34	It is contradictory for the plan to provide for increased flights and therefore carbon emissions when climate change is severely affecting the natural features of the park	Apply a climate change/emissions reduction lens to aircraft provisions.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/35	The decision to not specify types of use could advantage commercial scenic flights at the expense of recreationalists.	Make a condition of concessions that the concessionaire will not make scenic overflights of the park outside of their concession allocation and that the concession will be reviewed in 5 years. Make shut down of engines on landing a requirement except where safety is an issue.	
<i>Ellis, David</i> 803/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Association, Hutt Valley Branch Inc.</i> 804/6	Oppose the large increase in aircraft access in the Park. There appears no distinction made as to the nature of the flights with hunter transport seemingly given no more weighting than other access, yet hunting is of significantly more benefit to biodiversity goals. The adverse effects to recreational values would be extreme and risk killing the special character that makes the park special.	No decision stated.	
<i>Liddel, Gerrard</i> 805/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/5	Oppose the addition of powered flights to places where they were previously restricted.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Carr, Anna</i> 808/3	The provisions for aircraft landings in the draft Plan means pressure to consider more landing sites and increase the maximum number of landings. Excessive landing sites is to the detriment of natural quiet and contributes to climate change and its environmental impacts	No decision stated.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/4	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/23	Concessions relating to aircraft access should relate to existing Visitor Management Zones (VMZ), not a new type of zoning. The new "Aircraft Access Zones" should be removed from the Plan, and concessions for aircraft access based entirely on the VMZ map.	Remove all reference to new Aircraft access zones, and grant concessions on the basis of existing Visitor Management Zones. Update all affected policies in the plan to reflect this change. Remove sentence relating to additional landings if outcomes being met,	
<i>Carnaby, Penny</i> 813/2	Oppose any increase in landing zones in the Park. Increasing flight numbers would greatly diminish the unique nature of the park.	Remove any increase in landing zones from the plan.	
<i>Hoskin, Stephen &amp; Rosemary</i> 814/1	The number of proposed aircraft landings in AMC is far too high and levels should remain as they are in the current Plan. The proposed landing zones in AMC are also, in general, too large.	Keep current landing numbers (or less).	
<i>NZ Transport Agency</i> 815/2	NZTA proposes a new policy under aircraft: Policy 14 Shall allow aircraft, including remotely powered aircraft, to land and operate in association with the monitoring and maintenance of State Highway 6, including those land areas which may potentially have an effect on the operation of the State Highway.	Implement new policy outlined in the submission.	
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/6	Oppose the addition of flights into areas where they were previously restricted.	Amend plan to keep the status quo.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/8	Do not support the aircraft landing zones proposed. They are a significant change from the existing situation and way too accommodating for aircraft. Do not support additional flights to areas of the park that were previously no-fly areas. Increasing the number of flights is inconsistent with the objectives of the National Park and Conservation Acts.	Remove from the plan the proposals to allow flights to places where they were previously restricted.	
<i>Grinsted, Jack</i> 825/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wratt, Gillian</i> 826/2	Oppose the huge increases in aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc - Nelson-Tasman Branch</i> 827/6	The current Aoraki/Mt Cook plan limits commercial scenic landings to specific sites and this is preferable to the proposed zones. The new draft appears to allow 73,000 landings a year which is far too many. There should be no increase in air traffic within the park.	Remove any proposed increase in air traffic from the plan.	
<i>Moore, Bryan</i> 828/2	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/4	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/8	Oppose the proposal in the draft plan to increase aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP. Allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft is not appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.	Do not allow an increase in aircraft traffic and landing zones within AMCNP.	
<i>Freyens, Ben</i> 835/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Jessop, Keith</i> 836/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 838/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Tompkins, Jean</i> 839/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at	Delete this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.		
<i>Waters, Jay</i> 859/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Waters, Dana Lee</i> 860/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Hammelburg, Baud</i> 863/2	Opposed to any increase in air access. Existing access rights are too extensive and significantly derogate from the remoteness that these areas should preserve in perpetuity. There is no basis to justify the expansion of commercial operations with extended flight zones.	Any form of mechanised transport that can transport people into and within remote areas should, in my submission, be very strictly controlled.	
<i>Hopper, Megan</i> 865/2	Oppose the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. Tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 867/1	strongly against any 'Remote/ Wilderness' areas being demoted to 'Backcountry' areas	No decision stated	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 867/2	I am strongly against air access to pudding rock and any other new, proposed sites.	Instead of increasing air access I would like to see an effort to increase the ease of foot access by adding mid-valley huts.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/12	Policies 1, 2, 6 - 13: Support policies as written	Retain policies as written	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/57	General comments: 1. I submit that the number of proposed aircraft landings in AMC is far too high and levels should remain as they are in the current plan or be reduced. 2. I submit that the proposed landing zones in AMC are too large. 3. I submit that a distinction between user activities for aircraft access (private and guided recreationalists and non-recreationalists, such as scenic landings) is important and should be retained.	Withdraw and rework the plan to address the issues raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	4. Obfuscation of the linkages between utility of management frameworks, in particular VMZs, aircraft access zones and the addition of desired tranquillity outcomes.		
<i>Platt, Grant</i> 889/1	I plead that numbers of flights into wilderness areas be capped at current numbers and a ballot system be introduced to protect the wilderness.	Review the policies for managing aircraft in the Plan to address the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Intro</b>		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/31	Footnote 11 - Aoraki/Mount Cook Airport landings: Request clarification of the footnote	Provide further explanation of footnote and whether anyone can land at the airport to do business.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/49	Footnote 11: Does this mean that anyone can land at the airport to do business?	Amend footnote 11 to clarify the intent	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/2	Concerned about potential massive increase in aircraft activity within the Park. The current plan overly encourages aircraft-intensive and mass tourism activities.. Commercial interests are over-riding the public interest of National Park values. Not opposed to aircraft in principle, however the experience of those who are willing to put more personal effort to get into the mountains will be severely impacted by the proposed permissive and extensive access by aircraft.	Need better management of interaction between different groups to limit adverse effects.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/12	Would like to see a sensible cap and a reduction on air access. I have made many trips to Mt Cook over past few year but have lost inspiration to head back due to horrendous noise pollution. I am very concerned that the Tasman Glacier will soon be subject to excessive noise pollution as well. I would prefer that both the Tasman and Murchison Glaciers remained relative quiet places where the rapidly growing user group of backcountry skiers / ski mountaineers can flourish. There are very few remaining corners left where air access is prohibited. The expansion of air access in one area should perhaps be accompanied by a reduction in another. As proposed, expanding the amount of aircraft allowed to land, expansion of existing landing sites and the opening up new locations is an unfair approach for		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>users who prefer foot access (mostly New Zealanders). Those who prefer air access are getting more options are getting much more and those who prefer foot access and quality wilderness experiences will be getting much less.</p>		
<p><i>Gray, Stuart</i> 521/5</p>	<p>Regarding overflight number and paths I submit that DOC has ample influence to work with CAA to limit the impact of overflights if it so chooses. (Scenic overflights, not high altitude)</p>	<p>Amend plan as outlined in the submission to limit the impact of overflights.</p>	
<p><i>Loomes, George</i> 572/21</p>	<p>(See also submission points on the different landing zones and allowed numbers) Has problem with the new approach to the management of landings for aircraft. - The huge increase in both aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold). - A separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings. - No distinction between tourist/scenic landings and those for recreationalists drop-offs on the Grand Plateau. Recreationalists will be competing with tourists for flights, ‘tranquillity’ will be diminished, and overflights will increase. Do not support the size and lack of specifics with regard to these increases. Strongly disagrees with the proposed number of landings and the landing zones at: Tasman Lake, the Murchison Valley (x4) and Pudding Rock in the Hooker these set several precedents which do not fit with the stated goals of various Department documents, including this plan. Also object to the lack of specification for different activities. No distinction is drawn between scenic flight landings and those to support recreational opportunities. Given increasing tourism numbers it’s possible that limited resources like landings will increase in price drastically over the 10 year period of the plan, this may restrict opportunities for recreationalists to make use of helicopters for ease of access to alpine huts (particularly Kiwis who may not be able to compete with tourists on flights), while still subjecting them to the damage these flights cause to the environment in the mountains. More detail should be included in policies regarding aircraft to ensure continuing access to NZs alpine places for New Zealanders who recreate in the alpine area of the park. The use of helicopters is at odds with some of the</p>	<p>Management approach for aircraft landings (see details under policies for different landing zones)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	statements and policies including from the General Policies for National Parks. Refers also to inconsistencies with polices in the draft WTP NPMP.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/39	<p>1. NZAC supports the NZ Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association (NZHGPA) in their pursuit of a global concession for recreational hang gliders and paragliders, as an appropriate, quiet and self-reliant form of recreation within the Park.</p> <p>2. References to Maps 7.2 - 7.6 need correcting.</p>	<p>1. Amend the text in accordance with the submission</p> <p>2. Correct the map referencing</p>	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/4	<p>The CMC supports the control of aircraft in the Park as provided for in the current Plan.</p> <p>CMC does not support provisions to increase aircraft traffic within the Park above what is currently provided for.</p> <p>Increasing use of aircraft within the Park will degrade the experience of other user groups within the Park and reduce tranquillity values within the Park. With heightened awareness regarding climate change and anthropogenic impacts on the environment, allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and aircraft access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft, is not considered appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.</p>	<p>Moves to increase total aircraft activity should be avoided, or well managed to ensure there are areas that remain devoid of air traffic (i.e. areas classified as "Remote Areas") unless required for scientific research, predator control and for search and rescue.</p>	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/13	<p>Better jurisdiction is required to ensure that commercial aircraft operators remain within their flight boundaries. It is not unheard of for scenic tourist flights to fly through wilderness areas and CMC members regularly see operators breaching civil aviation rules by flying at low levels across Harper Saddle in the Hooker Valley. In addition, irregular tourist scenic flights flying close around the Sheila Face of Aoraki cause severe noise and vibration issues creating potential hazards and distraction to climbers in the area.</p>	<p>Improve compliance of flight boundaries.</p>	
<i>Air Safaris &amp; Services (NZ) Ltd</i> 703/3	<p>In general SUPPORT the concept of aircraft landing zones and locations indicated. ZONES provide for greater flexibility to land in safest locations on glaciers. As we see increased melting and crevasse / avalanche development (off valley sides) on the Tasman &amp; Murchison the zones allow options over the next 10</p>	<p>These zones should remain in final AMCNP plan.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	years. Currently (Feb 2019) it looks like only about 20% of the Murchison Landing Zone could be safely used as landing sites. There is extensive crevassing on glacier to high level. Has DOC done any research into 'usable' area of these zones during summer months ?		
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/15	Maps 7 and 7.1: The Aircraft access zones would be more useful if an overlay showing the desired tranquillity zones was added	Add an overlay showing the desired tranquillity zones to Maps 7 and 7.1 (or provide this elsewhere in the Plan)	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/40	TIA is supportive of the concept of aircraft landing limits and location restrictions, and of recreation/visitor management zones. TIA also works to support aircraft user groups and endorses their important role. In order to provide sustainable air access, park plans must enable viable business opportunities. Plans must include sufficient landing opportunities and be able to adapt to changing circumstances within their 10 year lifetime including the advent of quieter aircraft, longer term weather patterns, the nature of landing sites and shifting visitor demands. TIA requests that we are specifically identified and included in consultation processes related to aircraft activity.	Review the context and policies for aircraft management to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/3	<p>Maps 7 &amp; 7.1: Supports in part the use of the nationally consistent aircraft landing 'zones' as identified on Map 7 &amp; the proposed Heli-Ski zones illustrated on Map 7.1. The topographical version of these maps which were uploaded to the Department's website following public notification of the draft Management Plan are a more useful resource and should replace the originally notified Map 7.</p> <p>The reason for the partial support of the proposed Maps is that it is noted the Department proposes to add The Mt Cook Conservation Area and Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area into the National Park. While this land acquisition is not achieved entirely through the Management Plan process it signals the Department's intent.</p> <p>Highlighting this area for acquisition into the National Park has no recognition of the existing Heli Ski activity authorised by Concession to Mt Cook Heli Ski Ltd within the Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area or the existing high use scenic aircraft landing sites</p>	<p>The topographical version of maps 7 &amp; 7.1, which were uploaded to the Department's website following public notification of the draft Management Plan should replace the originally notified maps.</p> <p>Maps 7 and 7.1 should illustrate the potential additions and include the Heli Ski zone and high use aircraft landing sites at Brass Peak, Liebig Dome and Liebig Range landing sites. These are long time historical uses of the area in question and should not be disregarded as part of any future additions to the National Park. It is noted that the Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy identifies these areas of heli ski terrain and the green aircraft access zone incorporating Brass Peak and Gorilla Stream</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>authorised by Concession to THL/TTL.</p> <p>If the Department intends to seek the inclusion of these lands into the National Park then their intended management and appropriate activities should be illustrated within the Management Plan. The submitters concern is that if this is not identified now, these 'existing use rights' could be lost in the future.</p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/17</p>	<p>Does not support the notion of all Aircraft Landings being treated equally. While the noise and tranquillity effect may be similar, the intent of aircraft landing can be very different. For example, a flight that delivers mountaineers to a high alpine hut for the purpose of mountaineering should be treated very differently to a scenic snow landing. The first is a form of recreation, which the department must foster. The second is a form of tourism, which the department must only allow.</p>	<p>All Aircraft Landings shouldn't be treated equally.</p>	
<p><i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/18</p>	<p>The Red Zone descriptor is too restrictive and won't achieve objectives. The Orange Zone descriptor needs amendment to identify one off concessions for filming alongside heli-skiing as an allowed recognized activity. Intro states- 'While an area may have no, or limited, landings, this does not mean that no overflights occur' - support the Department in acknowledging this and encourage them to apply this factor to the management plan.</p>	<p>If the map is going to remain largely RED identify sporadic one off landings to the exceptions. Amend orange zone description to recognise filming. Amend plan with overflights in mind.</p>	
<p><i>Vass, David</i> 788/4</p>	<p>The Department has never established an effective means of managing the effects of overflights and this will continue into the new plan, despite ever increasing pressures. Section 29A of the Civil Aviation Act provides a pathway for control of airspace over sensitive areas in the public interest.</p>	<p>The Department should be advocating for more effective control of the effects of overflights, including the use of the terms of concessions and flight recorders for this purpose.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 1</b></p>		
<p><i>von Chrismar, Antony</i> 72/2</p>	<p>Any voluntary code of conduct administered by the aviation controllers would be ineffectual.</p>	<p>Reword the policy and provide explicit mapping of flight paths and limit the use to small areas.</p>	
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/13</p>	<p>Policy 1 (a) contradicts itself because the concept of aircraft operator establishing voluntary codes of conduct that avoid adverse effects is not practicable. Any flight path over the park generates a degree of adverse effects.</p>	<p>1. Develop and include within the plan, more effective policies to address the management of flight paths. 2. Develop and include clear guidance on which flight paths would be most compatible with achieving the requirements</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>It is not possible for voluntary codes to avoid adverse effects without cessation of the activity. A more specific and practical approach is needed to address the underlying issues. This means the Plan needs to state more effective policies, objectives, and methods to control aircraft impacts and achieve the desired outcomes. For example, if flight paths are the issue then why is the Department not developing clear guidance on which flight paths would be most compatible with achieving the requirements of the visitor management zones? This could be addressed directly by mapping and including desirable flight paths (for expected forms of air traffic) in the Plan, or in a document referenced by the Plan. Note that monitoring or modelling using the soundscape tools could be usefully applied to this exercise. However, the design of management controls must address the flight paths since they are geospatial source of the impacts irrespective of aircraft types. For all aircraft using Mount Cook Airport as the take-off or landing point, being within the national park, the Department has the opportunity to directly set expectations over flight paths, and have them included in the concessions granted to operators using the airport. See further point below. In practice this means going one step further than the current planning approach by identifying a set of flight path maps in addition to those for the Visitor Management Zones and aircraft landings. Of course all three zones should be well integrated. Developing these maps may need to occur outside of the plan review process but be reference by so that aircraft operators can be consulted and have inputs into the best options, along with other stakeholders. The essential objective is to clarify the locations where overflight activities are the most compatible with management objectives to improve certainty for all park users. The recent developments on the topic of aircraft impact suggest that the Department and aircraft operators are already heading in this direction with the Plan having several references to the intention of restricting flight paths in certain locations. If so, this submission point would relate mostly to improved clarity over the methods by which such intentions will be implemented. By mapping flight paths, the proposed monitoring provisions for GPS tracking (which are commended) could be used directly to evaluate plan effectiveness. In</p>	<p>of visitor management zones. Provide similar guidance on the frequency and duration of overflights. 3. For all aircraft using Mount Cook Airport as the take-off or landing point, include provisions to directly set the expectations for aircraft movements in relation to the national park.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the present draft there is no meaningful reference point against which such measurements can be usefully interpreted.		
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/23	Voluntary codes of conduct for aircraft operators are insufficient to maintain natural quiet/tranquillity in remote locations.	Reword policy 1 to state: "Establish mandatory codes of conduct to manage flight paths."	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/19	Given the proposed elimination of landing opportunities in the park, this is unlikely to be achieved.	Full review of TMT - Landing zones etc. is needed. Otherwise amend this statement.	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/19	<p>Generally support the concept of Red and Orange landing zones and the provisions that define them. However the Orange Zone is too broad and permissive to excess aircraft activity in a large area of the Park's alpine terrain.</p> <p>Voluntary codes of conduct for aircraft operators are insufficient to maintain natural quiet/tranquillity in remote locations.</p>	<p>Rezone Orange Zone to encompass only the lower Fox and Franz Josef glacier valleys (the current icefalls) and current permitted landing sites. Note that these are in WTP!!! All other areas to be Red Zone.</p> <p>Reword policy 1 to state: "Establish mandatory codes of conduct to manage flight paths."</p>	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/36	Support Policy 1.	Retain Policy 1.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 2</b>		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/11	<p>See general comments under 1.3.1.Policy 25)</p> <p>Reiterate the submission point already made regarding the implementation of the limited supply landing opportunity (Part 1.3.1 Authorisations, Policy 23). Believes the assessment criteria should also include and provide for consideration of applicants who currently have existing concession authorisations for the activity, and existing operator's performance.</p>	<p>See under 1.3.1. Policy 25)</p> <p>Review the assessment criteria for considering limited supply situations or opportunities (Part 1.3.1, Policy 23 c)) and add a criteria that includes existing concession holders for the activity, and performance of operators.</p>	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/45	<p>TIA does not support the change from annual to daily aircraft landing limits and strongly advocates for the current annual allocation policy to be retained. TIA submits that limits must enable sustainable aircraft operations.</p> <p>TIA has a number of concerns in relation to the proposed allocation approach, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Moving to a model of allocating landings with daily limit constraints (beyond those which occur naturally) will adversely impact the viability of an aircraft business and could give a misleading impression of very high</li> </ul>	Delete the proposed daily allocation approach and retain the current annual allocation policy	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>annual aircraft landing numbers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Aircraft operators need to utilise their allocated landings when the weather and demand allows - daily limits will seriously impact the ability for an operator to run an economically sustainable business.</li> <li>- We are also concerned that people could construe the number of landings in the Park per year to be a direct multiple of the daily limits. This gives a vastly inflated impression of the actual aircraft activity and makes it difficult for them to understand the real level of expected use. Aircraft access into our national parks is a sensitive issue and it is unhelpful to create a misleading picture of very high levels of use.</li> </ul>		
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/2</p>	<p>In general, TTL supports an allocation process being derived for the allocation of aircraft landing rights as despite a significant under-utilisation of aircraft landing rights in Aoraki Mt Cook National Park by AMCAL, the Department of Conservation has refused to break this historical and monopolistic aircraft landing right scenario and authorise other aircraft operators landing rights (in accordance with plan limits) in the Park.</p> <p>Providing an equitable allocation process that affords other aircraft operators including THL with an opportunity to secure some limited landing rights is therefore supported.</p> <p>However, TTL has significant concerns with the Department of Conservation's approach to aircraft landing management and the implementation of any proposed allocation process.</p> <p>The draft Management Plan provides no indication of how the allocation process will work (acknowledging that some qualifying criteria are provided). It is considered that leaving the development of an allocation process to be determined post approval of the draft Management Plan effectively excludes the aviation community and the general public from being consulted on the most appropriate allocation process.</p> <p>It is extremely inequitable to exclude affected parties from the formation of the allocation process with this proposed Policy approach particularly when most aircraft operators have historically had great difficulty in</p>	<p>Policy 2 should be amended to specify the exact allocation process to be utilised not just the assessment criteria. This amendment requires further public consultation.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>obtaining aircraft landing rights due to the monopoly situation held by AMCAL and authorised by the Department of Conservation described above.</p> <p>Not only is the lack of detail and ability to submit on the future allocation process considered to be unfair to existing aviation concessionaires such as THL but the submitter has valid concerns in regards to the Department of Conservation's ability to come up with an effective allocation process.</p> <p>THL also operates within Fiordland National Park and it is noted that the Fiordland National Park Management Plan became operative in 2007 with a limited supply aircraft landing management regime. No allocation process was identified in that Management Plan and subsequently, the Department of Conservation has refused to process new Concession's for aircraft operators in Fiordland National Park because it is not known how to allocate the limited landings. Accordingly, the incumbent aircraft operator concessionaires are continuing to operate on their expired Concessions that are now almost twelve years past their expiry date .</p>		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/20	Support Policies 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 3</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/34	<p>Policy needs to be reworded to remove the presumption that a concession will be granted. The policy should adopt a neutral stance on the outcomes while providing guidance to decision makers.</p> <p>The policy does not refer directly to Maps 7 and 7.1. The link should be clearly stated in the policy.</p>	<p>Reword policy to read:</p> <p>"Any applicant for a concession to land an aircraft at a designated landing site in an Orange zone, as shown on Map 7 and 7.1, in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) be a member of ...</li> <li>b) comply with ...</li> <li>c) install ...</li> <li>d) hold and comply ...</li> <li>e) avoid ...; and</li> <li>f) comply with the tranquillity outcomes for each area." </li></ul>	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/76	<p>Policy should include the additional conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mechanisms to avoid adverse effects on wildlife</li> <li>- mechanisms to avoid adverse effects on recreational values</li> </ul>	Amend Policy 3 to include the additional conditions as suggested	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/42	Conditions for granting concessions should also include a requirement that information about landing locations, landing activities, numbers of people, and waste management facilities as stipulated by the Department are provided.	Add to the list of required conditions in Policy 3: " - provide information as detailed by the Department about landing locations, landing activities, numbers of people, and waste management facilities."	
<i>Boyd, Vance</i> 689/2	Regarding Policy 3 a) "Membership of Air Users Group except for non commercial pilots." This is ambiguous as many private pilots have commercial licences.	Change to "except for pilots of non commercial private aircraft." i.e. make it clear that it is the status of the aircraft not the licence category of the pilot that is the decider.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/25	Support Policy, tracking systems should be installed on all aircraft.	Retain Policy 3 c).	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/13	Require Concessionaires to prove they have taken all practical steps available to minimise the noise emissions from the aircraft including the fitting of additional components to reduce noise emissions For clarity - Include powered aircraft landings and remotely piloted aircraft landings in the Red and Orange zones for Search & Rescue operations.	Reword Policy 3 to require Concessionaires to prove they have taken all practical steps available to minimise the noise emissions from the aircraft including the fitting of additional components and / or technology to reduce noise emissions. Especially in the 78Hz to 3,000Hz range of frequencies.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 4</b>		
<i>White, Mike</i> 179/2	Support this policy. Private Drone operators show little consideration to the public in pursuit of their own interests. Ensure policy reflected in bylaws with penalties applied to those in breach.	Retain policy.	
<i>Dickerhof, Nina</i> 315/2	Regarding Policy 4 d) Strongly oppose to opening of the Hooker Valley to helicopter landings	Remove Hooker Valley from this bullet point.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/20	Policy 4 b) Oppose : The use of drones for sporting events. Is a national park the place to hold sporting events that require drones? Is DOC going to allow drone racing (sporting)?	Reword : DOC needs to clarify what sporting events could use drones.	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/4	Oppose use of remote controlled aircraft (drone's) except where draft plan exclusions apply. Agree with draft plan exclusions regarding management purposes or permitted filming activities.		
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/7	There is minimal mention of drones in the Plan. While I agree with the one mention of drones in section 1.3.3 Aircraft, and their inclusion along with other aircraft, I consider that the management of visitors with drones is now a significant issue. I have experienced them a few	Implement specific management provisions in th plan regarding the prohibition of drones.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	times in the vicinity of Mueller Hut. Specific by-laws might help. It's not only the flight safety issues that concern me. Drones are intrusive, are taken in to the National parks by private visitors, and have a big impact on tranquillity and the privacy of other visitors. Their use (generally prohibition) needs specific management provisions in the plans.		
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/8	Support the restriction of drones in the park. Do not support the use of Drones in the National Park except where used by DoC staff for management or rescue purposes.	Retain the restriction of drones in the park.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/23	Policy 4 a) Strongly support the exclusion of remotely piloted aircraft for personal or commercial use. They are a total distraction to other park users and also to native fauna. Their only use is for management purposes. Policy 4 b) is very wide open for interpretation. Want more limits so its not up to individual staff to have to decide. Commercial use of the National Park is not in line with the Conservation Act when the quality of other users experience is lessened.	More restriction on Policy 4 b)	
<i>McPhail, Glen</i> 748/2	Regarding Policy 4 a) Support the ban on use of remotely controlled aircraft ie drones as a severe breach of privacy.	Allow no remotely controlled aircraft in the park except for emergency, ie fire, missing person etc	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/21	Support Notes regarding 4 iii) Certificate under Part 102, that other agencies are doing the same.		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/14	For clarity - Include powered aircraft landings and remotely piloted aircraft landings in the Red and Orange zones for Search & Rescue operations.	Reword Policy 4 to provide an exception that - Includes powered aircraft landings and remotely piloted aircraft landings in the Red, Orange & Green zones for Search & Rescue operations.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 5</b>		
<i>NZ Hang Gliding Paragliding Association (NZHGPA)</i> 77/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) NZHGPA strongly opposes the requirement to notify the Southern Alps Mandatory Broadcast Zone Air Users Group of the location, date and time of a flight before it occurs. Sufficient safeguards are already in place. The requirement is impractical and would create an unnecessary administrative burden for all parties involved.	Delete Policy 5 e) i)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Williams, Geoff</i> 169/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Skelton, Stephen</i> 170/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority	Remove this from the plan	
<i>McKenzie, Evan</i> 171/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Webster, Nick</i> 172/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Zambas, Xen</i> 174/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Saupin, Anthony</i> 176/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Mason, Warrick</i> 193/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Morgan, Grant</i> 201/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Heather, Melanie</i> 204/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Monteith, Fraser</i> 209/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Murphy, Danny</i> 231/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Gore, Gareth</i> 232/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Hearn, Kate</i> 244/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Cheng, Karen</i> 246/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Race, Paula</i> 247/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Hassett, Darren</i> 248/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Patterson, Doug</i> 252/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Griffin, Patrick</i> 258/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/21	Allowance needs to be made for maintenance flights to Caroline Hut to remove toilet waste, restock hut and carry out maintenance. DOC maintenance flights for other huts also need to be	Reword Policy 5(a) to read: "for the construction, operation, and/or maintenance of equipment and buildings (e.g. meteorological, seismic), or utilities ... "	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	covered.		
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/14	Regarding Policy 5 a) Allowance needs to be made for management flights for Caroline Hut and Ball Hut. For Caroline Hut this usually happens only once per year in order to fly out toilet waste, re-stock the hut and carry out maintenance. Doc's maintenance flights for other huts also need to be covered.	Reword a) to read "for the construction, operation and/or maintenance of equipment and buildings (e.g. meteorological, seismic), or utilities (e.g. communication systems, transmission lines) as authorised by the department."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/17	Regarding Policy 5 a) Allowance needs to be made for maintenance flights for Caroline Hut and Ball Hut. For Caroline Hut this usually happens only once per year in order to fly out toilet waste, re-stock the hut and carry out maintenance. DOC maintenance flights for other huts also need to be covered.	Reword Policy 5 a) to state "for the construction, operation and/or maintenance of equipment and buildings (e.g. meteorological, seismic, or utilities (e.g. communication systems, transmission lines) authorised by the department."	
<i>Neynens, Nick</i> 284/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Stead, Nick</i> 295/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Taylor, Peter</i> 297/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Hardman, Mark</i> 328/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Barnett, Alice - Genesis Energy Ltd, Environmental Lead, Planning and Policy</i> 334/2	Regarding Policy 5 a) Genesis is in support of this. This will enable the aircraft operators Genesis uses to continue to provide access to the environmental monitoring sites within the Park boundary.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/13	Support policy permitting aircraft landings in Red Zone for purpose of wild animal control, but should be broadened to allow such landings in all places for purpose of wild animal control..  Policy needs to provide for use of remotely controlled aircraft to assist with wild animal control	Amend Policy 4 to add new clause to provide for use of remotely controlled aircraft to assist with wild animal control Retain Policy 5(b)	
<i>Fraser, William</i> 347/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/77	Policy 5(d) should not allow for tourism activities in the guise of activities for cultural purposes.	Review Policy 5(d) in light of the concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/78	Policy 5(e)(i) is not considered to be in accordance with the NP Act or General Policy. They would add superfluous and impractical constraints to recreational hang glider and paraglider pilot's activities. A global concession should be granted to allow NZHGPA pilots to take off and land on all public conservation land, including in Aoraki/Mount Cook NP.	Amend Policy 5(e)(i) to remove identified constraints on hang gliders and paragliders activities Allow for a global concession to be granted to allow NZHGPA pilots to take off and land in the Park with a short term milestone.	
<i>West, Kat</i> 489/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Cleary, David</i> 533/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Miles, Clint</i> 571/6	The plan does not take into account NIWA sites that are in the park for aircraft landing sites, Muller hut, Rose Ridge Ridge and Panorama Ridge.	Amend the plan to take into account the NIWA landing sites.	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/6	Policy 5 e) Support the initiative to encourage new recreational uses for these areas (non-powered hang-gliders and para-gliders).	retain Policy 5 e)	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/43	Policy 5(e):: Recreational hang gliders and paragliders should not be required to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. Sufficient CAA safety protocols are already in place and notification would prove impractical.	Delete Policy 3(e)(i)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Monigatti, Paul</i> 719/1	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/22	The red zone has been over applied and too restrictive. Support policy 5 with the addition of the following exception: Policy 5 f): "For the purpose of commercial filming where the activity is of short duration and the effects can be mitigated" This is similar to clause 5.14 Implementation 1. d) in the current Fiordland NPMP. This effects based common sense approach has worked well and not created any issues.	Add a policy 5 f) "For the purpose of commercial filming where the activity is of short duration and the effects can be mitigated"	
<i>Tapper, Louis</i> 830/2	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/3	Regarding Policy 5 e) i) Oppose the requirement to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. There is already sufficient safeguards have been put in place by the Civil Aviation Authority.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/15	For clarity - Include powered aircraft landings and remotely piloted aircraft landings in the Red and Orange zones for Search & Rescue operations.	Reword Policy 5 to provide an exception that - Includes powered aircraft landings and remotely piloted aircraft landings in the Red, Orange & Green zones for Search & Rescue operations.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/20	Allowance needs to be made for maintenance flights for Caroline Hut and Ball Hut. For Caroline Hut this usually happens only once per year in order to fly out toilet waste, re-stock the hut and carry out maintenance. DOC maintenance flights for other huts also need to be covered.	Reword Policy 5a) to read " for the construction, operation and/or maintenance of equipment and buildings (e.g. meteorological, seismic, engineering, geological), or utilities (e.g. communication systems, transmission lines) authorised by the Department;"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 6</b>		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/23	Support with the addition of Policy 6 c) for the purpose of short term temporary filming activities where the effects can be mitigated.	Add a policy 6 c)	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 8</b>		
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/7	Why this has been specified, it would affect gliders from Omarama, if so strongly oppose it. Gliders have a much lower impact than helicopters and powered aircraft and	Delete Policy 8)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	are much more in line with the values and goals of the plan.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 9</b>		
<i>NZ Hang Gliding Paragliding Association (NZHGPA)</i> 77/2	Regarding Policy 9 b) NZHGPA strongly opposes the requirement to notify the Southern Alps Mandatory Broadcast Zone Air Users Group of the location, date and time of a flight before it occurs. Sufficient safeguards are already in place. The requirement is impractical and would create an unnecessary administrative burden for all parties involved.	Delete Policy 9 b)	
<i>NZ Hang Gliding Paragliding Association (NZHGPA)</i> 77/3	Regarding Policy 9 a) NZHGPA strongly opposes the prohibition on landings within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier landing zone as defined on Map 7 and in greater detail on Map 17. Given that they are non-motorised, the pilots cannot guarantee that they can avoid a landing in such a large area such as this. Their ability to remain airborne is completely dictated by atmospheric conditions.	Delete Policy 9 a)	
<i>Williams, Geoff</i> 169/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Skelton, Stephen</i> 170/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>McKenzie, Evan</i> 171/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Webster, Nick</i> 172/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Zambas, Xen</i> 174/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil	Remove this from the plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.		
<i>Saupin, Anthony</i> 176/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Mason, Warrick</i> 193/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Morgan, Grant</i> 201/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Heather, Melanie</i> 204/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Monteith, Fraser</i> 209/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Murphy, Danny</i> 231/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Gore, Gareth</i> 232/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols	Remove this from the plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	to provide for the safety of all air space users.		
<i>Hearn, Kate</i> 244/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Cheng, Karen</i> 246/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Race, Paula</i> 247/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Hassett, Darren</i> 248/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Patterson, Doug</i> 252/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Griffin, Patrick</i> 258/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Neynens, Nick</i> 284/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Stead, Nick</i> 295/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Taylor, Peter</i> 297/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Hardman, Mark</i> 328/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Fraser, William</i> 347/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/79	<p>Policy 9(a): This policy should be removed because hang gliders and paragliders have a long presence in the Park as quiet self-reliant recreationists and their prohibition would not be in accordance with the Act, General Policy, or the present operative plan. Air space users' safety is already provided for through Civil Aviation Authority protocols. CAA law allows hang gliders and paragliders to fly in the Tasman valley. Pilots cannot guarantee avoidance because dependent on atmospheric conditions.</p> <p>Policy 9(b): Policy is not in accordance with the Act or general Policy and should be removed. It would add superfluous and impractical constraints to recreational hang glider and paraglider pilots' activities. A global concession should be granted to allow pilots to take off and land on all public conservation lands, including the Park.</p>	Delete Policy 9(a) and (b) Allow the granting of a global concession to fly over all public conservation land.	
<i>West, Kat</i> 489/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols	Remove this from the plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	to provide for the safety of all air space users		
<i>Cleary, David</i> 533/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/44	Policy 9(a):: Oppose restrictions on recreational hang gliding and paragliding within the Haupapa/Tasman Landing Zone  Policy 9(b): Recreational hang gliders and paragliders should not be required to notify the Southern Alps MBZ Air User Group prior to flight. Sufficient CAA safety protocols are already in place and notification would prove impractical.	Delete Policy 9(a) and (b)	
<i>Monigatti, Paul</i> 719/2	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all airspace users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Moore, Bryan</i> 828/3	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Tapper, Louis</i> 830/3	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/4	Regarding Policy 9 a) Oppose the restriction on hang glider and paraglider landing within the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone. The Civil Aviation Authority has put in place sufficient protocols to provide for the safety of all air space users.	Remove this from the plan	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 10</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/80	Should not allow tourism activities in the guise of commercial filming and photography, or of sporting or other competitive events.	Review Policy 10 to take into account the matters raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/24	"Commercial filming and photography" is too vague and could be a catch-all excuse for inappropriate landings used by any pilot with a dSLR. There should be a clear, one-off, bona fide purpose to the filming.	Reword policy 10 to state "one-off, specified commercial filming and photography."	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/24	Policy mentions:"..to address any adverse effects..". Requests change of the word 'Any' to 'Possible', but is not sure of the intent of the statement regarding adverse effects? Is using a remotely piloted aircraft (drone) preferred to a helicopter? Is low-level flying preferred to landing?	Amend and clarify.	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/20	'Commercial filming and photography' is too vague and could be a catch-all excuse for inappropriate landings used by any pilot with a dSLR. There should be a clear, one-off, bona fide purpose to the filming.	Reword policy 10 to state "one-off, specified commercial filming and photography."	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/37	It is a concern that limits can be breached for filming. Filming should be required to fit within an allocation as there is potential for significant demand, especially if there are limits in other places.	Include limits for filming and other one-off applications.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 11</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/81	Policy 11(c): Should not allow for tourism in the guise of activities for cultural purposes.	Review Policy 11(c) to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/26	Currently these criteria (11 a), 11 b), and 11 c) could be misconstrued as being the only criteria for landing within the orange zone.	Add extra Policy 11 d) with same wording as Policy 5 c) "To support research, monitoring or the collection of material authorised by the Department."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 12</b>		
<i>Garton, Simon</i> 162/1	Oppose the tranquillity rating system for measuring peacefulness in the Park. It is too hard to measure park users tranquillity ratings.	Reduce the daily aircraft limit. I suggest planning no fly days and weeks so those seeking a peaceful experience can visit the park on no fly days or weeks.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/35	Support the policy to monitor effects of aircraft activity. To manage the aircraft concessions and to assess whether the plan is working effectively, aircraft activity needs to be monitored regularly.	Amend Policy 12 to read: " Monitor, and report at least every three years, the effects of aircraft activity in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park: a) on the tranquillity levels ... B) on the natural, historic, ...	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/82	Should state explicitly that monitoring will be related to robust baseline data Policy 12 - If the monitoring shows (b) : This should be removed because Tranquillity is incomplete and unproven and because of the raft of	Reword Policy 12 to reflect the matters raised. Remove clause (b) in Policy 12 - If the monitoring shows .	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	potential impacts.		
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/3	Policy 12 mentions only upward revision of landing numbers as a result of monitoring outcomes. This quite obviously needs to have the inverse possibility inserted.	1. Amend Policy 12 to include provision for downward revision of landing numbers pending monitoring outcomes. 2. Apply moratorium as per submission points 1 and 2 3. Withdraw Draft and delay further public hearing pending publishing of the documents listed in: - Aircraft landing policies - General; and - Aircraft Noise Regulation and Tranquillity - General	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/21	Policy 12 b)"the natural, historic, recreation and cultural values of the Park." Reword. Meaning is unclear. Again, we find this document very wordy. It needs structure to be able to be read and be a useable document.	Reword : Clarify language	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/8	Policy 12 b) i) and ii) These conditions are not adequate to protect the park from drastically increased powered air traffic. 'Tranquillity outcomes' are not a reliable measure and public consultation should be required before granting additional landings, keeping in mind the General Policy for National Parks 2005: 8.1(c) Planning and management for recreation and other opportunities for the benefit, use and enjoyment of each National Park should: i) preserve national park values, including natural quiet, as far as possible iv) maintain the distinctive character of recreation in New Zealand national parks, including the traditional New Zealand backcountry experience with its ethos of self-reliance.	Delete Policy:12 b)	
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/6	Support the management of noise caused by aircraft/drones in the park regarding the impact on fauna.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/6	Policy 12 advocates monitoring of tranquility levels despite the predetermination of these levels. There is no mention of consultation with affected user groups such as NZAC and New Zealanders and tourists engaged on non-aircraft recreational activities.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/10	Policy 12a Do not support increased air traffic and the resulting impact on tranquillity in the Park.	Retain and strengthen Policy 12a	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village</i>	Policy 12 ii) states: ".using an allocation process developed in accordance with 1.3.1, Policy 22	Review Policy 12 ii) and amend if appropriate.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Limited</i> 693/18	(Authorisations)." Suggests that this should refer to 1.3.1. Policy 23 (which relates to limited supply opportunities or situations)		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/21	"If monitoring shows: ..... " These provisos as to limiting or encouraging landings rely on 'desired tranquillity levels' . The plan has few indicators as how such levels would be measured, assessed and interpreted. The pressures from concessionaires and many visitors may be for more flights and DOC can only control landings, not overflights. These are not straightforward issues.	The Plan must be more open and direct on the processes and decision-making .	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/41	TIA supports Section 1.3.3 policy 12.	Retain as written	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/15	<p>Policy 12(b) enables the consideration of granting further aircraft landing rights if tranquillity levels are found to be met during monitoring over the lifetime of this plan .</p> <p>While this Policy is supported, surely the tranquillity rating has to be quantifiable as opposed to a subjective assessment by the Department to implement the above Policies? Such information is needed to provide a clear understanding of how the tranquillity ratings will be implemented, monitored and managed over the life of the plan.</p>	Provide more information on how the tranquillity rating is quantified.	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/17	<p>Policies 12(a) &amp; (b) implications of apparent contradiction between Section 2.3 Outcomes and Map 5. On page 133, it states:</p> <p>"The combination of aircraft activity with watercraft activity on Tasman Lake and motor vehicles on Tasman Valley Road means that the tranquillity levels throughout much of this Place will be low."</p> <p>However, on Map 5, the colour coded tranquillity setting for this place appears to be largely "Medium". It needs to be clarified as to whether this place is 'medium' or 'low' tranquillity (and how this is quantified). If there is contradiction between the Draft Management Plan's text and tranquillity maps then it will be difficult to monitor and confirm compliance with or exceedance of the relevant tranquillity setting.</p> <p>This then has flow on effects in regards to Policies</p>	Clarify whether Tasman Lake & Tasman Valley have "medium" or "low" tranquility levels.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	12(a)&(b) in Section 1.3.3 which could lead to restrictions on the authorised numbers of landings or prevent the granting of additional landing opportunities because a higher tranquillity threshold is imposed unintentionally.		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/38	I support the monitoring of effects but disagree the plan should allow an increase in limits without a public process.	Change "tranquillity" to "noise". Include in all concession documents a condition that the number of landings allocated is a maximum which may be reduced subject to monitoring. Limit concession terms to 5 years. Introduce a plan change if an increase in landings is being considered.	
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/7	Support Policy 12 a), include in the plan criteria or SMART measures to define 'tranquillity levels' within the Park.	Retain with addition of SMART measures.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.3 Aircraft Policy 13</b>		
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/13	We could not find the Conservation (Aircraft Landings) Amendment Bill.	Provide a date and reference for the legislation	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/16	We could not find the Conservation (Aircraft Landings) Amendment Bill	Provide a date and reference for the legislation	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/25	Policy is confusing - if this bill will affect the outcome of the future management of the park (in the life of this plan) it should be presented and considered as part of this process.	Clarify.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.4 Animals</b>		
<i>Letford, Frankie</i> 167/2	Pest control needs to be increased and dogs forbidden from the Park. Not enough focus on pests by DOC.	(Retain as dogs are already forbidden except disability assist dogs)	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/14	Support all policies in this section.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Trotter, Morgan</i> 327/1	In areas where there are no ground dwelling threatened birds dogs should be permitted for hunting	Amend the plan to permit dogs for hunting	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/39	Support all Policies under Animals.	Retain Policies.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/16	Support Clauses For Clarity - Should allow - Dogs specifically trained for Search & Rescue purposes.	Retain Policies as written with amendment to allow dogs specifically trained for Search & Rescue purposes.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.4 Animals Policy 1</b>		
<i>Warner, James</i> 75/5	Do not support proposal to ban horses from AMCNP. At minimum allow horses in certain places e.g. tracks.	Amend Policy 1 to "Work with interested parties to discuss where horses can/should ber allowed.	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/9	Policy 1 and Policy 6 Believe both these Policies to be unnecessarily prohibitive. Do not believe that horses have a large enough impact on the park to warrant a policy and are unlikely to have a large impact in future. Though would not agree that concessions should be granted for trekking. 'Other types of animals' is broad and unnecessary.	Delete Policy 1 & 6	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/26	Support Policies 1 - 6 with the addition of the following exception: "except for the purpose of filming where the animal is professionally trained, has a handler, certificate of inoculations, and will have droppings picked up after them."	Add exception to Policies.	
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/8	Support Policy 1.	Amend Policy 1 to state "permitted" historic re-enactment event purposes.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.4 Animals Policy 2</b>		
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/11	Support continued restriction on Introduced Animals. Policy 2 a) Support continued application of exclusion under section 56 B or E of the National Park Acts. Specific support for NZ LandSar search and rescue dogs to be able to access, be trained in, and available for deployment within the Park.		
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/20	Support Policy 2: the banning of dogs from the park (excluding guide and rescue) must be retained and re-enforced. More education and harsher repercussions is needed.	Retain Policy 2. Also educate New Zealanders about dogs in national parks so they understand the significance.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.4 Animals Policy 3</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/51	Support section 1.3.4 Animals, but would like horses being permitted, due to historic reasons.	Provide clarification on Policy 3	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors</b>		

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/4	Agree to policies	Retain 1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors policies	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/15	Rock crags are often nesting sites for our NZ falcon / kārearea. Whenever a falcon nest is identified on a crag, the falcons should have priority over climbers.	Develop guidelines for closures of rock climbing crags in the park whenever kārearea are nesting on site.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/22	Support the bolting policies, in particular Policy 5.	Retain 1.3.5	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/41	We support the bolting policies for safety reasons. Especially support Policy 5: support the NZ Alpine Club's process for managing bolting in NZ.	Retain all policies under Bolts and fixed anchors.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/18	Support the Bolting Policies, in particular Policy 5 "Encourage and support NZAC. NZAC has a solid process for managing bolting in NZ	Retain all policies under Bolts and fixed anchors.	
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/6	NZAC has a solid process in place that has addressed bolting nationally. This is moderated by a number of people in the climbing community and gets scrutiny from a variety of backgrounds and perspectives. Its sound and the 'go to' document for bolting standards in NZ.	Retain Section 1.3.5, particularly Policy 5	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/12	Support Internationally safety standard anchors (often bolts) in regularly used locations within the Park. Installation should be by skilled professionals (DOC staff, guides etc) and working within the NZAC guidelines.		
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/5	Support these policies	Retain text as written.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/4	Support these policies	Retain text as written	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/4	Support these policies	Retain text as written	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/5	Support these policies	Retain text as written	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/23	TIA supports the Plan reference to external good practice standards in relation to Bolting within the Park.	Retain section 1.3.5 as written	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/25	Generally support provisions.	Correct "sports climbin" to "sport climbing" - this is the appropriate term	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/27	Support all Policies in this section.	Retain all Policies under 1.3.5.	
<i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/3	Support policies under Bolts and Fixed Anchors.	Retain policies.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/17	Support policies as written	Retain policies as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors Intro</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/5	Extend the sport climbing area to include Sebastopol Stream.	Extend the sport climbing area to include Sebastopol Stream.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/46	<p>The use of the title "NZ Bolting Guidelines" in this submission comprises the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bolting Philosophy; and Standards (for Route Developers) ((2017)</li> <li>- the Rockclimbing Access Framework (2017)</li> <li>- Code of Conduct for Rock Climbers (2017)</li> </ul> <p>and any updates of these documents developed by NZAC</p> <p>The term "bolt/s" will generally replace "fixed anchor/s"</p> <p>The term "Sport Climbing" should replace "Sports climbing"</p>	<p>Include a definition of "NZAC Bolting Guidelines" as a footnote to the policies, or in the Glossary</p> <p>Replace "bolts and fixed anchors" with "bolt/s"</p> <p>Replace "Sports climbing" with "Sport Climbing"</p>	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/4	I agree to policy	Retain Policy	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/22	Generally support provisions.	Correct 'sports climbing' to 'sport climbing' - this is the appropriate term.	
<i>New Zealand Canyoning Association</i> 840/2	<p>Currently there is a relatively small amount of canyoning within the Aoraki National Park. However with the growth of the sport in NZ, and the proposed additions to the park in the draft plan, it is more than reasonable to assume that there will be further exploration of canyoning into the park boundaries in the very near future.</p> <p>Abseiling is one of the techniques commonly used in canyoning, particularly in steeper sections, and this at times requires the use of fixed anchors, as in caving and rock climbing.</p> <p>Currently in New Zealand, many of the established canyons have permanent anchor protection in the form of bolts as is necessary to descend the canyon, including the Sawyer Stream Canyon. In addition, as canyons</p>	<p>Amend 1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intro - Add the activity of canyoning and the use of NZCA's code of practice and bolting guidelines.</li> <li>2. Policy 1 - Refer to the NZCA code of practice and bolting guidelines as the primary document covering responsible conduct of canyoning activity within the park.</li> <li>3. Policy 2 - Include NZCA as the relevant recreational group representing the canyoning community and as such, be invited to provide advice and stakeholder views in all consultations, on all matters regarding recreational canyoning activity within the park.</li> <li>4. Policy 5 - Include NZCA as the relevant recreational group representing the canyoning community and as such, be invited to provide advice and stakeholder views in all consultations, on all matters regarding recreational</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	become more established with higher numbers of people descending them, natural anchors are often replaced with fixed anchors. This can be for a number of reasons, notably for environmental and safety reasons as natural anchors often change over time. Also note that fixed anchors in canyons, due to their location are generally only accessible to those in the act of canyoning.	canyoning activity within the park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors Policy 1</b>		
<i>Moffat, Steven</i> 17/1	Agree with the policies in this section relating to Bolts and Fixed Anchors	Retain Policies 1 - 5	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/6	Support this policy	Retain	
<i>Jolly, James N.</i> 530/4	Support bolting restriction to Mt. Sebastopol cliffs for sport climbing but needs allowance for bolting for future access cables	Add a provision for bolting and provision of access cables e.g. Pudding Rock and elsewhere where glacial retreat has made access dangerous	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/10	This section is well laid out and unambiguous with room for further development with NZAC given the central role in sports climbing areas. It would be preferable if some guidance was given on fixed anchors on mountain routes, is this also the purview of NZAC in consultation with other parties, as seems reasonable?	Retain intro and policies in this section.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/47	The documents referred to in Policy 1 relate to bolts only. Therefore the words "and fixed anchors" should be removed.	Retain Policy 1 after the removal of the words "and fixed anchors."	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/17	<p>Bolting is synonymous with sport climbing and modern mountaineering. Bolting increases the margin of safety for climbers in areas that would otherwise be too difficult for and dangerous to climb. Bolting in The Park has allowed not only the establishment of new climbing areas (encouraging visitors to The Park) but also allowed increased access to areas of the Park that would be difficult without bolts (i.e. Pudding Rock cables). The CMC is supportive of the installation of bolts to increase access to more remote areas of the Park.</p> <p>The CMC is supportive of the use of NZAC's "Position on Bolting " and "Bolting Technical Guidelines".</p>	The CMC supports the provision for bolting and the maintenance of existing bolts for climbing, mountaineering and access purposes in the Park.	
<i>McKellar, Thomas</i> 613/2	Support the Plan's approach to expand the number of fixed anchors in the Park. I would support strategic placement of fixed anchors at points in high alpine areas	Introduce a policy to allow placement of abseil rings at strategic common abseil points in the high alpine zone.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	to reduce the amount of abseil tat and to increase the speed and thereby safety of climbing parties.		
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/19	Submits that Departmental Policy on bolts and fixed anchors, should be consistent and aligned across all National Park Management Plans and Conservation Management Strategies. Recent revisions of the Paparoa National Park Management Plan and the Wellington Conservation Management Strategy settled on a broadly acceptable policy for bolting and fixed anchors.	Comment	
<i>New Zealand Canyoning Association</i> 840/5	<p>Currently there is a relatively small amount of canyoning within the Aoraki National Park. However with the growth of the sport in NZ, and the proposed additions to the park in the draft plan, it is more than reasonable to assume that there will be further exploration of canyoning into the park boundaries in the very near future.</p> <p>Abseiling is one of the techniques commonly used in canyoning, particularly in steeper sections, and this at times requires the use of fixed anchors, as in caving and rock climbing.</p> <p>Currently in New Zealand, many of the established canyons have permanent anchor protection in the form of bolts as is necessary to descend the canyon, including the Sawyer Stream Canyon. In addition, as canyons become more established with higher numbers of people descending them, natural anchors are often replaced with fixed anchors. This can be for a number of reasons, notably for environmental and safety reasons as natural anchors often change over time. Also note that fixed anchors in canyons, due to their location are generally only accessible to those in the act of canyoning.</p>	Amend Policy 1 to include the NZCA code of practice and bolting guidelines be referred to and used as the primary document covering responsible conduct of canyoning activity within the park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors Policy 2</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/7	Support this policy	Reatin policy	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/48	NZAC supports Policy 2 to the extent that it applies to Sebastopol Bluffs only	Amend Policy 2(a) to delete the words "... And any other authorised climbing development areas" Delete Policy 2(b), (c) and (d)	
<i>New Zealand Canyoning Association</i> 840/6	Currently there is a relatively small amount of canyoning within the Aoraki National Park. However with the growth of the sport in NZ, and the proposed additions to the park in the draft plan, it is more than reasonable to	Amend Policy 2 to recognise the NZCA within the management plan as the relevant recreational group representing the canyoning community and as such, be invited to provide advice and stakeholder views in all	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>assume that there will be further exploration of canyoning into the park boundaries in the very near future.</p> <p>Abseiling is one of the techniques commonly used in canyoning, particularly in steeper sections, and this at times requires the use of fixed anchors, as in caving and rock climbing.</p> <p>Currently in New Zealand, many of the established canyons have permanent anchor protection in the form of bolts as is necessary to descend the canyon, including the Sawyer Stream Canyon. In addition, as canyons become more established with higher numbers of people descending them, natural anchors are often replaced with fixed anchors. This can be for a number of reasons, notably for environmental and safety reasons as natural anchors often change over time. Also note that fixed anchors in canyons, due to their location are generally only accessible to those in the act of canyoning.</p>	<p>consultations, on all matters regarding recreational canyoning activity within the park.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors Policy 3</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/8	Support this policy	Retain policy	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/83	Question the value of Policy 3 as such barriers could prompt sport climbers to ignore the plan's requirements. References to relevant care codes should be made and the codes appendicised.	Review Policy 3 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/49	<p>NZAC considers the NZAC Bolting Guidelines adequately direct the consultation [process. Given that climbing is recognised as a valid activity in national parks, there would need to be a significant and acute concerns for it not to be authorised.</p> <p>Currently the draft plan provides no definition of what a new 'climbing development area' is, or how the authorisation process would work.</p>	Delete Policy 3 and insert: "The development of new climbing areas will be managed under general policies, i.e. as per proposed policy 1.3.5 (6)".	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/20	Policy 3 a) The requirement to consult with the Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board would be an onerous and time-consuming burden on the Board. The requirement is also likely to be ignored by private individuals engaged in recreational activities requiring bolts and/or fixed anchors.	Do not support Policy 3 a)	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors Policy 4</b>		

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/9	Support this policy	Retain this policy	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/50	This occurs naturally due to varied nature of both climbers and rocks.	Retain Policy 4	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.5 Bolts and fixed anchors Policy 5</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/10	support this policy	Retain this policy	
<i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/3	Support the Bolting policies, particularly Policy 5	Retain section 1.3.5 and its policies	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/51	The use and placement of bolts is already covered in the policies in 1.3.5. Once placed however, the management of the bolts becomes the responsibility of the user. The use of fixed anchors has risks which are well known to the climbing community and accepted by them. NZAC suggests this is the only feasible method of safety management, and no other management is necessary or practical.	Delete Policy 5 Insert a new policy: That the NZAC Bolting Guidelines be adopted by the Department as the primary mechanism by which to manage eth use of bolts throughout the Park, concurrent with its own input and that of its Treaty Partners and other stakeholders.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/21	Submits that this policy should read "Encourage and support NZAC to take the lead on bolts and fixed anchor guidance."	Do not support Policy 5. and request to amend.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/21	Support the Bolting Policies, in particular 5) "Encourage and support NZAC...". NZAC has a solid process for managing bolting in NZ - support this.	Retain 1.3.5. as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.6 Commercial filming, photography, sporting events</b>		
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/5	Policy should include a statement on Qualified Safety Services being required as part of the consent process. Note that this requirement is NOT included in the Code of Practice: Filming on Public Conservation Lands.	Include a requirement for Safety Plan and Qualified Safety Services in section 1.3.6 policies.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/25	Policies generally: Should include a statement on Qualified Safety Services (mountain, water or otherwise) being required as part of the process, because this is not included in the Code of Practice: Filming on Public Conservations Lands.	Include a policy requirement for Safety Plan and qualified Safety Services within 1.3.6	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/52	This section makes no mention of drones which should be prohibited from the NP for safety reasons (aircraft) and also for natural quiet reasons and intrusion of privacy.	Include policy to ban drones from the National Park	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/53	Should include statement on Qualified Safety Services (mountain, water, or otherwise) being required as part of the consent process. This requirement is not included in the Code of Practice: Filming	Amend 1.3.6 to include a requirement for a Safety Plan and Qualified safety Services	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/5	Add new policy Policy should include a statement on Qualified Safety Services (mountain, water, or otherwise) being required as part of the consent process. This requirement is not included in the Code of Practice: Filming on Public Conservation Lands	Include requirement for Safety Pan and Qualified Safety Services in 1.3.6	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/22	Applauds the Departments efforts to foster competitive sporting events. Notes the rise in popularity, across New Zealand, of 'pay-to-play' recreational events and the role they play in positive mental and physical health outcomes.	comment	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/18	Support policies as written	Retain policies as written	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/19	Support policies as written	Retain policies as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.6 Commercial filming, photography, sporting events Intro</b>		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/2	Identify the unique nature of the film industry and how it can be effectively managed while enabling conservation outcomes. The film industry has an established historic use within the park with a great track record. Our actual footprint/effects are temporary and extremely minor compared to other readily accepted commercial and conservation activities in the park. We support the existing and proposed use of the park for heli-skiing. Both the heli-ski operations and film activity rely on air access, but the film industry is more sporadic in frequency. Managing the effects of our activity similar to ongoing concessionaires is both illogical and overly restrictive. We generally prefer to get somewhere, land, and shut down, making our presence much more tranquil than the well-established activity of heli-skiing, who by comparison are currently granted unlimited landings per	Re-write the intro in consultation with film industry (can be based on text from current Mt Aspiring and Fiordland NPMP's). Separate film and events and make it standalone sections.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>day.            We are very different to sporting events and combining us with them does not make for effective management.            We propose that filming be addressed separately in the plan (in line with current Mt. Aspiring and Fiordland NPMP's) as opposed to being combined with sporting events.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sporting events based on public participation, and organisers maximise numbers to increase profit</li> <li>- film productions operating in a defined workspace and want to reduce crew numbers to minimise effects and costs.</li> <li>- sporting events planned years in advance and often annually, film productions don not have this lead time, want to access unique areas and are one-off events.</li> </ul> <p>Want to work with the Department to draft a new section in the plan specific to commercial filming and address any actual issues that have occurred.</p>		
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/23	<p>Event activities should be permissible within the National Park only if impacts are minimised, and provision should be made in the Plan that ensure that signage, gear caches or other detritus are not abandoned.</p>	<p>Introduce policy for requiring a bond or other fee for clean-up to be included in permits for one-off large scale events.            Introduce policy for monitoring and compliance in the above circumstances.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.6 Commercial filming, photography, sporting events Policy 1</b>		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/27	<p>Request to add a policy: "To allow temporary commercial filming in the Park where the adverse effects on national park values and other users of the National Park can be minimised."            Policy 1 b) Film and Events should be separated. Delete for Film as it relates to Events.            Policy 1 c) ii) Separate Film and Events and delete for Film as due to the remote nature of most of our activity peak visitor times are not relevant.</p>	<p>Add the above text to policies.            Separate for Film and Events.            Delete Policy 1 b) and 1 c) ii) for Film.</p>	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/40	<p>Regarding Policy 1 c) iii) should include avoid remote zones or other mechanism to ensure that filming doesn't occur in areas of highest natural quiet.            Filming concessions should require a 'leave no trace' condition.</p>	<p>Amend Policy as in submission.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.6 Commercial filming, photography, sporting events Policy 2</b>		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New</i>	<p>Film and Events should be separated.            Support and suggest recommend reviewing this</p>	<p>Separate Film and Events.            Review the 'Code of Practice; Filming on Public</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Zealand</i> 761/28	document. We are eager to contribute to this process.	Conservation Lands'	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.6 Commercial filming, photography, sporting events Policy 4</b>		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/29	Policy 4, 5, 6 and 7 Film and Events should be separated. Delete as they relate to events.	Delete this Policies for Film.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.6 Commercial filming, photography, sporting events Policy 7</b>		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/16	Add Policy 7 c) which states: it is compulsory for event organisers to clean up the place completely after the event, and setting hefty fines in the case where they don't.	Add policy for compulsory clean-up after a sporting event, with fines in case of non-compliance.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/26	Event activities should be permissible within the National Park only if impacts are minimised, and provision should be made in the Plan that ensure that signage, gear caches or other detritus are not abandoned.	Introduce policy for requiring a bond or other fee for clean-up to be included in permits for one-off large scale events. Introduce policy for monitoring and compliance in the above circumstances.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/30	Add the following policies: - Minimise adverse effects on the benefit, use and enjoyment of the park by other visitors and not have adverse effects on existing recreational opportunities in the area; and - Be consistent with the preservation as far as possible of the park in its natural state; and - Minimise adverse effects, including cumulative effects, on other national park values. - Maintain a close liaison with the New Zealand film industry so that any matters of mutual concern to the industry or the department can be discussed at the earliest opportunity. - May grant concessions for aircraft landings associated with a filming activity that does not meet the guidelines in a specific landing zone and/or the prescriptions for visitor management zones/places based on its merits and subject to an assessment of: a) cumulative effects on the values at the site; and b) the adverse effects on park users. c) The extent to which it is possible to avoid, remedy or mitigate those effects	Add the 5 policies from submission	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.7 Fishing and game bird hunting</b>		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/17	As per the National Park Act, all native flora and fauna is protected in a national park.	Prohibit recreational as well as commercial eeling in the park.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/41	Support all Policies under Fishing and game bird hunting	Retain Policies	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.7 Fishing and game bird hunting Intro</b>		
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/9	The preamble has included an incorrect reference to the "Fish and Game Council" instead of referencing the region that is charged with management of resources in the Park.	Amend the text to read: "The Central South Island Fish & Game Council manages sports fish and fishing, and game bird hunting in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park."	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/23	Do not agree that tuna/eels are "top predators".	Amend plan to address issue raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.7 Fishing and game bird hunting Policy 1</b>		
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/21	Commercial eeling, habitat loss and hydro development activities are considered to be major contributors to the decline of freshwater species generally, as well as for native eels. The wording of Policies 1 and 2 should be worded to ensure that populations of native eels and other freshwater indigenous species are preserved and enhanced, and so ecosystems can be restored and preserved in a healthy functioning state.	Replace the word "should" with "will" in Policies 1.3.7 (1) and (2)	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.7 Fishing and game bird hunting Policy 2</b>		
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/24	Support the Policies. Would like to see non indigenous game bird species reduced and where possible eliminated. They devour the native fish, they add to the faecal load in the waterways and compete with native ducks and wading birds. In Policy 2 inclusion of prohibiting the "catch and release" practice used by many fisherman. To deliberately release an exotic fish into waterways should not be permitted. Trout and salmon eat our native fish and compete for food.	Include policy that prohibits release of exotic fish and include policy that reduces or eliminates non indigenous game bird species.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.7 Fishing and game bird hunting Policy 3</b>		
<i>Central South Island Fish and Game</i> 37/10	Policy 3 includes an incorrect reference to the statutory body to be involved in the management of sports fish and game bird hunting in the Park.	Amend Policy 3 to read: "Work with the Central South Island Fish & Game Council in their management ..."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.8 Fire</b>		
<i>South Canterbury District Health Board</i> 742/6	Discarded cigarettes are a known cause of wildfires, and banning them completely will eliminate this risk. In the	Ban smoking in AMCNP	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
742/6	United States, 90% of wild fires are caused by human behaviour including discarded cigarettes. Research from Australia has provided conclusive evidence that discarded cigarettes can cause wildfires, and has led to campaigns educating about safe disposal of cigarette butts. The safest approach is to eliminate cigarettes altogether.		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/20	Support policies as written	Retain policies as written	
<b>Section: 1.3.8 Fire Policy 1</b>			
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/13	We strongly support Policy 1 and 2	Retain Policy 1 and 2	
<b>Section: 1.3.8 Fire Policy 2</b>			
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/11	Historically, firewood was sometimes carried to the location of a camp, in order to allow historical re-enactment, this clause should be reworded.	Reword Policy 2. "Should seek an amendment to the Mount Cook National Park Bylaws 1981 to restrict fires in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park to the use of portable cooking equipment except in circumstances involving historical re-enactment."	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/14	We strongly support Policy 1 and 2	Retain Policy 1 and 2	
<b>Section: 1.3.9 Grazing and farming</b>			
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/18	Stock damages native flora	Add a second policy, for all stock to be removed from the park within 3 years of the plan becoming active.	
<b>Section: 1.3.9 Grazing and farming Intro</b>			
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/9	Support. Unable to see a time when grazing would be consistent within AMCNP.	Remove the word "usually" from the intro.	
<b>Section: 1.3.9 Grazing and farming Policy 1</b>			
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/3	Support this policy	Retain Policy 1	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Sinton, Rowan</i> 357/2	Support the draft plan's approach to disallow grazing and farming in the park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/13	Oppose to Any grazing of introduced species within the Park. Most likely the Glentanner or Ferintosh leaseholds. Enough is enough. Mt Cook Station should be added to this if parts are added to National Park.		
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/15	Glentanner Station Ltd has an existing use grazing lease over the Birch Hills Flats. This is unable to be unauthorised without agreement between both parties.	Delete Policy 1	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/11	Grazing should not be allowed in the Park. Interested as to why Glentanner Station still continues to graze sheep within the Park. This is not consistent with the requirements to preserve national parks in their natural state.	Retain Policy 1 and ensure compliance	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/29	Support Policy 1, however this needs to be strengthened to ensure indigenous species are preserved. Undertake a review the current leases with a view to phasing out over the life of the plan. Apply adequate penalties when grazing rules are breached.	Amend Policy 1 to replace "should" with "will" to avoid ambiguity.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/27	Fully support	Retain	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/24	Fully support	Retain intro and policy.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/42	Support Policy 1	Retain Policy 1.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/21	Support policy as written	Retain policy as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.10 Guiding activities</b>		
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/4			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/84	Policy 1(c) needs considerable tightening: - definition of terms used - ensuring single concessionaires with multiple guiding businesses do not cause proliferation in guided activity settings. - actual numbers allowed should be clear and	Review Policy 1(c) to reflect the matters identified.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	unequivocal.		
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/5	Oppose Policy 1 c) Existing limitations on mountain guiding concessions is sufficient and appropriate.	Remove Policy 1 c) from the plan.	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/9	Oppose heli-skiing in the park, oppose heli-hiking above 1400m in the park.	Amend the plan to state no heli-skiing in the park and no heli-hiking above 1400m.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/23	Policy 1(c): This must be a mistake as it is contradicted elsewhere in the plan and would essentially render guiding business unviable. This does not represent nor support the rich guiding heritage and historical values of the area. DOC would lose a huge amount in concession fees if this were implemented. In any guiding business which remained, it would encourage unsafe practices through high guide:client ratio groups. 1:1 technical climbs would not be an option.	Remove policy 1(c)	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.10 Guiding activities Intro</b>		
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/23	Need stronger emphasis on the value guides provide, both in terms of guardianship of the environment and facilities, and in terms of their ability to increase visitors' appreciation of the Park.	Replace the last sentence ("Maintaining visitor experience ...") with the following: "Guides add value by providing interpretation and background stories, increasing visitors' connection to the place and desire to protect it. Guides also fulfil a valuable role in taking care of facilities, ensuring huts are left clean and tidy. They also help to minimise SAR callouts through assisting or advising unguided parties."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/15	There needs to be a stronger emphasis on the value guides provide, both in terms of guardianship of the environment and facilities and in terms of their ability to increase visitors' appreciation of the park and develop their desire to conserve it.	Add the following to the intro: "Guides add value by providing interpretation and background stories, increasing visitors' connection to the place and desire to protect it. Guides also fulfill a valuable role in taking care of facilities, ensuring huts are left clean and tidy. They also help to minimise SAR call-outs through assisting or advising unguided parties."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/19	There needs to be a stronger emphasis on the value guides provide, both in terms of guardianship of the environment and facilities and in terms of their ability to increase visitors' appreciation of the park and develop their desire to conserve it.	"Maintaining visitor experience is an important consideration" should be changed to: "Guides add value by providing interpretation and background stories, increasing visitors' connection to the place and desire to protect it."	
<i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/3	The preamble to the section includes: "Concessionaires provide visitors with the opportunity to explore and understand the values of the Park and experience its beauty up close. Maintaining visitor experience is an important management consideration"	Amend Section 1.3.10 to address the concerns raised and to apply to visiting guides in the Front Country zone as well as concessionaires.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>We endorse the statement but submit that it can appropriately apply to visiting guides in the Front Country zone as well as concessionaires.</p> <p>ProGuides accepts that concession charges are appropriate in cases where the business is based in the park, and in conservation areas generally, and we endorse the general provisions set out in the Authorisations section of the draft plan on Page 58, but we submit that the administrative overhead of requiring a concession for short casual visits is cumbersome and creates inequality.</p>		
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/22</p>	<p>There needs to be a stronger emphasis on the value guides provide, both in terms of guardianship of the environment and facilities and in terms of their ability to increase visitors' appreciation of the park and develop their desire to conserve it.</p>	<p>Change last sentence "Maintaining visitor experience is an important management consideration." to read: "Guides add value by providing interpretation and background stories, increasing visitors' connection to the place and desire to protect it. Guides also fulfil a valuable role in taking care of facilities, ensuring huts are left clean and tidy. They also help to minimise SAR callouts through assisting or advising unguided parties."</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.10 Guiding activities Policy 1</b>		
<p><i>Cole, Andy</i> 11/3</p>	<p>If we had only 1 group per concessionaire as this policy promotes, the guiding industry would be destroyed. Existing limitations on guided concessions is sufficient and appropriate.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 1.3.10 1(c)</p>	
<p><i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/6</p>	<p>Currently most guiding companies operate with more than 1 group per day within the Park. To restrict this to the proposed limit would bring economic hardship to these companies, and drive guiding prices up beyond the reach of NZ climbers.</p>	<p>Remove 1(c)</p>	
<p><i>Moffat, Steven</i> 17/5</p>	<p>Do not support this policy. Policy 1(c) will seriously impact on established guiding companies.</p>	<p>Delete clause (c).</p>	
<p><i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/11</p>	<p>Policy 1(c) is totally inconsistent with other parts of the Plan. Reducing mountain guiding concessions to one guided group per day would effectively close those businesses, which have limited seasonality. Existing concessions restrictions are appropriate.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 1(c)</p>	
<p><i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/3</p>	<p>As currently written this policy would destroy the guiding industry. Existing limitations on guided concessions are sufficient and appropriate.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 10c)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/5	Clause (c) seems strange. As it stands, policy may lower the quality of visitor experience by lowering the standard of guiding. It would be better for visitors and safety outcomes that good concessionaires take more groups.	Reword Policy 1(c) to read " .. Overall outcome of the activity is consistent with the outcomes of the plan."	
<i>Feild, Melissa</i> 52/3	unclear the logic of limiting to one group per day. Due to the scarcity of good climbing weather windows, multiple clients especially with the 1:1 guide ratio mandated to safely attempt some of the 3000m peak climbs	Delete policy 1c	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/6	Regarding Policy 1 c) It would effectively eliminate guiding climbing in the park as no concessionaire employing more than one guide would be able to offer services at remotely affordable prices if they were limited to one party per day.	Delete Policy 1 c)	
<i>Sweney, Stella</i> 76/8	Regarding Policy 1 c) Avoid a blanket rule of one guided group per day per concessionaire. This would likely mean established companies would not be viable, a wealth of experience, heritage and international level experience would be lost.	Avoid a blanket rule of one guided group per day per concessionaire.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/2	Policy 1(c): Policy is not practical. No business could make a profitable income	Delete Policy 1(c)	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/54	Oppose Policy 1(c). This is not practical and no guiding company can survive on one trip per day.	Delete Policy 1(c)	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/24	Policy 1(c): Must be a mistake as it is contradicted elsewhere in the plan. It would render guiding business unviable. Does not support rich guiding heritage and historical values of the area. Would result in DOC losing a huge amount in concession fees Would encourage unsafe practices such as high client:guide ratios, and remove option for 1:1 technical climbs.	Remove Policy 1(c)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/16	Regarding Policy 1 c) This would make guiding businesses unviable and would mean that guides would not have enough work to make a living. This policy	Remove Policy 1 c) from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>would effectively remove any 1:1 and 1:2 guide:client trips in favour of large ratio groups only. This would increase the risk in many cases, as it is common for 2 guides with 2 clients (ie. 2 groups to work together on technical terrain to increase safety. It is also common for 1 group to fly into the mountains the same day as a group flying out, which reduces the number of flights required for access/egress.</p>		
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/20</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 1 c) Oppose this policy. This does not represent nor support the rich guiding heritage and historical values of the area. DOC would lose a huge amount in concession fees if this were implemented.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 1 c) from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/11</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 1 c) This must be a mistake as it is contradicted elsewhere in the plan and would essentially render every guiding business unviable.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 1 c) from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Mellish, Diane</i> <i>(Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/36</p>	<p>The intent of the policy is unclear. The preamble implies that the policy would apply to all guiding activities while the wording of the policy limits it to 'alpine guiding'. The proposed policy also presumes that a concession should be granted. There will be situations where an application may be declined, in areas where increasing numbers of commercial interests compete for limited opportunities. A better approach would be to have a general activity policy covering all commercial guiding, and also limiting the number of concessions. Clause 1(b) seems redundant.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 1 and replace with: "All guiding concessions will: a) be consistent with the visitor management zones shown on Map 4 and described in Appendix 2; b) have no more than one guided group per day per concessionaire and c) have minimal adverse effects on the use and enjoyment of the Park by other concessionaires or visitors."</p>	
<p><i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/5</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 1 c) - Oppose. Commercial operations need to have more than one trip in the park on any given day in order to be a viable business and to cater for the public demand.</p>	<p>Remove the clause or clarify the original intent.</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/4</p>	<p>Policy 1(c): This policy would effectively shut down the guiding industry in the Park. Currently there can be multiple groups from a single guiding company in many different places in the Park in any one day. It seems a serious oversight to put a restriction on this now. This policy is in direct contradiction with Policy 2(d) Haupapa Place</p>	<p>Remove Policy 1(c)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/10	1 c) is contradicted in other places by different figures e.g. p133, 2.3.3 policies 2d) no more than 5 parties per concessionaire.	Shows lack of consistent thinking in planning policy, and intimates drawing on figures from other places and dropping them in Mt Cook i.e. a lack of practical understanding of the actual park.	
<i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/8	Regarding Policy 1.c) I oppose "no more than one guided group per day per concessionaire."	Delete Policy 1.c) from the plan.	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/14	Policy 1 c) Strongly oppose. Suggests that this must be a typo. Most concessionaires have (& have done for decades) multiple trips running concurrently. These may be similar activities (Heli hikes/ heli ski, trekking groups) or insular but more than 1 group on instruction, ascents etc.	Remove policy 1 c)	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/12	Policy 1 c) No more than one guided group per day per concessionaire is ludicrous. Though a limit could be set reasonably for the number of groups, each 'representative' of a concessionaire could guide.	Reword Policy c). Each guide has no more than 3 guided groups per day.	
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/6	Oppose Policy 1 c) Existing limitations on mountain guiding concessions is sufficient and appropriate.	Remove Policy 1 c) from the plan.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/5	Oppose Policy 1 c) Existing limitations on mountain guiding concessions is sufficient and appropriate.	Remove Policy 1 c) from the plan.	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/6	Oppose Policy 1 c) Existing limitations on mountain guiding concessions is sufficient and appropriate.	Remove Policy 1 c) from the plan.	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/3	'c) no more than one guided group per day per concessionaire' Guiding has been part of the history at Aoraki Mt Cook for a long time and that guiding history is celebrated. Use of guides encourages safety and respect and protection for the environment. If there was only 1 group per concessionaire as this policy promotes the guiding industry would be destroyed. Existing limitations on guided concessions is sufficient and appropriate.	Remove policy 1.3.10.c)	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/14	This appears to be the only guiding-specific policy in the Draft Plan. In specifying 'alpine' guiding, however, the policy may be unintentionally restrictive. Removing 'alpine' from the initial statement in Policy 1 would result in a more generic policy for guiding. For clarity, the term 'alpine' should be inserted in to policy 1c).	Policy 1 should read: "Should grant concessions for guiding only in accordance with the following criteria" Policy 1c) should read: "no more than one alpine guided group per day per concessionaire"	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village</i>	Policy 1 potentially creates confusion between what is considered 'alpine guiding' and guiding at alpine	Requests clarification on the interpretation of this section of the draft Plan, particularly in relation to; Policy 1 'alpine	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Limited</i> 693/19	<p>locations.</p> <p>Guiding activities within the Aoraki Mount Cook National Park are wide ranging, from walks in the valleys to day trips up to the alpine tarns at Sealy and Red Tarns, to the Mueller Hut overnight or to summit one of the many mountain peaks within the park. Concerned that 'Guiding Activities' and 'alpine guiding' in the context of this section of the draft Plan are not defined particularly well and has the potential to create some confusion.</p> <p>Policy 1 c) may be relevant to high altitude alpine guiding within the national park, but consider it not relevant for guiding to other locations within an alpine environment i.e. the Mueller Hut</p>	<p>guiding', and Policy 1 c): 'no more than one guided group per day per concessionaire'.</p> <p>Review, and consider including further detail for clarification around the terms 'guiding activities' and 'alpine guiding' to provide clearer interpretation of the policies.</p>	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/17	<p>Policy 1 appears to be the only guiding-specific policy in the Draft Plan. In specifying 'alpine' guiding, however, the policy may be unintentionally restrictive. Removing 'alpine' from the initial statement in Policy 1 would result in a more generic policy for guiding. For clarity, the term 'alpine' should be inserted in to policy 1©</p>	<p>Policy 1 should read: "Should grant concessions for guiding only in accordance with the following criteria"</p> <p>Policy 1© should read: "no more than one alpine guided group per day per concessionaire"</p>	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/61	<p>TIA is very concerned about and does not support section 1.3.10. We support the submission from Adventure Consultants Ltd which states "Guiding has been part of the history at Aoraki Mt Cook for a long time and that guiding history is celebrated. Use of guides encourages safety and respect and protection for the environment. If we had only one group per concessionaire as this policy promotes the guiding industry would be destroyed. Existing limitations on guided concessions are sufficient and appropriate." TIA believes that existing limitations on guided concessions are sufficient and appropriate.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 1(c)</p>	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/18	<p>Support in part as 'alpine guiding' is enabled subject to specified criteria. However, the Policy also requires that each Concessionaire for 'alpine guiding' is limited to one guided group per day. This restriction is considered un-necessary given the scale of the landscape in which such activities occur and is inconsistent with the provisions for alpine guiding in existing Concessions. For example, Concession 53613-GUI held by Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Limited allows up to five trips per day with 8 people per group for glacier skiing (an 'alpine</p>	<p>Delete Policy 1 c)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>guiding' activity by definition) in the Murchison Area provided that no more than two of the Concessionaire's groups are allowed in the area at any one time.</p> <p>No discussion/justification is given as to why the existing limits on this type of activity need to be reduced. It is therefore proposed Policy 1c) be deleted in its entirety.</p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/23</p>	<p>Policy 1 c) Submits that it may be perfectly feasible and justified for some types of concessionaires in some circumstances, to have more than one guided group per day. There are other methods to mitigate over-commercialisation of National Parks. The rationale for adopting this policy has not been presented.</p>	<p>Do not support Policy 1 c)</p>	
<p><i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/43</p>	<p>Support Policy 1 c) regarding the limit of 1 group/day/concessionaire to reduce overcrowding.</p>	<p>Retain Policy 1 c).</p>	
<p><i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/28</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 1 c) This policy is vague. Does this relate to the entire park or at a defined location? What is the maximum group size? What about two small groups instead of one large group, which may have a lesser impact?</p>	<p>Revise Policy 1 c) after consideration of submission.</p>	
<p><i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/4</p>	<p>Oppose Policy 1 c). One group per concessionaire contradicts existing and established concessions, is inconsistent with policy elsewhere and would destroy the guiding industry.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 1 c) Existing limitations on mountain guiding concessions is sufficient and appropriate.</p>	
<p><i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/22</p>	<p>Support Policy 1(a) and (b) Request Policy 1(c) to allow more than one guided group per concessionaire</p>	<p>Reword Policy 1.3.9.c to read: " Allow more than one short duration "front country" (less than 4 hours) guided group per day per concessionaire.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>1.3.11 Mining and sand/shingle extraction</b></p>		
<p><i>Letford, Frankie</i> 167/3</p>	<p>Do not agree with mining in Conservation Areas. The trucks used spoil the amenity aspect for visitors and makes windy roads unsafe.</p>	<p>Do not allow any mining in the Park.</p>	
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/55</p>	<p>Support this section</p>	<p>Retain as written</p>	
<p><i>Miles, Clint</i> 571/2</p>	<p>If the proposed additions to the National Park go ahead there will be no shingle extraction from the Jollie River. This means that the cost of road maintenance on hayman</p>	<p>Delete this from the plan.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	road will at least double. DOC do not own the land to the NE of the jollie bridge and it should stay that way		
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/3	Oppose Mining in the park for gravel etc.	Amend the plan to be more specific as to the proposed locations for the mining.	
<i>NZ Transport Agency</i> 815/1	NZTA is in support of a new policy: Policy 6 Consider applications for sand, shingle and other natural material (such as rock) extraction for road and track maintenance, to protect against coastal erosion, and for other construction purposes, where: a) Historically quarried; b) Availability of appropriate material is established; c) Adverse effects on natural, historic and cultural values are avoided, remedied or mitigated; d) Sourced from acceptable sites within the Park, wherever possible, to reduce the risk of introducing pest plants	Implement the policy outlined in the submission.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/23	Support policies as written	Retain policies as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.11 Mining and sand/shingle extraction Intro</b>		
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/3	Mineral activity (including prospecting, exploration, and mining and associated activities) should be prohibited, since these are inconsistent with sections 4 and 5 of the National Parks Act. ECO draws the attention of DoC and the Conservation Authority to the IUCN Recommendation WCC_2016_102_EN, passed at the 2016 World Congress of the members of IUCN, the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. New Zealand is one of the Government members of this body, as are a number of New Zealand NGOs. Consistent with this IUCN Recommendation especially operative paragraphs 1-4, ECO submits the following additions to the National Park Management Plan as rules that apply across the whole of the National Park: 1. Mineral activity including prospecting, exploration and mining and associated activities are prohibited in, on or under the National Park, as is any industrialisation of the Park from any industrial or industrial scale activities or infrastructure, since these are inconsistent with sections 4 and 5 of the National Parks Act. 2. No genetically modified organisms or materials may be introduced or allowed to stray into the National Park.	Amend section 1.3.11 to add a new policy to address the following: That mineral activity including prospecting, exploration and mining and associated activities are prohibited in, on or under the National Park, as is any industrialisation of the Park from any industrial or industrial scale activities or infrastructure	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	* Note - a copy of this IUCN Recommendation WCC_2016_102_EN has been attached,		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.11 Mining and sand/shingle extraction Policy 1</b>		
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/12	Mining should NEVER be permitted in the Park.	Amend Policy 1 to include 'mining within the Park is highly undesirable due to the impact on natural features and biodiversity.'	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.11 Mining and sand/shingle extraction Policy 2</b>		
<i>Gould, Marion &amp; David</i> 496/3	Regarding "Shingle extraction only for use within Mt Cook National Park." Immediate neighbours could introduce the plants/pests with cartage of shingle in which would then spread into the park.	Reword policy to include "and surrounding properties".	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/22	Remove the words "remedy" and "mitigate" from Policy 2 so that adverse effects on any freshwater values in the national park will only be avoided.	Amend Policy 2(b) to remove the words "remedied or mitigated"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.12 Private accommodation</b>		
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/12	Support policy	Retain policy	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/11	Should allow existing private accommodation to be renewed as long as it is in sympathy with national park values. Change policy.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.12 Private accommodation Intro</b>		
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/6	Support - although unclear how this relates to current concessionaire accommodation	Amend to clarify how this relates to current accommodation within Aoraki/Mount Cook NP	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/17	General Policy for National Parks 2005 defines "private accommodation" as "Place to live or lodge which is not available to the general public on an open basis". Because you have to book Mueller Hut, it is no longer available to the general public on an open basis; yet it cannot be regarded as "private". Nor can Caroline Hut be classified as "private" as it is bookable by any member of the public with an associated guided service. Part of Caroline Hut provides an emergency shelter, open to the public at all times.	Define "private" as being for the exclusive use of the owner and owner's friends and family. Define "public" as being available to the public whether through a booking system or not.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.12 Private accommodation Policy 1</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/11	No further [private huts should be allowed within the national park.	Retain Policy 1	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/10	Support Policy 1.No further private huts should be allowed within the national park.	Retain policy	
<i>McCartney, John</i> 38/7	Support Policy 1 that no further private huts be allowed within the national park.	Retain policy	
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/9	Support policy 1 - no further private huts should be allowed within the national park	Retain policy	
<i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/11	No further private huts should be allowed within the national park		
<i>Heliworks Queenstown Helicopters 2012 Ltd</i> 56/2	We feel that there needs to be more land allocation within Aoraki / Mt Cook Village for staff accommodation.	When rewording your policy, allow for more land allocation within Aoraki / Mt Cook Village for staff accommodation.	
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/11	No further private huts should be allowed within the national park		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/56	Would like some clarity on what is covered by this section. Historic huts such as Unwin, Wynn Irwin and Tahr Lodge should be able to retain their historic rights of occupation.	Amend Policy 1 by adding to the end: "... and according to concessions, leases and/or authorisations approval." (or words to that effect)	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/25	<p>The term "private" needs to be clarified. Caroline Hut should be regarded as a concessionaire-owned hut as it is available to the public through a booking system with an associated guiding service. GPNP defines private accommodation as "A place to live or lodge which is not available to the public on an open basis."</p> <p>Mueller Hut can no longer be considered completely "open to the public" as bookings are required to use it. Yet it is not considered private.</p> <p>Club lodges are identified in the draft plan as primarily for use by club members only.</p> <p>Guided groups are members of the public and need to be treated as such.</p> <p>The definition for "private accommodation" needs to change to acknowledge huts with booking systems and club-owned/managed facilities.</p>	Define "private" to mean "for the exclusive use of the owner's family, friends or club members."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/10	Making Caroline Hut "public" will mean Alpine Recreation can no longer continue it's operation there. With no guiding operator the number of SAR call-outs will increase considerably.	Define "private" to mean "for the exclusive use of the owner's family, friends, or club members". Guided groups are also members of the public and should be recognised as such.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/21	The term "private" needs clarification. This definition needs to change to accommodate huts with booking systems and club owned/managed facilities. An example is Mueller Hut can no longer be considered completely "open to the public" as bookings are required to use it during the summer season. It is no longer available to the general public on an open basis; yet it cannot be regarded as "private".	Define "private" to mean "for the exclusive use of the owner's family, friends, or club members". Guided groups are also members of the public and should be treated as such.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/12	The term "private" needs clarification. Caroline Hut should be regarded as a concessionaire-owned hut, as it is not a private bach and is available to the public through a booking system with an associated guiding service (and adjoining openly-accessible emergency shelter for unguided groups.)	Define "private" to mean "for the exclusive use of the owner's family, friends or club members". Guided groups are also members of the public and should be treated as such.	
<i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/6	Support. Accommodation that is for the sole use of its owner should be discouraged in the park.	Reword to clarify that commercially owned and operated facilities are not private and not covered by this clause.	
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/7	Support not authorising any private accommodation in the park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Wood, Nicholas</i> 685/5	Clarification is required for the meaning of the word "private" in this policy.	Reword Policy 1 as follows "private (not readily available to the public whether directly or by bookings through concessionaires offering guided tours) accommodation"	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Carla</i> 698/4	Concessionaire ownership of a hut does not make it private.	Define "private" to mean "for the exclusive use of the owner's family, friends or club members". Guided groups are also members of the public and should be treated as such.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/28	Fully support	Retain	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/19	Support Policy 1, living in the village is a privilege not a right.	Retain Policy 1.	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/25	Fully support	Retain intro and policy.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/24	Support policy as written	Retain policy as written	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/24	<p>The term "private" needs clarification. Private baches which are only accessible by the owner and their friends and family, are indeed private. Caroline Hut should be regarded as a concessionaire-owned hut, as it is not a private bach and is available to the public through a booking system. Mueller Hut can no longer be considered completely "open to the public" as bookings are required to use it during the summer season. This will also be the case for any other huts with booking systems in the future. According to the General Policy for National Parks 2005, private accommodation is defined as: "Place to live or lodge which is not available to the general public on an open basis". Because you have to book Mueller Hut, it is no longer available to the general public on an open basis; yet it cannot be regarded as "private".</p> <p>This definition needs to change to accommodate huts with booking systems and club owned/managed facilities. What about the Hermitage? This is a bookable accommodation business within the Park!</p>	<p>Define "private" to mean "for the exclusive use of the owner's family, friends, or club members". Guided groups are also members of the public and should be treated as such.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.13 Roding</b>		
<i>Miles, Clint</i> 571/3	<p>This section does not take into account the proposed additions to the park.</p>	<p>Amend this section to take into account the proposed additions to the park.</p>	
<i>NZ Transport Agency</i> 815/5	<p>An issue in the management of the state highway network can include that the road formation extends beyond the legal area of the road reserve. To address these situations, it is recommended that wording is included in the Management Plan:</p> <p>"At times the existing highway may not be within the legal road boundary due to realignment works. Where the state highway's legal road is surveyed it is normally a minimum of 20 metres wide, with some wider sections. Where the existing highway is not located on legal road, it has been agreed that the legal road alignment can reasonably be taken as 10 metres either side of the centre line of the existing highway (this is defined as nominal legal road). However, there will be variations in the legal road width in some areas with allowances to protect the stability of batters and ongoing maintenance of structures. It is considered that legalisation will occur as roading improvements are completed, with the desired outcome being the full legalisation of State Highway 80 over time. The National Parks Act allows</p>	<p>Amend plan as in submission.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	for such processes following road construction approvals."		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/25	Support policies as written	Retain policies as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.13 Roading Policy 1</b>		
<i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/8	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Mee, Donald</i> 239/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/10	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Gardiner, Ian</i> 253/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Low, Tyrone</i> 259/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Rainey, Heath</i> 275/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>King, Bill</i> 310/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 318/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/10	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Stevenson, Dr. Anthony</i> 330/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Wilson, Dan</i> 331/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/10	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Elliot, John</i> 367/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Poetschke, Alexandra</i> 386/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 473/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Watson, Elinor</i> 502/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Shinnamon, Anu</i> 535/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Fishman, Tana</i> 546/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Fishman, Charles</i> 547/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Hudson, Joshua</i> 553/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Daws, Peter</i> 556/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Mason, Sam</i> 558/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Ross, Mary</i> 565/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Rhynd, Keeley</i> 642/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>McGregor, Lucy</i> 658/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Rowden, Murray</i> 669/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Adank, Charlotte</i> 671/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Mitchell, Josh</i> 687/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/20	<p>Later sections of the draft Plan recognise that there is a need for a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) to be used for managing the movement of vehicles within the Village (amenities area) and front country roads within the Nohoaka Place.</p> <p>Policy 1 disables the Department to consider all options for competent management of vehicle movement, particularly within the Village amenities area. What if the TMP development process identifies that a new road for powered vehicles within the Village would provide a valuable solution to the congestion and vehicle flow in and around the Village? And that new road can be</p>	<p>Review and reconsider the wording of Policy 1 to enable the opportunity for all solutions to be considered under the proposed Traffic Management Plan (Section 2.1.3 Nohoaka Place Policy 13) when it is developed.</p> <p>As an example: "Should only grant consent for any new formed roads for powered vehicle use in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park Amenities Area where it has minimal effect on natural features and those undertaking the construction take measures to mitigate any adverse effects."</p> <p>Add another policy on roading that encompasses the rest of the National Park where it reflects that no new roads should gain consent.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	provided by another stakeholder. This solution would be encumbered by the current wording of the policy.		
<i>Garden, Tom</i> 705/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>DeRoy, Mary</i> 739/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Moyle, Nicholas</i> 741/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Ellis, Ben</i> 768/7	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/44	Support Policy 1	Retain Policy 1.	
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/8	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/8	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<i>Leder, Jakub</i> 834/12	Support CMC submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley to allow for 4wd access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. I would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained.	I would like to see the unformed legal roads in the Liebig Range and the Godley Valley areas formally identified and maintained.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.14 Structures, utilities and facilities</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mark, Dr Alastair</i> 267/4	No Gondola be allowed in the Park.	Make a policy that states no gondola be allowed in the park.	
<i>Barnett, Alice - Genesis Energy Ltd, Environmental Lead, Planning and Policy</i> 334/3	Genesis relies on access to the Aoraki/ Mount Cook National Park to operate, maintain and upgrade equipment relating to the provision of meteorological and other data that provides Genesis with accurate information about the hydrology influencing the Tekapo Power Scheme.	That the draft Plan recognises and provides for the operation, maintenance and upgrading of environmental monitoring sites associated with the Tekapo Power Scheme.	
<i>Canterbury Mountain Radio Service Inc</i> 557/1	The plan does not address the important issue of communications.	Implement a section regarding communications in the park.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/26	All policies: Support all policies as written with the addition of the following matters: - energy efficiency - solar power - electric vehicle charging stations - alternative energy sources	1. Retain the current policies and make the following additions: 2. Include a new clause to Policy 1 to read: "(f) is energy efficient and makes good use of renewable energy sources like solar power." 3. Include a new clause to Policy 2 to read: "(f) whether the activity and/or structure is energy efficient and makes good use of renewable energy sources like solar power."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.14 Structures, utilities and facilities Policy 1</b>		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/12	Policy 1 e) iwi management plans See general comments under 1.3.1.Policy 25)		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/31	Add the following policy: For the purpose of filming, the construction of temporary structures may be considered	Add policy from submission	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/27	Support policy as written with the addition of the following matters: - energy efficiency - solar power - electric vehicle charging stations - alternative energy sources	Include a new clause to Policy 1 to read: "(f) is energy efficient and makes good use of renewable energy sources like solar power."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.14 Structures, utilities and facilities Policy 2</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/85	Policy 2(e) is unnecessary	Remove Policy 2(e)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/74	TIA considers that the Plan should better recognise the importance of structures, utilities and facilities in supporting outdoor recreation experiences in the Park, and should have regard for this when assessing applications to build, create or retain these things.	Amend Policy 2(a) to have regard to the concerns raised	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/28	Support policy as written with the addition of the following matters: - energy efficiency - solar power - electric vehicle charging stations - alternative energy sources	Add a new clause to Policy 2 to read: "(f) whether the activity and/or structure is energy efficient and makes good use of renewable energy sources like solar power."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.14 Structures, utilities and facilities Policy 3</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/12	Support this policy, but would like to see opportunities for building at Mount Cook Airport..The airport was designed for fixed wing aircraft but the bulk of the traffic is now helicopter flights. The current aircraft facilities are no longer suitable for the user groups.The park plan specifically says that no monopolies should exist, however the current lease agreement is clearly monopolistic..	Retain policy bu re-word to allow concessionaires to develop infrastructure within the confines of the park pla. Address the airport situation.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/57	Clarification sought on what structures are covered Does this mean that "facility" buildings are permitted at the airport?	Amend Policy 3 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/86	Should allow advisory signage only within Nohoaka Place and airport. Policy should not allow business signage anywhere in the Park.	Reword Policy 3 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/45	There should be a very careful control on business advertising, even within the village and airport as the size and design can be exploited. There should be no promotional signs, only signs for identification of businesses and services to enable visitors to find them.	Include controls on advertising/promotion signage in the Village.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.14 Structures, utilities and facilities Policy 4</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/58	Clarification sought for what "facilities" includes? Does this mean all buildings in the village are to be removed?	Amend Policy 4 to clarify what "facilities" will be affected	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand</i>	Hydro generation is identified as having adverse effects on particularly native eels. To consider any part of a new hydro scheme would be inconsistent with avoiding	Replace Policy 4 with the following: "4. Must not grant any new authorisations for new hydroelectric power generation in any national park waters	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Incorporated</i> 700/23	adverse effects on native freshwater species.	or waters connected to the national park."	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/75	The Plan should better recognise the importance of structures, utilities and facilities in supporting outdoor recreation experiences in the Park, and should have regard for this when assessing applications to build, create or retain these things. TIA submits that Section 1.3.14 policy 4 include the requirement that decisions to remove or relocate existing facilities related to outdoor experiences are made in consultation with relevant recreational groups, the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and concessionaires.	Amend Policy 4 to include consultation with relevant recreational groups, the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and concessionaires before decisions on removal or relocation are made.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/29	The wording "where the threat from natural hazards cannot be safely remedied or mitigated" will result in huge amounts of subjectivity.	Revise Policy 4 to say "where the risk from natural hazards cannot be reduced to a level appropriate to the location and relevant user group" or words to a similar effect.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.15 Vehicles</b>		
<i>McPhail, Glen</i> 748/3	Support vehicles limited to formed tracks and no new track/roads be formed.	Retain policies	
<i>Southern Trail Blazers 4WD Club INC</i> 750/2	Support vehicles limited to formed tracks and no new track/roads be formed.	Retain policies	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/29	Support policies as written Promote e vehicles with the provision of charging stations.	Amend 1.3.15 policies to address the concerns raised	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.15 Vehicles Intro</b>		
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/25	Support the statement " Motor vehicles are limited to formed roads, including four-wheel drive roads.." as this by definition includes the use of existing roads /customary tracks.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.15 Vehicles Policy 1</b>		
<i>Radley, John</i> 47/4	Support the intention to liaise with user groups to identify opportunities to maintain roads, tracks and routes we are permitted to use.	Retain as written	
<i>Appleton, Dr Clive</i> 62/5	Support the liasion with vehicle user groups - also encourage DOC to promote TopoMap tracking apps by 4W drivers so they can trace their tracks back and make less tracks		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/26	Support liaising with the national body and local four wheel drive clubs. Most of the policies are reasonable and rely on dialogue with interested parties. Most clubs are willing to assist with track maintenance. Most are willing to apply for permission to enter an area, the drivers love these areas, so they are the eyes and ears for the Department who administer the park for public use.		
<b>Section:</b> 1.3.15 Vehicles Policy 7			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/87	Policy 7(f) needs tightening. Potential provision of facilities, especially in relation to overnight use and new opportunities vehicle use, is inappropriate for this national park setting. A strong precautionary approach is needed.	Amend Policy 7(f) to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/46	Policy 7 conflicts with Policy 1.3.13.1 There should be no new roads in the park. It also appears to promote the construction of huts associated with vehicle use. This is not supported.	Delete policy. If retained; Reword Policy 7 f) to not require overnight facilities.	
<b>Section:</b> 1.3.15 Vehicles Policy 8			
<i>Bruerton, Steve</i> 19/1	Support the retention of 4WD access up the Godley Valley to Separation Stream	Retain Policy 8 and Table 5: Pae Tawhiti Place	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/11	Support Canterbury Mountaineering Club's Submission advocating for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range (i.e. Cass Valley) and the Godley Valley to allow for 4WD access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. Would like to see these roads formally identified and maintained to provide safer access to and from these areas, as well as to reduce adverse impacts from vehicles in these areas. 4WD access is required in these areas to provide for access and for the NZDSA and the NZAC and other groups to administer their huts in these areas.	Provide for the existing use and access of the Liebig Range (i.e. Cass Valley) and the Godley Valley to allow for 4WD access along the established, unformed legal roads to these areas. Formally identify and maintain these roads.	
<b>Section:</b> 1.3.15 Vehicles Table 5			
<i>Marsden, Jason</i> 43/3	Pae Tawhiti Place: Support the continuation of 4WD access up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream. - well used by hunters and recreationists to access this area - gives persons with limited mobility and/or disabilities an opportunity to experience this magical place	Retain as written	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wilson, Wayne</i> 44/3	Support the continuation of 4WD access up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream. - well used by hunters and recreationists to access this area - gives persons with limited mobility and/or disabilities an opportunity to experience this magical place	Retain as written	
<i>McMillan, Ken</i> 45/3	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Houghton, Justin</i> 46/3	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Radley, John</i> 47/3	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Warner, James</i> 75/6	Support in part. Add provision for controlled 4wd access to be allowed on the TR of the Godley adjacent to Godley Peaks station.	Amend Table 5 to allow for provision of 4wd access on the TR of the Godley river.	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/10	Support and add provision for 4wd vehicle access on the western side of the Godley River. Godley Peaks Station has entered tenure review , so the public may gain 4wd access through this station - so 4wd access needs to be allowed for on the western side of the Godley.	Change Table 5 to allow for 4wd access on the western side of the Godley River.	
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/6	Support 4WD access to the Godley Valley, on an existing defined route to Separation stream and access to the true right of the Godley, including the NZ Deerstalkers' Association owned Eade Memorial Hut.	Retain access in Godley place as proposed in the plan.	
<i>Smith, Gert</i> 560/3	There should be more 4wd access routes in the park and looked after by DOC to assist hunters in controlling Tahr.		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/21	Tasman Lake Track - a possible misprint of the reference (see 1.2.16 policies 1-4)? No section exists in the draft Plan.	Check the reference within this table and cross reference with the appropriate section of the Plan.	
<i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/3	Vehicular access to the Godley Valley, on an existing defined route to Separation Stream is of particular importance to hunters. Access to the true right of the Godley, including the NZ Deerstalker's Association owned Eade Memorial hut is	Retain access to the Godley Valley both on an existing defined route to Separation Stream and to the true right of the Godley, including the NZ Deerstalker's Association owned Eade Memorial hut.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>also important. Ground hunting in this catchment, where there is little commercial hunting would be severely constrained if this access were lost. Strongly advocate for its retention as proposed in the draft NPMP.</p>		
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/60</p>	<p>TIA supports the inclusion of e-bikes and mountain bikes as a means of recreation in the Park. These are important and popular forms of recreation which enable a wide range of people to gain enjoyment from and establish connection with the Park. TIA believes they can be used on both designated and shared trails if well managed.</p>	<p>Retain Table 5 and Policies 8 and 9 as written</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.16 Watercraft</b>		
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/24</p>	<p>Adverse effects including cumulative effects from the use of watercraft are not identified. Adverse effects on freshwater species could arise from increased boat use including noise and disturbance of wildlife. This will be of particular relevance to braided river habitat.</p> <p>Forest &amp; Bird support the wording of 1.3.16, however more explanation needed to clarify how this policy applies to braided rivers, and especially braided rivers proposed for addition to the national park.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend the explanation and policies to address the concerns raised.</li> <li>2. Include a cross reference to 1.3.10 Guiding activities.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/30</p>	<p>Support policies as written</p>	<p>Retain policies as written</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.16 Watercraft Intro</b>		
<p><i>Morris, Colin J.</i> 528/3</p>	<p>I oppose the use of motorised water craft on all water bodies within Aoraki/ Mt Cook as it would affect the natural quietness that is one of the best features of the area. I am opposed to concessions being given for this activity and seek that any current concessions not be renewed.</p>	<p>Delete this from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/5</p>	<p>With the exception of the Tasman and Mueller terminal lakes, the use of jet boats inside the Park boundaries can only take place on the Tasman and Godley rivers. If these rivers and river beds are added to the park (1.3.2 Additions to NP) recognise the current use.</p>	<p>Suggest to amend introduction as follows: "Some recreational non-powered ... Mueller Lakes. Recreational use of independent powered watercraft occurs on the Tasman and Godley Rivers and may lead to a minor and transient effect on tranquillity in some places."</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.16 Watercraft Policy 1</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/47	The plan should not provide for watercraft to be carried in by aircraft unless for emergency purposes. Vessels are a vector for pests including microscopic spores etc	Reword Policy 1 to "Should allow non-powered watercraft in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park only where carriage of the watercraft to the location of use is on approved tracks."	
<b>Section: 1.3.16 Watercraft Policy 2</b>			
<i>Snoyink, Jules</i> 228/3	Support the prohibition of personal powered watercraft on the waters of AMCNP.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Miles, Clint</i> 571/5	Oppose the restrictions on boating. It has always been a NZ tradition. You are taking away the history of jet boating and people being able to enjoy themselves,	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/4	Delete this Policy as there is no justification (see points raised under 1.3.1. Policy 31 (bylaws) b) i),ii) and iii).	Delete Policy 2.	
<i>Air Safaris &amp; Services (NZ) Ltd</i> 703/2	Should allow independent powered personal watercraft in AMCNP.	Delete Policy 2	
<b>Section: 1.3.16 Watercraft Policy 3</b>			
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/4	Oppose policy as already have 30-yr concession to operate on Mueller Lake	Reword Policy 3 to include Tasman and Mueller Lakes	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/59	Clarification sought. There is a 30-year concession to operate on the Mueller Lake and Tasman lakes that we hold.	Amend Policy 3 to read "... Other than Tasman Lake and Mueller Lake."	
<b>Section: 1.3.16 Watercraft Policy 4</b>			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/60	Clarification sought. There is a 30-year concession to operate on the Mueller Lake and Tasman lakes that we hold.	Amend Policy 4 to add the following words: "... Providing these are not commercial enterprises which affect the natural quiet of the Mueller area."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/88	Should not allow for tourism in the guise of activities for cultural purposes	Reword Policy 4 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<b>Section: 1.3.17 Wild and game animals</b>			
<i>Warner, James</i> 75/7	Support in whole	Retain all	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/8	Wish to challenge the entire analysis of the Plan when considering Tahr.	Instead of a one size fits all policy with zero tahr everywhere, a policy based on identifying where it was deemed to have less than other areas would seem a more practical policy in terms of cost effectiveness and benefits (to all user groups).	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/6	Support pest eradication and total removal of tahr in AMCNP to preserve the Park's natural values. Support increased effort in weed and wilding pine control.	No commercial guiding operations to hunt tahr in National Parks are to be authorised. all tahr should be culled by professional hunters contracted to DOC.	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Assn, Nelson Branch</i> 306/6	Support buffer zones around huts and facilities excluding aerially assisted trophy hunting in their proximity	Amend plan to include buffer zones around huts and facilities excluding aerially assisted trophy hunting in their proximity	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/27	<p>1. Forest &amp; Bird do not consider the policy in 1.3.17 for wild and game animals appropriate in a national park plan. Wild animals must be managed in accordance with the NPAct and for Himalayan tahr in accordance with the Himalayan Thar Control Plan 1993.</p> <p>2. Strongly oppose the issuing of authorisations for aerially assisted trophy hunting in the national park. This is wholly inconsistent with the NPAct preservation purpose and the Himalayan Thar Control Plan.</p>	<p>Make the following amendments to address the issues raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adopt a more ambitious approach to pest control to complement Predator Free 2050</li> <li>2. Integrate animal and plant pest management by utilising CA section 17ZG provisions</li> <li>3. Reword 1.3.17 policies to be consistent with the NPA and with preservation of native species core to wild animal control</li> <li>4. No authorisations to be issued for aerially assisted trophy hunting in the Park</li> <li>5. Wild animal control by recreational hunters and commercial wild animal recovery is authorised for the purpose of wild animal control and pest management in accordance with the NPA section 4(2)(b).</li> </ol>	
<i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/5	<p>Presence of trophy bull tahr is the primary motivator for commercial and recreational hunters.</p> <p>The Department undertakes tahr culls to implement the provisions of the HTCP where commercial and recreational hunting do not provide sufficient control. It is important to continue to not target bulls during culls to maximise hunting sector control efforts and benefits e.g elimination of bull tahr would mean that AATH would not be taking the offset nanny tahr required by their concessions.</p>		
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/29	Support the complete elimination of tahr and other recreational hunting species from the park, or very large areas of it; these species thrive in adjacent areas. I say this as an occasional tahr hunter myself; I would like to see the area tahr free, yet routinely see large groups of	Plan should supersede 1993 tahr plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	tahr in areas as accessible as the Ball Shelter 4WD road – clearly the levels of this pest are unacceptably high. Suggest adopting an approach of extermination of tahr as for other pest species, or else embark on a publicly consulted but conservation and science-led revision and update of the now 26 year old Himalayan Tahr Control Plan.		
<i>The New Zealand Tahr Foundation Inc.</i> 819/2	Support the draft plan recognising the validity of hunting and making provision for it.	Retain text as written	
<i>The New Zealand Tahr Foundation Inc.</i> 819/4	Access provisions particularly aerial access are critical to enable hunting in difficult terrain etc. There are differential aerial access provisions to the Park for controlling tahr and these need to be resolved.	Resolve issues relating to aerial access in the Park for hunters.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/9	Support exterminating tahr within the Park, and actively controlling tahr adjoining the Park, as required in the Himalayan Tahr Control Plan 1993 and consistent with the National Parks Act's requirement to preserve the park's natural values. DOC hunters or professional hunters contracted to DOC should carry out the culling. We do not support recreational and commercial hunting in the Park. No commercial tourism guided hunting concessions to hunt tahr and other wild animals in the National Park should be authorised	Within the plan, require the Department, through its staff and contracted professional hunters, to remove all tahr and other wild animals from the park to preserve the Park's natural values. Remove reference to recreational and commercial hunting in the Park and commercial tourism guided hunting concessions.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/32	Policies 2 - 5: Support policies as written	Retain Policies 2 - 5 as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.17 Wild and game animals Intro</b>		
<i>Wood, Callum</i> 139/5	The heritage of this nation is intimately linked with hunting and fishing and should not be sidelined by policy that only considers the WAC Act.	Reword to recognise that the WAC Act is outdated, given that the GAC has been set up in 2013 to facilitate better management via other means. Reword to recognise that there doesn't have to be a zero tahr policy in the Park as that does not facilitate the benefits to user groups who hunt and whom can assist with control. Reword to acknowledge Tahr and management of them is area specific in the Plan.	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/8	1. Support the description of game and wild animal management. Should include the value of NZDA to DOC resources and as a long-term partner for management and contributor to DOC revenue and the local economy. 2. Hunters need unrestricted aircraft access wherever	Amend 1.3.17 to address the issues raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>they need to go to hunt game animals</p> <p>3. Include a 2-3km buffer zone around huts and lodges that excludes AATH activities to mitigate conflict with ground-based hunters and hut users</p> <p>4. Would like to see Himalayan Tahr granted the status of a herd of special interest, not eradication.</p>		
<i>Trotter, Morgan</i> 327/2	Recreational hunting within National Parks should be encouraged and recognised as an important form of animal control	Amend plan to state recreational hunting within National Parks should be encouraged and recognised as an important form of animal control	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/20	It is incorrectly stated that game animals in the Park are managed in accordance with the Game Animal Control Act 2013. The only wild animal management plan in the Park is the Thar Plan which was made in 1993 under the Wild Animal Control Act 1977. The GAC's only involvement in the Park has been very recent facilitation to revise tahr control measures.	Amend plan to address the concerns raised.	
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/1	<p>The statement "Game animals are managed in accordance with the Game Animal Council Act 2013" is somewhat misleading.</p> <p>The provisions relating to management of game animals only apply to herds of special interest. There are no herds of special interest, so the claim has no substance.</p>	Remove the identified statement	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/22	AMCNP must be managed to protect indigenous biota as far as possible. Wild animals are a severe threat to this and also encourage erosion in the very fragile alpine environment . A target of zero for thar is mentioned here (without much indication of how this might be achieved).	The Plan should provide aspirational limits for deer and chamois as transparently negotiated with the Game Animal Council.	
<i>The New Zealand Tahr Foundation Inc.</i> 819/1	Support the roles of recreational hunters in managing game animals in the Park outlined in the draft plan. Also support the potential for establishment of herds of special interest.	Retain text as written.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.17 Wild and game animals Policy 1</b>		
<i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/6	Recreational Hunters should enjoy the same aerial access as Wild Animal Recovery Operators Who can disturb the air with their noise for far longer than the simple dropping off a hunting party?	Relax the restrictions on aerial access for recreational hunters	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/77	TIA submits that the New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association is identified as a stakeholder in Section 1.3.17 Policies 1, 4 and 5.	Amend Policy 1 to include the NZ Professional Hunting Guides Association as a stakeholder.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society Inc - Nelson-Tasman Branch</i> 827/4	All wild animals within Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park should as far as possible be eliminated and this is the responsibility of DOC, not commercial and recreational hunting groups who will have a vested interest in retaining herds of tahr etc. Support controlling all new pest incursions to zero density.	Do not allow recreational and commercial hunting within the park.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/31	Develop a policy and action plan to achieve zero density wherever possible for Wild and Game animals	Reword Policy 1 to read: "1. Work with ... to facilitate the hunting of all wild and game animals to zero density in Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park ..."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.17 Wild and game animals Policy 2</b>		
<i>Turner, Patrick</i> 29/2	Ensure the Tahr Foundation and Game Animal Council are consulted and use their recommendations for the tahr control.	Amend Policy 2 to include Tahr Foundation and Game Animal Council	
<i>Clay, Lionel</i> 50/2	Fully support the target of a zero density tahr population and other introduced pests in this area		
<i>Garton, Simon</i> 162/2	Support the elimination of all pest species including Tahr.	The department to continue to kill all pest specimens as recreational hunters only shoot trophy males.	
<i>Snoyink, Jules</i> 228/5	Support managing tahr numbers in the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hall, Susan &amp; Dunn, Kevin</i> 517/4	We support DOC's Himalayan Tahr control plan to reach zero density in the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Backhouse, Luke</i> 559/2	Oppose the HTCP 1993 as it is not up to standard and should be changed.	Work with hunters to control the population better.	
<i>Smith, Gert</i> 560/2	The Himalayan Tahr Control Plan should be changed as the control plan is not up to standard. Work with hunters to control the population better.	Work with hunters to control the population better.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 637/6	Support the removal of Tahr by DOC and hunters contracted by DOC for pest eradication. Do not support authorising any commercial tourism guided hunting concessions in the park.	Amend plan to state no commercial tourism guided hunting concessions to hunt Tahr and other animals in the National Park should be authorised. Recreational and commercial hunting can occur outside the Park.	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/26	See submission under 1.2.1. Policy 9. Suggest adopting an approach of extermination of tahr as for other pest species, or else embark on a publicly consulted but conservation and science-led revision and update of the now 26 year old Himalayan Tahr Control Plan.	Plan should supersede 1993 tahr plan, Tahr to be eradicated.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Tahr Foundation Inc.</i> 819/3	Oppose eradication of tahr from the Park, suggest instead seeking a lowered population managed for hunting benefits. The Tahr Foundation offers to assist the Department to achieve this goal.	Manage tahr to a lowered population in the Park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.17 Wild and game animals Policy 3</b>		
<i>Turner, Patrick</i> 29/3	Remove the AATH from allowing access to the National Park	Remove AATH access from Policy 3(b)	
<i>Holer, Fred</i> 219/1	Regarding Policy 3 a) and 3 b) Strongly oppose the decision for authoring deer, chamois and tahr live capture or any aerial assisted trophy hunting.	Delete policy 1.3.17 3a and 3b and replace with: No deer, chamois or tahr live capturing allowed. No aerial assisted trophy hunting.	
<i>Hois, John</i> 227/1	Opposed to deer, chamois and tahr live capture and AATH	Reword policy 3 a) to exclude deer, chamois and tahr. Delete policy 3 b)	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/37	Policy 3(b) It is difficult to see how aerially assisted trophy hunting will materially contribute to the control of game animal populations.. The implication of this policy is that aerially assisted trophy hunting operations would not be subject to the same aircraft landing restrictions as other outdoor recreational activities in the Park.  Policy 3(b)(iii): Generally supportive of the management of game animals in the national park, however not clear how this policy will be applied. The current wording merely restates the department's statutory duties.	1. Delete clause 3(b)  2. Rewrite clause 3(b)(iii) clearly setting out the principles for managing aerially assisted game animal recovery.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/89	Policy 3(b) should not be in the Plan. The minimal positive effect of slightly reducing pest animal numbers does not outweigh the negative effects on other users and on other park values. FMC considers that aerially-assisted trophy hunting is not consonant with national park values.	Remove Policy 3(b) from the plan.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/12	Policies 3. b) aerial assisted trophy hunting Not supported. AATH is driven by tourist demand not animal control. On top of that it detracts from many other park values. All AATH must be banned in the park. This is a primarily commercial tourist activity and brings unwanted and unnecessary noise pollution to our national parks. It is also contrary to NZ hunting ethics.	Should specifically not grant authorisations for any aerially assisted trophy hunting anywhere in the National Park. Remove approvals for AATH in Mt Cook NP.	
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/7	I oppose concessions for the commercial hunting, trophy hunting and recovery of tahr and other wild animals, involving aircraft flights and landings within the	No specific decision sought.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	National Park. This activity should occur outside National Park boundaries.		
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/13	Policy 3 b) Aerially assisted trophy hunting encourages run-holders to deny public access to more and more remote areas (bordering the park) which would otherwise maintain higher conservation and cultural values. It also encourages the preservation of large numbers of animals in areas which are not hunted adequately to maintain low numbers. This provision also neglects to mention in the stipulations i), ii) and iii) that there are limits on where these helicopters can fly. i.e. Orange, Red and Green zones identified in Map 7. This also defies General Policy for National Parks 2005: 8.1(c) Planning and management for recreation and other opportunities for the benefit, use and enjoyment of each National Park should: i) preserve national park values, including natural quiet, as far as possible iv) maintain the distinctive character of recreation in New Zealand national parks, including the traditional New Zealand backcountry experience with its ethos of self-reliance.	Delete Policy 3 b)	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/10	The Himalayan Tahr Control Plan states that tahr will be controlled to zero density in national parks. Tahr should be removed by DOC and hunters contracted by DOC for pest eradication. This is essential to meet the requirements of the Tahr Control Plan and the National Parks Act. T here should be no commercial hunting concessions to hunt tahr and other animals in the National Park; recreational and commercial hunting can occur outside the Park.	DOC should cull tahr and other introduced animals in the national park, to preserve the park's natural values. DOC should be resourced to increase pest eradication and weed control generally in and around the National Park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.17 Wild and game animals Policy 4</b>		
<i>Holer, Fred</i> 219/2	Strongly oppose the decision for zero density tahr population.	Reword the policy to state: a population that the natural environment can support and that the tahr levels are accepted.	
<i>McClunie, Mike</i> 225/1	Regarding 4 a) Opposed to zero density as hunting is popular to New Zealanders.	Manage tahr to a level which benefits conservation and recreational and commercial hunting. More landing sites for recreational hunters. Help the GAC to set up funding for the herd, through licensing or similar.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Hois, John</i> 227/2	Opposed to zero density for tahr populations in the park.	Reword to state a population that the environment can support.	
<i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/2	Regarding 4 a) support the control of Tahr but not their extermination.	Tahr controlled in line with Tahr plan, but not to zero levels.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/61	Policy should include clauses to control where hunting occurs in relation to waterways	Amend Policy 4 by adding a new clause: "(c) At all times hunters are prohibited from shooting wild animals near waterways."	
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/4	Your undertaking to work with recreational hunters to manage tahr populations by the most appropriate means is appreciated, even though the zero density goal is not.	We look forward to ongoing consultation between the Conservation Minister, DOC and government representatives, the Game Animal Council and the Tahr Liaison Group to reach a conclusion acceptable to all, hopefully resulting in a review of the Himalayan Tahr Control Plan circa 2019.	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/11	Support this policy and [propose adding a further clause to encourage hunting of tahr.	Amend Policy 5 to add an additional clause 4(c) to read: "c) Encourage and support tahr hunting in AMCNP by consulting with hunting groups."	
<i>McCabe, Alister &amp; Haidee</i> 463/5	Oppose Policy 4. Additional wording to Policy 4: Obtain approval of a strategic management plan and annual operational plan, approved by the NZ Deer Stalkers or other appropriate hunting representative.	Delete Policy 4 a) and b).	
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/10	I support the control of wild animal species including the Himalayan Tahr by DOC and hunters contracted by DOC. I support the control of tahr at zero density in National Parks which is consistent with the National Parks Act, and the Tahr Control Plan.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/11	Do not support the provision of concessions for commercial tourism hunting within the park. Control of tahr should be conducted by DOC or hunters specifically contracted by DOC for that purpose.	Amend the plan to exclude commercial tourism hunting within the park.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/78	TIA submits that the New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association is identified as a stakeholder in Section 1.3.17 policies 1, 4 and 5.	Amend Policy 4 to include the NZ Professional Hunting Guides Association as a stakeholder.	
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/6	Regarding Policy 4 do not support any "watering down" of the stated legislation and management plan.	Provide the department with funding and structure to deliver on controlling tahr populations at zero density in the National Park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.17 Wild and game animals Policy 5</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/79	TIA submits that the New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association is identified as a stakeholder in Section 1.3.17 policies 1, 4 and 5.	Amend Policy 5 to include the NZ Professional Hunting Guides Association as a stakeholder.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/39	New Milestone 14 to address new natural hazards policy 1.3.1 Policy 12 (see sub point 25): The risk of a major earthquake in the national park is extremely high (Alpine Fault -30% chance in the next 50 years). The new milestone will implement the new natural hazard policy 1.3.1 Policy 12.	Add a new Milestone 14 to read: "Natural hazards 14. An emergency response plan to manage the immediate consequences of an earthquake on Mt Cook Village, park facilities and visitors to national park is in place (Year 1)." The plan will be revised upon completion of Project AF8.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/87	<p>General comments: NZAC considers the draft Plan does a good job discussing ecological monitoring for threatened nativespecies and pest species. The Club submits that the draft Plan requires additional detail on the specific monitoring of visitor management changes implemented in the draft Plan, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- how such monitoring will be made available to the public and</li> <li>- how the results of monitoring will trigger amendments to the draft Plan and</li> <li>- how the draft Plan has been informed by monitoring of the current Plan.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the milestones listed for each Place, NZAC considers a pop-out box is needed to discuss the approach taken to monitoring the draft Plan and provide context and the historical role of monitoring in Park planning. The mechanisms in the current Plan for using a public user group to review visitor satisfaction with expanding aircraft operations are commendable. Having no such mechanism in the draft Plan is a problem. Without a clear framework for measuring objectives, identifying changing needs and creating pathways for adjusting objectives means that the draft Plan is fragile and inflexible. The Club believes the Department needs to demonstrate how current monitoring has supported the need for the proposed changes to aircraft operations in the draft Plan, in particular justify the changes in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- aircraft access</li> <li>- visitor management of the front country,</li> <li>- surveys of visitor perceptions of crowding and conflict between user groups</li> </ul>	Amend the draft Plan to address the issues raised by the submitter.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- hut usage</li> <li>- aircraft operations at existing landing sites</li> <li>- visitor numbers along key tracks where trail counters placed.</li> </ul>		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/23	<p>These are exceedingly tepid with all of the 7 allocated to refuse/human waste removal and monitoring of aircraft activity/ tranquillity levels. Both important issues but they should be covered elsewhere.</p> <p>Some recreational outcomes are included by Place in Section 2 but a far-sighted, ambitious overview is required here that supports the touted 'integrated management'. This section betrays a lack of interest and foresight in recreational goals from the team that prepared the draft Plan.</p>	<p>There must be some milestones here for projects that improve and diversify recreational opportunities in AMCNP . These are sorely needed to cope with the tourist influx and to counteract the over-reliance on aircraft . More tracks for day walks. More mountain bike trails. One or two more huts that can take the pressure off Mueller Hut for overnight trips. Hooker Hut is mentioned elsewhere . Why not here? Timelines for improvements or replacements for the high alpine huts. Further bridges (3-4 wire) and innovations e.g. via ferrata for moraine walls, to overcome impediments to valley travel from glacial recession.</p>	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/33	Support all Milestones as written	Retain Milestones as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 4</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/90	<p>Milestone 4 should be rewritten as the Tranquillity tool is incomplete, and incompatible with the present visitor management zoning.</p> <p>Milestone should concern the review and monitoring of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- interim continuation of the present plan's aircraft activity provisions; and</li> <li>- provision for some additional; landings where recreational access has become genuinely difficult and cable or walkwire access is unfeasible; and</li> <li>- the general down-scaling of aircraft activity in the Park ; and</li> <li>- the effectiveness of Tranquillity mechanisms implemented by operators, both compulsorily and voluntarily.</li> </ul>	Amend Milestone 4 to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/23	<p>Does this mean it will be 4 years before this is done, and then repeated at year 8?</p> <p>As mentioned should be talking about 'noise', not 'tranquility'.</p> <p>DOC needs to show leadership in the management of noise throughout the park (and all national parks).</p> <p>Could self contained audio monitors be placed around the park? The real-time monitoring could be correlated with the aircraft movement based on GPS readings.</p> <p>Again, there is smart technology out there and smart</p>	<p>Reword : Add an Appendix stating how the noise levels will be monitored and what changes could be made to gain compliance, or reduce the noise footprint.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	people to create a real-time map of noise footprints.		
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/15	Agrees that it is appropriate for the Plan to include a milestone specifying a formal review of the tranquillity settings based on the outcome of visitor monitoring at AMCNP. However, Milestone 4 only refers to potential changes to aircraft landings, when it seems plausible that visitor experience monitoring could also indicate changes to the tranquillity settings, and this should be acknowledged in the Plan. The clause "as necessary" is also ambiguous.	Retain the milestone, but edit to read: "...and implemented any changes to aircraft landings, or tranquillity settings, as indicated by (or in alignment with) the data"	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/18	Agree that it is appropriate for the Plan to include a milestone specifying a formal review of the tranquillity settings based on the outcome of visitor monitoring at AMCNP. However, Milestone 4 only refers to potential changes to aircraft landings, when it seems plausible that visitor experience monitoring could also indicate changes to the tranquillity settings, and this should be acknowledged in the Plan. The clause "as necessary" is also ambiguous.	Retain the milestone, but edit to read: "... and implemented any changes to aircraft landings, or tranquillity settings, as indicated by (or in alignment with) the data"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 6</b>		
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/22	Milestones are vague; how can you measure success ( e.g. 6. Reported on success of the pack-out of refuse and human waste and level of compliance with the bylaw (Year 6, 8 and 10 ) when you haven't defined a target. There is absolutely no point in including milestones unless they are objective and measurable, and then measured..	Reword : It would be good to indicate how each of these milestones will be measured. Again, (Ad nauseam) you cannot deem any milestone a success without measures. Clarify : Does it mean that DOC will measure human waste from all of MCNP and use this as the benchmark?	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 7</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/38	With increasing numbers of tourists and more commercial operations, regular monitoring of all concessions is required to ensure that the management plan outcomes and policies are being met. Without good data the department will have little or no information to judge whether the plan outcomes are being met and effectiveness of the plan policies.	Amend Milestone 7 to read: "7. Monitored the level of use and effects of aircraft activity and concessions, including the effects ..."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/91	Milestone 7 should be rewritten as the Tranquillity tool is incomplete, and incompatible with the present visitor management zoning. Milestone should concern the review and monitoring of - interim continuation of the present plan's aircraft activity provisions; and	Amend Milestone 7 to reflect the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provision for some additional; landings where recreational access has become genuinely difficult and cable or walkwire access is unfeasible; and</li> <li>- the general down-scaling of aircraft activity in the Park ; and</li> <li>- the effectiveness of Tranquillity mechanisms implemented by operators, both compulsorily and voluntarily.</li> </ul>		
<i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/7	No mention of whether non-aircraft users in the park will be included.	Decision not stated	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/42	TIA submits that section 1.3.18 Milestone 7 include the review of allocated aircraft activity in light of monitoring results and note the potential to increase landings if effects are lower than the aims of the place. The Milestone should also include consulting on monitoring results with TIA and aircraft user groups.	Amend Milestone 7 to include the issues raised by the submitter	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/30	This milestone means nothing. How will monitoring be undertaken? How can park users report their experience? What if tranquillity levels aren't being met?	Revise Milestone 7 to reflect questions raised in submission.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 8</b>		
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/18	<p>Milestone 8 states: "Formal authorisations for existing club lodges located in the Park have been put in place (Year 3)." The Plan does not make it clear what formal authorisations are or what they entail.</p> <p>The current plan contemplates a concession being required for club lodges, and it is not clear if DOC is seeking through the Draft Plan to invoke this as a requirement. We note that Wyn Irwin has been in its current place for 60 years and has not changed In footprint or design in that time. Use of the lodge has remained largely constant throughout its existence. While we accept that DOC will from time to time review its concession arrangements, the CMC would oppose any concession requirements for Wyn Irwin Lodge. Imposing concessions for the use and maintenance of Wyn Irwin lodge would likely create a financial burden that the CMC would oppose.</p>	<p>Clarify what 'formal authorisations' entails and make this clear in the Plan.</p> <p>Do not impose any concession requirements for Wyn Irwin Lodge.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 10</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/71	Timelines to achievement should be shorter than proposed.	Amend Milestone 10 to reflect concern raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 11</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/72	Timelines to achievement should be shorter than proposed.	Amend Milestone 11 to reflect concern raised	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/92	milestone 11 should have an earlier completion date.	Amend Milestone 11 to review the completion date as requested.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/27	a) "stop or close the unformed roads". Strongly disagree as this is not in the spirit of 1.2.4 which speaks of community involvement as it will make community work in removing pest plant and animal difficult or impossible. It will not happen up the Godley if community members can not have vehicle access. It will deny bird watchers, photographers, family groups, hunters, climbers, trampers and others who just like to be out there.	Keep unformed roads open.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 12</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/73	Timelines to achievement should be shorter than proposed.	Amend Milestone 12 to reflect concerns raised	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>1.3.18 Milestones whole of park Milestone 13</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/74	Timelines to achievement should be shorter than proposed.	Amend Milestone 13 to reflect concerns raised	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/93	Milestone 13 needs a completion date which should be earlier than five years away..	Amend Milestone 13 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Part Two</b>		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/8	AMCNP does not generally lend itself to the DOC concept of place. The Park must be considered as a whole. Place may be useful for some specific management purposes. Section 2 should concentrate on the management priorities and milestones for each Place based on current practical needs and future vision. Most of the historical and other background information	Section 2 should concentrate on the management priorities and milestones for each Place based on current practical needs and future vision. Most of the historical and other background information should be moved to the Section 1 overview .	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	should be moved to the Section 1 overview .		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/32	Aircraft access issues: Aircraft access needs to be reviewed in all places in context with the entire park.	Review aircraft access in all places.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Part Two Intro</b>		
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/24	It is appropriate, perhaps to separate the village from the other areas. This is where tourists enter the park. The main problem being creating parking and accommodation. The other places have issues with human waste and noise.	Reword : The Mount Cook National Park is one place; not five.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/24	The geographic Places are largely artificial management constructs. The introductory Recreation sub-sections are incomplete in their summaries of the wide range of opportunities in each Place. Particularly lacking is the high peak climbing which could be summarised via the huts in each Place. These are each strategically placed as a base for particular climbing routes. Reference should be given to the NZAC Aoraki Tai Poutini mountaineering guide book by Rob Frost (NZAC, 4th edition, 2018) . As well as Copland Pass, there are other challenging tramping routes over alpine passes e.g. Barron Saddle to Landsborough Valley. The Historical contexts are also lacking, particularly for recreation, and often artificial in the separation into Places.	This recreation and historical information should be put in Section 1 as expanded and more comprehensive overviews.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place</b>		
<i>Lubas, Paul and Stevenson, Heather</i> 141/3	Various improvements to the village: DOC visitor centre needs to open for longer should be 8am-8pm (currently in summer it is 8.30-5pm many visitors arrive late afternoon when it is closed), signage throughout the village needs to be improved, a town map similar to the one at White Horse Hill Campsite, more restaurants and cafes, more car parks needed in the village, more accommodation for workers in the village, showers installed at White Horse campground.	Amend plan as in submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Welch, Anna</i> 237/2	There must be an exemption to allow New Zealand residents regular access to this recreational area for the purposes of both day and overnight trips.	Add a milestone regarding vehicle access to the Park stating explicit reference to exploring exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership.	
<i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/3	Tahr Lodge - Support the retention of this hut/ lodge by South Canterbury Branch NZDA It is well used and maintained, is available to be booked. By the length of time it has been present it must be considered historical if the department is consistent with other structures.	Retain hut as is.	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/3	Club lodges pg 91: Wyn Irwin lodge. Support submissions made by Canterbury Mountaineering Club (submitter 602)	Retain Wyn Irwin lodge in its current location, form and management. Remove incorrect statements regarding the siting of Wynn Irwin Lodge (identified by submitter 602)	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/6	It remains unclear where DOC actually stands on the issue of development in the park village: - page 97 states "there is a preference for no further development of facilities within the front country - page 100 states " there is a limited number of vacant sites available for new development in the commercial, visitor accommodation and residential zones within the Village - page 103 states "The Village zoning plan provides for limited future development"	Amend the plan to address the concerns raised	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/94	A crucial feature of Nohoaka Place is the visitor centre, whose design and displays represent national park values and the values of the Park well. The plan should provide for a continuation of this focus on conservation education and advocacy.	Review 2.1 Nohoaka Place to provide for the concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/107	Policies 17 - 33 should plan for no further development in the village, except for supporting the village's general coherence and natural values conservation.	Review Policies 17-33 to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/108	Policies -General: Policies should recognise the Place's historic sites and plan for their appropriate management. Include a milestone to ensure work is achieved in the short term.	Review the Nohoaka Place policies to address the concerns raised. Include a milestone to achieve the management of historic sites in the short term.	
<i>Inglis, Mark (MiddlePeak Ltd)</i> 601/3	Support workable and attractive inclusion for visitor requiring fully accessible access. Needs to be done in consultation with competent agencies - needs more than	Investigate options for better access for mobility impaired visitors.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	just a wheelchair ramp and a disabled car park.		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/25	Milestones General: This section concentrates on the issues relating to managing the Village and associated infrastructure to cope with increasing visitor numbers. This is important and the coverage of these issues and the level of detail seem appropriate, although the presumption that more tourists is better is questioned.	Refer to specific requests	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/28	New Recreation Milestones needed. Even in the restricted semi-urban Nohoaka Place there needs to be careful consideration of all recreational opportunities. Some of these may not directly involve moving in the out doors. Short-term visitors, especially in bad weather, would benefit from enhanced Visitor Centre experiences such as informative displays, videos, viewing platforms etc. Foot- and cycle-traffic in and around the village needs careful planning with tasteful implementation/improvement of a network of paths that link to the other Places.	More recreation milestones needed to address all recreational opportunities.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/35	Support the policy of focussing on the areas that are already compromised - highly modified. Specific focus on any short-term development being focussed only within the Amenities area. Preference is for any future long-term development to be outside the Park in a special area - "Park Entrance" development at Birch Hill.	Retain the objectives and policies	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/43	Policies and Milestones (pages 104 - 112): Support policies and milestones	Retain objectives, policies and milestones as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Intro</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/62	Should include reference to the Waitaha Nation who were also food hunters and gatherers in the wider environment. Aoraki Mount Cook Village has become home to a small number who permanently live there and have made it their home. This should be acknowledged in this paragraph.	Amend the Introduction to include the matters raised.	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/19	The Draft Plan states that "Unlimited aircraft landings occur in this Place at the Village helipad for Departmental management purposes and at Aoraki/Mount Cook Airport. What is not clear is	The Plan ought to clarify whether or not the unlimited landings at this Place is part of the anticipated future for this Place.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	whether this is a statement about current or future/anticipated practice		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Description and values</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/63	Cultural values: Support and respect the way Manaakitaka and ahi ka are described. Kāi Tahu inspired urban design and landscape elements on Kāi Tahu buildings and areas around them sounds very appropriate for Kāi Tahu buildings, but environment is also spiritual to mountaineers, guides and their families and alpine design is also appropriate in this region and should be included. Sadly this is brushed over in the current plan as though of no consequence. This village should be acknowledged as both an amenities area and a destination for those who simply want to be in the space of these spiritual mountains.	Include the following matters within the description of Cultural values: 1. Include alpine design as well, appropriate to the NZ alpine region of Aoraki/Mount Cook NP 2. Delete the requirement that all buildings are required to have a Kāi Tahu design. Alpine architecture should also be reflected in the design for alpine buildings of this culture 3. Include those people who do come to the village as a destination as many do not have the ability to access the back country as they once used to.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/64	Historic values: There are additional historic buildings not named here, including: Mt Cook Station homestead buildings Copland Shelter Haast Hut Malte Brun hut site Old Ball hut site Alpine Memorial John Brown's headstone and grave Unwin Hut Wyn Urwin Hut Tahr Lodge	Amend the Historic values section to include the historic places listed above if not already included elsewhere.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/26	Recreation values, para 7 "Camping ...": Support plan trying to address some of the problems associated with freedom camping	Retain this paragraph.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/18	Support the sentence under Recreation Values stating "Nohoaka Place Camping is also enabled under the Mount Cook National Park Bylaws 1981 within the wider Park, except within 200 m of a formed road, and 100 m radius of a hut". Good to see the Plan trying to address some of the problems to do with freedom camping.	Retain this statement.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/22	Support the statement "Camping is also enabled under the Mount Cook National Park Bylaws 1981 within the wider Park except within 200 m of a formed road, and	Retain this statement.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	100 m radius of a hut."		
<i>Rogers, Ian</i> 276/4	Natural Values - Dispute that the Mt Cook Buttercup is threatened, I see this species over a large territory.	Change this wording.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/19	<p>Page 91 (Club Lodges). This section from the Plan makes a number of baseless and incorrect assumptions regarding Wyn Irwin Lodge. To be clear, Wyn Irwin is sited in an ideal location for the purpose of the lodge. It provides easy access to the Hooker and Mueller areas, while being located in area that has high tranquillity away from the highly developed area of the village. This provides additional incentive for members to use the lodge. Contrary to the description from Page 91 of the Plan, Page 102 of the Plan contains a correct assessment that Wyn Irwin Lodge is well sited, stating: "Unwin, Wyn Irwin and Tahr Lodges are well sited to be used and valued by club members and the public year round".</p> <p>Furthermore, the location of the lodge was selected by the Park board and Park Ranger (Mick Bowie) as being a suitable site for the lodge for its purpose (mountaineering, climbing, backcountry walking etc) and also because the site faces north and receives adequate year-round sun, while being protected from southerly weather by Foliage Hill.</p> <p>Wyn Irwin Lodge is fully self-contained with an operational sewerage system (septic tank), is fully insulated and double glazed and has a self-contained solar power energy system providing off-grid electricity to the lodge. In addition to this, Wyn Irwin provides a year-round base for a full-time warden. The current warden has lived at the lodge for a number of years and can attest to the year-round comfort that the lodge provides.</p> <p>In recent years, an increase in tourist numbers has given rise to parking issues as a result of inadequate delineation of different Whitehorse Hill user groups. Some of the suggestions (i.e. Discussion Box "Village and front country spatial plan, White Horse Hill Campground, v.) will help to resolve these issues in</p>	<p>Reword the statement under "Club lodges" on page 9, following the first sentence, to say: "Booking of accommodation at the Lodges is possible. Clubs are expected to make full use of their existing lodges as a base for club activities. Where this is not the case - where facilities are not being regularly used through the year, or where the use is substantially for non-club activities or for the original purpose of the lodge - then the continued presence/location of the lodge should be reviewed.</p> <p>Club lodges used for accommodation purposes now require authorisation from the Minister to ensure that the lodges and their activities are managed consistently with their purpose and with other structures in the Park.</p> <p>An investigation of future management options for these all lodges in the Park would focus on providing year-round comfortable accommodation and the services required to achieve their required purpose within the Park.</p> <p>The CMC would support formal authorisation from the Minister for continued use of Wyn Irwin Lodge at its current site in perpetuity.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>particular having separate parking for Wyn Irwin Lodge users, in conjunction with adequate signage delineating parking for camp ground users, day visitors and club lodge users.</p> <p>The location of Wyn Irwin and the regular maintenance of Wyn Irwin Lodge by the CMC has resulted in a lodge that provides comfortable year-round accommodation and a climbing base for its members and non-members using the lodge for mountaineering, climbing, outdoor education and backcountry walking purposes.</p> <p>The CMC would support formal authorisation from the Minister for continued use of Wyn Irwin Lodge at its current site in perpetuity.</p>		
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/16	Under recreation values is stated that "Unlimited aircraft landings occur in this Place at the Village helipad for Departmental management purposes and at Aoraki/Mount Cook Airport." What is not clear is whether this is a statement about current or future / anticipated practice	The Plan ought to clarify whether or not the unlimited landings at this Place is part of the anticipated future for this Place.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/24	Submits that it would be appropriate to include a description or list of the various recreational pursuits available in this place. This would include, but not be limited to, Walking, Rock Climbing, Bouldering, bird-watching and photography.	Support with revision	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/25	Recreational values: It is good to see the Plan trying to address some of the problems associated with freedom camping and "freeloading" (ie. camping near a hut to use the facilities, but not paying any hut fees)	Retain as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Management considerations - intro</b>		
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/8	Oppose as doesn't identify access as a key management consideration	Amend to identify accessibility as a management consideration	
<i>Paardekooper, Luke</i> 22/7	Accommodation: People pay a good fee to camp in the Park Bed tax on village accommodation	No specific decision specified	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/6	Do not support the approach to management of club lodges. Under no circumstances should these club lodges be removed or expected to cater for the public. The plan is incorrect with the statements about the lodges being poorly maintained, with problematic sewerage and water, are difficult to keep warm and that they are underused by members.	Delete "Pulic can book accommodation only when they are not otherwise being used". Delete the paragraph starting with "The current location of the Tahr and Wyn Irwin lodges". Reword the paragraph "an investigation of future management options" to read "The club lodges should continue to be managed by the clubs themselves, to provide year round comfortable accommodation and required services within the Park to members."	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/6	In general, MDC supports this approach to Village growth, especially given the natural hazards Aoraki Village is subject to. Council supports the development of visitor services and facilities in existing townships such as Tekapo and Twizel. However, the wording "would occur" implies a degree of certainty which is misleading, when it is likely that such services and facilities will require a resource consent under the Operative Mackenzie District Plan 2004.	Amend the wording from "would occur outside the Park" to "may occur outside the Park, subject to resource consent from Mackenzie District Council."	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/7	While MDC supports the provision of a public transport/ Park and Ride service and facility as a general concept, Council queries the transparency of the process and assessment that has been undertaken to identify the most appropriate site for this activity. MDC argues that the provision of a large parking area and location of multiple structures should occur in a location which is already partially changed by human development, and/or which has a lesser degree of landscape values, as identified by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect.	Delete "from the Park entrance at Birch Hill", and amend from "outside the Birch Hill entrance" to "in the most appropriate location".	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/8	Regarding Nohoaka Place Spatial Plan, Point 5 MDC particularly supports this point. There are some potential "win-win" outcomes if the DOC and MDC are able to work together.	Retain text as written.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/65	The Department must represent all New Zealanders. The incorporation of Kāi Tahu values is entirely appropriate for Kāi Tahu buildings. The incorporation of alpine cultural values in design is also appropriate for cultural values of guides, mountaineers and their whānau and should be appropriate in buildings that reflect these values too.	Amend section to include alpine cultural values in design.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/66	Roads and Road ends: It is entirely unworkable to stop visitors to the Park	Amend this section to reflect the decision sought to the Park and Ride discussion	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
254/66	22km return from the amenities area in peak season (see submission points raised in relation to the Park and Ride Discussion Box, p.94)		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/67	Roads and Road ends: Establishing cycleways within roading corridors is a nice idea but impractical as a "safe alternative form of access ..." in an alpine environment. The weather is inclement and changes rapidly. This is not an urban environment. You can build these cycleways but they will be very rarely used in the way the plan envisages. A NZ family will want to take their car to the start of a track and they should have every right to do so.	Amend paragraph 8 starting "Establishing cycleways ..." by adding: "where appropriate, but this is not considered as a viable alternative to motor transport due to the changeable weather conditions."	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/68	Club lodges: It is disingenuous to infer that club lodges are not used much in winter months. It's not the department's concern if these lodges are difficult to keep warm in winter. It appears DOC is trying to get rid of these historic buildings, which is not appropriate as these huts were here before DOC or the NP.	1. Delete reference to "review" of lodges in first paragraph, and replace with "Protect historic nature of the club lodges in this area." 2. Delete last paragraph beginning "an investigation ..." and replace with: "DOC requires huts in this area to be in a tidy condition on the exterior."	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/69	Nohoaka Place spatial plan: Further clarification required for the review of the zones within the village. Those with authorisations and concessions should be confident there will be no change in their zoning. A one-way system to manage vehicle traffic in the village won't work for a number of reasons, including that it is not necessary, the current system of two alternative routes eases congestion, and for a small village area it would be unsafe, particularly for overseas visitors. There is no mention of the historic culture of mountain guiding and climbing in the context of the wider Te Manahuna/Mackenzie area. Limiting further development of services within the Park where these can be located outside the Park may be impractical for concessionaires who requires staff accommodation in the village. Considerations such as travel requirements for staff on split shifts, need to be taken into account by the Department.	1. Amend "1. Improving the quality of experience at the Village", first bullet point, by adding: "... in alignment with already existing concessions." 2. Delete 2. Traffic management within the Village, 3rd bullet point "Creating a one-way system for vehicle traffic" and add: "If necessary, create a car park at the south side entrance to the village at the end of SH80 for overflow vehicles in summer months in lieu of a "park and ride". 3. Amend "5. Managing the Village and front country in the context of the wider Te Manahuna/Mackenzie area", 3rd bullet, by adding "Highlight also the historic culture of mountain guiding and climbing of New Zealand that was born in this area of the High Alps of New Zealand." 4. Amend 5. Managing the Village, 1st bullet point to include "... Where practical and in liaison with concessionaires and holders of authorisations."	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/5	Club lodges: Thar Lodge has been recently upgraded to provide a year-round base to enable engagement with the environment. It is warm, well maintained and has a full	1. Amend the text under "Club lodges" to address the issues raised and remove any information errors. 2. Recognise the historic value of the Thar and Wynn Irwin Lodges in the plan	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>range of facilities. It holds great cultural and historic significance, and is valued by the NZDA (and the SCNZDA - South Canterbury Branch) and is part of the history of Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park. The hut is available to, and well used, by the public via a booking system which is essential to regulate numbers using the hut at any time. The Lodge contribute to providing a range of accommodation options within the Park We refute the statements made in the paragraph starting "Current location of ..." relating to the location and facilities of the lodges. These are poorly informed and incorrect. The reference to parking tensions has been largely mitigated by the placing of a sign at the access to the lodges. We support the statement in Discussion Box 3. White Horse Hill campground, p.96 to maintain the club lodges parking area separate from the main campground car park.</p>	<p>3. Consider the granting of a permit / Certificate of Title in perpetuity for Thar Lodge to the SCNZDA.</p>	
<p><i>Winkler, Prof. Dr. Stefan</i> 329/3</p>	<p>Strongly oppose any attempt to close SH80 past the Birch Hill NP entrance for individual access. Key reasons for opposition include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- impacts on individuals' ability to access the Park outside "open hours"</li> <li>- requirement to work to schedules for shuttle services</li> <li>- potential safety concerns as people speed on SH80 or rush along tracks, and take shortcuts to meet bus schedule times.</li> <li>- loss of freedom to stop and admire landscape along roads within the Park</li> <li>- potential imposition of a charge for the service</li> <li>- the policies and strategies outlined in the plan will create huge disadvantages to individual tourists, and especially to the 'ordinary Kiwi'.</li> <li>- inhibit ability to conduct future research and fieldwork if vehicle access restricted.</li> <li>- additional financial expenses or logistical restrictions prohibiting efficient performance of research and educational opportunities.</li> </ul> <p>Consider the following as alternatives to the Park and Ride proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- relocating the existing White Horse Hill campground</li> </ul>	<p>Amend section 2.1.2 to address the concerns raised by the submitter.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>(rather than the day car park facilities) to a more suitable site where facilities can be provided and waste management efficiently done</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- close White Horse Hill car park for overnight parking</li> <li>- create parallel lay-by spaces along existing Hooker valley access road to use as overflow parking</li> </ul>		
<p><i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/7</p>	<p>Management of "private lodges": It is unclear where DOC actually stands on the issue of development and the place of the lodges in the Park. Part 2 of the Plan conveys the clear impression that there is a shortage of budget public accommodation in the Village and DOC sees more public use of the lodges as part of the solution. Tahr Lodge is already available to the public, but encouraging hunters and non-hunters to share accommodation does not seem to be compatible with what the plan calls the key issue of "continuing to provide a high quality experience for rapidly increasing numbers of people." (p.89). A more harmonious solution might be to encourage more public use of an expanded and better managed campground. Disagree with assessment of lodges facilities on page 91 - consider that they are perfectly adequate, and not as described.</p>	<p>Amend plan to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/2</p>	<p>Club Lodges should be retained and priority given to its members or non-members using them for their original intended use.</p>	<p>The historical significance of the club lodges needs to be recognised and they should be allowed to operate as they have in the pas provided buildings to not become run down.</p>	
<p><i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/13</p>	<p>‘A main purpose of roads is to provide an experience rather than just a route to a destination’ That is disingenuous. For many active park users it is a route to a destination to start an adventure rather than an experience to protect. The park is weighting one experience over others, supporting visitors with minimal park engagement over those actively engaged. This primarily discriminates against local New Zealanders. Reconsider the whole park and ride proposal. It is not necessary and the park should provide other carparks for peak periods on what is introduced grassland. At the very least, allowance needs to be made for New Zealanders who live in the region to make impromptu visits as they have always done and is part of local outdoor culture, to access local roadends and leave vehicles for a few days without any significant charge.</p>	<p>Reconsider the whole park and ride proposal. It is not necessary and the park should provide other carparks for peak periods on what is introduced grassland. At the very least, allowance needs to be made for New Zealanders who live in the region to make impromptu visits as they have always done and is part of local outdoor culture, to access local roadends and leave vehicles for a few days without any significant charge.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/14	An investigation of future management should focus on supporting locals in their own park, and help facilitate their continued occupation given their long involvement with the park and their ongoing contribution of many of their members to the park. Year round comfortable accommodation is theirs to decide, not the park.	An investigation of future management options would focus on ways to support the clubs to continue to provide accommodation for their members and friends.	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/8	<p>Club lodges: These provisions are most regrettable. The Draft is here apparently being used as a means to ease these clubs out of the park Draft. That is not acceptable. Even a cursory reading confirms that DOC has not taken the opportunity to transparently and honestly state any concerns to these clubs. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Draft's assertion that provision of water and sewerage facilities to the Wyn Irwin and Thar Lodges on account of remoteness does not stand serious scrutiny. Services are, or can easily be, linked to White Horse Hill campground services. Their demands must represent a mere fractional addition to those services. If this is an issue, it is DOC's job</li> <li>- Secondly, the issue of occupancy rate is raised. Whereas in places the Draft contains an assertion (without data) of low winter usage due to site conditions (p91), elsewhere (p102) the Draft refers to good siting for year-round use. If DOC has a concern as to the occupancy rates, then, in consultation with the clubs concerned, it should seek clarity from the Minister as to her expectations on the matter.</li> <li>- Thirdly, it is difficult to see how the warmth of lodges, a further concern recorded in the Draft, is any concern of DOC's. Its presence does nothing but to cast the provisions as an indirect and dishonest expression of discomfort with the lodges.</li> <li>- Finally, it is most jarring that whereas elsewhere the plan is directed at celebrating the history of the park, in relation to these lodges and the clubs associated, it is silent. The past century's history at the Park has been contributed to richly by members of both clubs, and is physically manifested among other things in the lodges.</li> </ul>	At minimum, amend the Draft such that current concerns with club facilities are coherently and clearly recorded, and historical contributions of the clubs recognised.	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Society</i> 493/11	Nohoaka Place spatial plan Support for "Recognising the status of this area as part of the Te Wahipounamu South West New Zealand World Heritage Area, and as part of the Aoraki		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
493/11	Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve"		
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/13	Club lodges This passage contains a number of references to Tahr Lodge and Wyn Irwin Lodge. Wyn Irwin lodge is occupied year-round by a warden, and is fully double glazed, heated, and equipped with solar electricity. It operates on a fully-self contained waste system. Any suggestion that this hut is too cold, too encumbered by maintenance, or under-utilised is wholly without basis. Note that Foliage Hill is located to the south of Wyn Irwin and does not reduce direct sunlight in winter time. There are difficulties with parking due to tourist overcrowding at White Horse, however this should be regarded as an individual issue and not a negative point of the continued presence of lodges in this area. The subtext of the passage is that these lodges are under-utilised and ill-placed and therefore should be removed. This outcome would allow easier implementation of other proposed changes in the Management Plan such as a park and ride service, a campground concession and parking restrictions. It does not recognise the recreation or heritage values of these lodges and further alienates the 'Backcountry' 'Remote' and 'Wilderness' users.	Delete these lines in section 2.1.2 under club lodges: - "Public can book..being used." -"The current location of the Tahr..significant portion." -"Being sited adjacent..using the area"	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/52	Club lodges: Unwin Lodge was sited in its current location after much negotiation within the Club, the Lands & Survey Department and then with the Conservation Board. The lodge is well sited with substantial upgrade work completed in 2011. The lodge provides accommodation for members, school groups, and groups undertaking recreation and conservation activities. Thar and Wyn Irwin Lodges - the statements here contradict later statements in Nohoaka Place Outcomes on page 102. The statements on page 102 are correct.	1. Re-word the text in Management considerations, Club lodges to read: "These are managed differently ... priority use of them. Booking of accommodation at the Lodges is possible when they are not otherwise being used. Clubs are expected to make full use ... or where the use is substantially for non-club activities, or for the original purpose of the lodge - then the continued presence/location of the lodge should be reviewed.  2. Change the wording on page 91 to be consistent with that on page 102.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/23	Generally agrees with the statements made around management considerations of this Place. But have made specific comments relating to objectives, policies and milestones to do with this Place.	Consider the alternative management tools proposed by AMCAVL. Where a possible alternative is identified as management consideration, please approach AMCAVL for further detail.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/28	Considers a one way vehicle system within the Village would not alleviate any vehicle management issues. It may deliver more issues as often overseas drivers are unaware of the New Zealand road rules, including which	When developing a Traffic Management Plan for the Village and front country roads, keep the status quo regarding the direction of traffic within the Village setting.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>side of the road to travel. A one way system would not service all aspects of the Village and may end up being more confusing.</p> <p>Car parking capacity in the Village and at Whitehorse Hill Campground must be addressed. Suggestions are made in the following sections of this submission.</p>		
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/7</p>	<p>Roads and Road ends: The draft plan acknowledges that amendments to the CMS will be required before specific provisions relating to proposals to develop visitor facilities at the entrance to the Park at Birch Hill can be made operative. There is a hierarchy in the national park planning management regime that sets out the framework to ensure that new developments are given appropriate assessment of effects on national park values. To undertake a plan review and propose significant changes without reviewing the CMS at the same time is not consistent with the hierarchy.</p>	<p>Undertake the correct process by amending the CMS, any necessary bylaws and the national park plan concurrently</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/34</p>	<p>1. Village management considerations: Mount Cook Village is exactly that, a Village. People live and have their homes in this place. It is important that the Village retains its community heart and does not become solely an amenity area for the Park.</p> <p>2. Nohoaka Place spatial plan: TIA supports the Plan's use of a spatial plan to assist with understanding and managing the future use of the Village and front country areas in the Park. We also support that the management of the Village has regard for the context of the wider Te Manahuna/Mackenzie area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TIA submits that Village planning and development must have regard for the sustainability of existing businesses, and for supporting appropriate private sector investment, particularly in accommodation offerings.</li> <li>- TIA submits that concessionaries and businesses be specifically included in Village planning and development consultation processes and that a tourism business representative is included in the Design Assessment Panel.</li> <li>- TIA submits that the Village development and planning processes give high priority to supporting the residential community.</li> <li>- TIA submits that any changes involving negative</li> </ul>	<p>Ensure that the concerns raised above for the future development of the village are taken into consideration Retain the issues as identified for the spatial plan</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>impact on existing businesses in the Village are avoided where possible and mitigated when not, particularly with long lead in times to allow for businesses to plan for upcoming change.</p>		
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/30</p>	<p>Club Lodges: A number of factually dubious or prejudicial comments are made regarding Wyn Irwin and Tahr Lodge in this section in order to create a false context where "the continued presence/location of the lodge[s] should be reviewed". The impression is made of cold ("very hard to keep warm"), unkempt ("requiring a high level of maintenance") and under-utilised facilities when Wyn Irwin for example is occupied year-round by a dedicated warden and both huts have adequate systems. A seasonal decline in occupancy in winter applies to all facilities in the Park and is not particular to these lodges, and the presence of Foliage Hill, to the south, cannot physically shade these lodges as stated. The lodges are described as remote, but their possible connection to nearby sewerage/water supplies at White Horse Hill campground is a minor consideration compared to the removal of the Lodges.</p> <p>These lodges, along with Unwin Hut, serve a valuable purpose in the Park and are more than worthy of retention. By maintaining the long-standing historical and cultural connection between the clubs, their activities, and the Park, and provisioning accommodation for recreationalists who wish to experience the park in a manner different from camping with the crowds at White Horse Hill, or at the expensive, the Lodges enhance the range of local visitors to the Park.</p>	<p>Substantially rewrite section with a clear intent to maintain the existence of these lodges, subject to Section 1.3.1, pg. 57, Policy 14.</p>	
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/27</p>	<p>A number of factually dubious or prejudicial comments are made regarding Wyn Irwin and Tahr Lodge in this section in order to create a false context where the continued presence / location of the lodge[s] should be reviewed. The impression is made of cold ("very hard to keep warm"), unkempt ("requiring a high level of maintenance") and under-utilised facilities when Wyn Irwin for example is occupied year-round by a dedicated warden and both huts have adequate systems. A seasonal decline in occupancy in winter applies to all facilities in the Park and is not particular to these lodges, and the presence of Foliage Hill, to the south, cannot physically</p>	<p>Substantially rewrite section with a clear intent to maintain the existence of these lodges, subject to Section 1.3.1, Policy 14.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>shade these lodges as stated. The lodges are described as remote, but their possible connection to nearby sewerage/water supplies at White Horse Hill campground is a minor consideration compared to the removal of the Lodges.</p> <p>These lodges, along with Unwin Hut, serve a valuable purpose in the Park and are more than worthy of retention. By maintaining the long-standing historical and cultural connection between the clubs, their activities, and the Park, and provisioning accommodation for recreationalists who wish to experience the park in a manner different from camping with the crowds at White Horse Hill, or at the expensive, the Lodges enhance the range of local visitors to the Park.</p>		
<p><i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/12</p>	<p>This passage contains a number of references to Tahr Lodge and Wyn Irwin Lodge. Wyn Irwin lodge is occupied year-round by a warden, and is fully double glazed, heated, and equipped with solar electricity. It operates on a fully-self contained waste system. Any suggestion that this hut is too cold, too encumbered by maintenance, or under-utilised is wholly without basis. Foliage Hill is located to the south of Wyn Irwin and does not reduce direct sunlight in winter time.</p> <p>There are difficulties with parking due to tourist overcrowding at White Horse, however this should be regarded as an individual issue and not a negative point of the continued presence of lodges in this area. The subtext of the passage is that these lodges are under-utilised and ill-placed and therefore should be removed. This outcome would allow easier implementation of other proposed changes in the Management Plan such as a park and ride service, a campground concession and parking restrictions. It does not recognise the recreation or heritage values of these lodges and further alienates the 'Backcountry' 'Remote' and 'Wilderness' users.</p>	<p>Request to delete various lines in section 2.1.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "Public can book..used"</li> <li>- paragraph: "The current location of the Tahr..using the area"</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/8</p>	<p>Regarding the passage under "Club Lodges": Wyn Irwin lodge is occupied year- round by a warden, is fully double glazed, heated, and equipped with solar electricity. It operates on a fully-self contained waste system. Any suggestion that this hut is too cold, too encumbered by maintenance, or under-utilised is wholly without basis.</p> <p>The subtext of the passage is that these lodges are under-</p>	<p>Delete the second sentence from the first paragraph, delete the whole third paragraph.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	utilised and ill-placed and therefore should be removed. It does not recognise the recreation or heritage values of these lodges and further alienates the Backcountry, Remote, and Wilderness users.		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/36	Club lodges: That Club lodges are encouraged and supported by DOC to combine onto a single well serviced (water/wastewater/electricity/roading) site and build a new high-quality build, modern energy efficient building. Preferably within the Amenities area.	Retain the objectives and policies that address the concerns raised.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/37	Nohoaka Place spatial plan: A number of matters to be taken into consideration in relation to the spatial plan, including: 1) No Private Motor Vehicles inside the park from 1 Oct to 1 May. 2) Private bikes & e-bikes allowed within the park. 3) Provide Public Transport (1.5m Visitors predicted - 4000 visitors per day) 4) Provide good communications at ends of Tracks/walks for people to call / book transport. 5) Provide world class Visitor Centre / Information Centre / Education centre at Park Entrance / Park boundary south of Birch Hill with secure Parking for 1500+ vehicles. 6) Provide world class camping area (Tent & Camper Van) south of Birch Hill. 7) Accommodation providers - provide transport / shuttles from Park Entrance for their guests. 8) Tour buses / transport operators have access to Amenities area. Concession fee applicable.	Retain the objectives and policies in relation to the spatial plan	
<i>Brookes, June</i> 878/2	I oppose the proposal to introduce a "Park and Ride" shuttle bus scheme to control access and parking by private vehicles at Mt Cook Village. My opposition is on the following grounds: 1. Charging for entry. The imposition of a park and ride regime at Birch Hill at certain times of the year would inevitably require visitors to be charged on a per person basis for the compulsory "service". This would amount to a de facto National Park entry charge. The Government has specifically stated that there will be no entry charges for National Parks or any other conservation areas. It will impact disproportionately on families with children and	Amend the "Management Considerations - Roads and Road ends" to address the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>will discourage NZ families from accessing the National Park because of cost. How do you reconcile the "no access charge" policy with this proposal?</p> <p>2. Accessibility issues  Disabled and other persons with restricted mobility who are not able to access a bus easily will be disadvantaged by this policy. Especially if wheelchairs and other mobility aids are needed. Families with small children who need to take a lot of gear - clothes, walkers, snacks, drinks etc will be disadvantaged by having to get on a bus and leaving the vehicle out of reach.  What do you intend to do about people who turn up late unintentionally after the last bus has left for the night?  Leave them there?  The imposition of this proposal would in effect create arbitrary public opening and closing times for the Park and in effect (illegally?) restrict access. This is unprecedented and not in the spirit of traditional free public access to National Parks.</p> <p>3. Equity issues  The intention to allow only those people who can provide proof of booked accommodation in the park, at the Hermitage and any other venues, to park private vehicles in the village is discriminatory by being based on the ability to pay. This is not the NZ way of doing things.</p> <p>4. Enforcement  How do you police these parking restrictions at the park entrance – do you have a barrier arm, enforcement personnel and interrogate everyone who wishes to drive in?</p> <p>5. Reduce numbers not access  The real problem is too many people wanting access to the park at certain times of year. Devise strategies to alleviate this issue. I would prefer that priority be given to Nzers. Overseas tourists could be required to book for vehicle parking with numbers of vehicles allowed in set at a certain number per day. After that they park outside and take the shuttle.</p> <p>6. Oversize Vehicle / Campervan parking  I agree that campervans and large vehicles should be required to park outside the park entrance. When parking is in short supply it is not fair that these private vehicles should occupy one or more parking spaces or occupy spaces for extended periods.</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>This proposal gives priority to the interests of the tourism industry over the interests of NZ citizens who wish to visit and recreate in this wonderful natural environment. This contradicts the provisions of the National Parks Act.</p> <p>I want to see more priority given to conservation and low impact recreation and visitation in the park and much less priority given to the interests and ambitions of the commercial tourism industry.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Discussion box - Village and front country spatial plan intro</b>		
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/6	Do not agree that park and ride is a feasible option. Better to have overflow parking outside the park when park is full. Concessionaires would still need 24/7 access.	Remove Park and Ride concept.	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/7	Agree that limits on vehicle use is necessary during peak season. The discussion should be linked to Policy 13 a) on page 124.	The discussion should be linked to Policy 13 a) on page 124.	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/2	Support the proposal in the draft Plan for a village and front country spatial plan with standards and guidelines consistent with the NP conservation values. Support recognition that development in the village area is nearly at capacity and that action needs to be taken to manage the rapid increase in visitor numbers.	Retain. Support in principle the village zoning and front country spatial plans within the operational time frame of this plan.	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/4	<p>1. Park and Ride and cycleways: support Canterbury Mountaineering Club submission (submitter 602) regarding proposed solutions to manage traffic congestion.</p> <p>Park and Ride concept may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will arrive and exit at hours outside the operating hours of the proposed Park and Ride.</p> <p>Backcountry adventurers, particularly mountaineers, climbers, back country walkers, &amp; skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start (and finish) trips within the Park at hours that would fall outside any operating hours of the proposed Park and Ride system.</p> <p>There are a number of alternative mechanisms outlined in the CMC submission that should be considered to help mitigate traffic congestion and allow freedom of movement for mountaineers, climbers, back country walkers, &amp; skiers/snowboarders etc.</p>	<p>Vehicle access should be maintained for those intending to access AMCNP overnight and longer.</p> <p>Support proposals put forward in the CMC submission.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p>Mackenzie Guardians Inc, 541/5</p>	<p>Acknowledge that visitor pressure is one of the biggest concerns facing the Park and the wider Te Manahua/Mackenzie Basin. The draft Plan does not address the possibility of restricting tourism numbers, rather it seeks to manage the predicted increase. The Society supports the restriction of vehicles in the Village and front areas of the Park, however if people visiting the Park are predicted to total 2 million in the life of this plan, then it must be time to consider restricting the numbers of visitor s to the Park.</p> <p>The draft Plan proposes a Park and Ride public transport service which would require bus and car parks, overnight parking for campers and camper vans, toilets and other visitor facilities, to be located at the edge of the Park or further into the Basin. Concerned that new infrastructure required to meet future visitor numbers, is to be located outside the Park boundary, which may result in moving the problem from one area to another. The possibility of moving large -scale tourist /commercial development further into the Mackenzie Basin may threaten the current status of the Basin' s outstanding natural landscape, already at a ' tipping point' as described in evidence to MDC PC13, and evidence prepared for the Kidd /McIntyre Environment Court hearing in November 2017 (attached to submission). Mean threats to the Mackenzie Basin summarised from this evidence are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Ecological degradation and the loss of its distinctive grasslands habitat and landscape ;</li> <li>-The greening of the Basin;</li> <li>- Production forestry and shelterbelts;</li> <li>- Wilding pines;</li> <li>- Sporadic development;</li> <li>- Land and landscape fragmentation; and</li> <li>- The ' internationalisation' of the Basin landscape and loss of both its character and identity.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the threats mentioned in this evidence, Mackenzie Guardians wish to add ' clutter' as a problem, with lots of land and airborne vehicles moving and parking, as well as the additional, permanent and temporary infrastructure required.</p> <p>Believe there are opportunities for smaller scale on farm tourism ventures outside the Park, in the wider Te Manahua Mackenzie Basin. However, the scale of the proposed tourist development is such that it should not</p>	<p>Support the Village zoning plan and front country spatial plan.</p> <p>Oppose new development within the National Park Village and front country.</p> <p>Support in principle the park, ride and bike proposals.</p> <p>Carry out landscape and ecological assessments before developing new tourist infrastructure at Birch Hill or any other location outside the Park boundary.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	be left to Councils and District Plans to address but should trigger Governmental policies to manage the quantum of tourists visiting National Parks and other areas currently under pressure from rapidly expanding tourism.		
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/5	I support in principle the village zoning plan and front country spatial plan but do not support further development within the National Park. The village zoning plan must be enforced within this draft plan.	Amend the plan to enforce the village zoning plan and do not allow further development in the park.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/25	<p>Grasps the complexity of managing the issues of increased visitors and their vehicles to this Place, and how they travel in to and around the national park. Recognises the pressure on management of the Village and front country, especially at busy times.</p> <p>Does not support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposed park entry. Strongly opposed to such a concept.</li> <li>2. The location of the park and ride scheme at Birch Hill. Strongly opposed to this service at this location.</li> </ol> <p>Considers that if a park entry, inclusive of a park and ride system, was to be developed at Birch Hill there would be a loss of open space, and a proliferation of structures and infrastructure (intrusion of a 'non-natural facility) along the Mount Cook Road, the journey into the national park. This in a sense is incremental creep of the Village to the outer skirts of the national park, and if a charge is associated with the scheme, culminating in a perception of paying to access/enter the national park (park entry).</p> <p>Once a facility and service and possibly accommodation services at Birch Hill, was installed it would give opportunity to extend and expand, unless there are particularly robust parameters and restrictions around its development at the location. There is potential to displace some of the management issues occurring within the Village to the Birch Hill location.</p>	<p>A park entry and a park and ride transport service should not be developed at Birch Hill.</p> <p>Remove all objectives, policies and milestones relating to the consideration, feasibility, development, and trial implementation of the Birch Hill park entry and park and ride service.</p>	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/30	<p>Generally supportive of the village and front country zoning plan.</p> <p>Consider zoning and spatial planning approach useful for integrating the amenities area into the surrounding national park, however a more directive policy will be required to ensure that the spatial plan will be implemented and enforced.</p>	<p>Recommend that the Department only provide for activities in the front country area that enhance the unique qualities of the WHA</p> <p>Undertake a full assessment of environmental effects of the Birch Hill proposal, including anticipation of long-term needs for proposal and alternatives available.</p> <p>Limit further development of commercial tourism in most</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Building more and bigger facilities in the national park and at Birch Hill to accommodate increasing numbers of people is not feasible in the long term.</p> <p>Section 4 of the NPA provides for restrictions on entry subject to the preservation of native species and for the welfare in general of the parks.</p> <p>Some responses to the discussion box issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- promote walking and biking as solution to getting around village and close front country attractions.</li> </ul> <p>Support e-bikes and bike riding on existing roads including access to Lower Tasman Lake car park but not to Tasman Lake edge.</p>	<p>heavily used places in Park.</p> <p>Encourage camping outside the national park in existing public or private facilities</p> <p>Park and Ride could commence from nearby towns or accommodation outside the park.</p>	
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/28</p>	<p>Any mechanism to restrict car parking through means of paying represents a major shift in the ethos of how visitors to National Parks are able to access their land. The right to access the Park for free should be guaranteed, but is effectively restricted by such a policy. It will do little to encourage visitors of lower socioeconomic background to enjoy the Park. Where Park and Ride options are proposed, these need to be free, regular, and essentially optional. Refers to example in Canada where a free Park and Ride service from a nearby, large, and free park is offered during peak hours when the destination carpark is likely to be full. Recreationalists engaging in overnight activities or hunters (etc.) leaving early (before the likely operating hours of a Park and Ride) would in this case still have access to road-end parking to facilitate their trips. In the event that parking is to be restricted in the Park, NZ residents and those engaged in traditional outdoor activities in the park should not be disadvantaged by a system designed to manage the current glut of foreign short term visitors. Dispensations for unlimited free parking should be offered to those with booked accommodation, membership of Ngai Tahu, a NZ Drivers Licence /Passport, or membership of outdoor clubs such as NZAC, NZDA, CMC or an affiliate member of FMC.</p>	<p>Remove all references to paid parking from the plan. Retain free parking as a right of all visitors.</p> <p>Offer Park and Ride in addition to (not instead of) 24/7 first-come-first serve parking, or parking prioritised to those holding booked accommodation, membership of Ngai Tahu, a NZ Drivers Licence/Passport, or membership of outdoor clubs such as NZAC, NZDA, CMC or an affiliate member of FMC.</p>	
<p><i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/7</p>	<p>Support in principle the village zoning plan and front country spatial plan.</p>	<p>DOC needs to implement and enforce the zoning plan within the timeframe of this management plan.</p>	
<p><i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/10</p>	<p>Support many of the ideas in the discussion box. - Wish to speak on these.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place 1 Park Ride and cycleways</b>		
<i>Schroder, Jutta</i> 1/1	Oppose the idea of park and ride system for visitors	Cap overseas visitors on a daily basis and introduce Park and Ride for them. New Zealanders should have access to Park at any time with own vehicle.	Noted Test
<i>Clarkson, Sooji</i> 6/1	Opposes the change to proposed to vehicle access in the Park as proposed in points (iii) and (iv). These points will endanger climbers, important users of the Park, returning on a regular basis, often over a whole lifetime. Key dangers are fatigue and timing. Tiredness would be hugely compounded by an increased access distance, especially as the first part of access is often done on the night before, The addition of distance to the approach makes earlier, safer start times difficult in many cases.	Include a concession-based system whereby access to road-end access can be applied for on a permit based system to support activities like alpine climbing or ski touring. Make concession applications accessible from outside the national park, such as internet-based applications, for people not accessing the Park in normal work hours.	
<i>Paardekooper, Luke</i> 22/2	Support introduction of Park and Ride	Make sure transport from Park and Ride is easy, often and paid for as part of entry fee. Allow more communal activity based at Park and Ride such as guides for activities, booking opportunity for activities	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/13	Do not support the Park and Ride concept. Would pose barriers to those wanting to use the Park and ultimately affect businesses in village and restrict access to airport. There are ample areas to create additional parking between the sewage ponds and the village. A new carpark in this zone could alleviate the problem of limited parking in winter when the campground road is closed. Would support an additional overflow campground at Birch Hill for campers and campervans	Amend to reflect the points raised	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/7	A Park and Ride Scheme would work well for tourists undertaking a day trip between hours of 8am and 6pm, but would seriously curtail most mountaineering undertaken by locals by making it logistically challenging. Most mountaineering is done on an opportunistic basis and needs to have access to the park outside these hours.	Need to review this Scheme in light of comments above. No specific decision requested.	
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/7	Support - trialling a P&R system is an excellent idea to manage vehicle flows and improve visitor experience	Retain	
<i>Warner, James</i> 75/8	Support Park and Ride in part. Recognise that park and ride is suitable for day walkers but not all recreational users.	Amend proposal to recognise that shared transport is not suitable for hunters. If you have a DOC hunting permit, you do not need to take the shared transport.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/7	Do not support the proposed park and ride system. It will prevent many outdoor enthusiasts from accessing the park.	Reword 1 ii) to include "with the exception that vehicle access is always permitted at any time for members of CMC, NZDA, and any clubs affiliated with FMC, Anyone staying at Irwin Lodge, Tahr Lodge, anyone visiting family/friends in the village, people of Ngai Tahu. Define when a park and ride would be open. Retain 1 iii). Reword 1 iv) to say "Investigate options to reduce day visitor access during peak use seasons, or allow for limited vehicle access with evidence of booked accommodation.	
<i>Armour, Chloe</i> 159/6	With a park and ride I do not support Hermitage guests getting preferential treatment and allowances for taking own vehicles into the village.		
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/7	Reduce motorised road traffic within the urban / approaches to the Park. Utilise the use of public transport as an interpretive opportunity for users.	Support policies that address the comments above.	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/9	In principle, the MDC supports instituting a Park & Ride public transport service. However, we dispute that it must occur from outside the Park entrance. MDC argues that the provision of a large parking area and location of multiple structures should occur in a location which is already partially changed by human development, and/or which has a lesser degree of landscape values, as identified by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect.	i) Amend "from the Park entrance" to "from an appropriate location". iii) Amend "outside the Park entrance" to "in an appropriate location".	
<i>Stent, Elisabeth</i> 173/2	Support trial of Park and Ride system as long as no detrimental effects to the Park.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/9	Park and ride may help to reduce congestion but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who arrive and leave at hours outside of the park and ride operating hours. Vehicle access should be maintained for backcountry users such as climbers, trampers and skier etc who by the nature of their activities need to be able to start and end their trips outside of operating hours.	Investigate options to allow users to retain vehicle access when needing to arrive and leave outside operating hours.	
<i>Talbot, A. G</i> 218/3	Support the park and ride in principle. But request that a full assessment of the effects of development at Birch Hill Conservation Area on biodiversity, habitat and landscape values be carried out. Support bike riding on or adjacent to existing roads including to the Lower Tasman Lake carpark, but not to the Lake edge.	Amend the plan to state "a full assessment of the effects of development at Birch Hill Conservation Area on biodiversity, habitat and landscape values be carried out".	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/19	A Park & Ride system is not something you simply put in place by trial and error. It needs to be properly	Prior to the system being designed, data about hourly flow of vehicles into and out of the village need to be collected	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>designed.</p> <p>It is essential that climbers are allowed to drive to the road ends early in the morning / late at night, without having to wait for Park &amp; Ride shuttles.</p>	<p>for at least one year, preferably two or three years.</p>	
<p><i>Snoyink, Jules</i> 228/1</p>	<p>Support park and ride, and restrictions to visitors and vehicles. Concerned about possible impact of new infrastructure for th park and ride on surrounding natural values.</p> <p>Opposed to building more tourist facilities in the village or front country.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/21</p>	<p>The concept of park and ride away from the village will not work</p>	<p>Rework ideas to include ideas and map provided for better car park location in the village.</p>	
<p><i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/1</p>	<p>Support this option for the regular overseas tourist, and for non self-contained freedom campers. Not suitable for the likes of Serious Trampers/Climbers or Hunters.</p>	<p>Amend to be a non-compulsory option. Security would have to be looked at.</p>	
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/70</p>	<p>The consequences of a Park and Ride option for New Zealanders, recreationalists and those with an investment in the Park, may make this an unworkable option. The reasons for this option not working include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The charges for such a service will put independent travellers off travelling to the village, making it become a ghost town. People may go straight to a walking track and bypass the village, particularly if DOC plans to provide services at Birch Hill.</li> <li>2. DOC may be hard pressed to find a commercial operator to run such a service due to the 24hours it would have to run, 7 days a week, only for a few weeks that it may be required..</li> <li>3. Making people pay for a shuttle, means that the public have to pay to enter the Park. This violates the purpose of the NPA.</li> <li>4. Shuttles would create congestion with mass groups of people being dropped of at the same time and walking the tracks. This conflicts with the Visitor Management Zone that has the intention to spread groups out.</li> <li>5. Shuttles will affect the visitor experience with visitors stressed about schedules. Waits between shuttles from one place to another</li> <li>6. Safety concerns for weather changes, or people getting stranded at the end of a track after shuttle has</li> </ol>	<p>Amend the plan to provide alternative solutions for increasing visitor, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- expanded car parking adjacent to the village, at the current White Horse Hill campground, at Tasman Lake</li> <li>- time limits and payments for parking</li> <li>- access for residents, climbers, guides and staff in village at all times</li> <li>- consultation with local concessionaires, business owners to ensure legitimate expectations are not breached.</li> <li>- create another car park at the beginning of the Ball Hut track</li> </ul>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>finished</p> <p>7. Climbers wanting to come out at random times with no shuttle at the end of a long climb. Option for climbers to take their own transport up to Husky Flat.</p> <p>8. Will halt the concept of kiwis camping in the Park.</p> <p>9. May not make economic sense</p> <p>10. May be difficult to coordinate with aircraft schedules, thus disrupting the guide's concession.</p> <p>11. The uncertainty factors may make it too hard for people with families, overseas visitors inappropriately dressed, elderly and disabled</p> <p>12. Birch Hill facilities will duplicate facilities in the village and functions provided by concessionaires. There is a legitimate expectation that the village centre remains - concessionaires were assured the village centre would remain where it currently is and have invested based on that.. This is an exorbitant and unnecessary cost to the taxpayer to duplicate the village.</p> <p>13. Access for residents, staff, delivery etc</p> <p>14. Safety of cars at Birch Hill</p> <p>15. Shuttle distances too great, and will interfere with enjoyment of Park</p> <p>16. It is illegal to block off SH80 which is a public road</p> <p>17. All concessionaires clientele must be permitted to enter - accommodation providers already have to provide car parks on their land</p> <p>18. Loss of patronage for businesses in the village, such as cafes and bars. It is already a challenge to run a small café</p> <p>19. Will choke off walk-in traffic for the airport. People may miss flights if have to wait for a shuttle</p> <p>20. Shuttle service will need to operate on a 24-hour basis which will require at least 6 shuttles rotating constantly, a lot of staff, and housing.</p>		
<p><i>Mark, Dr Alastair</i> 267/3</p>	<p>Park &amp; Ride concept should be limited to visitors who are intending to stay for less than an entire day. Visitors to the park who wish to stay overnight should be permitted to park at the road end.</p>	<p>Allow visitors to the park who wish to stay overnight should be permitted to park at the road end.</p>	
<p><i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/27</p>	<p>Generally support Park and Ride concept, but exemptions needed for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- people booked on multi-day guided trips,</li> <li>- people staying overnight in huts, lodges,</li> <li>- mountaineers on technical trips where no facilities available</li> </ul>	<p>Retain Discussion Box 1(i)-(vi), but make allowances for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers (NZAC/CMC/NZMCA) who need access for technical/remote trips. Suggest authorisation tag for vehicles.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	- . mountaineers requiring access outside standard operating times		
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/19	Support this, on the basis that people who have booked a guided trip with a concessionaire or are staying overnight in an alpine hut (note that this would require all alpine huts to be bookable to have evidence of 'booked accommodation') would be included in the exemption for parking.	Retain all these policies, except make allowances for concessionaires/locals or climbers/ski tourers needing to leave a vehicle parked at Whitehorse Hill for their return from eg. a Ball Pass Crossing, or a trip up the Hooker Glacier. Would concessionaires/NZAC members be able to have a sticker to put on their vehicles to show they are authorised to park there?	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/23	Generally support the Park & Ride concept, but a parking exemption needs to be given to people who have booked a multi-day guided trip with a concessionaire or are staying overnight in an alpine hut or club lodge. Note that "evidence of booked accommodation" would only be possible for alpine huts if they actually have a booking system.	Retain Points i) to iv) but make allowances for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers who need to leave a vehicle parked at Whitehorse Hill for their return. Concessionaires, residents and NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members could have a scannable sticker or electronic tag to put on their vehicles to show they are authorised to park there.	
<i>Rogers, Ian</i> 276/3	The idea of Park and Ride is feasible, but only if the "Park" starts at the junction of SH8 and Hooker Valley Road. Not Birch Hill.	Amend location of the Park and Ride	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Assn, Nelson Branch</i> 306/3	Partially support park and ride system restrictions - It needs to be amended to target overseas tourists not the New Zealand citizens who should continue to have unrestricted access within reason, as originally intended in the principles for National Parks.	Amend Park and ride to target overseas tourists not the New Zealand citizens who should continue to have unrestricted access within reason, as originally intended in the principles for National Parks.	
<i>Kirkwood, Rod</i> 307/5	Concerned with how park and ride system will impact on multi-day/overnight users of the park.	Amend the plan to clarify how it would affect multi-day/overnight users of the park.	
<i>Dickerhof, Nina</i> 315/4	Partially support the Park and Ride system, would like the plan to mention that access for trampers and climbers etc that want to access or exit the Park at any time can do so, with an example being a gate that requires a NZ Drivers License to get a key for.	Include statements about how access for people wanting to enter outside the bus timetable is guaranteed.	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/12	<p>Hunting activity, the carriage of game trophies and the carriage of firearms means that Park and Ride is not a feasible option for hunters.</p> <p>Do not support restricting, in any way, self-drive access to New Zealanders to the Park. Consider this to conflict with NPA principle that public have right of entry. New Zealanders should be encouraged to visit. Support the use of a NZ drivers licence or some sort of pass system to enable access. Tourist access should be on a booking</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>basis for those wishing to stay overnight, and otherwise by a numbers per day limit.</p> <p>We believe Park and Ride more viable for freedom campers and day tourists who do not have booked accommodation at any Park facilities. Could use a system similar to the Te Araroa Trail and other Great Walks.</p> <p>We believe that occupants of campervans should not be allowed to overnight in the Park unless they have full on-board ablution needs for a minimum of three days.</p>		
<i>Sutherland, Scott</i> 332/4	Any park & ride system must provide for and in no way restrict traditional uses of the Park, for example mountaineering, rock climbing and hunting.	The specific wording and rules of any park & ride system should allow unrestricted access for those doing multi-day trips in the hills, and should be drafted and released for public comment/submissions before being implemented.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/9	<p>We cannot see Park &amp; Ride operating successfully for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are strict legal requirements for carrying firearms on public transport that would be problematic for Park &amp; Ride operating successfully.</li> <li>2. The hours that hunters tend to come and go are unlikely to be compatible with an economic Park &amp; Ride timetable</li> <li>3. Hunters' vehicles will need to be exempt from a Park &amp; Ride trial</li> <li>4. The need to charge for compulsory use of Park &amp; Ride would be incompatible with the "free entry" required by statute.</li> </ol>	Amend the plan to address the concerns raised	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/40	<p>Support a trial of a Park and Ride public transport service.</p> <p>Agree with the proposed points (1) to (iv).</p> <p>As proposed, the service does not allow for the needs of our club members, for example to make a very early morning start on a tramp or climb. Permission could be arranged in advance if needed and email documentation provided as evidence.</p>	<p>Add new point (v) to discussion box 1 Park &amp; Ride and cycleways to read:</p> <p>"Visitors wishing to go on walks or climbs which involve an early morning start or a late evening return when public transport is not available should be allowed vehicle access to the Park and be permitted to park in the vicinity of Whitehorse Hill or in the lower Tasman valley."</p>	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/12	<p>Partially support the Park&amp; Ride proposal. This proposal is suitable for day walkers but not hunters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hunters need own transport and allowance to drive and park by side of road.</li> <li>- If DOC makes access difficult then should not</li> </ul>	Change the proposal so hunters can drive their own vehicles and don't need to use Park & Ride.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>complain about tahr numbers.</p> <p>- Hunters cannot be expected to travel on a bus with other tourists with guns, carcasses etc.</p>		
<p><i>Thornton, James</i> 340/13</p>	<p>Support the Park and Ride for the average day tourist. Likely to have a chilling effect on independent mountaineering within the park. This kind of hurdle will make it much more logistically challenging - enough to go elsewhere.</p>	<p>Amend the Park &amp; Ride scheme to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>Perry, John</i> 346/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Young, Robin</i> 353/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Broadbent, James</i> 355/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>McIntosh, Dr Pat</i> 358/2</p>	<p>As a climber and trumper I would like to see the Park and Ride scheme implemented as soon as possible for day tourist use, but walkers and climbers may need to access the Park at other times of the day or night and this needs to be enabled.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to include allowances for walkers and climbers may need to access the Park at other times of the day or night.</p>	
<p><i>McKinnon, John</i> 359/2</p>	<p>Support Park and Ride, providing there is provision for those entering/leaving at unusual hours, like climbers.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to include provision for those entering/leaving at unusual hours, like climbers.</p>	
<p><i>Pickford, Alison</i> 364/1</p>	<p>Support Park and Ride</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Phillips, Hazel</i> 370/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Keeling, Anna &amp; family</i> 371/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Muir, Steven</i> 373/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	from the park at all hours.	
<i>Ellis, Michael</i> 394/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Hopper, Jason</i> 403/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Laurie, Davie</i> 410/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Eaton, Michael</i> 413/3	Without unlimited access to the national park the weekend trips so many of us recreational visitors from all over nz do are no longer possible. We often arrive in Mount Cook village at midnight on a Friday (having driven from chch after work) do a 2 day trip and get out Sunday night and drive home. This simply wont be possible under the new plan.	Please start the review again with a ground up approach that focusses on New Zealander's views for the future of the park	
<i>Robson, Ben</i> 416/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Svendsen, Grant</i> 418/1	Oppose Park and Ride for NZ'ers. It should only be for tourists and not affect our freedom to go places.	Amend Park and Ride to exempt people that prove they are NZ citizens.	
<i>Dunn, Hamish</i> 421/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Latty, Nicholas William</i> 423/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Harris, John</i> 427/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Parlane, Tony</i> 428/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Stevens, Carole</i> 430/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Hornblow, Quinn</i> 432/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Shearer, Nicholas, Thornton</i> 433/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Tanner, Chas</i> 434/1	Technology is available to enable discrimination between residents and local user groups. i.e.an electronic permit system, with a barrier arm. This would also enable control of the camp ground, a booking system could be introduced to limit numbers. The size of the camp ground and parking area would then not need to be continually increased.	Evaluate and incorporate ideas above into the park and ride system.	
<i>Scoz, Matteo</i> 435/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Peady, Dr. Cliff</i> 438/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Skea, Eric</i> 440/1	Support park and ride but there needs to be exemption for Canterbury and Otago residents who wish to embark on multi-day recreational activities as arriving late at night after work would be outside park and ride hours.	Include exemption mentioned in submission to the plan.	
<i>Camm, Adrian</i> 441/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>West, Sam</i> 442/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/5	Consideration should be made for alpine activities in the areas beyond the immediate village and Hooker Valley track that do not fit into "normal business hours". Guided groups can arrive and depart the Park at all times of the day and night.	Provide for entrance to the Park outside the "regular hours" and parking space, to accommodate guides movements.	
<i>Jessop, Daniel</i> 446/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/7	Support the Park and Ride proposal in theory, however there needs to be reasonable allowance for recreational climbers coming in and out of the village at all sorts of anti-social hours. People who are engaging with the Park over multiple days are not going to fit into a timetable that is 'operational hours'.	Amend Park & Ride discussion to include an allowance for climbers to enter and exit the Park at any time.	
<i>Cullen, Ross</i> 456/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Yong, Colin</i> 457/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/8	Park & Ride Facility at Birch Hill - This is a welcome innovation. The Draft should explicitly contain reference to exploring exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or possibly holders of NZAC, NZDA, CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership.	Amend to state explicit reference to exploring exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership.	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/9	The Draft contains reference to a Park & Ride Facility at Birch Hill. This is a welcome innovation. While clearly some way from fully-fledged policy development, the Draft must signal unambiguously that if there is to be	Amend Policy 2.1.3 Milestones to contain explicit reference to exploring exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>any exemption allowing private access to the park, then</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a regime favouring paying guests at Park accommodation places alone (ie those staying at significant sources of concession revenue) will not be justifiable against section 4(2)(e) of the Act.</li> <li>- Recreationalists, ie key stakeholders over the lifetime of the park, cannot be ignored. Practically speaking, all-hours arrivals and departures to road-ends is essential to these groups.</li> <li>- The Draft should explicitly contain reference to exploring exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or possibly holders of NZAC, NZDA, CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership.</li> </ul>	Tahu membership.	
<i>Gumbrell, Matthew</i> 468/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Allan, Tony</i> 470/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Stein-Abel, Sissi</i> 471/1	Regarding iv) I Recommend the opposite: Have accomodation providers provide free shuttles to these visitors and have them leave their cars at Birch Hill, and also shuttle them to Tasman Lake or to the start of the Hooker Valley walk. While people without pre booked accomodation are not affected.	Amend plan as in the submission.	
<i>Stein-Abel, Sissi</i> 471/2	The suggestion to trial a Park & Ride public transport service from the Park entrance during peak times appeals at first. But the weak point is that Mt Cook NP offers a lot of options and activities for a day visit, and the need to wait for shuttles will reduce the time that can be spent on these activities and also limit the number of activities that can be packed into a day. It is also negative that visitors forced to use the public transportation will feel like in a tour group when they first have to endure the chatter of others on the buses and then start their walks together with another two dozen visitors.	Suggest shelters are built at key points for shuttle service. Support the idea of keeping campervans and motorhomes that use up a lot of space on carparks at an outside carpark at Birch Hill. Perhaps that already leaves enough space for normal-size cars on the key carparks inside the Park. Would accept paying an access/parking fee for moving freely through the park in my vehicle instead of being forced on a shuttle bus.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Parke, Ross &amp; Carol</i> 478/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Pearson, Richard</i> 480/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Miller, Aubrey</i> 487/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/25	<p>Support Park &amp; Ride. Great idea. P&amp;R and other facilities should be tested for there workability by defining use case. That is for each type of tourist ensure that the range of facilities would meet their needs.</p> <p>For example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. People doing the Copland Pass would perhaps have a driver. They would camp overnight at White Horse Hill Campground. Next day the Copland Pass party would start out and the driver would exit the park.</li> <li>2. Campervan tourists want to do a short walk and come back to their campervan in the evening. They may want a meal.</li> </ol> <p>Provide facilities to allow campervans to stay outside the park. Tourists doing day and even overnight trips, e.g.. Mueller Hut could P&amp;R.</p> <p>Tourists who are going into the backcountry should not be restricted. They will have lots of gear.</p> <p>Tourists who want to enjoy the bars and restaurants would require a late return back to their campervans.</p> <p>These tourists would park at (Reword:) Birch Hill carpark - 10min drive by P&amp;R.</p> <p>Perhaps in the not-too-distant future the P&amp;R would be electric driverless vehicles and ordered by an app. An algorithm based on numbers and wait time would determine the pickup time.</p> <p>For overseas tourists it should be expensive to park in the village.</p> <p>No freedom camping should be allowed in the park. A</p>	<p>Support Park &amp; Ride. Great idea. P&amp;R and other facilities should be tested for there workability by defining use case. That is for each type of tourist ensure that the range of facilities would meet their needs.</p> <p>Consider suggested options.</p> <p>Any infrastructure developed should be paid by tourist revenue.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>no brainer.            Establish Park &amp; Ride from State Highway 8. This would be cheaper than Birch Hill. Charge more for Birch Hill parking. Establishing parking by Highway 8 would keep some vehicles off Highway 80.            Both carparks would have to have a level of security, especially for campervans/cars whose occupants will be away overnight.            Any infrastructure developed should be paid by tourist revenue.</p>		
<p><i>Gould, Marion &amp; David</i>            496/2</p>	<p>Transferring the problem to another area, instead of solving the problem.            Becomes an eyesore for people on the eastern side of Pukaki.            You will end up with other businesses being stationed there and a whole new community base between Glentanner and Mt Cook Village.</p>	<p>Delete this policy from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Naka, Taichiro</i>            498/1</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Bilek, Forrest</i>            501/3</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours. One method to go about this would be to create an amendment to the plan to allow for vehicles that are registered to persons with valid NZ drivers licences. In this manner, tourists (the majority of whom are not NZ nationals or vehicle owners in NZ) would be required to use the park &amp; ride system during peak season. A greater presence of DOC 'rangers' to police the behaviour of visitors would help reduce the degradation of the park's natural values.</p>	<p>Amend the plan as in the submission.</p>	
<p><i>Major, Christine</i>            504/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Johnston, Wendy</i>            505/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Groves, Nick</i> 506/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Campbell, Robert</i> 507/6	<p>Don't support the idea of a park &amp; ride and this shouldn't be investigated further. The park and ride concept will be difficult to incorporate given the diverse use the Park receives over the summer months. The recreational user will be most affected by this restriction through limited park entry? Climbers need to park from very early in the morning. Presume that park and ride will not be a 24-hour service?</p> <p>The culprit causing all the parking congestion in the park is the day tripper, visitors coming for a short day visit only. Therefore managing these day visitors is key in reducing parking pressures. Adding another large carpark at the village intersection would alleviate the parking pressure and allow for future tourist numbers. The park and ride concept will be very expensive and time consuming for DOC when that time and money is better spent on conservation.</p>	<p>Don't support the Park &amp; Ride idea.</p> <p>Idea for alternative option: Add another large car park next to the village intersection as you first enter into the village block hooker road when full and people can walk up to the hooker valley track from this carpark. Use the Tasman valley 'Wakefield carpark' as an overflow for vehicles (another 50 car parks in this area)</p>	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/5	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Green, Philip</i> 513/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/7	Park and Ride system introduces potential concern for the transport of firearms and carcasses. Preference is to exempt hunters from Park and Ride requirements. This is justified because of the contribution hunters make to wild animal control.	Amend Park and Ride requirements for recreational hunters.	
<i>Albrett, R.J.</i> 515/5	I support in part the Park and Ride proposal. I support new car parks and associated infrastructure for tourists, to be located within existing town zones such as Twizel, Omarama and Tekapo. Placing this infrastructure at the Park boundary or further out into the Mackenzie Basin may be inappropriate and could threaten the Basin's vulnerable status of outstanding natural landscape. I support the proposal to allow cycling in parts of the	No specific decision sought.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Aoraki/Mt Cook Park around the Village and front country.		
<i>Hall, Susan &amp; Dunn, Kevin</i> 517/6	Access by New Zealand citizens to the Park should not be disadvantaged by increasing tourist numbers. The Park and Ride plan is inconsistent with allowing New Zealanders the access they have traditionally enjoyed.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Janse, Bridget</i> 518/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Otago Tramping and Mountaineering Club</i> 520/2	Have concerns about the proposal and Policy 1.3.1 12(d) of restricting on-site parking in the Park and Ride proposal for Nohoaka Place. Many recreationalists arrive at the Park at times when a shuttle is unlikely to be running. For the policy to be workable, requires that provision is made to ensure that parking is available to overnight users. See also Nohoaka Place Policy 9, 10 and 1.3.1 General Management Policy 12(b)	Review Park and Ride proposal, including 1.3.1 Policy 12(b), and Nohoaka Place Policies 9, 10 to address the concerns raised	
<i>Gray, Stuart</i> 521/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Shearer, Dara</i> 522/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Chinn, Paul</i> 526/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Gunson, Leah</i> 527/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Morris, Colin J.</i> 528/1	As a recreational user of the park, it is vital to me that I am able to obtain access freely at any time, day or night. Any moves to introduce a 'park and ride' for visitors needs to be thought through carefully with this in mind. I have visited parks in North America where the 'park and ride' works very well for tourists and definitely can remove congestion. Whether this system is practical for	If a 'park and ride' service can reduce vehicle access to the park, it could be located at Twizel or Lake Tekapo where substantial made-man facilities already exist.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>all park visitors and especially mountaineers, remains doubtful in my mind. I can see no proposal as to where the public road would end and the 'park and ride' would start. I have visions of a massive and unsightly carpark constructed somewhere in the majestic Mackenzie country, which in my mind is just shifting the problem, and would certainly be prohibited under Mackenzie Basin plan change 13.</p>		
<p><i>John, Rhys &amp; Walker, Jennifer</i> 529/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Jolly, James N.</i> 530/5</p>	<p>Oppose park and ride in entirety as not thought through for an environment of extreme weather changes, families and their needs not considered, need for minimum of 15 min. frequency of shuttle vehicles available from early morning to late at night as visitors arrive is impractical.</p>	<p>Delete policy. Overcrowding at White Horse Hill carpark can be alleviated by providing day parking area further back on the Hooker flats where past grazing (and the old airstrip) has left primarily exotic grasses rather than native vegetation. Appropriate native plantings could shield the car park from views from the Village and hotels. Add a walking track to connect with Hooker and Mueller tracks.</p>	
<p><i>Dimozantos, Megan</i> 540/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/17</p>	<p>This needs more discussion. Inclination is to Oppose, but understand the reasoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Campervans and day parking are a real problem in the village. As per 1.3.1. support White Horse campgrounds being tent only</li> <li>- More parking does need to be available. Mixed feelings as to Park &amp; Ride.</li> <li>- As a local worker would expect some exemptions, but as previous frequent recreational mountaineer, would also expect to be able to roll up to White Horse or Celmisia flats at 4 am and leave a car when start walking.</li> <li>-This is where 'front country / back country' needs have to be respected. Perhaps a 'backcountry use waiver' for parking could be looked at.</li> </ul> <p>If Park and Ride were to go ahead, South of the Airport near Hoophorn Stream (already commercialised land) would be a better alternative to Lagoon Steam.</p>	<p>Suggest more discussion and looking at alternatives.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McCallum, John &amp; Thorpe, Anna</i> 544/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 549/2	In principle I support this development as I feel that this is an improvement on the current situation at Whitehorse and the village etc. Ideally people should be required to park at Birch Hill and enter the park under their own steam with bicycles or similar. I recognise that this would not be practical in a number of situations but it would be good to promote this to those who were able.	A full assessment should to be done of the Birch Hill area to be developed into a car park/camp ground and mitigating plantings will need to be carried out to maintain the parks current carbon footprint size.	
<i>Fraser, Lisa</i> 551/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Niven, Shona</i> 555/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/15	Support park & ride to manage vehicle numbers in the park. However, strongly feel there needs to be some provision for out of hours access to club lodges and road ends for climbers. For example, someone who is staying out of the park but needs to start their walk in at 2am to be able to climb safely, or people who are driving from Christchurch after work and arriving at 11pm for a club meet. Support the provision of cycleways throughout the park and would use them if available.	Allow for park & ride if necessary in the future but make sure there is provision for out of hours access to club lodges and road ends. Commit to providing cycleways throughout the Nohoaka Place.	
<i>MacQueen, Richard</i> 569/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hanich, Quentin</i> 570/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Rivett, Martyn</i> 573/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Wardle, Rob &amp; Kate</i> 574/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/3	Support in principle the 'park and ride' proposal if the parking area for cars/motorhomes is not within park boundaries. I would like to see it situated outside of the National Park area. I support a fee for this service which could be used for Park preservation. I do not support New Zealand tax payers subsidising this service, I support a user pays scheme.	Retain park and ride. Investigate a fee for the service of park and ride.	
<i>Cocks, John</i> 580/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Laurenson, Peter</i> 582/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Attrill, Frazer</i> 593/1	Oppose the park and ride scheme laid out in the discussion box. Many people in the outdoor community regularly use mount cook for climbing and mountaineering. Due to the nature of the sport it would be extremely limiting for there to be a park and ride scheme in place; the scheme would need to run at all hours of the day and night at regular intervals and preferably with out excessive stops as weekend mountaineering trips that come from the main centres of the south island run on very tight schedules.	Delete the park and ride scheme from the plan as it would have an extremely negative effect on existing historical park users.	
<i>Wesley, Dr Graham</i> 595/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	who will come and go from the park at all hours.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/53	Support the need for a rational approach to managing vehicular traffic. Park& Ride has potential to benefit day visitors to park, but also potential to compromise recreational access and the use of Unwin Lodge. Would not be practical for long day activities or multi-day visits extended or shortened by weather or other conditions.	Amend Discussion box - Park & Ride and cycleways to remove (ii) and (iv) Include provision that NZAC is consulted on any Spatial Plan development	
<i>Inglis, Mark (MiddlePeak Ltd)</i> 601/2	Any Park and Ride needs to go to the village as well as WHH, just busing people to WHH is not a comprehensive solution, the impact of visitors needs to be spread out.	Amend plan to also include the village as a destination for the park and ride.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/20	<p>The CMC supports the Park and Ride service concept in principle with the caveat that vehicle access at any time is maintained for those intending to access the Park overnight and longer. Back country adventurers, particularly mountaineers, by the nature of their activity need to be able to start (and finish) trips within the Park at hours that would fall outside any operating hours of the proposed Park and Ride. If the long and proud tradition of mountaineering in Aoraki / Mount Cook National Park (for which it is internationally famous for) is to be maintained this core tenement for mountaineers and skiers, climbers and backcountry walkers must be maintained.</p> <p>There is also the potential for basic unfairness that those with booked accommodation, such as those staying in the Hermitage, can drive to their final destination but those wishing to go to the road end or stay in a Club Lodge without evidence of booking may not be allowed to take their vehicles.</p> <p>Page 86 states that "Kāi Tahu have a strong belief that the Village itself should not be a destination. Rather, it should function only as an outpost that provides the amenities needed for visitors to venture into the Park itself and experience the mana and beauty of those ancestors embodied by the mountains". As described in the previous paragraph, aspects of the Park and Ride discussion are inconsistent with this statement as it would restrict and dictate when and how the backcountry adventurers can access Aoraki/ Mount</p>	<p>Amend point iv on page 94 to say: iv) Investigate options to remove all day visitor vehicle access to the Park during peak use seasons, but to allow for vehicle access with evidence of booked accommodation or for those accessing areas outside the front country who require after-hours access into and out of the Park.</p> <p>It is suggested that those wishing to take their vehicles into the Park to access areas outside the front country who require after-hours access into and out of the park sign in and complete an intentions statement at the Birch Hill Park entrance.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Cook National Park. Particularly, it will reduce the options available to explore and visit areas of the Park outside of Nohoaka Place.</p> <p>Page 89 states that "Continuing to provide a high quality visitor experience for rapidly increasing numbers of people has been identified as the key issue for the management of the Village and accessible front country". The Park and Ride concept may help to mitigate this issue but cannot be at the expense of other user groups of the Park who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed Park and Ride.</p> <p>The challenge for DOC will be how to discern genuine backcountry users from day visitors. This can only be confirmed by the intentions of the visitor.</p>		
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/21</p>	<p>It appears that part of the issue in regard to vehicle and visitor numbers at the Whitehorse Hill area is related to the highly accessible walkways that allow visitors access to the views that make the Park famous (i.e. Hooker Lake and Mueller Hut tracks). However, nowhere else in the Nohoaka Place are there as accessible tracks and camping that provide visitors with an experience such as this.</p>	<p>The Plan should focus on expanding the number of accessible walking tracks to spread visitor numbers throughout the Nohoaka Place and further into the other areas of the Park. This could be accomplished by building foot bridges over the Tasman and Murchison Rivers, providing a foot track to the east side of the Tasman valley and also into the Murchison Valley. This would also allow cycle users to link up the A2O Cycleway.</p> <p>Maintenance of the Ball Road (now known as the Ball Shelter Track) to an expanded Ball Hut would provide an additional hut for the public to stay, relieving pressure on Mueller Hut. Installing a track on the ridge at the Southern end of the Kirikirikatata / Mount Cook Range would allow visitor access up towards Mt Wakefield providing simultaneous views into the Tasman and Hooker Valleys. These options would relieve pressure on White Horse Hill Carpark and encourage more visitors to venture elsewhere in the Park</p>	
<p><i>Christchurch Tramping Club</i> 604/1</p>	<p>We support this initiative and understand the need to control the number of vehicles within Park bounds. Maximum flexibility is needed for trampers and climbers accessing the park. We arrive and leave at odd times and some trips are impossible without 24 hr access to the trailhead. Some people do multi-day backcountry trips so won't have accommodation bookings but also aren't day visitors.</p>	<p>Reword Park and Ride system to provide exemptions to park and ride system for - people with a residential address in Canterbury or Otago (locals) - people who are members of an FMC-affiliated tramping or climbing club - people who have with them ice axe and crampons</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	allow for private vehicles outside of the park and ride times and with permits during the park and ride times - system must be free - allow for exclusion of camper vans and other inappropriately large vehicles from the Park - Operate system during the day - Ability to do a car drop at the trailhead for a transalpine trip		
<i>Haugh, Andrew</i> 607/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Buchanan, Sean</i> 609/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/16	Support this idea in principle	Retain as written	
<i>McKellar, Thomas</i> 613/6	Any traffic management system, such as the proposed Park & Ride, must be implemented in such a way that does not limit Park users who want to get an alpine start or who want to finish a trip late in the evening.	Support traffic management systems in the Nohoaka Place as long as the ability to start a trip early or finish late is not compromised.	
<i>Sirguy, Dr Pascal</i> 625/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Nock, Volker, Miharu &amp; Felix</i> 626/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Jerram, Tom</i> 629/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Bell, Colin</i> 630/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hann, Nick</i> 631/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 633/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 637/3	Support the development of Park and Ride and bike facilities in principle. Support bike riding on existing roads including the Lower Tasman Lake access existing carpark but not to the Tasman Lake edge.	A full assessment of effects of the Birch Hill proposal on indigenous biodiversity and habitat, and a landscape assessment needs to be carried out in the first instance for the proposed new facilities. Amend plan to exclude bike riding to the Tasman Lake edge.	
<i>Liddle, Edward Leonard</i> 639/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Scott, Gary</i> 644/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Moran, George</i> 645/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Walden, Dr Annie</i> 650/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Diller, Beatrice</i> 651/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Stäger, Ines</i> 653/3	The park and ride concept is generally supported.	To avoid loss of natural values, a robust assessment of environmental effects on biodiversity and landscape values needs to be undertaken if the Birch Hill conservation area is to be developed.	
<i>Shaw, Dr Vivienne &amp; Dr Christopher T</i> 655/4	Opposed to any proposals that would require New Zealanders to pay to enter the park. We can see no reason why the access arrangements for New Zealanders	Amend plan to state park and ride will not impact New Zealanders free access to the park, and would be used mainly for overseas tourists. Investigate a system where	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	to Mount Cook Village cannot be retained. We have no issue with charging overseas visitors should a park and ride system be implemented.	New Zealanders can apply for a permit to take their vehicle into the park.	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/6	Do not agree that park and ride is a feasible option. There would be significant cost to administer, issues around scheduling and delivery etc. Better to have overflow parking outside the park when park is full, concessionaires would still need 24/7 access.	Remove Park and Ride concept.	
<i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Inta, Frida</i> 667/2	While I support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Wesley, Richard (&amp; family)</i> 668/2	Support, a park and ride scheme is excellent for reducing the impacts on the park from visitors.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Parker, Jeremy</i> 672/2	Mountaineering use of the hills requires access to the park at times not serviced by park and ride. Vehicle access to the club huts should be maintained.	Amend the plan to state vehicle access to the club huts will be maintained.	
<i>Woch, Paulina</i> 675/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Gallagher, Robert</i> 676/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Bell, Carlo</i> 681/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Sequeira, Liliana</i> 682/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Grand Properties (2011) Ltd</i> 686/1</p>	<p>Oppose the Park and Ride proposal. This proposal is fundamentally flawed and will not work. Birch Hill is too far removed from Aoraki/Mount Cook Village to make it viable. Visitors to the Park will not walk, bike, or e-bike to the Village or surrounding attractions because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Weather- often not suitable . Even if the weather was good in the morning it could quickly turn, and we are talking large distances to walk/cycle or e-bike.</li> <li>- Average physical condition of visitors - not all guests to the Park are physically fit and able to partake in such activities</li> <li>- Time - many visitors are on pre-determined determined itineraries and just do not have the time to complete what has been suggested. They want to be able to drive as close as they can to Mt Cook/Mt Sefton and not be told they have to wait for a bus or alternatively walk/bike or E-Bike.</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, how often will there be a shuttle bus service? Every 30 minutes may not be often enough at peak times. There will be massive queues of frustrated guests, many of whom will most likely decide to head back down SH 80 and visit somewhere else. Development of Birch Hill will degrade the surrounding area. There is obviously a need for carpark development, bus shelters and hospitality type buildings as discussed within the Plan. Isn't it better to keep all of this un- natural activity within the Amenities Area of the Village? We consider a better option is to have a Park &amp; Ride within the Amenities area</p>	<p>Delete Park &amp; Ride</p>	
<p><i>Marriott, Peter</i> 690/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	
<p><i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/2</p>	<p>A park and ride is necessary. There has to be some means of managing vehicle traffic and this has worked in other countries. (My experience in US and Canadian national parks indicates traffic management and controlled parking is essential.) There has to be though provision for climbers and other recreationalists who need to access the park at any time of day or night.</p>	<p>Amend the park and ride to include provision for climbers and other recreationalists who need to access the park at any time of day or night.</p>	
<p><i>Laing, Michele</i> 695/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	from the park at all hours.	
<i>Rivett, Christina</i> 696/2	While I support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend the plan to include guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/14	Maintain vehicle access to the park. Recreational users need to arrive and leave at times outside of park and ride.	Implement a new carpark between Unwin Lodge and Mt Cook Village	
<i>Abaffy, Clare</i> 701/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Preston, David</i> 702/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Wilkinson, Clare</i> 706/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Grant, Hayden</i> 707/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/6	Mandatory Park & Ride access to Aoraki Village and the Hooker, Mueller and Tasman Valleys introduces potential for public concern about hunters transporting firearms. Hunters are most likely to access hunting areas outside the hours the shuttle would operate, and many will be returning with carcasses, which other passengers may find offensive. Providing an exemption for hunters is justified because of the contributions hunters make to wild animal control.	Make appropriate provision for transport of firearms on the service or exempt hunters from Park and Ride requirements. Preference to exempt hunters.	
<i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/9	Does not support Park and Ride. Would be difficult to implement given the diverse use the Park receives over the summer months. The recreational user will be most affected by this restriction e.g. through timings required to go climbing in the morning (presuming the park and ride will not be	Build a carpark at the village entrance so people can walk to the hooker Valley and the village. Open Wakefield carpark for Tasman Glacier	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>a 24 hour service?) There is plenty of additional carparking that will not detract from the Park's amenity.</p>		
<i>Brothers, Penelope Jane</i> 715/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Brookes, June</i> 716/1	Oppose park and ride scheme. The compulsory 'service' would be a de facto National Parks entry charge - the Government has stated there will be no entry charges for National Parks. I agree that. The real problem is too many people wanting access to the park at certain times of year. Devise strategies to alleviate this issue. Policies should give NZ'ers priority over overseas tourists.	Remove the park and ride scheme from the plan. Campervans and large vehicles should be required to park outside the park entrance.	
<i>Costello, James</i> 721/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/6	Regarding 1. iv) This does not consider multi-day backcountry user needs. This proposal partially fails to meet the requirement of the NPA 1980 that "the public shall have freedom of entry and access to the parks."	Reword to make exceptions for concessionaires, local residents, students, and members of NZ mountain organisations members e.g. through a tag for their vehicle.	
<i>Granger, Paula</i> 727/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/28	<p>TIA supports the concept in principle of a Park and Ride service.</p> <p>A number of risks important to tourism operators need to be addressed in the planning process, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The requirement to park and ride may deter visitation to the National Park.</li> <li>- There are potential barriers to access for concessionaires and recreational users such as climbers and trampers - all of whom have specific access requirements which are different to those of most day-use visitors to the parks.</li> <li>- Coach schedules may not fit with itinerary/travel plans of Free Independent Travellers (FIT's).</li> <li>- The domestic market, currently not familiar with paying for park and ride systems on DOC land could react poorly to the new system.</li> </ul>	Amend the planning process for the Park and Ride service to recognise and address the risks identified above	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Location of associated new parking or camping facilities may impact adversely on existing businesses such as accommodation providers and transport operators, on natural amenity values, and on the overall visitor experience.</li> <li>- Costs (initial and on-going) associated with the infrastructure required and management of the facility.</li> <li>- Lack of integration with visitor flow through the area and/or the value proposition of the region.</li> </ul>		
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/31</p>	<p>Any mechanism to restrict car parking through means of paying represents a major shift in the ethos of how visitors to National Parks are able to access their land. The right to access the Park for free should be guaranteed, but is effectively restricted by such a policy. It will do little to encourage visitors of lower socioeconomic background to enjoy the Park.</p> <p>Where Park and Ride options are proposed, these need to be free, regular, and essentially optional. In Canada, many busy destination carparks (e.g. Moraine Lake, Banff NP) are available to the public at all hours, but a free Park and Ride service from a nearby, large, and free park is offered during peak hours when the destination carpark is likely to be full. Recreationalists engaging in overnight activities or hunters (etc.) leaving early (before the likely operating hours of a Park and Ride) would in this case still have access to road-end parking to facilitate their trips.</p> <p>In the event that parking is to be restricted in the Park, New Zealander residents and those engaged in traditional outdoor activities in the park should not be disadvantaged by a system designed to manage the current glut of foreign short term visitors. Dispensations for unlimited free parking should be offered to those with booked accommodation, membership of Ngai Tahu, a New Zealand Drivers Licence/Passport, or membership of outdoor clubs such as NZAC, NZDA, CMC or an affiliate member of FMC.</p>	<p>Remove all references to paid parking from the plan.</p> <p>Retain free parking as a right of all visitors.</p> <p>Offer Park and Ride in addition to (not instead of) 24/7 first-come-firstserve parking, or parking prioritised to those holding booked accommodation, membership of Ngai Tahu, a New Zealand Drivers Licence/Passport, or membership of outdoor clubs such as NZAC, NZDA, CMC or an affiliate member of FMC.</p>	
<p><i>Desborough, Dr Graham John</i> 737/2</p>	<p>Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Edwards, Gareth</i> 740/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Troup, Christina</i> 745/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Hay, Ron</i> 746/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Allison, Celia</i> 749/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Came, Sharron</i> 766/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/1	Oppose a park and ride system that doesn't have exemptions for locals and specific users (climbers etc) access to the village.	Amend the park and ride proposal to include for local users (those with a residency within South Canterbury or Canterbury) to enter the park.	
<i>Andrew, Jennifer</i> 786/2	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Gawith, David</i> 791/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Owen, David</i> 800/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Ellis, David</i> 803/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Association, Hutt Valley Branch Inc.</i> 804/5	Oppose Park and Ride as it would be an impediment to hunter access. The timings would not work and how many transport operators or tourists would want smelly hunters with rifles and bloody meat bags on their vehicles and at what time would they operate. New Zealanders should have priority for access to their own land.	Decision not stated. Investigate giving New Zealanders priority for access to their own land.	
<i>Liddell, Gerrard</i> 805/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/8	Support Park and Ride in principle.	Carry out a full assesment on the effects of the Birch Hill proposal on the indigenous biodiversity and habitat and a landscape assesment.	
<i>Carr, Anna</i> 808/1	I applaud the park and ride system and recommend all campervans park at the airport; whilst New Zealanders can drive in to the village.	Retain park and ride, recommend all campervans park at the airport; whilst New Zealanders can drive in to the village.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/31	Policies to restrict parking at roadends (such as the suggested Park and Ride) must not be at the expense of users who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of the proposed Park and Ride. Vehicle access should be maintained for those intending to access Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park overnight and longer. The proposed park and ride is in contradiction with The National Parks Act 1980.	Amend the plan to contain explicit reference to exemptions to the park and ride for holders of a New Zealand drivers licence, or identification as Kāi Tahu, or membership of the following clubs: Canterbury Mountaineering Club, the New Zealand Deerstalkers Association and any FMC affiliated club, such as the New Zealand Alpine Club. Explicit provision must be made for overnight parking at White Horse Hill for the purposes of backcountry adventure including but not limited to mountaineering/climbing, skiing/snowboarding, tramping and hunting.	
<i>Doughty, Laura</i> 816/3	Strongly opposed to the proposed park and ride traffic management system. As this will limit the ability for park users to access the park for alpine starts for traditional mountaineering.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/4	Support a 'park and ride' facility, and bike riding on existing roads.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/4	Support restricting vehicle access into the park and promotion of a park and ride (and bike) system around the Park's village and front country area. We support the	Provide for safe and well signposted cycle trails as proposed, on or adjacent to existing roads including to the Lower Tasman Lake car park, but not to the Tasman Lake	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	proposals to manage traffic during peak seasons. We support the development of park and ride and cycling facilities in principle.	edge. Insert requirement to carry out a landscape assessment for proposed new facilities. Insert requirement to carry out a full assessment of effects of the Birch Hill proposal on the Conservation Area with regard to indigenous biodiversity and habitat, landscape and historic values.	
<i>Grinsted, Jack</i> 825/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Wratt, Gillian</i> 826/4	Lack of guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours in the proposed park and ride system.	No decision stated.	
<i>Freyens, Ben</i> 835/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Jessop, Keith</i> 836/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>MacMurray, Hugh</i> 838/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Tompkins, Jean</i> 839/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Prince, Ray and Barbara</i> 856/1	Support a seasonal Park and Ride system to avoid overcrowding in the vicinity of the village and White Horse Hill from day visitors and camper vans	Park and Ride NOT to be at Birch Hill. A suitable area is at left of SH 80 opposite the airport. Close for safety purposes. Must be WITHIN the and CONTROLLED by the Park NOT commercial interests. Toilet facilities and shelter only to be provided.	
<i>Prince, Ray and Barbara</i> 856/2	Support a cycle way from the Park and Ride area we have suggested (opposite the airport, left of SH 80)	Instigation of cycle way close to the bluffs which could double as a walkway.	
<i>Waters, Jay</i> 859/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	from the park at all hours.	
<i>Waters, Dana Lee</i> 860/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Hopper, Megan</i> 865/3	Support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.	Amend plan to include a statement on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalists who will come and go from the park at all hours.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/5	In principle I support this development as I feel that this is an improvement on the current situation at Whitehorse and the village etc. Ideally people should be required to park at Birch Hill and enter the park under their own steam with bicycles or similar. I recognise that this would not be practical in a number of situations but it would be good to promote this to those who were able.	Amend the plan to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/4	Due to the very high tourist visitor numbers, it is essential that vehicle entry to the national park is restricted. I support in principle the restrictions, although instead of overnight facilities at Birch Hill, visitors should stay at commercially available facilities at Glentanner or Twizel. It is not the Department of Conservation's role to provide commercial tourism facilities. An identification system needs to be developed to accommodate workers and locals who need vehicle access and longer-stay visitors such as climbers.	Tourism vehicular access should be restricted but overnight facilities should not be developed at the park entrance.	
<i>Brookes, June</i> 878/1	I oppose the proposal to introduce a "Park and Ride" shuttle bus scheme to control access and parking by private vehicles at Mt Cook Village. My opposition is on the following grounds: 1. Charging for entry. The imposition of a park and ride regime at Birch Hill at certain times of the year would inevitably require visitors to be charged on a per person basis for the compulsory "service". This would amount to a de facto National Park entry charge. The Government has specifically stated that there will be no entry charges for National Parks or any other conservation areas. It will impact disproportionately on families with children and will discourage NZ families from accessing the National	Amend Nohoaka Place text and provisions to address the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Park because of cost. How do you reconcile the "no access charge" policy with this proposal?</p> <p>2. Accessibility issues  Disabled and other persons with restricted mobility who are not able to access a bus easily will be disadvantaged by this policy. Especially if wheelchairs and other mobility aids are needed. Families with small children who need to take a lot of gear - clothes, walkers, snacks, drinks etc will be disadvantaged by having to get on a bus and leaving the vehicle out of reach.  What do you intend to do about people who turn up late unintentionally after the last bus has left for the night?  Leave them there?  The imposition of this proposal would in effect create arbitrary public opening and closing times for the Park and in effect (illegally?) restrict access. This is unprecedented and not in the spirit of traditional free public access to National Parks.</p> <p>3. Equity issues  The intention to allow only those people who can provide proof of booked accommodation in the park, at the Hermitage and any other venues, to park private vehicles in the village is discriminatory by being based on the ability to pay. This is not the NZ way of doing things.</p> <p>4. Enforcement  How do you police these parking restrictions at the park entrance – do you have a barrier arm, enforcement personnel and interrogate everyone who wishes to drive in?</p> <p>5. Reduce numbers not access  The real problem is too many people wanting access to the park at certain times of year. Devise strategies to alleviate this issue. I would prefer that priority be given to Nzers. Overseas tourists could be required to book for vehicle parking with numbers of vehicles allowed in set at a certain number per day. After that they park outside and take the shuttle.</p> <p>6. Oversize Vehicle / Campervan parking  I agree that campervans and large vehicles should be required to park outside the park entrance. When parking is in short supply it is not fair that these private vehicles should occupy one or more parking spaces or occupy spaces for extended periods.  This proposal gives priority to the interests of the</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>tourism industry over the interests of NZ citizens who wish to visit and recreate in this wonderful natural environment. This contradicts the provisions of the National Parks Act.</p> <p>I want to see more priority given to conservation and low impact recreation and visitation in the park and much less priority given to the interests and ambitions of the commercial tourism industry.</p>		
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/26</p>	<p>(v) Investigate options to remove all visitor vehicle access to the Park ...:</p> <p>Generally support the Park &amp; Ride concept, but a parking exemption needs to be given to people who have booked a multi-day guided trip with a concessionaire or are staying overnight in an alpine hut or club lodge. Note that "evidence of booked accommodation" would only be possible for alpine huts if they actually have a booking system. Consideration also needs to be given to mountaineers who are attempting remote and technical trips where there are no facilities available and bivvying is required (they will also frequently require access during hours of darkness or outside of standard operating times of the Park &amp; Ride). Could this be addressed as an exemption for NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members? A scannable sticker or electronic vehicle tag (similar to road toll systems around the world) could be an option.</p> <p>Also location of parking needs careful consideration as extreme winds occur at the outflows of upper valleys that flow down and across the Highway, especially from the Hoophorn to Freds Stream areas.</p>	<p>Retain Policies 2.1.2 Discussion Box 1. i) - iv) but make allowances for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers who need to leave a vehicle parked at Whitehorse Hill for their return from eg. a Ball Pass, Fitzgerald Pass or Copland crossing, a trip to Sefton Biv or Empress Hut, technical/remote trips etc.</p> <p>Concessionaires, residents and NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members could have a scannable sticker or electronic tag to put on their vehicles to show they are authorised to park there.</p>	
<p><i>Pengelly, Stuart</i> 882/4</p>	<p>While I support the park and ride system as a means of managing vehicle congestion, there is no guidance on protecting access for climbers and other recreationalist who will come and go from the park at all hours.</p>	<p>Review the park and ride investigation to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.1 Nohoaka Place 2 Birch Hill and Park Entrance</b></p>		
<p><i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/8</p>	<p>Suggest Glentanner for gateway for Park&amp;Ride rather than Birch Hill - would be better complement the proposal to incorporate the Tasman River ecosystem within the Park.</p> <p>Alternatively access to the Park could be near bottom of Lake Pukaki where other visitor facilities already exist.</p>	<p>Review Park entrance to reflect new gateway suggestions.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 48/4	Why not use existing facilities at Glennanner, rather than developing a costly new Park and Ride facility at Birch Hill	No development at Birch Hill and encourage visitors to stay at Glentanner and Twizel	
<i>Lubas, Paul and Stevenson, Heather</i> 141/2	Oppose the proposition of all vehicles stop at Birch Hill area.	If all vehicles stop at Birch Hill area there needs to be at the least covered shelters for the extreme weather and transport stopping every 15 minutes.	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/10	while MDC supports the provision of a public transport/ Park and Ride service and facility as a general concept, it queries where the location should be. Instead, DOC should enter into discussions with the MDC and engage expert advice to determine the most appropriate location for such a large-scale development. More suitable locations for such a development include Pukaki Airport, Twizel township and/or Lake Tekapo township.	Delete the entirety of Point 2, and any reference to a development occurring at Birch Hill.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/28	Starting point for Park and Ride better placed in well established Twizel or Tekapo villages. Birch Hill very windy location with limited facilities. SH80 traffic into national park already significant hazard due to dangerous stopping or inappropriate parking along roadsides and lack of knowledge of NZ road rules.	Move Park Entrance and Park & Ride start to Twizel and Tekapo Villages to utilise established facilities and improve safety on SH80	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/24	The starting point for the proposed Park & Ride concept would be much better moved right back to the already well established Twizel and Tekapo Villages. Birch Hill is a very windy location with limited accommodation, food and general visitor facilities.	Move the Park Entrance and proposed starting point for the Park & Ride concept to Twizel & Tekapo Villages.	
<i>Brown, Rob</i> 464/1	The whole idea of a park and ride from Birch Hill seems deeply flawed. Birch Hill is one of the windiest areas in the valley. The plan does not deal with the campervan issue, it only shifts it to the Park Boundary.	The plan should instead not encourage campervans from coming up Cook Road.	
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/8	Agree wholeheartedly with the idea of providing carparking outside the park and a shuttle service for day visitors.		
<i>Miles, Clint</i> 571/4	Oppose the proposed carpark at Birch Hill. There is no way this car park would be able to comply with the requirements of the council and RMA.	Delete this from the plan.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/17	While this area was removed from the AMCNP for accommodation and facilities, it proved unsuitable due to the area's exposure to wind. It will also be unsuitable for the purpose proposed. A more suitable area may be adjacent to the village amenities area, on the south side	Delete Birch Hill area as an option and further investigate areas closer to the village amenities area.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	of SH80 where it joins the village loop road.		
<i>NZ Transport Agency</i> 815/3	Concerning the option of developing the Birch Hill area including the establishment of a park and ride facility and restricting visitor access to the Park, particularly during the peak seasons, as State Highway does not constitute part of the National Park it is suggested that significant discussions are undertaken between the Transport Agency and the Department of Conservation before this matter is explored further. The NZTA is not opposed to this concept, but it is suggested agreed arrangements regarding the control of this section of State Highway need to be agreed upon as this will have a significant impact on the undertaking of such a concept.	Discuss with NZTA before this matter is explored further.	
<i>Prince, Ray and Barbara</i> 856/4	Oppose closing SH80.	Filter system at Park and Ride to allow those with legitimate village business (trucks, hermitage buses, hotel/ motel guests, Unwin Lodge etc) to enter. Investigate a yearly swipe card for locals.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/6	A full assessment should be done of the Birch Hill area to be developed into a car park/camp ground and mitigating plantings will need to be carried out to maintain the park's current carbon footprint size.	Amend the plan to address the matters raised.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/27	The starting point for the proposed Park & Ride concept would be much better moved right back to the already well established Twizel and Tekapo Villages. Birch Hill is a very windy location with limited accommodation, food and general visitor facilities. The ever increasing amount of visitor traffic along SH80 into the National Park is already creating a significant hazard with many close calls and accidents due to dangerous stopping and inappropriate parking along roadsides, taking photographs while standing on the road in front of oncoming traffic (or even lying down in the middle of the road!), driving on the wrong side of the road, confusion around one-lane bridges, lack of knowledge of NZ road rules or lack of driving experience in general.	Move the Park Entrance and proposed starting point for the Park & Ride concept to Twizel & Tekapo Villages. This would utilise already well-established tourism facilities and would significantly improve safety on SH80 (and possibly SH8 between Tekapo and Twizel).	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place 3 White Horse Hill Campground</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/7	the removal of day and overnight parking as this will unfairly impact climbers who access the Hooker, Sefton Biv and the Mueller Range from here.	Remove (f) or provide provision for a parking permit for climbers/trampers.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/9	Support - these are good proposals for managing day visitor demand during peak season.	Retain as written	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/71	Agree that washing in streams is inappropriate and may impact on waterways Support additional areas for overnight parking for campervans, but oppose locating this at Wakefield Falls	No camping area to be located at Wakefield Falls Ensure additional camping parks are easily seen, have toilet and washing facilities Retain some visitor parking at White Horse Hill in peak seasons.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/29	Proposed option (i) will recreate the same problems in a different area. Limit the problem now and require booking to stay in the Park. Support proposed option (ii) so long as there is exemption for concessionaire, local residents and mountaineers	Reword proposal to require campervans to park overnight at Glentanner, Twizel or Lake Tekapo. Keep consistent with 4. The Park within the wider Te Manahuna/Mackenzie Basin. Retain options (i) - (iv) with allowance for parking exemption for concessionaire, local residents and NZAC/CMC/NZMCA members	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/20	Regarding i) Why should DOC have to provide parking areas for campervans when there is a perfectly adequate camping ground at Glentanner. How many more campgrounds is DOC going to create? You'll merely recreate the same problem in another area	Rewrite this proposal to require campervans to park overnight at campgrounds at Glentanner, Twizel or Lake Tekapo.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/25	Regarding Point i) How many more campgrounds and carparks is DOC going to create? This will simply recreate the same problem in a different area.	Rewrite this proposal to require campervans to park overnight at campgrounds at Glentanner, Twizel or Lake Tekapo.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/26	Regarding Point ii) Support this, so long as there is an exemption in place for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers (NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members).	Retain with allowance for parking exemption for concessionaires, local residents and NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/13	Support this, so long as there is an exemption in place for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers (NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members).	Retain points i) to v). Include a parking exemption in place for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers (NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members).	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/1	Support the separation of day visitor parking and overnight parking	Implement a camping area, reserved for tents only. Separate area further removed from Hooker Valley for campervans and overnight camping in vehicles.	
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/7	Support the idea of restricting camping at White Horse Hill Campground to tents only, and providing an alternative overnight parking opportunity for campervans. It is a very different experience to camp in a small tent, than to be in a large vehicle surrounded by lots of other large vehicles (you are essentially just in a large car park). I have thoroughly enjoyed camping at White Horse Hill camp area in the past with small children but would hate to do it now.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Jolly, James N.</i> 530/6	Support in part with tent camping only at White Horse Hill and Campervans (plus caravans) provided for at the existing camp ground at Glentanner	Retain part of overnight camping policy - tents only. Add caravans to Campervan restriction. Add clear signage at Glentanner to indicate overnight tenting only available within the National Park.	
<i>Tsuchiya, Sadao</i> 576/3	Oppose "remove all day visitor carparks from the White Horse Hill Campground" for all users. Tour buses/vans with DOC concession should be exception. Park users who start walking/climbing before shuttle services start running require carpark at the site for fair access right to the park.	Amend plan to include secure bus/van parks at the White Horse Hill Campground. Mitigate and manage carparks at White Horse Hill and Tasman Valley for park users who are not able to use shuttle service	
<i>Weir, E. C.</i> 579/4	I support the cessation of camping at Whitehorse Hill and the development of camping facilities away from the National Park area in order to prevent the use of rivers and streams being used as bathing facilities and worse.	Implement the above submission into the plan.	
<i>Inglis, Mark (MiddlePeak Ltd)</i> 601/1	Support the intention to more intensively manage WHH area.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/22	<p>Page 96 identifies 5 options to manage increasing people and vehicle use of the Hooker road end. With the exception of option ii), the CMC supports the proposed options to manage increasing numbers of people and vehicles at Whitehorse Hill. The use of any "Park and Ride" system will greatly diminish users experience of the Park, by restricting and dictating when users can enter and move through the Park.</p> <p>Removal of campervans from over-nighting at Whitehorse Hill and expanding the vehicle parking area beyond Foliage Hill would help to reduce parking issues in this area of the Park.</p> <p>Development of other areas of the Park to provide more accessible walkways (i.e. foot bridges over the Tasman and Murchison Rivers to allow foot traffic into the lower Tasman and Murchison Valleys) would provide suitable attractions to help relieve some day and over-night visitors.</p> <p>Development of a campground in the Tasman Valley would reduce strain on the resources at Whitehorse Hill and help to disperse visitor numbers.</p> <p>The CMC support free vehicle parking within the Park.</p>	<p>Delete current option ii) and replace with: Do not allow campervans to overnight at White Horse Hill.</p> <p>Add three further options as follows: vi) Expand the carpark at Whitehorse Hill beyond Foliage Hill to allow for increasing visitor numbers. vii) Develop a campground and dedicated campervan overnighiting area in the Tasman Valley and establishment of foot bridges and tracks in the Tasman and Murchison Valleys and other areas of the Park to allow visitor numbers to be more dispersed around the Park. vi) Tar seal the Tasman Road to encourage more users to travel to this area of the Park.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/18</p>	<p>Option (i) : Strongly support a limit on overnight camping and creating a booking system</p> <p>Option (ii): Strongly support overnight vehicles to position commercial and recreational guiding and climbing activities, and shuttle buses only to use Hooker and Tasman Valley roads. Do not support use of Birch Hill for parking - unsuitable due to exposure to winds.</p>	<p>Amend the options proposed to reflect the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>Lousley, Donald</i> 648/3</p>	<p>Oppose putting control and management of parking in the hands of contractors such as Wilsons.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state DOC will continue to control the management of parking in the park.</p>	
<p><i>Shaw, Dr Vivienne &amp; Dr Christopher T</i> 655/3</p>	<p>Opposed to making this a campsite for tents only and forcing motor caravanners to stay at a site outside of the park.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to continue to let caravans park at White Horse Hill Campground.</p>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/32</p>	<p>Agrees with the discussion points around the White Horse Hill Campground, and many of the proposed management strategies to provide an enhanced experience for visitors go some way to alleviate some of the management issues.</p> <p>The issues of traffic flow and congestion, day and overnight visitor car parking, campground visitors and the facilities available at the White Horse Hill site adversely impact on the Village (visitors and residents) in particular and other road networks close by. Better use of the campground site and use of land adjacent to the Village will address many of the issues the draft management plan has identified.</p> <p>-The campground requires an overhaul of zoning for the different visitor types and management of compliance enforcement. A Section 50 authorisation for management of the facility would provide a higher quality solution. The management of the campground facility, parking organisation and compliance enforcement would be better operated if there was an onsite presence.</p> <p>No need to change the campsite category and the likelihood is it would free up some of the Department's resources. If further car parking facilities (day and/or overnight) were required there may be options at the already modified land by the airport and/or adjacent to the Village itself (see extension amenities area). This would alleviate the congestion not only within the</p>	<p>Consider the suggested alternative options for the campground (see also policy 15).</p> <p>Investigate the options of land available adjacent to the amenities boundary for development, particularly for facilities and services that will address management issues already identified for the Village and the nearby road ends; including but not limited to car parking (day and overnight), infrastructure (toilets and shower facilities), day visitor shelters and options of commercial operations to service visitors etc.</p> <p>Investigate the option of utilising already modified land at the airport for car parking overflow in the busy periods. This may include the use of the land for visitor overnight parking and shuttle services to the Village and road ends.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Village at busy times, but also potentially at the White Horse Hill site.		
<i>Prince, Ray and Barbara</i> 856/3	Support the retention of White Horse Hill camping - facilities already present	Camping confined to hikers tents, motorcyclists tents, small cars tents ONLY. Not small vans with mattresses	
<i>Hammelburg, Baud</i> 863/3	Oppose commercialisation to support more campervans at White Horse Hill Campground.	No decision stated	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/39	Take the following matters into consideration in the options for management of the White Horse Hill campground: - Developed to give a remote mountain / wilderness experience. - Develop landscaping to provide some privacy. - Remove Cub huts /lodges - Becomes road end with Tent Camp ground only with good Toilet / Wash facilities. Limited parking area (If any) - Serviced by shuttle bus.	Retain the objectives and policies as written	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/28	(i); "How many more campgrounds and carparks is DOC going to create? This will simply recreate the same problem in a different area. Limit the problem now and declare Aoraki/Mt Cook National Park a special place, which requires booking well in advance if you wish to stay in the village; or if that is full, you arrange accommodation outside the park. New Zealanders who belong to the NZ Motor/Caravan Club have a scenic camping ground of their own in Tekapo. Adhere to what you propose on P. 97: "Except where necessary for safety reasons, there is a preference for no further development of facilities within the front country of the Park,"  (ii): Support this, so long as there is an exemption in place for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers (NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members).	(i): Rewrite this proposal to require campervans to park overnight at campgrounds at Glentanner, Twizel or Lake Tekapo. No new campervan park at Wakefield Falls Carpark."  (ii): Retain Policies 2.1.2 Discussion Box 3. i) - v) with allowance for parking exemption for concessionaires, local residents and NZAC/CMC/NZMGA members.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place 4 The park within the wider Mackenzie basin</b>		
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/30	Introduce a National Parks fee with a tiered payment system for international visitors and NZ residents. This is common in national parks around the world. Could be implemented in conjunction with the Park&Ride concept. An annual or seasonal pass should	Introduce a National Parks fee with a tiered system and consideration for concessionaires and their booked visitors who are essentially already paying a fee.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>be available. Preference should be given to Nzers, regional residents and students. Support school groups to visit the Park to encourage appreciation for Park values.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/54</p>	<p>Support the reference to a preference to have no further development in the front country of the Park</p>	<p>Retain the last sentence of 4. The Park within the wider Te Manahuna/Mackenzie Basin, beginning " Except where necessary for safety reasons ..."</p>	
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/19</p>	<p>Support no further development of facilities within the front country of AMCNP. The Park should be managed as an integral part of the wider Te Manahuna/Mackenzie area.</p>	<p>Retain as written</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/29</p>	<p>Introduce a National Parks fee. This is common in National Parks around the world and could be implemented for AMCNP in conjunction with the Park &amp; Ride concept (or at all international airports for a nationwide concept). A tiered system whereby eg. International visitors pay a set fee, Australian residents pay 50-100% of the international fee, NZ residents pay 25-50%, Mackenzie region residents pay 0-25% and NZ school groups/students are free. An annual or seasonal pass should be available. Concessionaires and anyone booking a guided activity with them are essentially already paying a parks entrance fee, other visitors should also be contributing to the funding of the National Park. Preference should be given to New Zealanders, regional residents and students so that they can afford to continue visiting the National Park without getting squeezed out by mass tourism. Support for school groups to visit the National Park should be encouraged, so that the next generation grows up with an appreciation for the natural, cultural, historical and recreational values that make AMCNP so special.</p>	<p>Introduce a National Parks fee with a tiered system and consideration for concessionaires and their booked visitors who are essentially already paying a fee.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Question 1</b></p>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/72</p>	<p>Ideas for future management within the Park include: 1. Remove Park and Ride and Birch Hill concepts, and replace concept with range of additional car parking adjacent to village, at Blue Lakes car park 2. Separate campsite campervans and day visitor parking at White Horse Hill.. 3. No further campsite or caravan site to be built in the</p>	<p>Amend the plan to address the issues raised</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Park.</p> <p>4.Ensure sufficient washing and ablution blocks provided at White Horse Hill.</p> <p>5. Use booking system for campsite only at peak season</p> <p>6. Designate specific areas for car parking. Locate day visitor parking close to start of tracks. Place DOC wardens on duty in car parking areas</p> <p>7. Allow day visitors free access to Park throughout the year.</p>		
<i>Fraser, James &amp; Fiona</i> 351/1	<p>Would like to see a toll gate across Highway 80 that has a charge of \$30 per head (Oct - April) which is to be shared between the Pational Park and the Mackenzie District Council to be used for improved services, but not to increase the total number of tourists. Visitors can buy a season Pass to all our parks for \$150, or pay \$30 for each Park for a season. Immediate locals and service people have a free pass. This area could be enlarged to include toll gates at Burkes Pass, Lindis Pass and Kurow.</p>	<p>Implement a toll gate for the Park.</p>	
<i>Pickford, Alison</i> 364/3	<p>Would argue that limiting the number of people visiting the Park - particularly day trippers is important. This could be achieved by a booking system - including for tour buses.</p>	<p>Look into developing a booking system for the Park.</p>	
<i>Morris, Colin J.</i> 528/4	<p>I support a restriction on visitor numbers in order to preserve the intrinsic values of naturalness that Aoraki/Mt Cook embodies.</p>	<p>Implement a restriction on visitor numbers in the park.</p>	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/22	<p>Believe that parking, waste management and dangerous pedestrian behaviour are the main issues which need to be addressed in the front country areas of the NP.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Question 2</b>		
<i>Jauregui, Christopher</i> 278/4	<p>Propose a Park entry fee for all non-NZ citizens/permanent residents/working visa holders.</p>	<p>Explore a National Park entry fee for non-residents.</p>	
<i>Eatson, Michael</i> 413/2	<p>I am not against the addition of a toll gate in the Tasman Valley (just before the Airport) where you can either park and ride (read: park services fee) or as a New Zealander can buy a permit (like Yosemite) that allows you to drive to the Tasman lakes, White Horse carpark, or to the CMC and NZAC club huts.</p>	<p>Investigate the proposals outlined in the submission.</p>	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/15	<p>Main issue I see to address is the attitudes of park planners that they should control the fringe roads in the park beyond what transit would normally do anywhere</p>	<p>Withdraw the rights of park planners to control road traffic and leave it up to Transit. They know what they are doing with transport and traffic control.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	else in the country.		
Gould, Marion & David 496/5	<p>Ideas for future management of the Park. Pay to enter the park (i.e. same system as entering the Canadian Rockies, so much per day with a sticker attached to front windscreen with an exemption for NZ'ers). Limits on numbers entering the park per day. A booking system for overseas guests. You seem to be trying to restrict the number of vehicles but putting no restriction on the number of people.</p> <p>Under the Conservation Act, recreation should be fostered and tourism is allowed as long as it is compatible with the parks preservation purpose. More emphasis on conservation and preservation and less on tourism which is not the job of the National Park.</p>	Consider the ideas outlined in the submission.	
Albrett, R.J. 515/4	<p>I support the restriction of visiting overseas tourists, and tourist vehicles entering the Park. With the increase of tourism, we run the risk of destroying the intrinsic value of the National Park, the very reason people visit NZ. Tourism has destroyed many `natural` places around the world. National Park policies in other countries address the adverse effects of tourism by restricting visitor numbers. We can learn from them.</p> <p>I believe a distinction should be made between overseas tourists, and NZ visitors and recreationalists; mountaineers, hunters, trampers/hikers, skiers and ski tourers mand others who visit the park. Their numbers are less, and they should not be disadvantaged by the rapid increase in overseas tourists. The National Parks Act states that the public shall have freedom of entry and access to the Park, but DOC can place conditions on tourist and recreational activity if the general welfare of the Park is threatened.</p>		
Hall, Susan & Dunn, Kevin 517/5	<p>The draft plan needs to address restricting visitor numbers. A cap on visitor numbers should be set and managed. A fee-for-access to the park, such as in Canada would ensure visitors have a rewarding and memorable experience and provide the opportunity to fund infrastructure. This cannot be achieved by free, open access for unlimited numbers of tourists. Such an approach can only end in disappointment and downgrading of the destination.</p>	Implement a cap on visitor numbers should be set and managed and a fee-for-access to the park.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/23	The increasing number of tourists benefits all New Zealanders economically, though it may begin to have large adverse effects on our values, including those enshrined in our national park plans and the general management plan. Removing vehicle access for New Zealanders into the areas proposed is such an effect. This would also cause problems for tour operators, permanent residents and other businesses operating in the park who would all need exceptions. Many hunters, skiers, climbers and other back-country users who utilise the roadways in the park are using these at very odd hours of the day, (very early morning 0100 – 0600, and late evening 2000-2200) in order to maximise their use time in the park, and in the case of climbers to be able to travel at the safest times of day when avalanche and rockfall hazards are reduced. They also carry large amounts of gear which is better suited to motor vehicles than other forms of transport. As such a better amendment would be to allow vehicles whose registered owner is present (or those who can present a NZ driver's license), into the park and ask tourists (the majority of whom are not NZ nationals or vehicle owners in NZ) to use a Park to Ride system during the peak season. I think a greater presence of DOC 'rangers' to police behaviour on roadsides and to ensure visitors are not degrading the natural values of the park through poor waste management is required at all times of year. Waste management also requires a large number of serviced rubbish and toilet facilities.		
<i>Hay, Elizabeth</i> 692/7	The AMCNP draft plan needs to engage with how many visitors it is prepared to allow into the park, and how these will be managed, recognising that the visitors it cannot provide for, will provide benefit for areas outside the park, such as Twizel.	Amend the plan to provide visitor number capacity and explain how these will be managed.	
<i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/4	Oppose the approach and focus generally on increasing visitation rather than increasing yield and retaining the inherent amenity and value of the Aoraki Mt Cook National Park and surrounding areas	Investigate options for see an overarching decision made that identifies and quantifies the maximum visitation for specific uses and experiences.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Question 3</b>		
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/27	Introduce a National Parks fee. This is common in National Parks around the world and could be implemented for AMCNP in conjunction with the Park & Ride concept (or at all international airports for a	Introduce a National Parks fee with a tiered system or consideration for concessionaires and their booked visitors who are essentially already paying a fee.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	nationwide concept).		
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/14	Introduce a National Parks fee.	Introduce a National Parks fee with a tiered system and consideration for concessionaires and their booked visitors who are essentially already paying a fee.	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/24	That the traditional use and enjoyment of New Zealanders continue as normal and that the management of increasing numbers of tourists from outside New Zealand be considered separately to this.		
<i>ProGuides New Zealand</i> 872/8	We welcome the discussion section starting on Page 94 of the plan, which considers future options for handling increasing numbers of visitors while maintaining the quality of the experience. We would be keen to contribute to further development of these options.	Retain the Discussion section and reflect the matters raised by the submitter	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Discussion box - Village zoning plan</b>		
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/9	Propose a park entry fee for all non NZ citizens/permanent residents/working visa holders. If overseas travellers have the disposable income and leisure time to visit AMCNP then they should have the means to pay a small entry fee for improvement of the park.	Add: investigate a National Park entry fee for non-residents	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/73	Some anomalies and errors in the village zoning plan identified and listed	Reword and redraw the zoning map to include all approved building projects Correct the errors listed by submitter	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/74	1. Zoning and development standards in Village: Support development of overall village design. Village should reflect the nature of a New Zealand alpine environment. Design guidelines should include requirement for buildings to be alpine in nature. The current landscaping in the village is simple and does not require a substantial revamp, except perhaps on the perimeter of the old and new motels. Support the design panel, including a Kāi Tahu representative as long as they are qualified in architecture and/or landscaping. Desired outcome should be a collaborative and cohesive design. Public and local residents should be consulted for any design standards and guidelines. No one commercial body or culture should have advantage over any other. Alpine architecture should be a key component of design	Amend the zoning and standards to address the matters raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and landscaping.		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/75	Limited capacity for development in Village: While agree that village has limited development capacity, do not support staff on shift work having to commute 100km per day from Twizel Do not support placing cultural Activities Zone over DOC Administration building without any public consultation process Some areas of protected vegetation could be removed to allow for further accommodation	Amend the Village Zoning to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/12	Design Standards and guidelines Management of lighting in the village and Park area is critical to preserving the natural value of the park. Design Standards should cover both exterior and interior lighting where that interior lighting can spill out of a building or structure. Support for "The standards and guidelines will reflect the significance of the Park to Kai Tahu, and the international status of the Park as part of the World heritage Area and an International Dark Sky Reserve."		
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 549/1	The major redevelopment with the park village should not take place. Any further development could take place at Birch Hill or further away from the National Park. The village zoning plan needs to be enforced. Removal of the multi-storied hotel would be an improvement. It is an inappropriate design for the area and from a distance it looks like a prison building!	Amend the plan as outlined in the submission.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/55	2. Limited capacity for further development in the Village: Support retaining the current size of the amenities area	Retain the 1st sentence, paragraph 2, as written: "For these reasons, the size of the amenities area will not be increased."	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 637/2	Support in principle the village zoning plan and front country spatial plan and that the spatial plan recognises that development in the village area has nearly reached capacity and that new developments should occur outside of Aoraki Mount Cook National Park in the wider Mackenzie District towns.	Please do not authorise major redevelopment within the National Park village, and implement and enforce the village zoning plan within the time frame of this plan.	
<i>Stäger, Ines</i> 653/2	Support the Village zoning plan in principle.	Further development is needed in terms of providing practical solutions and solving problems in terms of: increased use; avoidance of increased pressure on the natural environment; not allowing major development within the NP.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Grand Properties (2011) Ltd</i> 686/2</p>	<p>The current proposal is too conservative. All that is being proposed is the creation of a zone over an existing activity. Given that all these activities are supported (allowable) by an underlying lease or concession, where would it be possible to develop new commercial activities? On page 100 the draft plan suggests new commercial activities could be allowed to occur within areas that are available ("limited number of vacant sites") via an auction, tender, expression of interest scenario. Submit that these sites do not even exist as they are already tied up within a concessionaire's lease. Even if some land did exist it is most likely to be sited in the wrong place to make it commercially viable to operate a business from. There is an obvious shortage of commercial eating operations within the Village. This draft plan will exacerbate this situation and lead to disgruntled visitors/guests. There is a pressing need for more cafes and more restaurants to service the current and future demand from visitors. More competition in this sector is the only way you will see better service, better food options on offer and more competitive pricing.</p> <p>There is plenty of scope within the existing Amenities area to create commercial zones which will help to alleviate this problem.</p> <p>Land at the confluence of Bowe Drive and State Highway 80 is an ideal spot for a commercial activity such as a Café / Restaurant. It is proposed to be zoned Amenity Open Space due primarily to a now outdated assessment of the area from a flood risk perspective.</p>	<p>More opportunities for commercial. Change the zoning for the proposed Amenity Open Space for land at the confluence of Bowe Drive and State Highway 80 to Commercial Zone</p>	
<p><i>Grand Properties (2011) Ltd</i> 686/6</p>	<p>The existing amenities is massive. There is space to manoeuvre, to adapt without the proposals that are currently being looked at. The only areas of immediate concern within the Village are the top end of both Bowen Drive and Terrace Road where there is an obvious shortage of space, limited car parking etc. So, the following is what we firmly believe should happen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1. A large metalled carpark within the lower Glencoe fan area be developed. This sits at the entrance to the Village, directly in front of the turnoff at SH80 and Bowen Drive and is an obvious stopping point for visitors. This area is also within the amenities area and even with the inappropriate flood risk rating of grade D, does allow for short term car parking. This area sits in a</li> </ul>	<p>A large metalled carpark within the lower Glencoe fan area be developed and track to be upgraded to the Village centre.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>hollow so the fact there may be hundreds of vehicles here at any point in time will not visually impact visitors' experiences. Public toilets to be provided here as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2. Tracks to be upgraded/widened to allow for visitors to walk up the Glencoe Fan to be able to enter the "Village Centre" without congesting it with traffic. This would be a leisurely walk not a 10km trek from Birch Hill as proposed for in the draft plan.</li> <li>- 3. Visitors could be shuttled from here up the Hooker Valley or Tasman Roads, a much shorter distance than coming in from Birch Hill. Alternatively, they could walk, cycle or e-bike to these destinations from here.</li> <li>- 4. This proposal will provide people with the ability to enter the National Park and wow at the scenery whilst not impacting on the environment. There is plenty of scope for what we are proposing.</li> </ul> <p>Firmly believe that the biggest issue facing Aoraki/Mt Cook is customer experiences. Many visitors to this beautiful spot leave impressed with the scenery but disillusioned with other facets such as eating options and lack of parking within the central part of the Village. Our carpark proposal and associated walking linkages to the "central village" will alleviate this and open up the national park for a more sustainable experience.</p> <p>A visible car park to visitors entering the village will solve the problem of cars parking at the intersection of SH80 and Bowen Drive in the peak months with many near miss accidents resulting from the congestion caused by this.</p> <p>A large carpark within the Village will solve all of the current congestion problems and allow for visitors to then choose whether to shuttle, walk, bike or e-bike to their chosen destination. Realistically Birch Hill only provides one option a shuttle bus.</p>		
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/29</p>	<p>Opposed against the management direction to restrict the size of the Village amenities area to the existing footprint and restricting the development to within that footprint. The discussion points raised to maintain status quo are valid, to a point. There is land immediately adjacent to the amenities area that should be investigated to be occupied for further development and legislated as part of the Village amenities area. This would avoid the potential of a much larger impact; incremental creep and</p>	<p>Consider the option to increase the size of the amenities area.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>significant cumulative effects (Birch Hill park entry and activities). The Birch Hill Visitor Hub proposal would be a 'subset' of the Village, as it will require large modification to the land for parking, infrastructure, structures, buildings and accommodation facilities, irrespective of who manages the operations at the site. Does not consider that an extension of the amenities area, it's subservience to the greater national park, and preservation and conservation of the national park values, are exclusive of one another. There are options available adjacent to the Village (amenities area) that would not create as significant effects on landscape, scenic and natural values.</p> <p>Not opposed to the redevelopment of existing activities within the Village to provide for a more functional, sustainable and attractive environment for visitors and residents.</p> <p>As an operator within the Village and the wider national park, our purpose and aspiration is to support an environment that is most beneficial to visitors and residents experience, including preserving and protecting the natural, historic or cultural values of the national park.</p> <p>Safe cycle ways, addressing car parking capacity, and positioning of visitors (separation of day and overnight) at Whitehorse Hill, and within the Village will assist with the management of visitors in and round the amenities area. However, these could be better cultivated by also increasing the amenities area and the capacity of the infrastructure servicing visitors and residents, in conjunction with the proposed outcomes and policies relating to zoning, design, natural heritage, roads and traffic and landscaping etc.</p> <p>General Policy National Parks (2005) provides for identifying extended or modified amenities areas in national park management plans, on the basis the i) the development and operation of recreational and public amenities appropriate for public use and enjoyment of the national park cannot practicably be located outside the national park; and ii) where adverse effects on the rest of the national park can be minimised. There is sufficient cause to consider this option while being consistent with the General Policy.</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/11	Support a village landscape plan. This is vital to prevent the establishment of ad hoc style developments that are not in line with the objectives and values for a sustainable outcome.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sagar, Joy L.</i> 817/3	Support the village zoning plan and ask that that major redevelopment of village does not take place.	Amend the plan to not allow major redevelopment of the village.	
<i>Hamblett, Annette &amp; Michael</i> 823/3	We support the requirement for any new developments to be outside of the National Park in the wider Mackenzie District towns. This is necessary to preserve and protect the Park's natural and amenity values	Do not approve any further major development within the National Park village. Implement and enforce the village zoning plan within the time frame of this plan. Proceed cautiously and carefully with any developments outside the Park, fully assessing impacts on landscapes.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/2	The major redevelopment with the park village should not take place. Any further development could take place at Birch Hill or further away from the National Park. The village zoning plan needs to be enforced. Removal of the multi-storied hotel would be an improvement. It is an inappropriate design for the area and from a distance it looks like a prison building!	Amend to reflect the concerns raised	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place 1 Zoning and development standards in the Village</b>		
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/11	MDC supports instituting rules and standards to guide development within Aoraki Village. In particular, Council supports rules or standards to control outdoor lighting.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/24	Not convinced that by incorporating Kāi Tahu cultural values in design will ensure that the Village is a functional place. However, it will assist in achieving many other objectives and policies of the draft Plan relating to developing and maintaining a deeper cultural recognition for visitors and residents and a more attractive Village environment. Not opposed to including such design aspects for developments in the Village, and along with other tools being promoted for use within this place (landscape architecture, spatial plan, zoning plan) it will become a more sustainable, functioning village environment.	Review the statement to better reflect the use of Kāi Tahu cultural values and their purpose for use in the Village.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place 2 Limited capacity for further development</b>		
<i>Mulvany, Dr Stanley</i> 9/1	Ultimately the number of overseas tourists have to be restricted. The overcrowding at White Hill carpark is unbelievable. This has to change.No where in the draft is this discussed apart from a "Park and Ride" proposal for day visitors. The concept of overflow campgrounds is a	Amend the plan to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	short-term fix but will ultimately prove unsuccessful.		
<i>Lubas, Paul and Stevenson, Heather</i> 141/1	Realise the village is inside AMCNP but this area needs to grow for the continued influx of visitors and not be stopped.	Add that there is room for growth while still looking nice.	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/13	Do not "privatise" more land in the village. Make concession/lease fees higher from existing operators and potentially a percentage of their income.	Amend to ensure that: 1. Do not add more buildings to the village 2. Charge higher fees for the permanent and exclusive use of public land.	
<i>Hall, Susan &amp; Dunn, Kevin</i> 517/7	We do not support any more development in the Park village.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/35	TIA supports the Plan's aim to keep development within the current Village footprint until it is at capacity, at which time further development would occur outside the park.	Retain as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Outcomes - Place</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/76	No one culture should overpower the other	Amend outcome to include: "The village has a long historical association with alpinists and mountain guides and is the most significant of New Zealand's alpine environments. This is also how the village firs came about. As such it should reflect the alpine nature of the environment through its architecture and this to be acknowledged, recognised and respected by visitors and locals as it will illustrate balance in harmony between historic alpine historical presence and the Kāi Tahu presence.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/95	Outcomes should include the ongoing visibility and presence of alpine endeavour and its history and culture, in the village and throughout.	Amend the Place Outcomes to include the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Outcomes - Front country and roads</b>		
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/9	Does not identify accessibility as an outcome sought	Ensure that accessibility is improved through management particularly in urban and front country areas.  Identify, review and audit current and future accessibility opportunities.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/77	No park and ride as outlined	1. Delete "park and ride" and public transport being the "main means of visitor movement". 2. Add: Establish a car park on the south side of SH80 in the area where it does not interrupt views and is landscaped aesthetically from the road and offers approximately 4 to 5	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		<p>acres of parking area.</p> <p>3. Add: Expand Tasman Valley car park area.</p> <p>4. Delete club lodges being used for the public unless they desire it.</p>	
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/96</p>	<p>The Front country and roads outcomes need to retain flexibility to respond to changing circumstances. Changes are required to paragraphs 2 and 3 to address this in relation to public transport and the purpose for club huts.</p>	<p>Reword para 2 to read: "A range of parking and transport options allows for well-connected transport flows ..."</p> <p>Reword para 3 to ensure huts' and clubs' purposes are not compromised by obligations to public use</p>	
<p><i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/14</p>	<p>Disagree with handing over control of CMC or NZAC huts in the village or anywhere in the Park to DOC. DOC has proven it is unable to sustainably manage its assets shown by the gradual loss of backcountry huts. This will only have a harmful effect on New Zealand's (ski and) mountaineering culture while providing a barely noticeable remedy to the tourist problem.</p>	<p>Retain club huts managed by clubs.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/36</p>	<p>We note that section 2.1.2 states that the village environment has a high level of tranquillity. TIA does not agree with this - the village is a busy place near to an existing airport. We do, however, support the careful management of the DOC heli-pad in the village to minimise its impact on tranquillity.</p>	<p>Amend the Outcome to acknowledge that the Village has a lower level of tranquillity than stated</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Outcomes - Village</b></p>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/78</p>	<p>Support the Kāi Tahu relationship with the sacred mountains being communicated, but important that this village is not turned into a predominantly Kāi Tahu village with the historical alpine environmental nature of the Park being squeezed out. This does not represent all new Zealanders - all New Zealanders should feel at home living here at Aoraki.</p>	<p>Amend outcome to add the following outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Kāi Tahu shares a strong visible presence in the village in liaison with the historical alpinist history of New Zealanders from which this village was first established. The spiritual nature with which the mountaineering community regards this area is also acknowledged.</li> <li>2." The village gives visitors a substantial understanding of the historical nature of this traditional alpine environment and the early climbers and guides up to the present day."</li> <li>3. "The village centre remains where it is in the village in the area of the VC and car park."</li> <li>4. "If there is , at any time, any type of park and ride, it will stop and drop off at all concessionaire businesses, although this is not anticipated for many years and voted on by concessionaires and residents within the village."</li> <li>5. " While lighting should be down-lighting outside businesses in the Park, there will be no restriction on lighting within concessionaires buildings for their respective</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		businesses."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/97	Both paragraphs 1 and 2 need to be tightened to ensure that park values are uppermost and services are modest. Para 2 implies a significant proliferation of activities, many of which could readily take place outside the Park.	Amend para1 to clarify its intent Amend para to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/98	FMC believes the village footprint should not be extended, regardless of the amenities area extent. A heavier human footprint would be an unnecessary, disproportionate environmental burden. Where there is competition for limited space, the needs of the Department and emergency services should be prioritised. Paragraph 11 should be rewritten to ensure the outdoors community connected to the Park as turangawaewae have their "sense of place" recognised	Reword the Village outcomes to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/13	Growing awareness of the night sky in a mountain setting is drawing international and domestic attention to the Aoraki Mt Cook National Park. Support for "Residents and visitors can fully experience the night skies of the Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve without interference from lighting in the village"		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/42	Support - Outcomes - Improve the Tranquillity of the Village by the removal of private motor vehicles, reduce traffic flows. - Promote walking & cycling within the village and surrounds	Retain outcomes as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 1</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/79	Support Policy 1(a) - (c)  Policy 1(d):dealing with pests in village and near waterways should be - without poisons and without any aerial drops of 1080 or roundup or other poisons, and - absolutely forbidden from entering water, or sprayed overhead in the village - without rotting carcasses from culling being near water - any loading of poison done completely out of the village  Policy 1(e) :support in part, although concessionaires cannot be prohibited from operating in the evenings due	Amend Policy 1 to address the matters raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>to "night sky" as there is a huge area of land in the vicinity to see the night skies from.</p> <p>Support Policy 1(f) and (g)</p>		
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/99</p>	<p>Make it clear in the policy that it is the Department's role to preserve all parts of the natural environment. The input of others is additional only.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 1 to reflect the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/14</p>	<p>Retain "1 e) minimising adverse effects of structures, facilities and vehicles on the dark skies 'nightsapes' and natural quiet;"</p>	<p>Retain</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 2</b>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/80</p>	<p>Decision-making within the village should include other concessionaires in addition to Kāi Tahu. All New Zealanders should be represented - our varying cultures and regards for sacredness of the mountains is expressed differently - this should be reflected here.</p> <p>Policy 2(b): This needs further explanation. It is unclear how Mātauranga Maori is translated into all aspects of management decision making. The village and the National Park are a place for all New Zealanders.</p> <p>Policy 2(c): Advertising should not be a Departmental requirement for one business over other</p>	<p>Amend Policy 2 to incorporate the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. incorporate wording to include New Zealand alpine culture in harmony with Te Rūnanga Ngāi Tahu culture with cultures working in harmony.</li> <li>2. Include further explanation in Policy 2(b) to address the matters raised for joint decision making</li> <li>3. Ensure signage for business is even-handed and advertising of businesses, cultural or otherwise, is the responsibility of each of the commercial enterprises.</li> <li>4. Add "and historical alpine stories" to Policy 2(d)</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/35</p>	<p>The use of Mātauranga Kāi Tahu?</p>	<p>Please provide a translation or definition for mātauranga (or is this a misspelling as it only occurs once in the entire document i.e. not in the glossary).</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 3</b>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/81</p>	<p>Support Policy 3</p>	<p>Retain as written</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 4</b>		
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/100</p>	<p>This policy should not provide for new developments.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 4 to reflect the concerns raised.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 6</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/12	MDC would welcome the opportunity to work with DOC on such an initiative.	Retain text as written.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/82	Further explanation needed. It is not the job of DOC to "integrate" Rūnanga Ngāi Tahu culture with other cultures working in harmony.	Amend Policy 6 to clarify concerns raised	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/26	Identifies collaborating with regional authorities as a management consideration for managing the Park in the context of the wider Te Manahuna/Mackenzie area. As an example, working with the Mackenzie District Council (and others) with the objective of providing a litter free environment within the Park by having suitable sites outside of the park. Considers it reasonable to create a policy that is more specific to working with the Mackenzie District Council (and others) to provide alternative visitor management strategies. (see also section 1.2.4. Policy 5 that refers to the aim of collaboration). Furthermore the Haupapa Place Engagement Values discussion identifies exciting opportunities for partnerships to be developed to address and provide future management of vehicle and accommodation facilities as they approach capacity levels within the park.	Create a policy that is more specific to working with the Mackenzie District Council (and others) to provide alternative visitor management strategies.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 7</b>		
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/13	MDC would like to be consulted along with the NZTA regarding such proposed initiatives.	Amend to read "Consult with the New Zealand Transport Agency and the Mackenzie District Council and their contractors"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 8</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/83	Oppose inclusion of SH80 within the Park. New Zealanders should have ability to access the national park as provided for in the NP Act.	Delete Policy 8	
<i>Winkler, Prof. Dr. Stefan</i> 329/4	Submission refers to all of section 2.1.3, and particularly Policies 8 -11, 15: Strongly oppose any attempt to close SH80 past the Birch Hill NP entrance for individual access. Key reasons for opposition include: - impacts on individuals' ability to access the Park outside "open hours" - requirement to work to schedules for shuttle services	1. Delete Policies 8, 9, 10, 11 and 15(f) 2. Delete any policies applying to restrict individual motor vehicle access to the existing day parks at White Horse Hill and Tasman valley. 3. Delete any policies for a "forced" park & ride service from Birch Hill NP entrance 4. Consider relocation of White Horse Hill campground rather than the day visitor car park.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- potential safety concerns as people speed on SH80 or rush along tracks, and take shortcuts to meet bus schedule times.</li> <li>- loss of freedom to stop and admire landscape along roads within the Park</li> <li>- potential imposition of a charge for the service</li> <li>- the policies and strategies outlined in the plan will create huge disadvantages to individual tourists, and especially to the 'ordinary Kiwi'.</li> <li>- inhibit ability to conduct future research and fieldwork if vehicle access restricted.</li> <li>- additional financial expenses or logistical restrictions prohibiting efficient performance of research and educational opportunities.</li> </ul> <p>Consider the following as alternatives to the Park and Ride proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- relocating the existing White Horse Hill campground (rather than the day car park facilities) to a more suitable site where facilities can be provided and waste management efficiently done</li> <li>- close White Horse Hill car park for overnight parking</li> <li>- create parallel lay-by spaces along existing Hooker valley access road to use as overflow parking</li> </ul>	5. Create additional parking space along the Hooker Valley road for overflow parking.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/20	Consider not relevant to incorporate SH80 into the Park. Maintenance cost will be high and be a financial burden on Park administration.	Delete Policy 8	
<i>Grand Properties (2011) Ltd</i> 686/5	This policy says that options will be investigated to include SH80 within the National Park to enable the management of vehicles. Submit in opposition to this. Has the Department given thought to how these roads would then be maintained? If the maintenance of this part of SH80 is to come under our Local Body levies the we strongly disagree with this proposal. NZTA should be compelled to maintain all SH80 as it is State Highway. Why would DOC want to take over this road just so that it can manage who comes into the Village and when? This proposal has no sense.	Oppose Policy 8	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 9</b>		
<i>Clarkson, Sooji</i> 6/2	A Park and Ride system is wholly unsuitable for recreation users of the Park who will be exiting the Park	Reword Policy 9 to include provision for vehicle access for recreational users (not campers and day visitors)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	at times when the Park and Ride system is not operating.		
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/8	Support the reduction of motorised road traffic within the urban / approaches to the Park.	Utilise the use of public transport as an interpretive opportunity for users	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/14	MDC argues that DOC should investigate and assess potential locations for the proposed carparking area and Park & Ride public transport service.	Change "from the Park entrance" to "from an appropriate location". Add the following as point a) : investigating and assessing potential locations for the proposed carparking area and Park & Ride public transport service.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/84	Oppose use of park and ride as will make it difficult or impossible for people to access and enjoy the Park.	Delete Policy 9	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/101	support level of flexibility shown in policy 9	retain policy	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/56	Support policy	Retain Policy 9	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/13	Support the trialling of a public transport service during peak times. This should never be compulsory for New Zealanders who can show identification such as a driver's licence.	Retain Policy 9. It should not be compulsory for vehicles in which the driver can show a NZ Driver's Licence.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/29	<p>TIA is supportive of the Park and Ride concept. A strong focus on impact analysis and mitigation, including consultation with concessionaires, other affected businesses, and recreational groups is needed in the consideration of such a concept, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prioritising the support of relevant existing businesses wherever possible.</li> <li>- Carefully consider whether 'parking areas' are for parking only or for overnight stays.</li> <li>- Whether services should be public or private sector led.</li> <li>- An integrated approach with relevant local and central government agencies.</li> <li>- Identification of a sustainable funding mechanism.</li> <li>- How will the service be provided and what process will support this? Including tender processes, the ability to scale up or down as demand requires, and provision to replace the provider if the service quality is not appropriate.</li> </ul>	Ensure DOC addresses the points raised above in its work to develop a Park and Ride system, and that this work includes consultation with tourism operators and recreational groups.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/11	Support. Great initiative. Solution urgent. Complex operationally. Unclear as to the review process and who the Department is reporting back to.	Retain. Clarify the review process and decision making process.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 10</b>		
<i>Clarkson, Sooji</i> 6/3	Restriction of vehicle access (including overnight parking) to road ends directly adds a significant distance to the approach required for a climber to access objectives in the Park. A Park and Ride system is wholly unsuitable for recreational users of the Park who will be exiting the Park at times when the Park and Ride is not operating.	1. Reword Policy 10 to include provision for vehicle access for recreational users (not campers or day visitors). 2. Consider using a concession based system whereby access to road ends can be applied for on a permit based system. Enable applications from outside the Park and outside Park work hours, such as an internet-based application system.	
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/8	Agree but there needs to be provision for climbers/trampers that may want to access Park outside public transport times.	Reword Policy 10 to investigate possible provision for backcountry users needing day or overnight parking within the park.	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/14	We do not support peak season restrictions. There are alternatives for parking close to the village	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/17	Climbing, skiing and other recreation activities in the mountains may be day long from the early hours to late in the day. They may be extended due to weather or other conditions. A park and ride system would not be practicable for such activities.	Remove the word "all" from policy 10.	
<i>The Vintage Car Club of NZ, South Canterbury Branch</i> 73/2	Regarding Policy 12 d) We are concerned that if the Park and Ride system is established that we would no longer be able to complete our commemoration run to the Hermitage door. We are trusting that there would be some kind of exemption incorporated into the plan for our type of activity (South Canterbury Branch of the Vintage Car Club of NZ).	We are trusting that there would be some kind of exemption incorporated into the plan for our type of activity (South Canterbury Branch of the Vintage Car Club of NZ).	
<i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/3	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Armour, Chloe</i> 159/2	Support managing tourist vehicles and front country access through park and ride but do not support for backcountry access as use of a park and ride would mean either much longer access walks or start times dictated	Add policy allowing for backcountry trips to have vehicle access to the Park. Also maintain vehicle access to the Wyn Urwin Lodge and Thar Lodge.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	by service times.		
<i>Mee, Donald</i> 239/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/5	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Gardiner, Ian</i> 253/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/85	Oppose restricting access as cuts off majority of clients to day facilities and concessionaires in the village.	Delete Policy 10 Replace with: "Parking made available (and landscaped) adjacent to the village on the south side, so it doesn't impede views, of SH80."	
<i>Low, Tyrone</i> 259/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/31	Support the policy concept but with exemptions for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers	Retain policy with allowance for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers to have access	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/28	Generally support the Park & Ride concept, but a parking exemption needs to be given to people who have booked a multi- guided trip with a concessionaire or are staying overnight in an alpine hut or club lodge. Note that "evidence of booked accommodation" would only be possible for alpine huts if they actually have a booking. Consideration also needs to be given to mountaineers who are attempting remote and technical trips.	Retain policies, but with allowance for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers.	
<i>Rainey, Heath</i> 275/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/5	Our support for restricting visitor vehicles is conditional upon free and uninterrupted access continuing to be made available to New Zealanders and any restrictions should only be applied to overseas visitors. A precedent for this already occurs now on the Great Walks.	Amend plan to state restrictions should only be applied to overseas visitors	
<i>King, Bill</i> 310/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 318/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/5	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.		
<i>Stevenson, Dr. Anthony</i> 330/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Wilson, Dan</i> 331/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/41	Our club members may wish to make a very early morning start on a tramp or climb. They may require vehicle access many hours before the Park and Ride service commences. Permission could be arranged in advance if needed and email documentation provided as evidence.	Amend Policy 10 to read: "Manage vehicle entrance ...once a Park & Ride public transport system is operating within the Park, unless permission for vehicle access has been approved in advance by Park staff."	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/5	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Elliot, John</i> 367/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Poetschke, Alexandra</i> 386/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/102	should consider more aspects of traffic in the Park than simply crowding. Other aspects to be considered include arrival and departure times, effect of shifting parking to new area on conservation; values; carriage of recreational hunters' firearms and animal carcasses; costs of staffing a Park & Ride operation; vehicle security; meeting needs of young families and people with disabilities. FMC considers the plan should allow for optional free peak time park-and-ride service that will attract visitors to use it. A publicly-funded subsidy will be needed to support. Trial periods should be planned for.	Review Policy 10 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/28	Many recreationalists, e.g. climbers, will arrive at the park at both very early hours and late hours of the day when a shuttle is unlikely to be running. Similarly, people returning to the road ends may do so at odd hours. This suggests the need to either accommodate these people in design of the park and ride service, or ensure parking is available to overnight users.	Clarify whether tourist busses will be expected to park at Birch Hill and transfer to a shuttle bus versus the continuation of access for tourist busses at White Horse Hill.	
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 473/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Torok, Tomas</i> 484/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Watson, Elinor</i> 502/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Shinnamon, Anu</i> 535/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Fishman, Tana</i> 546/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Fishman, Charles</i> 547/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Hudson, Joshua</i> 553/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Daws, Peter</i> 556/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.		
<i>Mason, Sam</i> 558/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Ross, Mary</i> 565/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion. Allow backcountry adventurers and the wider public freedom of movement to access the park.	
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/9	Oppose the restriction of day visitor vehicle access once a park and ride system is in place. It cannot be at the expense of backcountry users.	Delete Policy 10.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/57	Recreational activities in the mountains may be long day activities, and may be extended by weather or other conditions. A Park & Ride system would not be practical for such activities.	Amend Policy 10 by deleting the word "all" .	
<i>Rhynd, Keeley</i> 642/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers,	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.		
<i>McGregor, Lucy</i> 658/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Rowden, Murray</i> 669/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Adank, Charlotte</i> 671/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/14	Support the trialling of a public transport service during peak times but New Zealanders should be allowed through by showing a NZ Drivers Licence.	Allow New Zealanders driving access to their Park.	
<i>Mitchell, Josh</i> 687/2	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/22	Within part Two of the draft Plan the term ‘peak season’ is specified in relation to management considerations at some of the Places. Specifically in the Nohoaka Place, it is proposed to manage traffic within the Park by a	Review the depth of information formulated within the draft management plan around ‘peak season’ and provide some direction in the plan as to how this may be defined, and how, outside of the management plan itself, will it be	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>variety of tools during ‘peak seasons’. (e.g. Section 2.1.3. policy 10; restricting vehicle access in peak season).</p> <p>Would like to understand how the term ‘peak season’ is to be defined?</p> <p>The Great Walk Season is clearly defined by dates. Is it envisaged the same for ‘Peak Season’? During the term of the plan there is a potential possibility that ‘peak season’ timing may change. How will this be managed? How will this be communicated to potential visitors to the park so they are clearly informed of when the peak season commences or ends?</p>	<p>communicated to potential visitors.</p>	
<p><i>Garden, Tom</i> 705/2</p>	<p>The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.</p>	<p>DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.</p>	
<p><i>DeRoy, Mary</i> 739/2</p>	<p>The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.</p>	<p>DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.</p>	
<p><i>Moyle, Nicholas</i> 741/2</p>	<p>The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.</p>	<p>DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.</p>	
<p><i>Ellis, Ben</i> 768/2</p>	<p>The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and</p>	<p>DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.		
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/3	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/3	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/7	The park and ride system may help to mitigate traffic congestion, but it cannot be at the expense of other user groups who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed park and ride. Backcountry adventurers, such as mountaineers, climbers, backcountry walkers and skiers/snowboarders by the nature of their activity need to be able to start and finish trips outside of the park and ride operating hours.	DOC should consider the proposals put forward by the CMC, regarding traffic congestion.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/30	As per comments on Discussion Box - Park and Ride (see submission point 26)	Retain Policy 10 but with an allowance for concessionaires, local residents and mountaineers as per submission point 26.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 11</b>		
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/15	As previously discussed, the selection of Birch Hill as the most appropriate location for such a development has not been a transparent process, and may not be consistent with the approach taken to development within the wider Mackenzie Basin under the Operative Mackenzie District Plan 2004	Amend from "a Park entry facility at Birch Hill" to "a Park entry facility in an appropriate location"	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/32	Disagree with Park entrance and parking being created at Birch Hill. Car parking at entrance to village is more viable from a visual and statistical viewpoint. See attached Map 2.	Delete Policy , or reword to: "Car park at the entrance to the village. Cars can drop off passengers in the village then go to car park. Shuttles can be available if required. Time limits on parking in the village with payment system."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/86	Disagree with the park entrance and parking at Birch Hill Does not delineate where visitors will be dropped off - so could favour one concessionaire over the other.	Delete Policy 11 and reword to: "Car park at entrance to village. Cars can drop off passengers in the village then go to car park when the village is full."	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/32	Entry should be moved to Twizel and Tekapo villages. Birch Hill a very windy location with few facilities. See response to Park and Ride Discussion Box.	Move Park&Ride entry to Twizel and Tekapo Villages	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/29	The starting point for the proposed Park & Ride concept would be much better moved right back to the already well established Twizel and Tekapo Villages. Birch Hill is a very windy location with limited accommodation, food and general visitor facilities.	Move Park & Ride entry point to Twizel and Tekapo Villages.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/23	<p>The CMC supports the Park and Ride service concept in principle with the caveat that vehicle access at any time is maintained for those intending to access the Park overnight and longer. Back country adventurers, particularly mountaineers, by the nature of their activity need to be able to start (and finish) trips within the Park at hours that would fall outside any operating hours of the proposed Park and Ride. If the long and proud tradition of mountaineering in Aoraki / Mount Cook National Park (for which it is internationally famous for) is to be maintained this core tenement for mountaineers and skiers, climbers and backcountry walkers must be maintained.</p> <p>There is also the potential for basic unfairness that those with booked accommodation, such as those staying in the Hermitage, can drive to their final destination but those wishing to go to the road end or stay in a Club Lodge without evidence of booking may not be allowed to take their vehicles.</p> <p>Page 86 states that "Kāi Tahu have a strong belief that the Village itself should not be a destination. Rather, it should function only as an outpost that provides the amenities needed for visitors to venture into the Park itself and experience the mana and beauty of those ancestors embodied by the mountains". As described in the previous paragraph, aspects of the Park and Ride discussion are inconsistent with this statement as it would restrict and dictate when and how the backcountry adventurers can access Aoraki/ Mount</p>	<p>Provide for those accessing areas outside the front country who require after-hours access into and out of the Park.</p> <p>It is suggested that those wishing to take their vehicles into the Park to access areas outside the front country who require after-hours access into and out of the park sign in and complete an intentions statement at the Birch Hill Park entrance.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Cook National Park. Particularly, it will reduce the options available to explore and visit areas of the Park outside of Nohoaka Place.</p> <p>Page 89 states that "Continuing to provide a high quality visitor experience for rapidly increasing numbers of people has been identified as the key issue for the management of the Village and accessible front country". The Park and Ride concept may help to mitigate this issue but cannot be at the expense of other user groups of the Park who will exit and arrive at the Park at hours outside of the operating hours of proposed Park and Ride.</p> <p>The challenge for DOC will be how to discern genuine backcountry users from day visitors. This can only be confirmed by the intentions of the visitor.</p>		
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/21</p>	<p>Birch Hill not suitable as Park entrance due to exposure to high winds</p>	<p>Delete Policy 11</p>	
<p><i>Young, Rob</i> 628/6</p>	<p>Oppose creation of a Park and Ride facility at Birch Hill, this area should remain unmodified.</p>	<p>If there is a need for a P&amp;R then it should be established in the modified area below the DOC workshop, right adjacent to the village, with a separate entrance off SH80.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/31</p>	<p>Move Park and Ride entry point to Twizel and Tekapo villages. See discussion in submission 27</p>	<p>Amend entrance for Park and Ride to reflect concerns raised.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 12</b></p>		
<p><i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/15</p>	<p>We support a network of cycle trails</p>	<p>Retain Policy 12</p>	
<p><i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/7</p>	<p>We support the development of cycle trails</p>	<p>Retain Policy 12</p>	
<p><i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/14</p>	<p>Strongly support the approach outlined in the plan. Cycle trails are an excellent way to experience the park. They are healthy, carbon neutral, and quiet.</p>		
<p><i>Young, Rob</i> 628/8</p>	<p>Oppose Wakefield Track Cycle trail, this track with historic nature should be reopened as a walking track. To create a safe cycle trail will require significant disturbance to the natural environment.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state Wakefield Track will be reopened as a walking track.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/7	Support the development of cycle trails.	Retain Policy 12	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/16	Support the development of cycle trails.	Retain Policy 12	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/27	Supports the use of cycle ways within the park where they are away from the main roads. Currently cyclists share the road and at times this can be quite unsafe for all parties. See the potential for safe travel around the Village and road ends close by to the Village by way of cycle ways. Visitors, especially families, should be enabled to bring their bikes closer to the Village or road ends. The Birch Hill park entry would be too far away for many visitor types. Unclear how policy 12 (network of cycleway) is intended to be implemented. By whom?	Support 2.1.3 Policy 12 on the basis visitors and residents are able to bring their bikes closer to the Village and road ends (Birch Hill is too far).	
<i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/31	Support bike riding including E bikes on existing roads including the Lower Tasman Lake car park, but not to Lower Tasman Lake edge.	Amend Policy 12 to remove consideration of cycle trails to "Lower Tasman Lake access"	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/37	TIA supports the inclusion of cycleways in the Village and adjacent areas.	Retain as written	
<i>Ainsworth, Lewis</i> 744/1	Support this policy. Cycleways around the village will thin out traffic and provide more accessible activity for visitors and residents.	Retain policy.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/25	Supports the establishment of cycle trails.		
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/13	Strongly support the approach outlined in the plan. Cycle trails are an excellent way to experience the park. They are healthy, carbon neutral, and quiet.		
<i>Burke, Carol Linda</i> 806/9	Support bike riding on existing roads and to the Lower Tasman Lake access existing carpark but do not support bike riding to Tasman Lake edge.	Decision not stated.	
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/12	Support. Sound well timed initiative.	Retain text as written.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/9	Strongly support the approach outlined in the plan. Cycle trails are an excellent way to experience the park. They are healthy, carbon neutral, and quiet.	Retain Policy.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 13</b>		
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/16	As previously discussed, the selection of Birch Hill as the most appropriate location for such a development has not been a transparent process, and may not be consistent with the approach taken to development within the wider Mackenzie Basin under the Operative Mackenzie District Plan 2004.	Amend Policy 13 d) vi) to delete "operating from the Birch Hill Park entry".	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/33	Support only with requested amendment to policy wording	Reword Policy 13 to include consultation with local concessionaires and business owners.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/87	Reword to include consultation with permanent residents, local concessionaires and business owners. Delete clause 13(d)(iv)	Amend to address the concerns raised	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/103	Should consider more aspects of traffic in the Park than simply crowding. Other aspects to be considered include arrival and departure times, effect of shifting parking to new area on conservation; values; carriage of recreational hunters' firearms and animal carcasses; costs of staffing a Park & Ride operation; vehicle security; meeting needs of young families and people with disabilities. FMC considers the plan should allow for optional free peak time park-and-ride service that will attract visitors to use it. A publicly-funded subsidy will be needed to support. Trial periods should be planned for.  Should amend the policy to include recreation groups in consultation processes.	Review Policy 13 to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/22	Policy 13(d)(vi): Consider Birch Hill unsuitable due to exposure to high winds.	Delete Policy 13(d)(vi)	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/9	Oppose The proposal to have a P&R system and parking charges will hinder NZ'ers access to the Park. There should be free and unhindered access to the park for	Amend the plan to state New Zealanders will have free and unhindered access to the Park at all times. Including the arrival of the real park adventurers like climbers at all times	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/36</p>	<p>New Zealanders.</p> <p>Presumes that the term ‘community’ in relation to those parties who would be consulted, involves the Village community. However, the word ‘community’ can often be also inclusive of the climbing fraternity, and to that end, other recreational user communities who have a connection to the national park in some way. Is this the intention?</p> <p>Wishes to reiterate the submission point already made earlier in this submission: under Part 1.3.13 Roding, Policy 1.</p> <p>The Traffic Management Plan will be developed in consultation with a variety of organisations, businesses and other stakeholders facilitating diverse thinking and potential opportunities to address management of vehicle movements.</p> <p>One opportunity might be to redesign the road layout and utilise another source for its implementation. It may include a road layout providing for a new road(s) within the Village. The proposed policy (Policy 1, Part 1.3.13) would not support this, and could be detrimental to the purpose and intent of the Traffic Management Plan.</p>	<p>of the day and night.</p> <p>Clarify the parties that the Traffic Management Plan consultation refers to so that ambiguity around the term ‘community’ is removed.</p> <p>Reiterates the need to review and reconsider Policy 1 of Part 1.3.13 Roding.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/33</p>	<p>Paying for parking and/or park and ride facilities: TIA is aware that the costs of providing parking and transport services are significant. Fees for parking or transport can be used to help recover these costs and also as a tool to help manage visitor flow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TIA is not opposed to DOC charging for parking services.</li> <li>- TIA is supportive of charging for parking and park and ride services, but not to the extent where it provides an unreasonable barrier to visiting the park. It is particularly important that any fees are managed in a way that supports New Zealander’s access to our national parks.</li> <li>- TIA is supportive of differential pricing, however we acknowledge that this can be complex to administer. Differential pricing could apply to specific user groups such as concessionaires and climbing clubs, or between domestic and international visitors.</li> <li>- The development of payment options must include consultation with affected parties including TIA, concessionaires and recreational user groups. Pricing should be tested on a trial basis, with results informing</li> </ul>	<p>Amend Policy 13 to acknowledge and take into consideration the matters raised above.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	any final decisions.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/38	TIA submits that planning of vehicle access and movement within and to the Village must have regard for access requirements for recreational and concessionaire use of the Park.	Amend Policy 13 to acknowledge the concerns raised	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 15</b>		
<i>Clarkson, Sooji</i> 6/4	Overnight parking is necessary for recreational users of the Park who will be absent from their vehicles for more than a day. Restriction of vehicle access (including overnight parking) to road ends directly adds a significant distance to the approach required for a climber to access objectives in the Park.	Delete Policy 15(f).	
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/8	Do not support removal of day and overnight parking from White horse hill during peak times.	Delete policy 15 f)	
<i>New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.</i> 148/1	Support policies 15 a), b), c), d), g). The NZMCA is keen to discuss opportunities to support DOC and policy 15 g).	Retain these policies 15 a), b), c), d), g). Add a new policy "Work with the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc. to implement a planting programme to visually soften the impact of camping on the surrounding landscape and improve the camping experience."	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/4	Regarding 15 g) and h) Support the need for fencing and planting to address erosion caused by visitors walking off track near the campsite.	Fencing and planting of this area needs to be addressed.	
<i>Dinsdale, Penelope</i> 200/1	Regarding Policy 15 f) Strongly opposed. Overnight parking is required for recreational users of the park. The park and ride system will not service the large number of recreational users who require access to the park at all hours of the day and night for the purpose of early starts and late returns.	Delete Policy 15 f). Amend Milestones to include explicit reference to exploring exemption for all holder of New Zealand Drivers Licenses or NZDA, NZAC, FMC membership licenses or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership.	
<i>Welch, Anna</i> 237/1	15 f) Oppose removal of day and night parking. Overnight parking and private vehicle access is a requirement for recreational users of the Hooker valley. This group includes regular climbers, trampers, hunters and skiers who will use the valley for both day and overnight trips in the National Park.	Delete policy 15 f).	
<i>Cox, Rowan</i> 250/1	Oppose Policy 15 f) Overnight parking and private vehicle access is a requirement for recreational users of the Hooker valley.	Amend the plan to include exemptions which allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the Hooker valley road end for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park/backcountry.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/88</p>	<p>Disagree with proposal to manage campground as a booked facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No need to book except in high season</li> <li>- NZers should not be limited to 4-night stay in their own national park.</li> </ul> <p>Policy15(a)-(d) - support 15(e) - alternative overnight facility must include toilet and washing facilities to keep area clean 15(f) - disagree with removing parking as this is not practical for climbers in the mountains or those returning late 15(g), (h) - support</p>	<p>Amend wording to specify booked camping in high season and to allow Kiwis to camp without limit</p>	
<p><i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/33</p>	<p>Policy 15(f): Support the concept, but preferable to locate shuttle services at Twizel, Tekapo or Glentanner rather than Birch Hill. Allocation needs to be made for multi-day recreationalists who often arrive/return at unsociable hours of the day.</p>	<p>Campervans should use Glentanner / Tekapo / Twizel for overnighting. Exclusion for multi-day recreationalists.</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/21</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 15 f) I support the Park &amp; Ride concept to avoid having to build bigger and bigger car parks at White Horse Hill or elsewhere in the park. Instead of using Birch Hill consider locating the shuttle service at the Mt Cook Lookout; or better get people to use shuttle services from Twizel, Tekapo or Glentanner.</p>	<p>Campervans should use Glentanner for overnighting.</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/30</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 15 f) Support the Park &amp; Ride concept to avoid having to build bigger and bigger car parks at White Horse Hill or elsewhere in the park. However, instead of at Birch Hill use Twizel, Tekapo or Glentanner.</p>	<p>Campervans should use Glentanner/Twizel/Tekapo for overnighting, where a good service is already being provided outside of the pack. Exclusion for muti-day recreationalists.</p>	
<p><i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/6</p>	<p>The White Horse Hill Campground should be closed and removed to the Birch Hill entrance. However, parking areas and existing facilities should remain and be available for the use of managed day visitors.</p>	<p>Amend plan as per submission</p>	
<p><i>Pickford, Alison</i> 364/2</p>	<p>Regarding 15 b) Support the separation of day parking, campervans and overnight camper parking.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/104</p>	<p>Should consider more aspects of traffic in the Park than simply crowding. Other aspects to be considered include arrival and departure times, effect of shifting parking to new area on conservation; values; carriage of</p>	<p>Review Policy 15 to reflect the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>recreational hunters' firearms and animal carcasses; costs of staffing a Park &amp; Ride operation; vehicle security; meeting needs of young families and people with disabilities.</p> <p>FMC considers the plan should allow for optional free peak time park-and-ride service that will attract visitors to use it. A publicly-funded subsidy will be needed to support. Trial periods should be planned for.</p>		
<p><i>Rhodes, Heather</i> 447/1</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 15 f) Oppose removal of parking. Recreational users such as mountaineers, hunters, trampers and skiers need overnight parking and private vehicle access to the Hooker and Tasman Valleys. There must be an exemption to allow New Zealand residents regular access to this recreational area for the purposes of both day and overnight trips. This exemption must include private vehicle access and overnight parking for multiple nights</p>	<p>Delete Policy 15 f). Amend Policy 2.1.3 Milestones to contain explicit reference to exploring exemption options for all holders of, say, New Zealand driver's licences who having climbing/skiing/tramping/mountaineering gear with them.</p>	
<p><i>Borrie, Ella</i> 466/1</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 15 f) Oppose this policy as it doesn't account for multi-day users such as regular climbers, trampers, hunters and skiers who will use the valley for both day and overnight trips in the National Park. The plan in its current form is orientated to towards managing tourist visitors who will only spend a single day in the park in their entire lives.</p>	<p>Amend the policy to contain explicit reference to exploring exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership, or some other way of identifying NZ residents, These exemptions must allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the Hooker valley road end for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park.</p>	
<p><i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/10</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 15 f) Oppose removal of day and overnight parking from White Horse Hill campground during peak use times.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 15 f)</p>	
<p><i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/15</p>	<p>(Refers also to 1.3.1. Policy 19) Strongly oppose approach in the draft plan. Overnight parking and private vehicle access is a requirement for recreational users of the Hooker valley. This group includes regular climbers, trampers, hunters and skiers who will use the valley for both day and overnight trips in the National Park. The plan in its current form is orientated to towards managing tourist visitors who will only spend a single day in the park in their entire lives. For those park users wishing to explore the mountains on their own steam, without the use of private helicopter operators, access to a large area will be unjustifiably restricted by the proposed changes. There must be an exemption to allow New Zealand residents regular access to this recreational area for the purposes of both</p>	<p>Delete Policy 15 f) Amend Policy 15 to contain explicit reference to exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership. These exemptions must allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the White Horse Hill area for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	day and overnight trips. This exemption must include private vehicle access and overnight parking. The proposed park and ride system will not service this large recreational group who require access to the park during all hours of the day and night for the purpose of early starts and late returns. Many significant ascents of Aoraki have been made that would have been unduly affected by this policy.		
<i>Christchurch Tramping Club</i> 604/2	Support proposal to remove all day cars and campers (to use park and ride) and allow camping on a booking system. Sites will be marked and numbered. Require that club lodge carparks will be separate from main campground carpark and will still be accessible by car to those staying there - this is essential.	Retain policy booking White Horse hill campground	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/23	Policy 15(f): Support the option to remove, parking other than for booked camping, from White Horse Hill campground	Retain Policy 15(f)	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/5	Oppose White Horse Hill Campground - any future development. The plans to modify this area further will not future proof it given that tourist numbers are projected to double again in the next 5 years.	Amend the plan to state that White Horse Hill Campground should be closed. It should just be a day visitor area with the area landscaped with places to sit and picnic. All camping should take place outside the park.	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/17	15f Opposed to all campers but particularly those in large campervans being given priority over day-visitors at White Horse Hill. Those in campervans are predominantly overseas visitors. Day visitors are more likely to include New Zealanders, who would then be excluded from driving into their own Park.	Amend 15f to state that initially large campervans will be excluded and that a system for allowing New Zealanders to access the car park will be investigated.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/33	The campground requires an overhaul of zoning for the different visitor types and management of compliance enforcement. A Section 50 authorisation for management of the facility would provide a higher quality solution. The management of the campground facility, parking organisation and compliance enforcement would be better operated if there was an onsite presence. Other public conservation campground facilities are successfully being managed in this way.	Review and reconsider Policy 15 (White Horse Hill Campground) to include the option of authorising an operator to manage the campground. The policy should include the process (legislative mechanism) in which the Department will consider this opportunity. The policy should include parameters in which the operation shall be managed, some of which are already included in Policy 15 i.e. separation of day users and overnight users, redesign of the car park, landscaping, redesign access roads around the car park etc. The policy should also provide for the authorisation of an onsite manager.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Whittaker, Susan</i> 710/1	Policy 15 f) Oppose removal of day and overnight parking at White Horse Hill campground. Trampers, climbers etc need overnight and multi-day parking to access the backcountry.	Delete Policy 15 f) or amend to state exceptions for backcountry users who require the parking.	
<i>Barnett, Frances</i> 734/3	Regarding Policy 15 f) Oppose removal of day and overnight parking. There must be an exemption to allow people wishing to use these access points as a means of getting to the backcountry for overnight/multiday recreational trips.	Delete Policy 15 f) from the draft plan. Add a milestone for exploring exemptions that allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the Hooker valley road end for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park/backcountry.	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/14	Strongly oppose approach in the draft plan. Overnight parking and private vehicle access is a requirement for recreational users of the Hooker valley. This group includes regular climbers, trampers, hunters and skiers who will use the valley for both day and overnight trips in the National Park. The plan in its current form is orientated to towards managing tourist visitors who will only spend a single day in the park in their entire lives. For those park users wishing to explore the mountains on their own steam, without the use of private helicopter operators, access to a large area will be unjustifiably restricted by the proposed changes. There must be an exemption to allow New Zealand residents regular access to this recreational area for the purposes of both day and overnight trips. This exemption must include private vehicle access and overnight parking. The proposed park and ride system will not service this large recreational group who require access to the park during all hours of the day and night for the purpose of early starts and late returns.	Amend to contain explicit reference to exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership. These exemptions must allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the White Horse Hill area for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park.	
<i>Campbell, Ross</i> 807/13	Support. May not be able to support all present activities. Future proof.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/10	Strongly oppose approach in the draft plan. Overnight parking and private vehicle access is a requirement for recreational users of the Hooker valley.	Delete Policy 15 f) and amend plan to contain explicit reference to exemption options for all holders' of New Zealand driver's licences, or holders of NZAC, NZDA and CMC membership cards, or identification showing Ngai Tahu membership. These exemptions must allow for unlimited private vehicle access to the White Horse Hill area for the purposes of tramping, mountaineering, skiing, and hunting in the wider National Park.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/40	Take the following matters into consideration in the options for management of the White Horse Hill campground:	Retain the policy as written	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Developed to give a remote mountain / wilderness experience.</li> <li>- Develop landscaping to provide some privacy.</li> <li>- Remove Cub huts /lodges - Becomes road end with Tent Camp ground only with good Toilet / Wash facilities. Limited parking area (If any)</li> <li>- Serviced by shuttle bus.</li> </ul>		
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/32</p>	<p>Policy 15(f): Support the Park &amp; Ride concept to avoid having to build bigger and bigger car parks at White Horse Hill or elsewhere in the park. However, instead of at Birch Hill, one of the windiest parts of the park, consider locating the shuttle service at the Mt Cook Lookout; or better get people to use shuttle services from Twizel, Tekapo or Glentanner. Allocation needs to be made for multi-day recreationalists who are spending a night in an alpine hut or bivvy (ie. May have no 'booked' accommodation) and often arrive/return at unsociable hours of the day.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 15(f) to reflect the concerns raised: - Campervans should use Glentanner/Tekapo/Twizel for overnighing, where a good service is already being provided outside of the park. - Exclusion for multi-day recreationalists.</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 16</b></p>		
<p><i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/1</p>	<p>Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Hut currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.</p>	<p>Reword the policy as according to the submission.</p>	
<p><i>Mee, Donald</i> 239/1</p>	<p>Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Hut currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.</p>	<p>Reword the policy as according to the submission.</p>	
<p><i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/4</p>	<p>Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Hut currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.</p>	<p>Reword the policy as according to the submission.</p>	
<p><i>Gardiner, Ian</i> 253/1</p>	<p>Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Hut currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months.</p>	<p>Reword the policy as according to the submission.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/89	Club huts were present before the National Park and have historic status not requiring authorisations	Amend policy to acknowledge matters raised	
<i>Low, Tyrone</i> 259/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Hut currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Rainey, Heath</i> 275/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Hut currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/7	We support the proposal for the Park to work closely with the Lodge owners to develop options for their building's retention, their continued management and availability for their membership and any public use.	Amend plan to state club members must have priority of use and public bookings managed in close consultation with the clubs concerned.	
<i>King, Bill</i> 310/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Hut currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 318/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/4	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Stevenson, Dr. Anthony</i> 330/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Wilson, Dan</i> 331/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/8	We are at a loss to understand the suggestion that need to meet requirements for authorisation - we understood that we already had authorisation. Policy appears to give notice of introducing some new kind of authorisation.	Either delete the policy, or clarify the terms of authorisation required.	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/4	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Elliot, John</i> 367/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Poetschke, Alexandra</i> 386/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/105			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/106	Requiring maximum and general public occupancy would mean that club huts would and could no longer be fit for purpose. Basic New Zealand recreation must not be compelled to step aside for international tourism. The	Review Policy 16 to reflect the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	huts' ongoing operation in their present and long-standing formats, including accommodation for non-club and mountain users, is consonant with General Policies 8(1)(c)(iv) and 9(a).		
<i>Skea, Eric</i> 440/2	Object to the closure or removal of the CMC hut. The hut was there before the car park, and the Department should be able to manage the car park in such a way that the hut can continue to exist.	Delete the proposal to consider requiring that the club lodges be moved or removed.	
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 473/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Torok, Tomas</i> 484/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Watson, Elinor</i> 502/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/9	The draft Plan threatens retention of Tahr Lodge which has significant historic and cultural value for hunters of New Zealand. GAC supports the NZDA's wish to retain the status quo.	Amend the Management Considerations - Club lodges, and Policy 16 to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Shinnamon, Anu</i> 535/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Fishman, Tana</i> 546/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	by DOC.		
<i>Fishman, Charles</i> 547/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Hudson, Joshua</i> 553/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Daws, Peter</i> 556/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Mason, Sam</i> 558/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Ross, Mary</i> 565/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/58	NZAC supports this policy	Retain Policy 16	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/24	Policy 16 refers to achieving "authorisation". "Authorisation" is not defined in the Plan. What "authorisation" entails and what is required by the Clubs to achieve this needs to be made clear in the Plan.	The Plan should define what authorisation entails and what is required by the CMC for this to occur. The CMC would desire to be consulted on this matter. The CMC would support formal authorisation from the Minister for continued use of Wyn Irwin Lodge at its current site in perpetuity.	
<i>Christchurch Tramping Club</i> 604/3	We wish to express our support for these Club lodges in their present location and under their current management parameters.	Reword policy to ensure that the status quo is maintained and Clubs are not forced to maximise occupancy of these lodge	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/7	Oppose removal or moving of the Wynn Irwin Lodge, it is historically important and also provides a base for an important visitor group.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Rhynd, Keeley</i> 642/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>McGregor, Lucy</i> 658/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Rowden, Murray</i> 669/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Adank, Charlotte</i> 671/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Mitchell, Josh</i> 687/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	by DOC.		
<i>Garden, Tom</i> 705/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>DeRoy, Mary</i> 739/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Moyle, Nicholas</i> 741/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Ellis, Ben</i> 768/1	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/2	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/2	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months. It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	
<i>Leder, Jakub</i> 834/6	Oppose the review of the management of the Wyn Irwin Lodge currently managed by the Canterbury Mountaineering Club. Disagree with the statement that the lodges are not fully utilised over the winter months.	Reword the policy as according to the submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	It would be sad to see management of the hut taken over by DOC.		
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/41	Take the following matters into consideration in the options for management of the White Horse Hill campground: - Developed to give a remote mountain / wilderness experience. - Develop landscaping to provide some privacy. - Remove Cub huts / lodges - Becomes road end with Tent Camp ground only with good Toilet / Wash facilities. Limited parking area (If any) - Serviced by shuttle bus.	Retain policy as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 17</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/90	Support except for concerns raised in relation to Policy 1.3.14	Amend as necessary to address concerns raised for Policy 1.3.14	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/24	Policy 17(a)-(d): Support Policy 17 with the addition of an adjacent area that has been deemed suitable for Park&Ride.	Amend Policy 17 to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/30	The amenities area should be extended to provide for services and facilities that enable visitors to enjoy the wider natural, historic and cultural values of the Park. In its design and layout, any extension would not need to intrude on the preservation of the national park values and be carried out in a way that is consistent with the other outcomes and policies for this Place and other sections of the management plan. Investigate areas of land to the north of Kitchener Drive (this land has been identified previously in the operative plan 2004), and/or north-east boundary of the amenities area (adjacent to the proposed residential, community and visitor accommodation zones); and/or to the south side entrance to the Village where SH80 ends. Add a new policy that reflects provision for appropriate extension of the amenities area to mitigate ongoing and increasing management issues of the current Village, most particularly day visitor car parking and/or overnight parking for campervans etc. The extension should include the infrastructure services of power, water and sewage.	Consider increasing the size of the amenities area and amend Policy 17. Related to this: Add a new Milestone that addresses seeking an amendment to the amenities area footprint for the purpose set out in Section 15 National Parks Act 1980. Remove Milestones 9 and 11. Replace with feasibility studies and documents that consider the extension of the amenities area for the Village and the requirements under the legislative mechanism.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 18</b>		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/22	Policy 18(h)(iii): This policy gives a competitive advantage to an operator without any public process or notification. Any concession or lease should go through the normal concession process.	Delete Policy 18 (h)(iii)	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/91	Refer to points raised in relation to Map 12, page 98 - Village Zoning Map Some errors/ inconsistencies in zoning have been identified, including: - Glencoe and site of spa should both be in designated commercial zone	Amend Policy 17 and Map 12 to address the concerns raised	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/92	<p>Policy 18(a)(i)-(ii): Clarification sought to identify that existing leases and licences have the right to have the public patronise their restaurants, cafes and facilities as their leases currently permit. Concern that Policy 18(a)(ii) is inappropriate for some types of existing accommodation as outlined in their authorisations or leases. Need clarification that this clause refers to new concessions or authorisations yet to be granted? Policy 18(a)(iii) - this is inappropriate for some types of existing accommodation, so should not be referring to existing authorisations</p> <p>Policy 18(b) - appears that Department is constricting activities already approved or existing valid operations. This cannot be done without agreement of the interested parties. Compare with 18(h) Cultural zone where permitted to have a range of facilities that conflict with the designated areas DOC has proposed.</p> <p>Policy 18(c) - concerns raised that rental rates in residential zone being charged at commercial market rates. Needs clarification</p> <p>Policy 18(d) - do not support the removal of tennis courts from existing site. DOC should seek 100% consensus vote from current concessionaires if they plan to pass on costs of relocation to concessionaires</p> <p>Policy 18(h)(iii) - oppose as this gives competitive</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend Policy 18(a)(ii) to clarify that existing leases and authorisations have the right to have the public patronise their restaurants, cafes and facilities, as their leases have already permitted.</li> <li>2. Delete "maintaining a range of visitor accommodation types " in Policy 18(a)(iii) if it will also refer to existing authorisations</li> <li>3. Amend 18(b)(v) to add: "Except for existing leases already granted by the Department to the Aoraki Mount Cook Spa and Glencoe, where they remain free to operate all facilities as listed in their authorisations/concessions, and offer these to visiting public and residents without constriction."</li> <li>4. Add new 18(c)(iii) to read: "DOC acknowledges that this area of staff accommodation is not a commercial endeavour due to DOC restrictions, but simply a convenience for staff, as it would be impossible to employ them without staff accommodation in the village. As such DOC agrees ground rental on staff accommodation areas is only reviewed and increased according to CPI figures and in modest amounts or to lift the amount of restrictions on the concessionaire so they may be rented out to public in the low season."</li> <li>5. Amend Policy 18(d) to reflect that any transfer of community facilities, such as a tennis court, will be at the expense of the Department or only passed on to Local Body if all in Local Body agree.</li> <li>6. Delete Policy 18(h)(iii)</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>advantage to a commercial competitor without due process. Should go through a concession process.</p>		
<p><i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/18</p>	<p>18biii Opposed to any new accommodation being provided in the Park as this will impact on the environment. Towns such as Twizel and Tekapo can be used by visitors who wish to visit the Park. Aoraki Mount Cook village does not need to grow. If it does it will lose much of its alpine village appeal.</p>	<p>Delete 18biii or strengthen it to state that new accommodation activities are not desirable.</p>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/34</p>	<p>Understands that a number of the proposed zoning provisions have changed from the current management plan Village zones. This includes the policies to relocate non-visitor accommodation activities, as and when sites are redeveloped. Understands that there are very limited sites left for staff accommodation within the residential zone. The draft Plan identifies these as a limited opportunity. Therefore, a time may come during the life of the management plan that AMCAVL will need staff accommodation but have nowhere to relocate to. From a business perspective in this environment that is very concerning. Recruitment and retention of staff is utterly dependent on the potential employees being able to secure adequate accommodation. Travelling the road from Twizel or Tekapo is not always a viable option for prospective employees. As an operator who prides itself on providing high quality products to visitors to the national park it is crucial that a large percentage of our staff reside within the Village for the efficient operation of our services and facilities.</p> <p>Policy 18 b) ii) should also provide that those activities are relocated suitably within the appropriate zone of the Village environment.</p> <p>Policy 18 b) v), proposes that authorisation may be granted for small on-site food and bar service facilities only for those staying on site (not for the general public). Seek clarification over the interpretation of this proposed policy regarding existing facilities within this zone and how it might implicate these services?</p> <p>Policy 18 a) vi) states that no authorisation of facilities for camping or campervans/caravans. Seeks clarification regarding the Campervan dump station facility, which it considers to be within the proposed Commercial Zone. Will this facility be relocated? If the suggested proposal for the White Horse Hill Campground is implemented (authorisation to manage the campground), this could be</p>	<p>Review and reconsider the wording of Policy 18 b) ii) to reflect that any relocation of non-visitor accommodation activities (i.e. existing staff accommodation) will be provided for within the appropriate zone of the Village environment (i.e. Residential Zone).</p> <p>Explain the intention behind Policy 18 b) v) in relation to existing services being provided within this zone. This may have some bearing on our position regarding this proposed policy.</p> <p>Clarify Policy 18 a) vi): dump station relocated? Or if there is another purpose for this policy i.e. No new facilities will be authorised, but existing facilities will remain?</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	included in the facilities and services at that site.		
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/18	Regarding Policy 18 h) Support the cultural activities zone. The proposed central location is appropriate.	Retain Policy 18 h).	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 23</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/16	Support granting of concessions for new development in the commercial zone, but concerned about the allocation process. We see auction or tender from commercial sites as anticompetitive and should be disallowed. Incumbent operators and companies providing essential services to the Park should be specifically considered alongside new amenity services like a grocery shop.	Retain Policy 23 but amend the allocation process to: - remove tender and auction options - give more weight to factors such as experience; history; safety management; appropriateness and utility within the Park.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 25</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/93	Concern raised that any intensification of housing in Residential zone must be well-spaced and acknowledged as being in a quiet zone.	Amend Policy 25(c) to include: "... tasteful housing and intensification in the residential zone in harmony with ensuring all residents are able to enjoy the natural quiet. No tenements.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 26</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/94	Design guidelines should be in harmony with the alpine environment.	Amend Policy 26 to include the above sentence.	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Society</i> 493/15	Support the development of Design Standards and Guidelines. Architectural design standards are important for managing the use of light throughout the night.	Retain "26. b) reflect the international status of the Park as part of a world Heritage Area and an International Dark Sky Reserve" Retain "26 f) manage and set standards for architectural and urban design of buildings and spaces, including lighting (Dark Sky compliant),..."	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/39	TIA submits that the important history of recreation and tourism in the Park be reflected in the Village design standards and guidelines.	Amend Policy 26 to reflect the matters raised above.	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/12	Support policy 26 as this will ensure consistency and balance going forward. The International Dark Sky Reserve and the requirements for lighting must be constantly adhered to.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/48	Policy 26 should include a limited commercial atmosphere through controls on advertising and promotion through signage and any other means. A maximum building height should be specified (lower than the current tallest building) through the design	Amend Policy as in submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	guidelines, seeking a low profile.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 27</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/95	Oppose Policy 27(b) - this is at the back of the village and could encourage day visitors to wander into the DOC area or into private residential areas Support Policy 27(c)	Delete Policy 27(b)	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/13	Support Policy 27 and the village landscape plan.	Retain policy 27.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 28</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/96	Support policy with inclusion of residents and concessionaires.	Amend policy to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/59	NZAC supports this policy	Retain Policy 28	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/14	Support Policy 28 detailing public consultation during the development and review of the village landscape plan.	Retain Policy 28.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 29</b>		
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/15	Support Policy 29 regarding the establishment of a Design Assessment Panel.	Retain Policy 29.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 30</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/97	Concern with having a Kāi Tahu representative on the design Assessment panel as they will have vested commercial interests in the Park. If this remains, then there should also be a person representing concessionaires appointed.	Amend Policy 30 to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/16	Support Policy 30.	Retain Policy 30.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 32</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/98	Oppose the inclusion of Kāi Tahu design elements when assessing any new or redevelopment proposal. This should not be mandatory in all buildings. Alpine buildings and Kāi Tahu elements can exist in harmony, but not one to the exclusion of the other.	Delete the words "inclusions of Kāi Tahu design elements" from Policy 32	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark</i>	Support this policy.	Retain "32 The Design Assessment Panel and the Department should consider the outcomes sought for the	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/16		Village..lighting (Dark Sky Reserve compliant),.."	
<b>Section: 2.1 Nohoaka Place Policy 34</b>			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/99	Oppose charging residents or workers in eh village for parking	Amend policy 34 to include: "No charge for residents or workers within the village."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/109	Policy 34 Bylaws should address many more aspects of traffic management than simply crowding at certain sites.	Review Policy 34 Bylaws to address the issues raised by the submitter	
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/19	Policy 34 a) Do not agree with charging for parking within a National Park. Having a user-pays Park and Ride or a user pays for parking option is essentially the same as charging for access to our own National Park. Policy 34 b) Support tighter control of the use of campervans within the Village and wider Park. With the proposed Park and Ride, they could be excluded during peak periods.	Delete 34a Retain 34b	
<b>Section: 2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 2</b>			
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/16	I note under Milestones cultural values there is no reference to recognising and protecting the significant cultural heritage of the tramping and climbing culture in the village and vicinity, and monitoring that it is being supported by the park.	Add a new milestone under cultural values to reflect that and that the park monitor how they are supporting those tramping and climbing cultural values.	
<b>Section: 2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 3</b>			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/100	It is important that visitors also have an appreciation of the cultural heritage of New Zealand climbers, guides and early pioneers.	Include a new Milestone 4 to read: "Visitors have an appreciation of the cultural heritage of New Zealand climbers, guides and early pioneers."	
<b>Section: 2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 4</b>			
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/37	Supportive of milestones 4,5,6 and 7, and broadly supportive of the policies that come before them within this Place, except where specific opposition has been identified and other suggestions provided. Want to ensure the Department of Conservation, the Conservation Board and Kāi Tahu appreciate the position that other stakeholders are, and will be in while standards and guidelines and plans are being developed. Agrees these are priorities for management within this	Include a communication plan for the residents and stakeholders who are integral to the continued operation of high quality facilities and services within the Village and wider national park.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Place. Their development and subsequent implementation, as well as the proposed change to management of the White Horse Hill Campground will not only give effect to many of the policies of this Place but will also provide a precedence as to how these entities will work together in partnership moving forward.</p> <p>Concurrently while documents are being developed, and change is occurring for the management of White Horse Hill Campground, other stakeholders, businesses and visitors to the park will be going about their own plans. Some with more direction than others. These milestones provide a timeline for many changes and development. All of which will require considered and involved dialogue.</p> <p>Prefers these to occur in a timely and cohesive manner, and as a stakeholder within the park be given assurances and updates through judicious, effective communication, as the draft plan speaks to (for Engagement Values 1.2.4).</p> <p>Are cautious optimism over the standards, guidelines and plans being developed within the suggested milestone. This stance is particularly relevant when the timeline mechanism's for a shared and active partnership management with Kāi Tahu (milestone 1, A Living Treaty Partnership) is longer than some of the management decisions required under this section of the draft plan.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 5</b>		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/27	Flexibility needed to apply to bookings for campsites and accommodation (integrated with NZAC lodge requirements).Should not disadvantage independent travellers, particularly those on extended tramping or climbing trips in high, remote areas of the park. Due to uncertainties of weather, their timetables will be unpredictable and accommodation booking systems will need to be able to cope with variations in arrival time and exit times.	Flexibility needed to apply to bookings for campsites and accommodation (integrated with NZAC lodge requirements).	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 8</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/110	Visitor monitoring survey identified in Milestone 8 should assess 'satisfaction' in terms of the statute's purpose and General Policy, and established visitor management zoning.	Amend Milestone 8 to clarify the monitoring of visitor satisfaction as identified by the submitter.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section: 2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 9</b>			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/101	Do not support Milestones 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 18. Refer to comments in relation to these matters - Park and Ride, Club lodges,	Delete Milestones 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16 and 18.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/111	Milestones 9, 11, 15, 16, and 18 should consider the range of aspects of traffic management associated with a Park and Ride system as identified in submission point 102.	Amend Milestone 9 to consider the range of aspects of traffic management identified by the submitter.	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/31	Add a new Milestone that addresses seeking an amendment to the amenities area footprint for the purpose set out in Section 15 National Parks Act 1980. Remove Milestones 9 and 11. Replace with feasibility studies and documents that consider the extension of the amenities area for the Village and the requirements under the legislative mechanism.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/30	TIA supports the Park and Ride concept in principle and considers it an innovative tool to support management of what are now acute issues of visitor flow and parking congestion,	Milestone 9 should be brought forward to address the acute Village access and parking issues.	
<b>Section: 2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 10</b>			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/116	Milestone 10 should express FMC's advice that authorisation of club huts should allow the clubs ongoing management of their huts subject to appropriate maintenance and their provision of accommodation for other mountain users.	Amend Milestone 10 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/25	Timeframes are discussed for the implementation of "authorisation" but "authorisation" is not defined in the Plan.	The Plan needs to define what authorisation entails and what is required by the CMC for this to occur. The CMC would expect to be consulted on this matter. The CMC would support formal authorisation from the Minister for continued use of Wyn Irwin Lodge at its current site in perpetuity.	
<b>Section: 2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 11</b>			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/112	Milestones 9, 11, 15, 16, and 18 should consider the range of aspects of traffic management associated with a Park and Ride system as identified in submission point 102.	Amend Milestone 11 to consider the range of aspects of traffic management identified by the submitter.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/26	Measures to control vehicles such as Park & Ride should not disadvantage independent travellers, particularly those on extended tramping or climbing	Measures to control vehicles such as Park & Ride should not disadvantage independent travellers, particularly those on extended tramping or climbing trips in high, remote	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	trips in high, remote areas of the park. Due to uncertainties of weather, their timetables will be unpredictable and transport/parking systems will need to be able to cope with variations in arrival time and exit times both at the village and at road-ends.	areas of the park.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/31	TIA supports the Park and Ride concept in principle and considers it an innovative tool to support management of what are now acute issues of visitor flow and parking congestion,	Milestone 11 should be brought forward to address the acute Village access and parking issues.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 12</b>		
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/25	Support the Milestone to implement recommendations for the future development of White Horse Hill layout and booking system	Amend the Milestone to delete the word "facilities" and insert the words "layout and booking system".	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 13</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/117	Milestone 13 should express FMC's advice that authorisation of club huts should allow the clubs ongoing management of their huts subject to appropriate maintenance and their provision of accommodation for other mountain users.	Amend Milestone 13 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/26	Timeframes are discussed for the implementation of "authorisation" but "authorisation" is not defined in the Plan.	The Plan needs to define what authorisation entails and what is required by the CMC for this to occur. The CMC would expect to be consulted on this matter. The CMC would support formal authorisation from the Minister for continued use of Wyn Irwin Lodge at its current site in perpetuity.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 15</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/113	Milestones 9, 11, 15, 16, and 18 should consider the range of aspects of traffic management associated with a Park and Ride system as identified in submission point 102.	Amend Milestone 15 to consider the range of aspects of traffic management identified by the submitter.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/27	The CMC does not support this as its implementation will adversely affect visitor experience in the Park for all user groups.	Delete Milestone 15	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/32	TIA is supportive of the Park and Ride concept in principle and considers it an innovative tool to support management of what are now acute issues of visitor flow and parking congestion,	Milestone 15 should be brought forward to address the acute Village access and parking issues.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/17	Park and Ride is supported in concept. Consideration for how village stakeholders, guests, clients etc can obtain access to the park over a 24hr period needs to be investigated. An extensive trial period would be needed with consideration of all options.	If park and ride is too difficult implement, investigate creating more carpark space to meet demand.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 16</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/114	Milestones 9, 11, 15, 16, and 18 should consider the range of aspects of traffic management associated with a Park and Ride system as identified in submission point 102.	Amend Milestone 16 to consider the range of aspects of traffic management identified by the submitter.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/28	The CMC does not support this as its implementation will adversely affect visitor experience in the Park for all user groups.	Delete Milestone 16	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.1 Nohoaka Place Milestone 18</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/115	Milestones 9, 11, 15, 16, and 18 should consider the range of aspects of traffic management associated with a Park and Ride system as identified in submission point 102.	Amend Milestone 18 to consider the range of aspects of traffic management identified by the submitter.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/29	The CMC does not support this as its implementation will adversely affect visitor experience in the Park for all user groups.	Delet Milestone 18	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place</b>		
<i>Potton, Craig</i> 64/1	Please stay adamant in your plan to exclude helicopters from the Hooker Valley.	Please also add a long term goal to reduce vehicular noise in all valleys in the park so as to return the mauri to this wonderful place	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/25	Haast Hut needs to be maintained. It is essential for climbers walking in to Plateau Hut.	Haast Hut to be maintained as an essential port of calls to climbers walking in to Plateau Hut.	
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/7	Support implementing an emergency shelter built on the site of the old Gardiner hut on a use at your own risk basis.	Amend plan as in the submission.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/80	The proposed draft Plan designates the upper Hooker Valley as a remote zone. Given the unique natural features of the upper Hooker Valley, the fundamental issue is the preservation of its 'intrinsic worth' as provided for in the current Plan. Therefore the NZAC submits that the Pudding Rock Landing Zone be removed from the draft Plan. The Club acknowledges that air access is a contentious	Remove the Pudding Rock Landing Zone.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	issue within the climbing community with arguments both for and against providing for some air access to the upper Hooker Valley. Surveys by NZAC and CMC of their members showed the majority favoured keeping the status quo (no air access). However it remains a debate within the climbing community.		
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/6	Map 15 Support the aircraft landing zones identified for the Aroarokaehe Place on the topographical version of Map 15	No decision sought	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/12	I support any movement by DOC, NZAC, CMC or another group to rebuild a hut at the Gardiner Hut site. It appears odd that DOC would promote its use as a camping site, having built a water tank and a toilet at the site, but deem it too dangerous to rebuild a hut there.	No decision stated.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/44	Support the outcomes, policies and milestones	Retain the objectives, policies and milestones	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokaehe Place Intro</b>		
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/26	This place and the next three places all have similar problems; noise, human waste, access, tourist dispersal. As mentioned previously, 'quick-fix' tourists should be eliminated. Touching down on a glacier, then stepping off should be eliminated. Expanding tracks and cycle trails should be the focus. Where access is difficult due to moraines, eg. Copland Pass, then track improvements, safety anchors, ropes should be installed.	Restructure the document to amalgamate the common elements of the five places.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/60	Photo: The photo appears to show the upper Tasman Glacier in Haupapa Place. Consider using a photo showing a scene in Aroarokaehe Place	Amend the photo in accordance with submission.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/12	Where foot access is an issue for areas of the Park such as the Hooker Valley, additional huts should be built (i.e. a replacement to the Gardiner Hut in the Hooker Valley) along with increased maintenance of tracks and access aids (such as increased maintenance of the Pudding Rock cables). This will encourage increased foot access to these areas of Park and maintain the existing tranquillity of these areas. Increasing aircraft traffic and introducing aircraft to areas which previously did	The Plan should reflect a stronger focus on preserving foot access to places within the Park outside the front country area.  Install a mid-valley hut to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.  Maintain Pudding Rock cables.  Do not allow aircraft into areas which previously did not	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	not have any aircraft traffic will degrade the existing tranquillity values of that area.	have any aircraft traffic. Ensure the Hooker Valley remains aircraft free, except in case of emergencies requiring evacuation, predator control and scientific research.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Description</b>		
<i>Aubrey, Paul</i> 25/1	That the Haast Ridge Hut should not be demolished or removed	Deem the Haast Hut to be a "historic relic", situated on an historic site in its current location.	
<i>Logan, H</i> 58/1	<p>The statements about Maori guides being the "guides of choice" is factually incorrect. The "guides of choice" were the few senior guides or more especially the Chief Guide (see all the literature written at the time). The text seems to have been lifted from the wording of the draft Westland Plan.</p> <p>Jo Fleurty to my knowledge did not guide east of the Main Divide. All his guiding was in Westland. The Makaawhio family members of the Te Koeti whanau did guide in the east, almost exclusively between 1910 and 1914, but in the case of the two Bannisters, as second guide to either the Chief Guide or the Senior Guide (Darby Thomson). George Bannister did make one ascent as a sole guide with Samuel Turner on Nuns Veil.</p>	Just change the text to be more accurate, especially to reflect the history of park area.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/18	Regarding Recreation Values paragraph 7: This argument has been used for increased flight access to areas where this is not specifically the case.	Reword paragraph 7 to be: Access to some of the more remote backcountry tracks and huts has been severely limited by the effects of glacial recession on the stability of the moraine walls that formed an important component of the track network. These places specifically include the western aspect of the Malte Brun Range, the eastern and western moraine terraces in the Hooker Valley and to a lesser degree the approaches to Plateau Hut from the Tasman Glacier. This has led to increased pressure for aircraft access to these areas. Consideration of any such new aircraft access must first establish that the specific location is actually affected by significant moraine wall issues. This argument should not be used to justify generalised increased flight access.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/19	The Upper Hooker Valley access is not dependant on moraine wall access, as normal access for many years has been around the western edge of the Hooker Lake. The arguments used in paragraph 8 do not justify the removal of protection from aircraft access from this "remote" area.	Remove the words " as well as on Pudding Rock" from paragraph 8.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/6	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/34	Historic values: Joe Fluerty and George Bannister were employed by the Hermitage. They were not particularly the guides of choice, and were not here before the 1900s	Reword to add some of the history of the early mountaineers and guides. Delete the inaccuracies.	
<i>Mee, Donald</i> 239/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/8	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Gardiner, Ian</i> 253/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/102	Historic values: This section of the plan is misleading and should be corrected to accurately reflect the history of the early mountain guides. See documented accounts of early history.	Rewrite this section to accurately reflect the history of early mountain guiding in the Park.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/103	Historic values: Hooker Hut should be replaced in the Hooker Valley in an area available to climbers rather than for day walkers. It is important that mountain huts are retained for climbers to climb remotely.  The Copland Shelter is also an historic climber's building and should be recorded as an historic site. The original site of the Ball Hut should be made an official historic site as well as Green's five camps.	Amend the Historic values section to address the matters raised.	
<i>Low, Tyrone</i> 259/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/34	Recreational values: The statement re Caroline Hut needs clarification. It would be completely unviable for Alpine Recreation to continue operation at Caroline Hut if it were made completely available to the unguided public and other guiding companies. The main part of the hut is not big enough for more than one guided operator, or to allow simultaneous guided and unguided use.	Reword the sentence starting "In addition, ... " to read " ... the concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is bookable and available to the public through the guided activity."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/11	Regarding the following sentence under Recreation Values: "In addition, the concessionaire- owned Caroline Hut is bookable and available to the public." This needs clarification as Caroline Hut is already bookable and available to any member of the public booking a guided trip. It would be completely unviable for Alpine Recreation to continue operation at Caroline Hut if it were made open to the unguided public and other concessionaires. The main part of the hut simply is not big enough for more than one guiding operator, nor is it big enough to allow simultaneous unguided and guided use. (Caroline Hut can only sleep 8 plus 2 guides.)	Reword the sentence to read ... "The concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is available to the public through a bookable guided package, with an openly accessible emergency shelter."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/31	The statement "The Department manages six huts within this .. In addition, the concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is bookable and available to the public" needs clarifying as Caroline Hut is already bookable and available to any member of the public booking a guided trip. It would be completely unviable for Alpine Recreation to continue operation at Caroline Hut if it were made completely open to the unguided public and other concessionaires.	Reword the last sentence to "the concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is bookable and available to the public through the guided activity."	
<i>Rainey, Heath</i> 275/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>King, Bill</i> 310/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 318/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/8	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Stevenson, Dr. Anthony</i> 330/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Wilson, Dan</i> 331/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/8	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Elliot, John</i> 367/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Poetschke, Alexandra</i> 386/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/118	Historic values: Section makes no mention of early guides such as Mannering, Green, or Adamson; or the 1894 first ascent of Aoraki by Fyfe, Graham and Clarke. Yet Fluerty, who was not born until 1903 is written about at disproportionate length.	Amend 2.2.1 Description - Historic values to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/7	Regarding the 4th paragraph under "Recreation Values" - Support with clarification that the booking system and conditions of booking are managed by the owner and operator of the hut.	Reword with clarification as suggest with regard to management.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/17	The statements under Historical values is an example of why the whole plan should be burnt and the process begun again. Trish McCormack's paper is a Westland History. Trish's A History of Surveying and Mountaineering in South Westland puts Joe into context as a very able Westland guide. There were many very capable Mt Cook guides, so why Joe is singled out for	I'm happy to lend DOC the concise history section of Aoraki/Tai Poutini Mountaineering Guide by Rob Frost to help with their awareness of our climbing heritage. That DOC produces a document like this does nothing for their credibility and even less for that of their planners. Educate the planners and rewrite the historic values.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the Aoraki plan baffles me. There is extensive literature and other records of the historic climbing values of the park, and on which the park was partly founded.		
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/18	Caroline Hut should remain under control of the concessionaire provided they continue to operate in the cooperative way they do.	Availability for booking of Caroline hut is at the discretion of the owners. The emergency shelter remains.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/19	Access to the more remote back country tracks and huts has been severely limited... In the last couple of years I have walked up the Murchison Glacier and down the Tasman, with a group of 10 tramping club people. Nowhere was this a problem. Increased aircraft pressure comes from people not wanting to walk, and a park management that cant get them in planes and helos quick enough.	Replace 'severely limited' with 'affected' Replace 'This has led' with 'There has been'	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/20	Allow limited landings under the same conditions as the previous plan for Plateau Hut and Barron Saddle Hut. No to landings on Pudding Rock. This sentence Landings near these huts can continue... is very disingenuous. There is an inference in it that landings at Pudding Rock are already allowed when whoever wrote this knew very well this was a major departure.	Rewrite to exclude specifically any landings at Pudding Rock. Reason. To keep at least this small corner of the park with a semblance of natural quiet. Everywhere else in the Tasman River Catchment has already been traded off with aircraft noise and visual pollution to some degree.	
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 473/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Torok, Tomas</i> 484/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Watson, Elinor</i> 502/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/3	Support the proposal to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) at Pudding Rock or a similar suitable area as a base for mid Hooker activities, and a stop-over/bad weather refuge enroute to the upper Hooker and Empress Hut.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/8	Page 115 "is interspersed with the iconic and threatened Mount Cook buttercup ( <i>Ranunculus lyallii</i> )" - the Mt Cook lily is wide spread and abundant over much of the Park, and is clearly not threatened. Change this wording.	Amend the passage to reflect the Mt Cook lily is wide spread and abundant over much of the Park.	
<i>Shinnamon, Anu</i> 535/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Fishman, Tana</i> 546/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Fishman, Charles</i> 547/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Hudson, Joshua</i> 553/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Daws, Peter</i> 556/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Mason, Sam</i> 558/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Ross, Mary</i> 565/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/16	Recreation values (Hooker Glacier) Do not support the approach outlined in the plan This contains reference to glacial recession and states that access to remote backcountry huts has been limited by	Delete statement that accessibility is severely restricted	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>glacial recession.</p> <p>Strongly disagree with the statement that access to the Hooker valley has been severely restricted; never had any issues accessing Pudding Rock. It is obvious that glacial recession has changed the manner in which the upper Hooker is accessed - more hard ice and flat moraine travel is required. Similar travel is required both below and above Pudding rock.</p> <p>Allowing helicopter access ostensibly due to difficult foot access below Pudding Rock is without basis when the same access difficulties (glaciated terrain) is present above Pudding Rock. Groups unable to manage these difficulties will be placed at undue risk by being allowed to fly in and likely end up well outside of their comfort zone with no reasonable retreat possible.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/61</p>	<p>Natural values: Query the notion that <i>Ranunculus lyallii</i> is threatened - we see it over a huge range of territory</p> <p>Historic values: Description of guiding needs to be more balanced for both Maori and Pakeha mountaineers</p> <p>Recreation values: While glacial wasting has caused access issues in a number of specific places in the Park, this argument has been used to justify increased flight access to areas where this is not specifically the case. Access to the upper Hooker Valley is not dependent on moraine walls, as normal access for many years has been around the western edge of the Hooker Lake. The arguments used in para 8 do not justify the removal of the protection from air access that is currently in place for this 'remote' area.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review the natural values text in accordance with the submission</li> <li>2. Develop the historic section with a substantial early climbing history.</li> <li>3. Reword 2.2.1 Recreation values, para 7 to read: "Access to come of the more remote backcountry tracks and huts has been limited by the effects ... of the track network. These places include the western aspect of the Malte Brun Range, parts of the Hooker Valley and to a lesser degree the approaches to Plateau Hut from the Tasman Glacier. This has led to increased pressure for aircraft access to these areas. Consideration of any such new aircraft access must first establish that the specific location is actually affected by significant moraine wall issues. This argument should not be used to justify generalised increased flight access where it is not relevant."</li> <li>4. Reword Recreation values, para 8 to remove the words: "... as well as on Pudding Rock ..."</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Rhynd, Keeley</i> 642/5</p>	<p>Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.</p>	<p>Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).</p>	
<p><i>McGregor, Lucy</i> 658/5</p>	<p>Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.</p>	<p>Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Rowden, Murray</i> 669/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Adank, Charlotte</i> 671/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Mitchell, Josh</i> 687/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Garden, Tom</i> 705/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/29	Hooker and Mueller valleys are key destinations for short- and medium-term visitors to the Park, and for access to important high climbing and tramping areas . The Historic values sub-section has a paragraph on Kai Tahu guiding with an excellent anecdote.	Move the paragraph on Kai Tahu guiding from the Historic values sub-section to an expanded sub-section in Section 1 on Historical aspects for all of AMCNP.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/32	<p>The plan states "historically the Hooker Glacier valley has been managed to preserve an environment of natural quiet." This should be maintained, but the plan would erode the natural quiet of the valley by allowing a landing site at Pudding Rock.</p> <p>No justification is provided for the replacement of the Plateau Hut landing site with the broader landing zone on the Grand Plateau. The existing limited landing site (at the hut) should be maintained to prevent visual impact of landings on the Grand Plateau (widespread tracks, etc.) and to avoid impact to recreationalists on the glacier. Access from the Hut landing site to the glacier is straightforward with basic equipment, such as would ordinarily be carried by all mountaineers or skiers in the area.</p>	<p>Remove Pudding Rock landing site.</p> <p>Maintain aircraft landing-free status of Hooker Glacier valley.</p> <p>Remove Grand Plateau landing zone and maintain current landing site at Hut.</p>	
<i>DeRoy, Mary</i> 739/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Moyle, Nicholas</i> 741/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/26	Recreation values- - submits that the extent to which Caroline Hut is currently bookable and available to the public is disputable, or at least unclear, to the general public. - submits that the list of huts within this place should include Hooker Hut, which has only been temporarily removed from the Hooker Valley, with Departmental commitment to returning it.	Comment Caroline hut Support with addition of Hooker Hut.	
<i>Ellis, Ben</i> 768/5	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/29	The plan states "historically the Hooker Glacier valley has been managed to preserve an environment of natural quiet." This should be maintained, but the plan would erode the natural quiet of the valley by allowing a landing site at Pudding Rock.	Remove Pudding Rock landing site.	
<i>Speck, Walter &amp; Zita</i> 801/4	Commercial operations should be nallowed and encouraged. It is not possible to operate safely, nwithout the assurance, that the guiding company has got control over the accommodation and other necessary infrastructure.	Reword the statement of "the concessionaire owned Caroline Hut is bookable and available to the public." to "the concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is available to the public through a bookable guided tour and/or bookings managed by the concessionaire owner; similar to our proposal of managing Club huts."	
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/6	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/32	This photo is of the Tasman Glacier (pg113).	Replace photo with one of the Hooker or Mueller Glacier.	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/6	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/10	Support the CMC submission to add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer.	Add a policy for the installation of a mid valley hut (replacement for Gardiner Hut).	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/11	<p>"Description - Natural values":</p> <p>ECO opposes the approach taken in this section because:</p> <p>a) It identifies threatened rock wren and its habitat, located in this place. Also identifies that habitat is in vicinity of alpine walks but there is no mention of potential threats of human use to rock wren.</p> <p>b) It provides no information on how areas with rock wren will be managed to reduce/minimise threats from pest animals &amp; human use of alpine walks.</p> <p>c) It doesn't mention if there are any rare/threatened plant species and/or communities.</p> <p>d) Map 14 doesn't include anything mentioned in the natural values section: Hooker &amp; Aoraki ecosystem management units, rare moraine ecosystems, herbfields, shrublands, populations of alpine plant species, and habitat for threatened fauna located within boundaries of this place.</p>	<p>Seek the following additions to the text, "Description - Natural values":</p> <p>a) Provide information on any potential threats from human use of alpine walks to rock wren &amp; its habitat.</p> <p>b) Provide detailed plan of how areas with rock wren will be managed to reduce/minimise any threats from pest animals and from human use of alpine walks. ECO urges DoC to continue pest control to protect rock wren and other native species, as well as providing specific measures to protect rock wren from human impacts.</p> <p>c) Clarify if any rare or threatened plant species or plant communities are located within the boundaries of this place.</p> <p>Seek the following amendment to Map 14: Revise Map 14 to include the following natural values located within the place's boundaries: Hooker and Aoraki ecosystem management units, rare moraine ecosystems, herbfields, shrublands, populations of alpine plant species, habitat for threatened fauna.</p>	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/33	<p>Recreation values, para 4: "The Department manages six huts ... The concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is bookable and available to the public."</p> <p>This statement needs clarification as Caroline Hut is already bookable and available to any member of the public booking a guided trip (as mentioned above). If Caroline Hut were to be made available to the unguided public (beyond the current free-of-charge emergency shelter) then that would mean it automatically becomes available to other guiding companies, of which there are many who hold concessions for Mt Cook National Park.</p> <p>DOC should be well aware of the costs of maintaining alpine huts, so it will come as no surprise that it would be completely unviable for Alpine Recreation to continue operation at Caroline Hut if it were made completely open to the unguided public and other concessionaires, if they are only paying DOC's standard hut fees. Further, the main part of the hut simply is not big enough for more than one guiding operator, nor is it big enough to allow simultaneous unguided and guided</p>	<p>Reword the last sentence of Para 4 to read:</p> <p>" ... The concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is bookable and available to the public through the guided activity."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	use.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Management consideration</b>		
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/8	Regarding two new aircraft landing locations. Potential slippery slope here, allowing aircraft access for mountaineers could turn into access for scenic flights	Consider how to design restrictions to discourage loosening over time	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/20	Regarding second paragraph under Recreational Values sub heading. Excellent paragraph	Retain this paragraph	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/21	Regarding the 4th paragraph under the Recreational Values subheading: This paragraph implies that access to the Upper Hooker Glacier (Pudding Rock) is unsafe unless an aircraft is used. This is not the case. It is however conditions and seasonally dependant. The argument of safety does not justify the removal of protection from aircraft access that is currently in place for the "remote" Upper Hooker Glacire area.	Reword the paragraph as follows, replace the start with "One new aircraft landing location has been proposed" and also remove the words "the old Gardiner Hut site and"	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/104	<p>Natural values: Culling of tahr should be undertaken taking care not to leave rotting carcasses near water ways</p> <p>Recreational values - natural quiet - support banning drones - keep area of village and Hooker free of aircraft of any type - allow landing at Gardiner Hut site, but flight path to cause least noise to Ball Pass, village and Hooker valley</p> <p>Waste management: - request waste receptacles to be at all huts</p>	<p>1. Amend the Natural values section by adding: "If poisons to be used, then to only use them 500m from water ways, to keep the water pure. Animals preferably culled through hunting only. Non-toxic means of killing weeds to be look into and trialled. Make AMCNP an organic place. This is true respect for the environment. Keep all poisons out of water due to spiritual nature of the environment and due to health hazards involved with poisons in the water to animals and humans."</p> <p>2.Add to the Recreational values section to address the matters raised above</p> <p>3. Amend Waste management section to make waste receptacles available at all huts</p>	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/35	<p>Recreation values - aircraft landing locations: Would prefer a replacement hut in the upper Hooker rather than new aircraft access granted. Prefer to see Pudding Rock managed in a way that strikes a balance between access for mountaineers and remoteness and tranquillity. Upper Hooker a very special and remote place that deserves respect. Any landings should not be restricted seasonally, but be limited to only mountaineers seeking access to key huts</p>	Support concept of landing site on the Hooker Glacier between 1700-1740m, but only with strict management of flight paths and numbers, and only for positioning multi-day mountaineering visitors.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>and climbing routes. Strictly NO scenic flights, snow landings or day tourism on or above the Hooker Glacier. Flight paths to Pudding Rock need to be strictly controlled to avoid Ball Pass and upper Ball Glacier, Kaitiaki Peak and Turner Peak.</p> <p>Proposed Pudding Rock Landing Zone lies in a known recent avalanche path - propose that land on Hooker Glacier between 1700m and 1740m instead.</p>		
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/22</p>	<p>The goal to maintain natural quiet in this area is supported, but please ensure flight operators use Billiken Pass, not Ball Pass, if flying through to the upper Hooker Glacier. It becomes a safety issue for people on the ground if they cannot hear forewarning of rockfall due to aircraft noise. Flight path to access upper Hooker Glacier needs to be of sufficient elevation to not detract from the natural quiet experience of walkers in the Hooker Valley and on the Ball Pass route.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state If flying to landing zone above Pudding Rock avoid using Ball Pass.</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/32</p>	<p>Regarding the statement "Two new aircraft landing locations have been proposed in the north of the Place..on the tranquillity levels for the valley." Aircraft access into the Upper Hooker needs to be treated very carefully, as once aircraft are allowed up there, there is no going back. I would far rather see Gardiner Hut replaced than aircraft access granted. A "miniumum stay' requirement of 1 night should be imposed to limit air access to multi-day trips only.</p>	<p>Support the concept of a landing site on the Hooker Glacier between 1700m and 1740m, but only with strict management of flight paths and numbers. Landings permitted for multi-day mountaineering visitors only. Flight path to go over Billikin Pass instead of Ball Pass.</p>	
<p><i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/15</p>	<p>The statement under Recreational Values "The Department manages six huts in this place..In addition the Caroline Hut is bookable and avaliable to the public" needs clarification as Caroline Hut is already bookable and available to any member of the public booking a guided trip.</p>	<p>Reword the last sentence to read: the concessionaire-owned Caroline Hut is bookable and avaliable to the public through guided activity.</p>	
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/119</p>	<p>Recreational values - opportunities to maintain quality of visitor experience:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Should include encouragement of visitation outside peak seasons and times only if departmental multi-disciplinary specialists support it, as it could lead to undesirable outcomes for ecological values.</li> <li>2) Proposal to redesign the Hooker Track will be helpful if it enables re-introduction of environmental features such as micro topography to distribute walkers, variety and focuses attention on valley's small and grand scale</li> </ol>	<p>Amend text to address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>features.</p> <p>3) Should include construction of a new track only if Departmental multi-disciplinary advice supports it</p>		
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/21	<p>There should be no booking of any huts except Mueller and Hooker Huts. All huts except Mueller and Hooker huts remain open on a first come first served basis. A new hut suitable for trampers and basic climbers recreation should be built on the Wakefield Range and open to the public on a first come first served basis.</p>	<p>Amend text about booking huts and new huts.</p>	
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/8	<p>Recreational values: "creating an additional day or overnight walking experience that complements the Hooker track experience"</p> <p>Things like reinstalling the Wakefield Track, putting a hut on the Mt Cook Range on the northern side of Little Mt Wakefield that provides a more challenging but doable alternative to Mueller; there is an ideal platform already there, and excellent hiking, mountaineering and ski touring options from that location.</p>	<p>No specific decision sought</p>	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/17	<p>For all Places within the Park, the protection of natural light is as important as natural quiet and tranquillity.</p>	<p>Include management considerations and policy statements to protect the natural light values of these areas.</p>	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/2	<p>Request to undertake possum control in the Aroarokaehe place.</p> <p>See also submission under section 1.2.1. Pest plants and animals</p>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/62	<p>Recreation values: While the plan recognises the significance of Aoraki to Kāi Tahu, NZAC feels that the plan should equally recognise the importance of Aoraki and this place to the mountaineering community, who hold it in an equally meaningful place in their hearts. Mountaineering values are very much about respect for the mana of Aoraki. Mountaineering values in this place receive scant mention in the draft plan. Para 1 mentions every other level of 'people powered' enterprise, but not mountaineering which is arguably the most high-profile activity in this area. Recognise this</p>	<p>1. Insert the following paragraph into Recreational values section: "For mountaineers, Aroarokaehe Place is, and has long been, a crucible for high alpine climbing, centred around Aoraki/Mount Cook and surrounding peaks. Many would regard it as the spiritual heartland of mountaineering in Aotearoa, from the first attempts to climb Aoraki through to the present day and beyond." 2. Retain Recreational values, para 2 as written. 3. Reword Recreational values, para 4 as follows: - replace the start with "One new aircraft landing has been proposed ..."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>with a specific statement.            Para 2 beginning "Increasing limitations ..." is fully supported.            Para 4, beginning "Two new aircraft ..." implies that access to the upper Hooker Glacier is unsafe, unless an aircraft is used. This is misleading. Access is 'safe' even though it is seasonally dependent. The argument of safety does not justify the removal of protection from aircraft access that is currently in place for the 'remote' upper Hooker Glacier. The Grand Plateau is already serviced by many aircraft landings so the status quo as proposed should remain.</p> <p>Waste management:            NZAC supports this section</p>	<p>- remove the words "... The old Gardiner Hut site and ..."            4. Retain the Waste management section as written.</p>	
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i>            602/30</p>	<p>The draft Plan proposes two new aircraft landing locations at Pudding Rock and at the Grand Plateau.</p> <p>The CMC supports the control of aircraft in the Park as provided for in the current Plan.</p> <p>The CMC does not support provisions to increase aircraft traffic within the Park above what is currently provided for. Increasing use of aircraft within the Park will degrade the experience of other user groups within the Park and reduce tranquillity values within the Park. With heightened awareness regarding climate change and anthropogenic impacts on the environment, allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and aircraft access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft, is not considered appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.</p> <p>It is noted that the Department is proposing to introduce these new landing zones to provide safe access to the backcountry area and to ascents of Aoraki/Mount Cook. Areas of the Park that are remote and difficult to access such as these places require specific skills to travel in and access these areas. The CMC questions whether the approach of allowing aircraft access to these areas is sensible if visitors would not ordinarily have the skills required to access these areas by foot. Introducing new and increased aircraft traffic movements is not considered a safe approach to</p>	<p>The CMC seeks that the Department maintains existing aircraft traffic provisions, as specified in the existing Plan.</p> <p>The CMC would like to see further investment in additional huts, tracks and access aids (e.g. Pudding Rock Cables etc).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>increasing access to these areas.</p> <p>Those who currently access these areas do so specifically to get away from disruptive and distracting aircraft noise effects, and to experience the high tranquillity that these areas currently offer.</p>		
<p><i>Shaw, Dr Vivienne &amp; Dr Christopher T</i> 655/5</p>	<p>The proposed development of a loop track may help to improve visitors' experiences and possibly reduce the feeling of being overcrowded. However, we have seen a lot of people only walk a short distance on the Hooker Valley track before turning round. Many people visiting this track are not capable of completing the whole track so having one-way loop track may not work in the way DOC intends.</p>	<p>Decision not stated.</p>	
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/30</p>	<p>Aircraft access (p118) It is acknowledged that aircraft access to huts above the Hooker and Mueller valleys, as with the Tasman, has become more popular. A more self-reliant approach should be encouraged by all and this Plan could assist with some specific projects to improve routes through moraine areas. Perhaps this is what is meant by: "Designing and managing tracks and facilities to (preserve a high level of tranquillity by minimising the impact of anthropocentric noise levels on people visiting and recreating in the Hooker valley". .</p>	<p>Final bullet point under "Recreational Values" needs rewording to be more explicit as to the proposed measures and how they will work. It should also be incorporated into the Outcomes, Policies and Milestone for this place</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/27</p>	<p>Waste management Supports the implementation of the pack-out approach to human waste and encourage the Department to work closely with stakeholders to bring about the operational and social changes required for the approach.</p>		
<p><i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/18</p>	<p>Section under recreation values contains reference to glacial recession and states that access to remote backcountry huts has been limited by glacial recession. Wish to specifically address the issue of access up the Hooker valley. I have been up the Hooker valley every summer for the last 4 years and have been one of the more frequent users of Empress Hut over this time. Strongly disagree with the statement that access to this area has been severely restricted; had never any issues accessing Pudding Rock. It is obvious that glacial recession has changed the manner in which the Upper Hooker is accessed. It represents not a restriction but a transformation of access. Reduced use of Empress Hut and the Hooker valley is</p>	<p>Support any movement by DOC, NZAC, CMC or another group to rebuild a hut at the Gardiner Hut site.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>strongly driven by the loss of Gardiner Hut, and I would support the replacement of this hut to improve utilisation of this area.</p> <p>It appears odd that DOC would promote its use as a camping site, having built a water tank and a toilet at the site, but deem it too dangerous to rebuild a hut there. Rebuilding this hut would improve use of the valley while preserving the desired tranquillity outcomes and existing character and recreational values preserved by prohibiting aircraft access.</p>		
<p><i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/13</p>	<p>"Management considerations - Recreational values": ECO opposes the approach taken in this section because it doesn't consider potential impacts to nesting birds by increased use of aircraft, or how potential impacts will be minimised.</p>	<p>Amend the text to include a statement recognising any potential impacts to nesting birds by increased use of aircraft, and how impacts will be minimised and managed.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/34</p>	<p>Recreational values, para 4: Aircraft access into the Upper Hooker needs to be treated very carefully, as once aircraft are allowed up there, there is no going back. It has been a very special and remote place and deserves respect. I would far rather see Gardner Hut replaced than aircraft access granted. While I am not completely against landings on the glacier near Pudding Rock, I'd like to see it managed in a way that strikes a balance between access for mountaineers, and remoteness and tranquility. Landings should not be restricted seasonally, but rather, should be limited to only overnighing mountaineers requiring access to key huts and climbing routes. Ie. strictly NO scenic flights, NO DAY TRIPS, tourist snow landings or day tourism on or above the Hooker Glacier. A "miniumum stay" requirement of 1 night should be imposed to limit access to multi-day trips only. There is already plenty of allocation for day tourism activities elsewhere in the Park. Heli-skiing and heli-hikes are aircraft intensive and have a high impact on the tranquility and natural quiet. The flight path to the Pudding Rock landing site needs to be strictly controlled, so as not to affect popluar foot-accessed areas in the mid-Hooker Valley, such as Ball Pass and the Ball Glacier. Aircraft operators should not be allowed to fly above Ball Pass and the upper Ball Glacier, Kaitiaki Peak and Turner Peak. Instead, the</p>	<p>Amend the text to address the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the concept of a landing site on the Hooker Glacier between 1700m and 1740m, but only with strict management of flight paths and numbers.</li> <li>- Landings permitted for multi-day mountaineering visitors only.</li> <li>- Flight path to go over Billikin Pass instead of Ball Pass.</li> </ul>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>flight path to access Pudding Rock Landing site should go through Billikin Pass and be at a sufficient elevation so as to sufficiently minimise the noise impact.</p> <p>Note that having a landing site in a known recent avalanche path is not a good idea. Propose landing on the Hooker Glacier between 1700m and 1740m instead. Note that a provision be inserted into the plan that once a safe walking access track has been implemented and maintained up the Hooker Valley to access the Hooker Glacier, that flight access be stopped.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Outcomes - Natural</b>		
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/105</p>	<p>No poison should be used in the culling of tahr. The meat and skins should be sold to sustain the culling industry. The goal should be organic parks in New Zealand.</p>	<p>Add to the Natural values outcome: "No poison (includes roundup and 1080) used near water, so health of people and animals and birds and the sacred nature of the water is protected.</p> <p>Poverty is increasing in NZ. If culling tahr then the following should be observed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Only shoot away from water, so carcasses don't pollute the water.</li> <li>2. Skin the animals. Sell the skin so funds from it can go back into DOC to further protect our sacred areas.</li> <li>3. Save the meat. This should be set up to be processed to help those in poverty who cannot afford meat, or it can be sold to commercial contractors and the meat can be sold this way with funds going back to DOC for protection of the environment using non-toxic methods.</li> <li>4. Pay private hunters to cull tahr and also trap possums, setting traps with lures that attract the pests from long distances and can be digitally reset. These traps are on the market now. Possum fur can also be sold with funds going back to DOC.</li> </ol> <p>The best outcome from this culling is to use the tahr meat, skins and the fur from possums, and sell this so the industry of culling is able to sustain itself rather than be a continual drain on DOC funds.</p> <p>No poison should be used in culling pests unless in small traps birds cannot enter.</p> <p>To carpet-bomb with poison is disrespectful and it endangers the health of all people in the bush, including trampers on tracks in national parks and all hunters who eat the meat. The goal should be organic parks in NZ.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Outcomes - Cultural</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/106	This area and these mountains are sacred to most alpinists. All New Zealanders should feel this is part of their culture as well.	Amend the Cultural values outcomes to reflect the concerns raised	
<b>Section: 2.2 Aroarokahe Place Outcomes - Recreational</b>			
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/10	Does not identify accessibility as an outcome sought	Ensure that accessibility is improved through management particularly in urban and front country areas.  Identify, review and audit the current and future accessibility opportunities.	
<i>Paardekooper, Luke</i> 22/3	Include a number of management options for the Hooker track: - well appointed hut at Hooker Lake. Stop being booked out way in advance. Keep places for NZ people and children. - overseas tourists pay more for accommodation, facilities that NZ people - limit group numbers on sunset tours . Make free for Nzers and payment for overseas tourists - allow food vendors at start/finish of Hooker Track - make wheelchair accessible to lookout over first bridge - include more topilets on track	Amend Aroarokahe Place outcomes and policies to reflect the matters identified	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/10	The whole Hooker valley should be a place where natural quiet values are quite high - not just the lower Hooker.	Reword the Recreational values outcome to read: "The Mueller glacier and the entire Hooker Glacier valleys remain free of aircraft and other motorised vehicle noise, allowing visitors to experience natural quiet and very high tranquillity."	
<i>Gliding New Zealand Incorporated (GNZ)</i> 40/1	Para 1: There is no need for a 1NM 'no-fly' zone in respect of gliders. Gliders make no discernible noise, but the proposal for a 1 nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook to respect its "cultural significance" appears to be additional consideration to that of noise. Also hard to reconcile with ability of the public to actually climb on the mountain itself. The Civil Aviation Rules related to flight safety are adequate to preserve the tranquillity the plan seeks to achieve.	Reword para 1, 2nd sentence to read: "A 1 nautical mile "no-fly" zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook for powered aircraft respects the cultural significance of the mountain."	
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/10	Para 7 - Overnight use of all huts Caroline Hut is alpine hut currently overseen by concessionaires. If opened to the public without going	Reword outcome by deleting final sentence of Para 7.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>through concessionaire, then</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- run the risk that visitors who are close by in Nohoaka Place may decide to venture into back country without appreciating the extreme alpine environment that they are entering.</li> <li>- visitors may have little awareness of cultural significance of Topuni.</li> <li>- existing access to emergency shelter is fit for purpose</li> </ul> <p>Note that other accommodation open to public and operated by concessionaire is not singled out in this plan.</p>		
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/10	An expanded booking system would probably need wardens to enforce it and may not be practical at huts that are primarily accessed by helicopter, since groups can and do get stuck due to weather.	Implement booking system for huts accessible in all weather accompanied by wardens (or guides) to enforce	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/23	The mountains are inherently unsafe places, if the word safe is to be used, there should be an explanation of how it is to be interpreted.	Remove the words "where this is safe" from the second last paragraph.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/24	Regarding second to last paragraph: wonderful statement although it is inconsistent with the proposed flight access to Pudding Rock	Retain second to last paragraph	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/25	Options for a replacement to Gardiner Hut at a potentially new site. This would serve as a base for mid/lower Hooker Valley climbs and also as a stopover on the way to Empress Hut	Insert new outcome in accordance with the submission.	
<i>NZ Hang Gliding Paragliding Association (NZHGPA)</i> 77/4	NZHGPA seeks exemption to the one nautical mile no fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook for non-powered hang gliders and paragliders. The rising air currents which enable the hang gliders and paragliders to remain airborne predominantly exist within one nautical mile of the mountains, as the mountains themselves create the rising air. Therefore, these pilots must fly in relatively close to the mountains in order to gain the lift.	Amend the no fly zone to be for "powered aircraft" only	
<i>Williams, Geoff</i> 169/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Skelton, Stephen</i> 170/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>McKenzie, Evan</i> 171/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Webster, Nick</i> 172/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Zambas, Xen</i> 174/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Saupin, Anthony</i> 176/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/3	Support the need for high quality visitor experiences. The access route to Mueller Hut has become eroded and rutted. Toilets are needed at the Sealy Tarns.	Fix up the access route to Mueller Hut. Toilets need to be installed above the Sealy Tarns area. Install signage on the track to inform visitors about the importance of the area.	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/11	Support a replacement hut near the old Gardiner Hut site to allow for easier foot access to the head of the valley.	Install a replacement hut near the old Gardiner Hut site.	
<i>Mason, Warrick</i> 193/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Morgan, Grant</i> 201/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Heather, Melanie</i> 204/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Monteith, Fraser</i> 209/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/21	Oppose "The Hooker Hut has been returned to the Hooker valley as a bookable overnight opportunity", because of the impact it would have on the scenery in the valley.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Murphy, Danny</i> 231/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Gore, Gareth</i> 232/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp;</i>	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mount Cook.	Remove the no-fly requirement for hang gliders and paragliders.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/41			
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Hearn, Kate</i> 244/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Cheng, Karen</i> 246/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Race, Paula</i> 247/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Hassett, Darren</i> 248/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Patterson, Doug</i> 252/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/107	<p>See issues raised in relation to 2.2.1 Description - Historic values The Hooker Hut should be returned a site for use by climbers</p> <p>New Zealanders should have priority access to their huts and any booking system should enable this.</p>	<p>Amend the Recreational values outcome to add:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "The Hooker hut has been returned to the climbers deep in the Hooker Valley in a safe space. The hut is for climbers."</li> <li>2. "New Zealanders should have priority access to their huts and any booking system should reserve a certain number of spaces each night for them. If not taken up then they can be booked by overseas visitors."</li> </ol>	
<i>Griffin, Patrick</i> 258/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/36	Do not support overnight use of Caroline Hut to the public except through guided activity. Hut is seldom unoccupied during main seasons, and prone to high avalanche risk and snow conditions requiring high levels of skill and experience during the winter months.	Reword the Outcome to read: "Accommodation at Caroline Hut is available to the public through the guided activity and provision of an openly-accessible emergency shelter."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/37	The sentence "Camping next to huts and along tracks, including the Ball Pass route, has minimal impacts on the environment." is inconsistent with the current Mount Cook National Park Bylaws 1981 which prohibits camping within a 100m radius of a hut, and Policy 6 which states "Should not allow camping ... within 100m of a hut and 200m of a track, except for camping next to Mueller Hut."	Reword outcome to read: "Camping next to huts and along tracks is closely monitored to ensure minimal impacts on the environment."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/12	<p>Oppose the sentence "Accommodation at Caroline Hut is well used by guided clients and available to be booked by the public at other times."</p> <p>It is seldom that there is "spare" hut space through summer. In winter, when there is space, Caroline Hut is often not accessible due to high avalanche risk. Even if avalanche risk is low, because of deep snow and shorter daylight hours, the number of people sufficiently skilled and experienced to safely get to Caroline Hut is considerably less in winter than in summer.</p>	Reword the sentence to read "Caroline Hut is available to the public through the guided activity and provision of an openly accessible emergency shelter."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/25	Regarding the statement "Camping next to huts and along tracks, including the Ball Pass route, has minimal impacts on the environment." This seems to be at odds with Policy 6 which states "Should not allow camping in the Aorokaehe Place within 100 m of a hut and 200 m of a track, except for camping next to Mueller Hut. This is also at odds with the Mount Cook National Park Bylaws 1981 which states "camping is enabled within the wider park, except within 200 m of a formed road, and 100 m of a hut."	Reword the statement to "Camping is monitored to ensure minimal impacts on the environment."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/33	Regarding the statement "Overnight use of all huts is managed to avoid..Accommodation at Caroline Hut is well used by guided clients and available to be booked by the public at other times." It needs to be recognised that in winter Caroline Hut is often not accessible due to high avalanche risk, and also less accessible due to deep snow and shorter daylight hours.	Reword the last sentence to read: Accommodation at Caroline Hut Is available to the public through the guided activity and provision of an openly-accessible emergency shelter.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/34	Regarding the statement "Camping next to huts and along tracks including the Ball Pass route, has minimal impacts on the environment." This is not consistent with the Mount Cook National Park bylaws 1981 which prohibits camping within a 100m radius of a hut. The statement is also inconsistent with Aorokaehe Place Policy 6 which states "Should not allow camping in the	Amend the statement to read "Camping next to huts and along tracks including the Ball Pass route, is closely monitored to ensure minimal impacts on the environment."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Aroarokaehe Place within 100 m of a hut and 200 m of a track, except for camping next to Mueller Hut."		
<i>Neynens, Nick</i> 284/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/16	Regarding the statement: "Accommodation at Caroline Hut is well used by guided clients and available to be booked by the public at other times." It needs to be recognised that in winter Caroline Hut is often not accessible due to high avalanche risk and/or deep snow and shorter daylight hours, the number of people sufficiently skilled and experienced enough to safely get to Caroline Hut is considerably less in winter than in summer.	Reword the last sentence to read; Accommodation at Caroline Hut is available to the public through the guided activity and provision of an openly-accessible emergency shelter.	
<i>Stead, Nick</i> 295/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Taylor, Peter</i> 297/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/6	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft-free, except in case of emergencies requiring evacuation, predator control and scientific research.	Retain the Hooker Valley as an aircraft free area.	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/7	The Plan should reflect a stronger focus on preserving foot access to places within the Park outside the front country area. Will benefit the Park as a whole by encouraging more people to venture further into the Park, relieving pressure on front-country resources while allowing more people to access the special high tranquility areas of the Park like the Hooker Valley.	The Plan should reflect a stronger focus on preserving foot access to places within the Park outside the front country area.	
<i>Muirson, Robin</i> 301/8	Support Canterbury Mountaineering Club's submission for the installation of a mid-valley hut (i.e. a replacement for Gardiner Hut) to make access to the head of the valley easier and safer as well as ongoing maintenance of the Pudding Rock cables.	Provide for a new mid-valley hut to replace Gardiner Hut	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Wills, Gavin</i> <i>(Managing Director, Glide Omarama Ltd</i> 325/1	We seek an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Hardman, Mark</i> 328/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/17	The whole Hooker Valley should be a place where natural quiet values are quite high, not just the lower Hooker.	Reword the Outcomes, Recreational values, para 1 to read: "The Mueller Glacier and the entire Hooker Glacier valleys remain free of aircraft ..."	
<i>Fraser, William</i> 347/3	NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.	Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/120	<p>1) Outcomes should express the advice outlined in submission point 119</p> <p>2) Should not impose hut booking systems at huts other than Mueller and the to-be-established Hooker Hut. Booking systems should not be established for any public huts except easy-access front country huts that are under heavy pressure.</p> <p>3) The 1-nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only. Hang gliders and paragliders must be allowed to fly in close proximity in order to gain the necessary lift created by the mountains.</p> <p>4) remove the reference to "where this is safe" from the outcome "Foot access into the back country is fostered where this is safe ..."</p>	Amend outcomes for recreational values to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/6	Support effort to increase ease of foot access by adding mid-valley huts. Installation of a hut in the Hooker, mid-Tasman and replacement of Murchison hut would be helpful.		
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/8	Support occassional maintenance of Ball Road to help foot access up the Tasman. Would be great to see maintenace beyond Husky Flat.		
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/22	Very strongly disagree with park huts being booked. Many trampers and climbers make on the spot decisions about where they are going and this provision would severely affect and be detrimental to the climbers experience, so much so as to completely wreck the	Completely abandon all plans for hut booking systems throughout the park except hooker and Mueller.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>enjoyment of their trip.</p>		
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/21</p>	<p>The Plan appears to have overlooked the above, despite it being one of the obvious changes in recent years. To address this it is submitted that reinstatement of a mid-valley hut should be the first priority of the Department. Importantly, this would directly address all of the aspects of GPNP 8.1(c). In particular, it would help to provide for a range of experiences, and maintain the distinctive character of recreation in the area, including traditional New Zealand backcountry experiences with an ethos of self-reliance. Notwithstanding the latter, a mid-valley hut would make the upper valley more accessible through reducing the level of exposure to the elements (and therefore seriousness of the undertaking) for parties travel under their own power. It is important to note that the reliability of access to the upper valley through the lower icefall has been seasonal for many years (decades) and this situation has not materially changed in recent years. Parties, especially late in the season, have always had to contend with the likelihood of the icefall being difficult to negotiate, or impassable, necessitating a forced bivvy and/or retreat down valley. Regarding the lower valley, In addition, the opportunities for aquatic recreation and access modes have in fact increased with the expansion of Hooker Lake. In the future this could become a preferred access mode. A mid-valley shelter could help support these forms of recreation and access.</p>	<p>Include a time-bound commitment to reinstate a mid-valley hut in the Hooker valley.</p>	
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/22</p>	<p>Another important point is that New Zealand has previously been seen as a leader in National Park management and outdoor recreation. Yet in the draft park plan there is little evidence of commitment to innovation. In this instance, the Hooker Valley provides a text book example of the types of challenges that have talked about for years in the context of responding to climate change and glacial recession. Could New Zealand demonstrate innovation and lead by example? In particular, the challenge of facilitating recreational access in the Hooker valley in a manner consistent with the purposes of national parks would appear to present a perfect example of glacial recession challenges that are being experienced in other parks worldwide. Innovative solutions were identified and discussed in the glacial recession section of the NZAC survey report on</p>	<p>Show leadership, for the benefit of other glacial recession situations both nationally and globally, through a commitment to implementing the above using innovative approaches.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>recreational access in national parks (see <a href="http://bit.ly/RecAccessNatParksCh3">http://bit.ly/RecAccessNatParksCh3</a>). Options that could be explored to reinstate a mid-valley hut in the Hooker include the use of a light-weight, modular, movable hut that could be shifted in response to the dynamics of the environment. Hut sites that are 'safe' could be considered to be lacking the valley. However this could present another subject for innovation. For example, could a lightweight hut be placed on raft that is anchored to the lower glacier? or a terrace? and moved as required?</p>		
<p><i>West, Kat</i> 489/3</p>	<p>NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."</p>	
<p><i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/4</p>	<p>I support The Hooker Hut to be returned to the Hooker Valley.</p>	<p>No specific decision sought.</p>	
<p><i>Cleary, David</i> 533/3</p>	<p>NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."</p>	
<p><i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/18</p>	<p>Reduced use of Empress Hut and the Hooker valley is strongly driven by the loss of Gardiner Hut, and would support the replacement of this hut to improve utilisation of this area. Supports any movement by DOC, NZAC, CMC or another group to rebuild a hut at the Gardiner Hut site. It appears odd that DOC would allow it's use as a camping site, having built a water tank and a toilet at the site, but deem it too dangerous to rebuild a hut there. Rebuilding this hut would improve use of the valley while preserving the desired tranquillity outcomes and existing character and recreational values preserved by prohibiting aircraft access. DOC should consider input from the outdoor community with regards to hut design - specifically the water tank hut design pioneered by Erik Bradshaw. Use of such a modular design would allow easy installation and removal if required. <a href="https://alpineclub.org.nz/parkside/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/1-TankHut.pdf">https://alpineclub.org.nz/parkside/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/1-TankHut.pdf</a></p>	<p>Consider to rebuild a hut at the Gardiner site</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/64</p>	<p>1. 2. There is little mention of outcomes specific to mountaineering. The area should equally be managed as Icon destination for "world class short and day walks ..." , and as an iconic, world class mountaineering</p>	<p>1. Insert the following Recreational values outcome: "The outstanding values of this place as a mountaineering destination will continue to be maintained and enhanced." 2. Reword para 1 to read: " A 1 nautical miles "no-fly" zone</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>destination. This should be recognised with an appropriate statement.</p> <p>Para 1 identifies a "1 nautical mile 'no-fly' zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook respects the cultural significance of the mountain." NZAC considers that the hang gliding and paragliding pilots treasure the ability to fly in this area in the same way as climbers and skiers and many others treasure this mountain.</p> <p>3. Para 9 refers to foot access "where this is safe". The mountains are inherently unsafe, so if the word 'safe' is to be used, there should be an explanation as to how this is to be interpreted.</p> <p>4. Support the statement in the 3rd para "Foot access into the back country is fostered ...". However this conflicts with proposed aircraft access to the currently remote zoned upper Hooker Valley.</p> <p>5. Explore options to replace Gardiner Hut as a base for mid/lower Hooker Valley climbs and as halfway stopover to Empress Hut</p>	<p>for powered aircraft around Aoraki/Mount Cook ..."</p> <p>3. Remove the words "where this is safe" from the 2nd last para</p> <p>4. Retain para 3</p> <p>5. Add new outcome re replacement for Gardiner Hut</p>	
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/9</p>	<p>The absence of the Gardiner Hut has made access up the valley difficult and even dangerous for the majority of parties in this valley.</p> <p>Recent discussions regarding a hut mid-way up the Tasman appear to be resolving issues in this valley and the CMC believe that this should be encouraged for other areas such as the Hooker Valley where climate change, erosion etc. are making access more difficult.</p>	<p>Consider and discuss options for a replacement hut for Gardiner hut in the Hooker Valley.</p>	
<p><i>Monigatti, Paul</i> 719/3</p>	<p>NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."</p>	
<p><i>Moore, Bryan</i> 828/4</p>	<p>NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."</p>	
<p><i>Tapper, Louis</i> 830/4</p>	<p>NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."</p>	
<p><i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/5</p>	<p>NZHGPA seeks an exemption to the one nautical mile no-fly zone around the summit of Aoraki/Mt Cook.</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state that "a one nautical mile no-fly zone around Aoraki/Mount Cook should apply to powered aircraft only."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>New Zealand Canyoning Association</i> 840/3</p>	<p>The NZ Canyoning Association (NZCA) submits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- That canyoning is an activity which encourages people to experience Conservation areas in a positive way, that it enhances their perception of the natural world and does so in a way that has minimal environmental impact.</li> <li>- That canyoning be included as a permitted activity in the Aoraki National Park and included under general policy for its recreational values of the park management plan; subject to the normal criteria governing park users as per the National Parks Act 1980 and the Doc General Policy for Conservation areas and National Parks 2005.</li> <li>- That the NZCA be recognised within the management plan as the relevant recreational group representing the canyoning community and as such, be invited to provide advice and stakeholder views in all consultations, on all matters regarding recreational canyoning activity within the park.</li> <li>- That the NZCA code of practice and bolting guidelines be referred to and used as the primary document covering responsible conduct of canyoning activity within the park.</li> </ul>	<p>Amend Aroarokaehe Place outcomes to add the activity of canyoning.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/35</p>	<p>P122, 1st para - "Overnight use of all huts ..."</p> <p>It needs to be recognised that in winter Caroline Hut is often not accessible due to high avalanche risk. Even if avalanche risk is low, because of deep snow and shorter daylight hours, the number of people sufficiently skilled and experienced enough to safely get to Caroline Hut is considerably less in winter than in summer. The terrain around Caroline Hut is steeper, more complex and serious than at Mueller, with no marked track and greater exposure to avalanches. During the summer season (Nov-Apr) it is seldom that the hut is unoccupied. During the shoulder season (Mar-Apr) it is often the only hut in the park occupied, apart from Mueller Hut. During winter, Alpine Recreation runs occasional ski touring and snowshoeing trips and winter mountaineering skills courses for guided members of the public.</p> <p>The emergency shelter remains available free-of-charge to unguided members of the public who have the skills, equipment and experience to cope with the complex conditions on their own. The spartan nature of the shelter does not appeal to individuals who would otherwise be out of their depth, so is automatically self-</p>	<p>Reword the last sentence to read: "Accommodation at Caroline Hut is available to the public through the guided activity and provision of an openly-accessible emergency shelter."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>limiting.</p> <p>On occasion, the hut has been made available to non-Alpine Recreation guides to guide their own clients under our concession and safety management plan and also been used by the NZMGA for training and assessing their Alpine Trekking Guides.</p>		
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/36</p>	<p>Page 122, para 2: "Camping next to huts ...": "This is not consistent with the page 87 bylaw which prohibits camping within a 100m radius of a hut. The impacts on the environment depend entirely on numbers and will not necessarily be minimal. Policy 6 on p.123 also states: ""Should not allow camping in the Aroarokahe Place within 100 m of a hut and 200 m of a track, except for camping next to Mueller Hut.""</p>	<p>Reword to read: "Camping next to huts and along tracks, including the Ball Pass route, is closely monitored to ensure minimal impacts on the environment."</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 1</b>		
<p><i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/11</p>	<p>Support - Policies 1, 2 and 3 are good as they recognise the need for high-quality experience in a special area that is subject to increasing demand.</p>	<p>Retain Policy 1</p>	
<p><i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/5</p>	<p>Support this key policy, maintains historic management of quietness</p>		
<p><i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/26</p>	<p>Regarding policy 1 c) a wonderful statement, but inconsistent with the proposed flight access to Pudding Rock.</p>	<p>Retain policy 1 c)</p>	
<p><i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/1</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 1 a) It is inconsistent with allowing aircraft above the Hooker Valley, allowing drones and allowing large vehicles such as buses and campervans at the WHHC.</p>	<p>Either remove the words "natural quiet" or fix the inconsistencies in the plan.</p>	
<p><i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/108</p>	<p>Seek to maintain the experience of natural quiet within the village as well as the Hooker valley.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 1(a) to read: "Protecting the experience of natural quiet within the Hooker valley and the village."</p>	
<p><i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/43</p>	<p>The Hooker valley offers relatively easy access to the Park. It is important that aircraft noise does not intrude on peoples' experiences. Policy 1(a) could be expressed more clearly to address this.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 1 to read: "Maintain quality recreational experiences in the Aroarokahe Place by: a) protecting the natural quiet within the Hooker valley; b) ... "</p>	
<p><i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/3</p>	<p>Support Policies 1,2,3</p>	<p>Retain Policies 1,2,3. Landing permits and scenic flight zones should not be increased for these reasons.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/23	Support protecting natural quiet and encouraging visitors to experience nature on it's own terms, and topuni.	Change 'Protecting the experience of' natural quiet within the Hooker Valley' to 'Protecting the natural quiet within the Hooker Valley'. More than 'the experience' needs to be protected. This isn't a video game.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/91	Policy 1c): 1. Support policy wording 2. Note anomaly to policy with proposed air access to upper Hooker Valley via Pudding Rock Landing Zone which will remove concept of experiencing nature on own terms	Retain Policy 1c)	
<b>Section:</b> 2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 2			
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/12	Support - Policies 1, 2 and 3 are good as they recognise the need for high-quality experience in a special area that is subject to increasing demand.	Retain Policy 2	
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/6	Support for creating additional day or overnight walking experiences that complement the Hooker track experience. development of hiking routes including one up true left of Hooker Valley to large terraces and behind moraine wall, with Tyrolian traverse to allow experienced climbers and guided parties across first gulch.	development of hiking routes including one up true left of Hooker Valley to large terraces and behind moraine wall, with Tyrolian traverse to allow experienced climbers and guided parties across first gulch.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/121	Recreation policies 2, 3: 1) Policies for new recreation opportunities should include the consideration of Departmental multi-disciplinary advice of effects on natural values (see submission point 119) 2) Should allow for the establishment of a Hooker valley hut to replace the Gardiner Hut	Amend Policy 2 and 3 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/17	Support the investigation of new recreation opportunities in the Aroarokahe Place.	Retain Policy 2	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/20	MCGG supports the investigation of new recreation opportunities in the Aroarokahe Place		
<b>Section:</b> 2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 3			
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/13	Support - Policies 1, 2 and 3 are good as they recognise the need for high-quality experience in a special area	Retain Policy 3	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	that is subject to increasing demand.		
<i>Bosshard, K</i> 57/1	There should be no airplane or helicopter activities or landings in the Hooker Valley. This valley and its peaks should remain a reserve for mountaineers who still believe that to climb a mountain one must start at its base.	There should be no airplane or helicopter activities or landings in the Hooker Valley.	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/9	Support the proposal of providing new day and overnight walking facilities with the Aroarokahe Place, in conjunction with developing additional walks in the neighbouring Tasman Valley		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/122	Recreation policies 2, 3: 1) Policies for new recreation opportunities should include the consideration of Departmental multi-disciplinary advice of effects on natural values (see submission point 119) 2) Should allow for the establishment of a Hooker valley hut to replace the Gardiner Hut	Amend Policy 3 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/28	Supports the provision of new day and overnight walking facilities		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 4</b>		
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/8	Support the policy as written	Retain Policy 4 as worded	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/4	I support the installation of a via ferrata system on lower Pudding Rock to allow all season access onto the lower ledges and the start of the cable and anchor system once fully installed.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/92	Placement of bolts within Sebastian Bluffs Climbing Area best managed using NZCA guidance. Policy should reflect this.	Amend Policy 4 by deleting (c)	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/31	The CMC supports the use of bolting and fixed anchors.	The CMC supports the provision for bolting and the maintenance of existing bolts for climbing, mountaineering and access purposes in the Park.	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/8	Fixed anchors. I support policy as written.	Retain 2.2.3.4 Bolting policy as worded	
<i>New Zealand Recreation</i>	Submits that the use of the term 'precautionary approach' is redundant as it is encapsulated by and	Support with revision	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Association</i> 756/29	inherent in the NZAC guidance documents on bolting and fixed anchors.		
<i>New Zealand Canyoning Association</i> 840/4	The NZCA wish to be recognised within the management plan as the relevant recreational group representing the canyoning community and as such, be invited to provide advice and stakeholder views in all consultations, on all matters regarding recreational canyoning activity within the park. The NZCA code of practice and bolting guidelines should be referred to and used as the primary document covering responsible conduct of canyoning activity within the park.	Amend Policy 4 to recognise and address the matters raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 5</b>		
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/7	Support for no powered watercraft		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/5	Support policy	Retain Policy 5	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/109	Support Policy 5	Retain as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 6</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/9	Camping within 100m of a hut will keep environmental degradation within one area. Campers can use any toilet facilities but should pay a fee.	Reword Policy 6 to state that camping near huts is allowed but a fee is required to cover costs of toilet maintenance.	
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/11	Encourage camping around Caroline Hut for public to make use of toilets facilities provided.	Reword policy to encourage camping close to Caroline hut toilet facilities	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/9	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged so that campers use the toilet facilities provided.	Amend Policy 6 to encourage camping close to huts	
<i>McCartney, John</i> 38/6	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged so that campers use the toilet facilities provided	Amend Policy 6 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/7	Do not support Policy for camping around huts. Camping in the emergency shelter, or around the Hut should be encouraged so that campers use the toilet	Amend policy to reflect concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	facilities provided.		
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/38	Support policy trying to address some of the problems associated with freedom camping and "freeloading".	Retain Policy 6	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/35	Support Policy 6. It is good to see the Plan trying to address some of the problems associated with freedom camping and "freeloading".	Retain Policy 6.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/93	Policy 6 states that camping should not be within 200m of a track Bylaws 12e) prohibits camping within 500m of the Hooker track  These statements need to be aligned	Amend Policy 6 or Bylaws to align the requirements for camping	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/37	It is good to see the Plan trying to address some of the problems associated with freedom camping and "freeloading" (ie. camping near a hut to use the facilities, but not paying any hut fees).	Retain Policy 6 as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 7</b>		
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/10	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged so that campers use the toilet facilities provided.	Amend Policy 7 to encourage camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter.	
<i>McCartney, John</i> 38/5	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged so that campers will use the toilet facilities provided	Amend Policy 7 to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/8	Do not support Policy. Camping in the emergency shelter, or around the Hut should be encouraged so that campers use the toilet facilities provided.	Amend policy 7 to reflect concerns raised.	
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 48/1	Caroline hut is too small to operate effectively by the concessionaire if opened to the public. If opened to the public it would result in much larger numbers of inexperienced visitors attempting the demanding Ball Pass crossing without experienced guides.	Caroline hut should be retained in the way it has been operated for nearly three decades.	
<i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/9	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged (not discouraged as the draft suggests) so that campers will use the toilet facilities provided. The concessionaire should not be encouraged to treat this part of the park as their own domain.	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/9	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged (not discouraged as the draft suggests) so that campers will use the toilet facilities provided. The concessionaire should not be encouraged to treat this part of the park as their own domain.	Camping in the Caroline Hut emergency shelter or around the hut should be encouraged.	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/11	Support this policy but may be impractical without a warden to enforce it if the rest of the hut becomes available for bookings	Retain policy but recognise interaction with any measures taken to open access to Caroline Hut	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/39	Support Policy 7	Retain Policy 7 as written	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/26	Support Policy 7. It would be good to continue this policy of not encouraging planned overnight use of the emergency shelter at Caroline Hut, so that it is available for genuine emergencies.	Retain Policy 7.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/36	Support Policy 7. If the shelter is advertised as available for planned overnight use, there would likely be a rapid increase in numbers and the shelter would no longer be available for people with a genuine emergency.	Retain Policy 7.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/17	Support Policy 7. If the shelter is advertised as available for planned overnight use, there would likely be a rapid increase in numbers and the shelter would no longer be available for people with a genuine emergency.	Retain Policy 7.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/123	Should replace the word "camping" with "sheltering" or something similar.	Amend Policy 7 to replace the word "camping" as requested.	
<i>Laverty, Jared</i> 431/8	Support so that the emergency shelter is available should it need to be used in a genuine emergency.	Retain text as written.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/94	Subject to the outcome of 1.3.1 Policy 16 and our submission on this, this policy would become redundant	Amend Policy 7 in line with submission	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/10	Oppose Caroline Hut emergency shelter proposal. The concessionaire should be directed to provide space in this hut for overnight stays free of charge as part of the concession conditions. The shelter was originally intended as such a space. Camping should be allowed around this hut and the concessionaires toilet be available for campers.	Amend the plan to state the shelter is allowed for overnight stays and the area around the hut is allowed for camping.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/38	<p>This policy should remain, as planned overnight use of the emergency shelter would encourage inexperienced visitors who might otherwise be deterred. Currently the emergency shelter is well utilised by (mostly) well prepared, self-sufficient individuals and groups who have the necessary skills, fitness and experience to cope with the challenging conditions and terrain in the Ball Pass area.</p> <p>Alpine Recreation guides have on a regular basis taken care of unguided members of the public who have over-extended themselves/under-estimated the conditions while crossing Ball Pass and have encouraged them to use the shelter to avoid a full-scale emergency. In several instances, they have taken cold, wet and hungry or sick/injured people into the main part of the hut and given them food, hot drinks and/or medication and supported in their evacuation when required.</p> <p>If the shelter is advertised as available for planned overnight use, there would likely be a rapid increase in numbers and the shelter would no longer be available for people with a genuine emergency.</p>	Retain Policy 7 as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 8</b>		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/44	<p>Given the large numbers of visitors to Mueller Hut, a booking system is essential to prevent congestion in and around the hut. Any booking system should be managed to avoid the 'first in first served' rush by holding back sites and spaces and progressively making campsite and bunk spaces available during the year.</p>	Amend Policy 8 to include a new clause (c) to read: "c) manage the bookings so that at least 30% of the campsites and bunk spaces are available for booking up to one week in advance.":	
<i>McIntosh, Dr Pat</i> 358/4	Support controlled booking and camping at Mueller Hut	Retain this policy	
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/4	<p>I've been a volunteer warden at Mueller Hut over many years. Since the introduction of the booking system for the hut, I've had many no-shows, in spite of DOC's best efforts to monitor the bookings situation daily. Consequently, potential visitors miss-out. A smarter phone-app could help to solve this issue.</p>	Investigate the feasibility of a new booking app that can readily accept cancellation and confirmation of booking.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 9</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/17	<p>We do not support this policy. This policy discriminates against people who choose to hire a guide.</p> <p>Part (b) indicates that having a guided party has a detrimental effect on other users</p> <p>Part (c) sets a dangerous precedent. Guided parties will</p>	Delete Policy 9(b), (c), and (d)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>have to rush to get in and out of the hut around inclement weather conditions</p> <p>Restricting to one concessionaire is not fair and makes no sense in a small guiding community</p>		
<p><i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/9</p>	<p>Do not support policy and feel it is discriminatory towards people who hire a guide. All recreational Park users, irrespective of whether they are commercially guided or otherwise should be treated equally in Park management plans. Appears inconsistent with the general purpose of the National Parks Act 1980.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 9 b), c), and d).</p>	<p>Check consistency with 1.3.1 Policy 27 - do we need different policy approaches?</p>
<p><i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/41</p>	<p>Policy 9(b)-(e): These restrictions discriminate against members of the public choosing to go guided.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 9 (b), (c), (d) and (e),</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/38</p>	<p>These restrictions descriminate against members of the public choosing to go guided.</p>	<p>Remove Policies 9 b), c), d), e).</p>	
<p><i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/45</p>	<p>Support general approach to policy, however oppose the notion that concessions for guided groups should be granted. Given the pressure on the hut facilities from day visitors, mall guided concessions should be covered by the policy, not just overnight groups. To manage visitor numbers to this accessible destination, applications for guiding concessions may need to be declined to prevent congestion.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 9 to read: "Concessions for guided groups going to Mueller Hut or the adjacent camping area, must: a) pre-book their stay using the Department's booking system; b) have only one concessionaire group present in the hut and camping area on any one night; c) only book a maximum of two nights in any one week and eight nights in any calendar month; d) only have maximum of six clients plus one guide; and e) have no concessionaire lockers."</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/6</p>	<p>Policy 9(b) - (e): Mueller Hut is a popular introductory area for people learning mountain skills. Policy discriminates against guides who choose to engage with these services, and their clients who are wanting to engage with the mountain environment. If the policy is referring to guided groups in the form of hiking tours then this should be clearly stated.</p>	<p>Remove Policies 9(b), (c), (d) and (e)</p>	
<p><i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/24</p>	<p>Concessionaire use should be increased to allow for more than 1 per night to 2.</p>	<p>Change concession numbers per night to 2. Reason. The hut is now a tourist hut and there seems little reason to differentiate.</p>	
<p><i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/9</p>	<p>Do not support this policy and feel it is discriminatory towards people who hire a guide. Guided parties regularly avoid crowded hut situations and are the ones who manage the huts when they are full, ensure</p>	<p>Remove policy 9b, 9c, 9d</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>cleanliness, give feedback for what maintenance is required and so on. Guiding has been integral to the development of mountaineering in the park and participants should not be treated as second class citizens.</p> <p>All recreational Park users, irrespective of whether they are commercially guided or otherwise should be treated equally in Park management Plans. The nature of a visitor's experience and the effect of the visitor experience, whether private or public, should be treated the same. This approach would reflect the general purpose section of the National Parks Act 1980 (section 4) which provides that national parks are to be 'preserved ..for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the public..' At no point in this general purpose section or in other parts of the Act is there a distinction between commercial and other users of national parks. The Act clearly envisages that the public at large share in the enjoyment and benefit of access to national parks.</p>		
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/68</p>	<p>TIA supports the submission from the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association (Sub 443) on Section 2.2.3, Policies 9b-e:</p> <p>Mueller Hut is a popular introductory area for people learning mountain skills. Policy discriminates against guides who choose to engage with these services, and their clients who are wanting to engage with the mountain environment.</p> <p>If the policy is referring to guided groups in the form of hiking tours then this should be clearly stated.</p>	<p>Remove Policies 9(b), (c), (d) and €</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/39</p>	<p>Policy 9 (b)-(e):</p> <p>Mueller Hut is popular with guided groups (including NZAC instruction courses employing guides) learning mountaineering skills. Guides often choose to bivvy out near the hut, or towards the Annette Plateau, but at certain times of year the weather may preclude this. These restrictions discriminate against members of the public choosing to go guided. If the policies are referring to guided groups in the form of hiking tours, then this should be clearly stated.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 9 (b) - (e)</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.2 Aoraroakehe Place Policy 10</b></p>		
<p><i>Cradock, Nick</i> 7/1</p>	<p>A year round landing is needed at the Pudding Rock landing site. The issue for access is not only getting</p>	<p>1. Retain the policy for a landing site at Pudding Rock. 2. Reword to enable landings all year</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	through the icefall, but in particular getting around Hooker Lake. While the icefall is passable in late winter/spring, the lake and surrounding moraine walls are very problematic at all times and growing by the day. Considering it is a 10-year plan, and the rate of glacial retreat, it would be short-sighted to not allow landings all year.		
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker valley at Pudding Rock.	Delete Policy 10(b)	
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/1	Support the landing of helicopters at Pudding Rock on a limited number per day, and that this be suspended if a new hut is built.	Retain Policy 10(b)	
<i>Goddard, Penny</i> 15/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock.	Delete Policy 10(a)	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/2	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock	delete Policy 10(b)	
<i>Moffat, Steven</i> 17/4	Grand Plateau Landing Zone - 10 landings per day is not enough due to only a select number of fine weather flying days available. Should increase to 35/day as for Murchison. Pudding Rock - open up landings to all year round. Increase to same amount of flights as Barron Saddle.	Amend Policy 10 to read: (a) Grand Plateau Landing Zone - no more than 35 landings per day (b) Pudding Rock Landing Zone - (i) no more than 10 landings per day, between 8am and 6pm only; and (ii) aircraft to shut down on landing, if the pilot leaves the aircraft. (c) Barron Saddle Hut landing Zone - no change required.	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock.	Delete Policy 10 (b)	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/18	Support the landing zones in Map 15, but do not support the limits and criteria applied in Policy 10: a) 10 landings on Grand Plateau is too few. At peak times there will be more than 10/day as groups take advantage of limited fine spells. Once allocations used up, climbers may be forced to walk out in unsuitable conditions - creates a dangerous precedent. B) support limiting landings at Pudding Rock to 6/day but question seasonal restrictions, as climbing conditions can be good year round in upper Hooker c) No need for arbitrary landing times as civil twilight hours restrict aircraft access anyway.	Retain Policy 10 but with the following amendments: - retain Policy 10(a) but reword to remove landing restrictions or allow up to 20 landings/day during peak season. - retain Policy 10(b) but amend to allow for landings year-round - retain Policy 10(c) but remove landing time restrictions,	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/10	As climbing in the upper Hooker is more popular in winter than summer why limit the seasons especially since there are fewer people in the lower Hooker who would be impacted.	Reword Policy 10b) to retain "no more than 6 landings per day" and to remove "1 November and 28/29 February"	
<i>Macfarlane, Paula</i> 39/1	Do not support new flight access permitted into the Hooker valley at Pudding Rock. The draft plan expresses a commitment to providing a wide range of differing experiences and levels of remoteness within the park. The Hooker Valley in its current state, with no flight access, sits as an incredibly valuable example of how such a framework can and should work. Arguments about difficult access past Pudding Rock are relatively unfounded as access has been seasonal and never guaranteed for at least the last 25 years.	Amend Policy 10 to retain the protection that the current management plan places on the upper Hooker Valley.	
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock..In an era where we are aware of climate change we should really have a no flight access in the Park in the interests of preserving such a unique and delicate environment. The increased interest in climbing tourism is likely to result in ever more pressure for more flights resulting in more people in huts and on the mountain.. As night skies without light pollution are becoming increasingly rare, so too will areas free of noise pollution become ever more important. As a signatory to the Paris Climate Accord, and national policy to reduce our carbon emissions, we need to keep the bigger picture at the forefront of these discussions rather than the short-term commercial reasons for increasing flight access.	Amend Policy 10(b) to remove flight access to Pudding Rock.	
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 48/2	Significant flight movements into the Hooker Valley will significantly increase ambient noise and reduce natural quiet for visitors.	Oppose any aircraft landings in the Hooker Valley.	
<i>Clay, Lionel</i> 50/1	The concept of limiting flights at pudding rock landing zone seems justified, but I would like to see these limited for climbing parties only - scenic snow landings and aircraft accessed short glacier walk type activities seem to be more than well catered for in other parts of the park. The set dates limit for pudding rock landings of 1 Nov to 28/29 Feb is flawed, and seemingly in contradiction to the intent of minimalizing impacts on peak times of peak activity in the lower valley.	I submit that six landings per day at this site be accepted but over the entire year.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock. Please do not overturn the wonderful protection that the current management plan place on the Upper Hooker Valley. The Hooker valley in its current state with no flight access sits as an incredibly valuable example of how the park should support a wide range of differing experiences and levels of remoteness within the park.		
<i>Ord, Gregory</i> 54/3	The Hooker valley should remain free of aircraft landings and noise so as to protect the sense of solitude. Noisy flights up the Hooker will only disturb valley walkers.	The Hooker valley should remain free from aircraft landings and Pudding Rock aircraft landings. If Hooker valley flights and Pudding Rock landings are allowed then they should be of the order of six per summer and not six per day.	
<i>Heliworks Queenstown Helicopters 2012 Ltd</i> 56/1	Policy 10 a) We feel that this will be hard to manage across all operators - 10 landings a day can easily be done by one operator alone. We would like this to be considered an allowance per operator.	Reword policy to 10 landings a day per operator	
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock. Please do not overturn the wonderful protection that the current management plan place on the Upper Hooker Valley. The Hooker valley in its current state with no flight access sits as an incredibly valuable example of how the park should support a wide range of differing experiences and levels of remoteness within the park.		
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/8	Regarding policy 10 b) do not support helicopter landing sites at Pudding Rock.	Delete policy 10 b)	
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/4	Regarding Policy 10 b) support limited access to the upper Hooker, season should be extended to allow for alpine activities outside of peak climbing season	Remove the wording of "1 November and 28/29 February"	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/27	Regarding Policy 10 b) Pudding Rock flight access remove Policy 10 b).	Remove Policy 10 b)	
<i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/5	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10.	
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/9	Do not support aircraft landings in the Hooker Valley. Allowing them would be contradicting the desired tranquility outcomes in the plan and would lessen the experience of walking the Hooker track.	Delete all references to the Pudding Rock landing zone in the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Button, Margaret</i> 165/2	Do not agree with proposed landing numbers per day. Impact of noise by aircraft is excessive.	Reduce landings by 50%.	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/2	Aircraft landing at huts should only be allowed for backcountry (multi day) users. Too many huts are overrun with novice tourists such as Plateau hut.	Restrict helicopter landings at huts to allow access for only backcountry (multi day) users. Regulate adventure businesses and commercial helicopter access to backcountry huts.	
<i>Barker, Rodney</i> 182/10	Do not support Hooker Valley landing zones	Keep the Hooker Valley aircraft free except in case of emergencies, predator control and scientific research.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/22	No landings allowed in the Hooker	Remove from plan.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/23	Regarding 10 c) this is inconsistent with the surrounding red zone and major noise impact on the whole red zone.	Remove this landing zone from the plan.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/6	Need aircraft support for boat replacements and shed maintenance at Mueller Lake	Reword Policy 10 to include: "d) Shall allow aircraft assistance to approved watercraft concessionaire operation at Mueller Lake for concessions equipment positioning and maintenance."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/7	Policy 10(b): Extend dates to 31 March and allow for winter access as well	Reword Policy 10(b) to read: " ... no more than 6 landings per day, between 1 November and 31 March and 1 June to 30 September."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/8	Policy 10(a): More than 10 landings/day are needed at Grand Plateau to access the hut in fine weather periods.	Reword Policy 10(a) to allow 50 landings/day.	
<i>Mee, Donald</i> 239/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/7	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10.	
<i>Cox, Rowan</i> 250/2	Strongly oppose the proposal to have any helicopter landing zone in the Hooker Valley.	Delete policy 10 b)	
<i>Gardiner, Ian</i> 253/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/110	The Grand Plateau landing site requires more than 10 landings per day for parties to access the hut in fine weather periods.	Amend Policy 10(a) to read: "Grand Plateau Landing Zone - no more than 50 landings per day."	
<i>Low, Tyrone</i> 259/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/42	Policy 10(b): Landing zone should not be restricted seasonally, rather restricted to multi-day mountaineer drop-offs only. Limit concession to one operator only with requirement to maximise occupancy and link back flights whenever possible	Reword Policy 10(b) to read: "Hooker Glacier Landing Zone (between 1700m and 1740m) - no more than 6 landings per day, limited to multi-day mountaineering visitors only. Flight path to go over Billikin Pass."	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/43	Policy 10(c)(ii): Shutting down aircraft only makes sense for scenic flights. When dropping off climbers, only a short stopping period to unload gear. Shutting down would increase noise associated with starting up of engine again. This would have to be consistent with CAA rules which govern aircraft use.	Reword Policy 10(c)(ii) to exclude loading/unloading, reflect what most pilots are already doing, and consult with CAA regulations.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/45	Should also restrict landings at Grand Plateau, Pudding Rock and Barron Saddle to drop-offs for multi-day recreationalists only. Strictly no scenic stopovers or day-tourism landings.	Amend Policy 10 by the addition of "(d) no day tourism related drop-offs, multi-day recreationalists only."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/23	Regarding Policy 10 b) Oppose the limit of 6 landings per day.	Amend the plan to state a maximum of 6 landings per week for Pudding Rock landing zone. (For climber or ski tourers only - no scenics)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/24	Landings at Barron Saddle Hut, Plateau Hut and in the upper Hooker Glacier area should be determined according to hut space to avoid overcrowding and landings at these sites should be only for multi-day recreationists (low numbers), NOT day tourists (high numbers). There seems to be no clear justification for the restriction to 1 November to end of February.	Restrict landings at Grand Plateau, above Pudding Rock and Barron Saddle to drop-offs or pick-ups for multi-day recreationists ONLY. Strictly no scenic stopovers or day tourism landings. Remove the restriction of 1 November to end of February for Pudding Rock landing zone.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/39	Regarding Policy 10 b) Pudding Rock Landing Zone should not be restricted seasonally, rather it should be restricted to multi-day mountaineer drop-offs only and suggest that a concession for this particular landing site be limited to ONE operator only.	Reword Policy 10 b) to Hooker Glacier Landing Zone (between 1700m and 1740m) - no more than 6 landings per limited to multi-day mountaineering visitors only. Flight path to go over Billikin Pass.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/40	Regarding Policy 10 c) ii) This only makes sense for scenic flights. When dropping off climbers or skiers, the pilot often needs to assist with unloading of gear. If there is only a short stopping period, shutting down would actually increase the noise and time exposed to it, due to the additional time required to start up and shut down the engine.	Reword Policy 10 c) ii) to exclude loading/unloading, reflect what most pilots are already doing and consult with CAA regulations.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/42	Regarding the landing zones in Policy 10: Restrict landings at Grand Plateau, Pudding Rock and Barron Saddle Hut to drop-offs for multi-day recreationalists only. Strictly no scenic stopovers or day-tourism landings.	Add a Policy 7 d) stating "No day-tourism related drop-offs. Multi-day recreationalists only."	
<i>Rainey, Heath</i> 275/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Kirkwood, Rod</i> 307/2	Regarding Policy 10 b) Oppose aircraft access to Pudding Rock would disrupt what is currently a landing free area.	Remove this from the plan	
<i>King, Bill</i> 310/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 318/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/7	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Stevenson, Dr. Anthony</i> 330/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Wilson, Dan</i> 331/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Sutherland, Scott</i> 332/3	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/46	Proposed policy presumes that all landing concessions should be granted. There will be situations where an application should be declined.	Reword Policy 10 t read: "An application for a new, or replacement, concession for commercial aircraft landings in Aroarokahe Place will: i) be assessed using an allocation process, developed in	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	It is unclear whether the intent of Policy 10(b) is to allow unlimited landings outside 1 November and 28/29 February period, or to allow only up to 6 landings per day within this period.	consultation with kaitiaki rūnaka and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu; ii) be allowed only in the following zones iii) Grand Plateau Landing Zone ... Iv) Pudding Rock landing Zone - no more than 6 landings per day, only between 1 November and 28/29 February; and v) ..."	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/15	There should be no helicopter landing zones within Aroarokaehe Place : - Barron Saddle Hut is easily reached on foot - the Hooker Valley should remain a place where the values of remoteness and tranquillity are maintained - these two landing sites are inconsistent with the large Red Zone that surrounds them - those wanting to access the Park using mechanical means are already extremely well catered for in the Tasman valley	Delete Policy 10 (b) and (c) - remove helicopter landing zones at Barron Saddle and Pudding Rock	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/7	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Broadbent, James</i> 355/5	10 b) Support the proposed new landing site at the old Gardiner Hut site. This would be a safer access to the upper Hooker for recreation.	Retain the policy of new landing site at the old Gardiner site. But with the season being more realistically October to March.	
<i>Elliot, John</i> 367/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Poetschke, Alexandra</i> 386/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/124	The present operative plan, in line with the Act and General Policy, appropriately gives the upper Hooker area aircraft-free status, meaning that anyone going there encounters nature on its own terms. This should continue.	Delete Policy 10(b).	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/5	Strongly against air access to Pudding rock and any other new sites. Spring and summer months are times where climbers and skiers want to access the Hooker Valley by foot and foot access is possible (due to crevasses being filled in).		
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/17	There have been many opposing arguments for and against air access to Pudding Rock. Those who are for it, are seemingly the older generation and guides who		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>would profit from new guiding opportunities. Those who are against are most often foot access recreationalists. See the discussions in the recent climber magazine.</p>		
<p><i>Skea, Eric</i> 440/3</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 10b There should not be a landing site at Pudding Rock, or elsewhere in the Hooker Valley. There are few enough areas of the Park without landing zones as it is. The approaches to Empress Hut should continue to be free of air access.</p>	<p>Delete policy 10b, Pudding Rock Landing Zone</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/7</p>	<p>Policy 10(a): Plateau Hut is becoming increasingly popular as a destination for instruction courses and general guiding. Limiting landings to 10 per day may not adequately cover the usage it is receiving.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 10(a) to allow 20 landings per day</p>	
<p><i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/25</p>	<p>Aircraft b). Maintain the status quo. No landings at pudding rock. Though access is sometimes more difficult, this valley is primarily used by climbers at the top of their field. They have the skills to access. This place should remain with it's natural quiet values as much intact as possible and the National Park should maintain that.</p>	<p>Remove b) allowing landings at Pudding Rock</p>	
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/23</p>	<p>The implications of proposed new aircraft access to Pudding Rock are not assessed and appear to be underestimated. It can also be observed that there no compensatory measures proposed to ameliorate negative impacts. Irrespective of personal views on the merits of allowing air access in the Hooker, it will have wide ranging effects on recreational use and remoteness values of the upper valley. The NZAC survey of stakeholder perspectives on recreational access in park (see <a href="http://bit.ly/RecAccessNatParksCh4">http://bit.ly/RecAccessNatParksCh4</a>) showed that there are some park users who will benefit from the proposed changes and others who will be impacted. This needs to be very carefully considered against the purpose of national parks and the 2005 General Policy for National Parks 8.1(c). In relation to recreation in the Hooker Valley, all of parts i) to iv) are particularly relevant. However, it is important to address change, and one of the major changes in recent times has been the loss of not one, but two traditional backcountry huts in the mid-Hooker Valley.</p>	<p>Reconsideration of the current aircraft access proposal. Any proposal for the introduction of aircraft access must be consistent with the results of full assessment of impacts on negatively affected park users, and an evaluation of those effects for any discrepancies with the purposes of the National Parks Act and General Policy. Note that this process does not appear to be possible within the timeframes of the current Plan review. It also requires that the issue regarding proposed changes to Visitor Management Zones is directly addressed prior. It does not make sense to pursue development proposals that could only occur on the assumption that major changes to the permissible levels of human impact would be accepted. This is especially relevant given that the location concerned is a National Park. In any event it makes sense to deal first with any fundamental changes to interpretation of the Act, and following this, with any new development proposals that might be enabled, or otherwise.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/9</p>	<p>Policy 10(a) - Grand Plateau Landing Zone: 10 landing is too few; the record of intentions can attest to that (with 40 people there one night last month). And whilst walking access is still possible, it is not everyone's cup of tea, or even manageable for many overseas tourists not used to NZ access conditions. To have the same for Barron Saddle is not in keeping with where the demand is being applied.</p> <p>Policy 10(b) - Pudding Rock Landing Zone: The Great Debate amongst climbers - to fly or not to fly. Both sides have merit however having seen the deterioration in the Hooker over the past 10 years, and walked up there on average 2 times a year for the past 10 years, a seasonal based heli accessed period seems like a great compromise. The Hooker remains a serious place to access and climb. Allowing heli access I don't think will result in a whole bunch of guided groups up there on instruction. It's not the right terrain, and only landing at Pudding Rock maintains the separation and commitment to get to the only shelter in the valley - Empress Hut. How will those landings be allocated? First come first serve? And any difference between recreational v's guided parties? Why not make it 10 in keeping with the rest of the landing allowances?</p>	<p>Remove Policy 10(a), or Amend to allow 20 landings per day Retain Policy 10(b) but consider amending to 10 flights/day</p>	
<p><i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/6</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 10 b) The Draft does not contain a serious discussion of why a Pudding Rock landing zone has become necessary. That is not acceptable where it involves the disestablishment of a long-standing no-landing zone.</p>	<p>Delete orange zone at Pudding Rock and delete Policy 10 b).</p>	
<p><i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/4</p>	<p>Policy 10(b): The Draft does not contain a serious discussion of why a Pudding Rock landing zone has now become necessary. That is not acceptable where it involves the disestablishment of a long-standing no-landing zone. Safety arguments for alpine helicopter landings are well known. Those arguments merit general concern, but even with the loss of Gardiner Hut, a new landing site at Pudding Rock is not a logical local response. Obvious replies include: - first that parties have the option of avoiding the Hooker if one of their number is not up to the area's challenges, and would be exposed to unacceptable levels</p>	<p>Delete Policy 10(b)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>of risk in that place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- secondly, park-wide opportunities for 'safe access' and guiding will significantly increase based on Draft landing policies for other areas of the park.</li> <li>- thirdly, parties can also elect to land immediately west of Harper Saddle in Westland National Park, based on draft landing provisions for that park.</li> </ul> <p>Other issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the influence from third-party commercial aircraft and guiding operators, and the legality of that</li> <li>- the wider discussion of huts needing to be self-funding. It has been irresponsible for DOC to the level of detailed policy-setting</li> <li>- DOC's refusal to enforce park policies or concession conditions to the extent, for example, of preventing 'landing-site creep'. A Pudding Rock landing site will undoubtedly see landings much closer to Empress Hut, beginning with "just over that next big slot".</li> </ul>		
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 473/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Ramm, David</i> 481/3	Oppose proposed pudding rock landing zone. This site has rare and endangered Rock Wren which is vulnerable to helicopters. Climbers who fly to save walk-in time before they start is bad practice and does not give time to get adjusted to the terrain of the climb on "natures terms". The climb itself is for only very fit people and these people would not need the helping hand of flying in.	Remove the proposed pudding rock landing zone.	
<i>Torok, Tomas</i> 484/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/3	I support grant concessions for Pudding Rock Landing zone.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>Watson, Elinor</i> 502/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/2	I do not support any aircraft landings in the Hooker no fly zone - particularly I do not support any landings at Pudding Rock.	Remove this from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>McCrone, Ash</i> 519/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock. The Hooker Valley in its current state with no flight access. The Hooker Glacier in its currently protected state, being surrounded by the biggest and most serious mountains in New Zealand is an iconic place. Increasing flights will reduce the mauri of the area, and experience of climbers.	Remove Policy 10 from the plan.	
<i>Jolly, James N.</i> 530/3	Oppose Aircraft access and landing sites in Hooker and Mueller Valleys.	Remove this from the plan and maintain long standing mutual agreement with industry to keep Hooker and Mueller Valleys as no fly zones thus protecting tranquility in at least one part of the park.	
<i>Shinnamon, Anu</i> 535/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Fishman, Tana</i> 546/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Fishman, Charles</i> 547/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Ross, Neville</i> 552/5	I oppose any allowance for helicopter landings in the Hooker Valley. I have watched rescues by helicopter from Mueller Hut and they are very audible when operating in the Hooker Valley by Pudding Rock.	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Hudson, Joshua</i> 553/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Daws, Peter</i> 556/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Mason, Sam</i> 558/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/6	Support the idea of aircraft access to the mid Hooker area (an area between 1900m-2000m). With the limited number of visitors to the area, access over the Mt Cook range impacts will be low especially if access is not for sightseeing flights but for climber access. I agree with restricted dates and the suggested dates of November to March for mid Hooker aircraft access.	I feel the daily landings should be 4 and for climbers only in the Hooker (old Gardiner site). I feel the number of landings at Barron Saddle could be reduced to 5 or cut completely. It should be for climbers and back country skiers only. I feel landings at Plateau should be increased to 15.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Ross, Mary</i> 565/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/18	Policy 10 b0 and c): As described under map 15 feel very strongly that allowing landings at pudding rock degrades the experience of climbing in the hooker valley. Also feel that landings at Barron Saddle are unnecessary and removing this landing zone would increase the values associated with the upper Mueller Glacier.	Remove 2.2.3 policy 10.b&c	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/14	Pudding Rock is not a location which requires landings, the glacier still provides access to those who most respect the natural and cultural values of the park with effort. This precedent will have a drastic effect on the tranquillity of this area of the park. The landing numbers generally are much too high and should be limited further. Alternatively, allowing helicopter access to the pudding rock site should be countered by a 'no-fly' zone in the Mueller including no landings at Barron Saddle. Allowing landings also defies General Policy for National Parks 2005: 8.1c) (i) & (ii)	Reword Policy 10 (lower numbers and add text for guided parties) a) "Grand Plateau Landing Zone - no more than 8 landings per day, with a maximum of 4 by guided parties" b) delete c) "Barron Saddle Hut Landing Zone - i) no more than 4 landings per day, between 8 am and 6 pm only, with a maximum of 2 by guided parties; and"	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/1	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/17	Accessing Pudding Rock by foot is still good possible: have been up in both December and January and never had any issues accessing Pudding Rock. The myth of difficult access up the Hooker is largely driven by hearsay and armchair climbers, along with an attitude prevalent amongst the climbing community that increased difficulty compared with a generation ago as meant that access is already on the verge of impossibility. This is patently false, as my own climbing experiences have proven. Concerning guiding interests - they already have extensive access to the peaks and glaciers of the park, and have failed to demonstrate a necessary business need for additional landing areas in this protected area. Allowing additional landings places	Delete Policy 10 b) Delete reference to Pudding rock on map 15 and 7	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>the interests of private companies over those of individuals. Access as proposed will remove the natural quiet that has been effectively preserved in this area for many years and drastically change the spirit of mountaineering in this valley. Aoraki is an iconic peak of New Zealand, with a proud history of ascents without helicopter access. DOC preserving a side of the mountain where helicopter access is forbidden would represent a strong endorsement of these self-reliant values that set often New Zealand climbers apart from others. That the majority of ascents are made from the Tasman side via the Linda Glacier route is not evidence that ascents from the Hooker are unduly difficult. (see also submission on section 2.2.1 Recreational values)</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/95</p>	<p>Policy 10b): Oppose Policy 10b) as discussed in Key Submission 8 on Park preservation, Public access and Aircraft</p>	<p>Delete Policy 10b)</p>	
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/16</p>	<p>A survey of CMC members on air access resulted in 67% opposing an additional landing zone in the Aroaroahaeke Place. 43 members replied to this survey.</p>	<p>Do not add an additional landing zone in the Aroaroahaeke Place.</p>	
<p><i>Christchurch Tramping Club</i> 604/4</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 10 b) We do not support a landing site at Pudding Rock. The Department does not have a way to control flight paths, this would impact on natural quiet in the Hooker.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 10 b) Pudding Rock Landing Zone.</p>	
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/26</p>	<p>Support granting of concessions using an allocation process, however the process needs to be better described</p>	<p>Amend Policy 10 to provide a detailed description of the concession allocation process</p>	
<p><i>McKellar, Thomas</i> 613/5</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 10 b) The Hooker Valley has long stood as a no-landing zone and offers tranquillity and remoteness to those who are prepared to work for it. Allowing landings on Pudding Rock is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Delete the orange zone at Pudding Rock and remove the Pudding Rock landing zone from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/7</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 10 a) Limiting landings to 10 per day is too few to cater for weather and safety issues for alpine climbing.</p>	<p>Increase allowable landings to accommodate peak demand.</p>	
<p><i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/8</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 10 b) Why limit the seasons.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 10 b) by retaining the wording "no more than 6 landings per day" but removing "between 1</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		November and 28/29 February"	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/6	Regarding Policy 10 a) Limiting landings to 10 per day is too few to cater for weather and safety issues for alpine climbing.	Increase allowable landings to accommodate peak demand.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/7	Regarding Policy 10 b) Why limit the seasons.	Reword Policy 10 b) by retaining the wording "no more than 6 landings per day" but removing "between 1 November and 28/29 February"	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/6	Regarding Policy 10 a) Limiting landings to 10 per day is too few to cater for weather and safety issues for alpine climbing.	Increase allowable landings to accommodate peak demand.	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/7	Regarding Policy 10 b) Why limit the seasons.	Reword Policy 10 b) by retaining the wording "no more than 6 landings per day" but removing "between 1 November and 28/29 February"	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/7	Regarding Policy 10 a) Limiting landings to 10 per day is too few to cater for weather and safety issues for alpine climbing.	Increase allowable landings to accommodate peak demand.	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/8	Regarding Policy 10 b) Why limit the seasons.	Reword Policy 10 b) by retaining the wording "no more than 6 landings per day" but removing "between 1 November and 28/29 February"	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/11	Support landings at these sites for overnight staying only.	The landings at Pudding Rock should be for a longer period and prescribed on a person limit not a landing limit. Reallocate other landings to this site if necessary eg: from Baron Saddle.	
<i>Layburn, Stephen</i> 632/3	As NZAC has submitted, the sheer weight of numbers when combined with the lack of a distinction between tourist landings and those, say, for climber drop-offs on the Grand Plateau, will inevitably extend tourism in the National Park. Climbers and other recreationalists will be competing with tourist for flights, tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase.	Opposed against increase in numbers and landing zones (in general) and that there is no distinction between drop-offs for climbers versus landings for tourist.	
<i>Rhynd, Keeley</i> 642/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Gunn, Matt</i> 643/1	Oppose allowing helicopter access into the Pudding Rock area. It would destroy the experience of remoteness in a high alpine area.	Amend the plan to not allow any helicopter landing in the Hooker Valley	
<i>Westphall, Mark</i> 646/1	Regarding Policy 10 b) Oppose the 6 flights to pudding rock up the hooker valley. This valley should be aircraft free except for emergency of doc maintenance	Delete Policy 10 b) from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	requirements.		
<i>Westphall, Mark</i> 646/2	Regarding Policy 10 c) Oppose the number of landings allowed per day to Baron Saddle Hut Landing zone.	Amend the plan to state a maximum of 4 flights per day at the Baron Saddle Hut Landing zone.	
<i>McGregor, Lucy</i> 658/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/10	policy 10 a) Grand Plateau Support landings on Grand Plateau but the proposed limit at 10 per day is too few to cater to weather issues and especially if some groups are doing day trips. On page 119 it states that `landing sites will be restricted, both seasonally (limited from November to March)'. This is not consistent with the written policy.	Reword policy 2.2.3.10.a) to allow for 20 or more flights each day or remove policy. Reword blurb on page 119 to align with policy statement.	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/11	Policy 10 b) Pudding rock As climbing in the upper Hooker is more popular in winter than summer why limit the seasons especially since there are fewer people in the lower Hooker who would be impacted?	Reword policy 2.2.3.10.b) to retain `no more than 6 landings per day' and remove `1 November and 28/29 February.'	
<i>Beale, Simon</i> 665/8	How will DOC monitor and enforce flight paths on operators? Eg South of the park to reach the Baron Saddle Hut Landing Zone. What concessions would be provided if cloud cover precluded that approach but could be achieved via Mueller Glacier?	Amend the plan to state how DOC intends to monitor and enforce flight paths on operators.	
<i>Rowden, Murray</i> 669/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Adank, Charlotte</i> 671/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Mitchell, Josh</i> 687/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/18	Support the proposed granting of concessions for commercial aircraft landings in Aroarokaehe Place. INFLITE has identified Grand Plateau as an ideal alternative site to the upper section of the Tasman Glacier, for snowshoeing. It provides an alternative in some weather and snow conditions and in the event fixed wing aircraft are not available. The current draft Plan significantly restricts guiding numbers at Grand	The plan should contemplate that Grand Plateau may be utilised as a snow shoeing site and allow a significant increase in guiding numbers for this purpose.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Plateau which would preclude this option being utilised. We submit that the Department should reconsider zoning this area to permit this activity.		
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/4	Oppose the Grand Plateau landing zone.	Remove the Grand Plateau landing zone from the plan and replace with a specific landing site below 1400m altitude only.	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/8	Regarding Policy 10 b) Oppose Pudding Rock flight access.	Retain the status quo of no flight access in the Hooker Valley.	
<i>Garden, Tom</i> 705/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Whittaker, Susan</i> 710/2	Regarding Policy 10 b) Oppose landing zone at Pudding Rock. This would impact on park users wishing to explore an area without helicopter disturbance.	Delete Policy 10 b)	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/21	MCGG supports the proposed granting of concessions for commercial aircraft landings in Aroarokahe Place.  MCGG has identified Grand Plateau as an ideal alternative site to the upper section of the Tasman Glacier, for snowshoeing. It provides an alternative in some weather and snow conditions and in the event fixed wing aircraft are not available. The current draft Plan significantly restricts guiding numbers at Grand Plateau which would preclude this option being utilised. We submit that the Department should reconsider zoning this area to permit this activity.	The plan should contemplate that Grand Plateau may be utilised as a snow shoeing site and allow a significant increase in guiding numbers for this purpose.	
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/7	Regarding Policy 10 a) and 10 b) Oppose. The Upper Hooker is a special and remote place. I submit that it should remain free of aircraft access.	Remove the landing zones at Grand Plateau and Pudding Rock from the draft plan.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/46	TIA does not support the change from annual to daily aircraft landing limits and strongly advocates for the current annual allocation policy to be retained. TIA submits that limits must enable sustainable aircraft operations: - Moving to a model of allocating landings with daily limit constraints (beyond those which occur naturally) will adversely impact the viability of an aircraft business and could give a misleading impression of very high annual aircraft landing numbers. - Aircraft operators need to utilise their allocated landings when the weather and demand allows - daily	1. Review the allocation limits for landings in the Aroarokahe Place in relation to the concerns raised. 2. Carefully consider and act on the feedback from aircraft concessionaires, guided mountaineering operators and the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association on the landing limits for particular sites/zones.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	limits will seriously impact the ability for an operator to run an economically sustainable business.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/71	TIA believes that the requirements in the Plan that aircraft shut down on landing goes against industry good practice and could be unsafe. We understand that aircraft user groups already voluntarily expect aircraft to shut down on landing where safe and practicable. IA recommends that DOC continue to work with aircraft user groups to support agreements where operators shut down their machines to manage noise impact on other users whenever safe and practicable to do so.	Delete Policy 10(c)(ii)	
<i>Barnett, Frances</i> 734/4	Regarding Policy 10 b) I strongly oppose the proposal to have any helicopter landing zone in the Hooker Valley. Allowing access to this valley will remove the only opportunity in Aroarokaehe Place for climbers, trampers, hunters & skiers seeking to explore an area that is not disturbed by helicopters and helicopter access.	Delete Policy 10 b) from the draft plan.	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/7	<p>A limit of 10 landings per day is provided for the Grand Plateau site. 10 aircraft landings per day on the Grand Plateau is too few given that this area has become a venue for different mountain activities. At peak times when the weather is unsettled there is already more than 10 aircraft landings occurring per day as groups take advantage of often limited fine spells .</p> <p>This is also self-regulating as groups will tend to avoid crowded huts so one would question the need for such restrictions. It is therefore suggested that the number of landings authorised by this Policy should be increased.</p> <p>Support the cap of six landings per day at Pudding Rock given the nature of the climbing opportunities and hut limitations in the valley. However, the seasonal restrictions are questioned, as climbing conditions are understood to be good year round in the Upper Hooker and aircraft access would be beneficial to supporting this activity.</p> <p>Aircraft landing limits specified for Baron Saddle are supported.</p>	<p>Increase the number of landings for Policy 10 a) to 20 per day throughout the peak mountaineering season as a minimum.</p> <p>Remove the seasonal restriction from Policy 10 b)</p>	
<i>DeRoy, Mary</i> 739/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Moyle, Nicholas</i> 741/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Ainsworth, Lewis</i> 744/2	Regarding Policy 10 b) Support this policy, access into the hooker will enable more use of empess hut which is currently underutilised. Furthermore it will future proof access into NZs premier mountaineering location.	Retain policy.	
<i>Ellis, Ben</i> 768/4	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/30	<p>The plan would erode the natural quiet of the Hooker Glacier valley by allowing a landing site at Pudding Rock.</p> <p>No justification is provided for the replacement of the Plateau Hut landing site with the broader landing zone on the Grand Plateau. The existing limited landing site (at the hut) should be maintained to prevent visual impact of landings on the Grand Plateau (widespread tracks, etc.) and to avoid impact to recreationalists on the glacier. Access from the Hut landing site to the glacier is straightforward with basic equipment, such as would ordinarily be carried by all mountaineers or skiers in the area.</p>	<p>Remove Pudding Rock landing site.</p> <p>Maintain aircraft landing-free status of Hooker Glacier valley.</p> <p>Remove Grand Plateau landing zone and maintain current landing site at Hut.</p>	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/15	<p>It is obvious that glacial recession has changed the manner in which the upper Hooker is accessed - more hard ice and flat moraine travel is required. Similar travel is required both below and above Pudding rock. However, this does not represent a restriction on access - instead a transformation of access. Allowing helicopter access ostensibly due to difficult foot access below Pudding Rock is without basis when the same access difficulties (heavily glaciated terrain with hard ice and crevasses) is present above Pudding Rock.</p> <p>Groups unable to manage these difficulties will be placed at undue risk by being allowed to fly in and likely end up outside of their comfort zone with no reasonable retreat possible.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 10 b)</p> <p>Also remove the Pudding Rock landing zone from Map 15 and Map 7</p>	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/49	Do not support increase in landings.	Reduce the size of the landing zones and numbers of flights (revert to current plan provisions which have been well-tested).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/50	Regarding Policy 10 b) This is ambiguous - does this mean landings 1 Nov - end Feb, or that outside this time there is no limit to landings?	Clarify the Policy.	
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/5	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/33	Do not support the proposal to allow aircraft into the Hooker Valley. Do not support aircraft access in Aroarokaehe Place.	Remove all aircraft access to Aroarokaehe Place. If landings in the Hooker are allowed, then remove all landings from Barron Saddle Hut so that the entire Mueller Valley can be a place of high tranquillity levels.	
<i>Hoskin, Stephen &amp; Rosemary</i> 814/2	Regarding 10 b) Oppose the establishment of a landing zone at Pudding Rock in the Hooker Valley. Aircraft noise and visual impact travels well down the valley.	Remove landing zone at Pudding Rock. Keep the Hooker for the tranquillity and natural experiences that make NZ special, attractive to overseas people and a great place to live and play.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/11	Oppose Pudding Rock landing zone. Wish to specifically address the issue of access up the Hooker valley. Glacial recession has changed the manner in which the upper Hooker is accessed - more hard ice and flat moraine travel is required. Similar travel is required both below and above Pudding rock. However, this does not represent a restriction on access - instead a transformation of access.	Delete Policy 10 b) reference to Pudding Rock landing zone	
<i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/5	Regarding Policy 10 a) Limiting landings to 10 per day is too few to cater to weather and safety issues for alpine climbing. There also needs to be a distinction between scenic landings and those climber drop-offs.	Amend plan to differentiate between scenic and climber drop-off landings and Increase allowable landings for climber drop-offs for safety and practicality.	
<i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/6	Regarding Policy 10 b) As climbing in the upper Hooker is more popular in winter than summer why limit the seasons especially since there are fewer people in the lower Hooker who would be impacted	Reword Policy 10 b) to no longer state "between 1 November and 28/29 February."	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/5	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/9	Hooker Valley should remain aircraft free, except in cases of emergency, predator control and scientific research.	Delete Policy 10	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/40	Policy 10 (a)-(c): Restrict landings at Grand Plateau, Pudding Rock area, and Barron Saddle Hut to drop-offs for multi-day recreationalists only.	Reword Policy 10(b) to read: "Hooker Glacier Landing Zone (between 1700m and 1740m) - no more than 6 landings per day, limited to multi-day mountaineering visitors only. Flight path to go over	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Strictly no scenic stopovers or day-tourism landings, or heliskiing.</p> <p>Policy 10(b):            Pudding Rock Landing Zone should not be restricted seasonally, rather it should be restricted to multi-day mountaineer drop-offs only as per submission point 34 comments above.            To avoid half-full aircraft, suggest that a concession for this particular landing site be limited to ONE operator only e.g Heliworks, with the requirement to maximise occupancy and link back flights whenever possible. If only one operator has this concession, it is easier to ensure responsible use of aircraft (including flight paths) to the area.            Limiting to six landings per day is not in line with safe mountaineering and weather and conditions. For eg. 7 loads may fly in on Monday during good weather, then a storm comes in, then climbing on good days, followed by another storm, and then 7 loads may need to get out as food has been depleted. This is then only 14 loads over a 7day period for eg. Propose a limit on the no of flights per year so as not to compromise safety.            Hut bed spaces will naturally limit numbers anyway as it is indeed dangerous to weather a full blown alpine storm in a tent in these environments.</p> <p>Policy 10(c)(ii):            This only makes sense for scenic flights. When dropping off climbers or skiers, the pilot often needs to assist with unloading of gear. If there is only a short stopping period, shutting down would actually increase the noise and time exposed to it, due to the additional time required to start up and shut down the engine. For longer stops, pilots generally shut down anyway in order to save fuel.            This could also be tricky to implement as they are governed by CAA rules.</p>	<p>Billikin Pass."</p> <p>Reword Policy 10(c)(ii) to exclude loading/unloading, reflect what most pilots are already doing and consult with CAA regulations.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 11</b>		
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/7	Support occassional maintenance of Ball Road to help foot access up the Tasman. Would be great to see maintenace beyond Husky Flat.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Petrove, Tanya</i> 673/15	Do not agree that the proposed Park and Ride being administered from within the Park. ie Birch Hill. This should preferably be outside the Park.	Amend Policy 11 to state possible venues for administration of the proposed Park and Ride will be outside the Park boundary or possibly on the airport flats.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Policy 12</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/10	Camping next to Caroline hut should be allowed and a fee should be payable to Alpine recreation to maintain the toilet.. To not allow would give Alpine Recreation further exclusive rights to the area.	Reword Policy 12(f) by removing the words "or next to". Add that camping next to the hut will incur a fee.	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/9	Camping in or around the Caroline Hut emergency shelter should be encouraged so that campers will use the toilet facilities provided.	No specific policy change requested. Consider amendments to Policies 6, 7 and 12 to reflect the issue raised.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/24	Regarding 12 e) Strongly oppose. Camping needs to remain free in the Hooker Valley	Remove this from the plan.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/35	Policy 12(h): Oppose as our concession allows the use of pa motor on the guided kayaks.	Reword policy to include "except on existing watercraft concession."	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/111	Oppose Policy 12(c) as written.  Oppose Policy 12(h) . Our 30-year concession allows for us to use a motor on the guides kayaks	Amend Policy 12(c) to add the following: "... In peak seasons" Amend Policy 12(h) to exempt existing watercraft concessions	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/40	Policy 12(f): Support Bylaw policy to prohibit use of the emergency shelter except in an emergency.	Retain Policy 12(f) as written	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/46	Policy 12(b): Support the 2 night limit for Mueller Hut and the reinstated Hooker Hut, but no limit should be applied to high alpine huts as this would not be realistic given the difficulty of access and NZ weather.	Retain Policy 12(b) but ensure an exception for other alpine huts	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/47	Policy 12(h): Support policy - boats have no place on Mueller or hooker Lakes	Retain Policy 12(h)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/27	Regarding Bylaw 12 f) Support this. It would be good to continue this policy of not encouraging planned overnight use of the emergency shelter at Caroline Hut, so that it is available for genuine emergencies.	Retain Bylaw 12 f).	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/37	Support Policy 12 f). If the shelter is advertised as available for planned overnight use, there would likely	Retain Policy 12 f).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	be a rapid increase in numbers and the shelter would no longer be available for people with a genuine emergency.		
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/43	Regarding Policy 12 b) Agree that 2 nights be the limit for Mueller Hut and the reinstated Hooker Hut, but no limit should be applied to high alpine huts (as this would not be realistic given the difficulty in access and the NZ weather.)	Retain Policy 12 b) but ensure there is an exception for other alpine huts.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/44	Regarding Policy 12 h) In favour of this policy as powered boats have no place on the Mueller or Hooker Lakes.	Retain Policy 12 h).	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/18	Support Policy 12 f). If the shelter is advertised as available for planned overnight use, there would likely be a rapid increase in numbers and the shelter would no longer be available for people with a genuine emergency.	Retain Policy 12 f).	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/19	Support Policy 12 h) as powered boats have no place on the Mueller or Hooker Lakes	Retain Policy 12 h).	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/20	Regarding Policy 12 b) Agree that 2 nights be the limit for Mueller Hut and the reinstated Hooker Hut, but no limit should be applied to high alpine huts (as this would not be realistic given the difficulty in access and the NZ weather).	Retain Policy 12 b) but ensure there is exception for other alpine huts.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/125	Policy 12(b) should recognise that back country etiquette is an expectation at all huts and sometimes people need to stay more than two consecutive nights, and sometimes there will be more people than beds. Appropriate flexibility should be provided for.	Amend Policy 12(b) to allow for a more flexible approach as requested.	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/15	Policy 12 g) Camping anywhere on the sides of the Copland track will have detrimental effects on track users and increase problems with waste management.	Delete Policy 12 g) Or amend to exclude the Copland track below Douglas Rock Hut.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/96	Policy 12f): May become redundant as a consequence of our submission on 1.3.1 Policy 16	Amend Policy 12f) in accordance with submission	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/31	Policy 12 b) The booking arrangements for popular Mueller hut are probably inevitable and should be largely workable, although the uncertainties of weather mean some leeway in enforcement of rules will be required. Visitors should be required to carry sleeping mats so floor space can be utilised in emergency situations. This NZ backcountry etiquette should be	Require visitors to carry sleeping mats and promote NZ backcountry etiquette to all visitors	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	promoted to all visitors.		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/32	Policy 12 g) Enforcing no camping within 500m of the Copland Track will be unworkable.		
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/41	<p>Policy 12(b): Disagree that 2 nights be the limit for Mueller Hut and the reinstated Hooker Hut. NO limit should be applied to high alpine huts (as this would not be realistic given the difficulty in access and the NZ weather).</p> <p>Policy 12(f): Support This policy should remain, as planned overnight use of the emergency shelter would encourage inexperienced visitors who might otherwise be deterred. Currently the emergency shelter is well utilised by (mostly) well prepared, self-sufficient individuals and groups who have the necessary skills, fitness and experience to cope with the challenging conditions and terrain in the Ball Pass area. It is already common for groups (wanting to avoid carrying a tent) to use the shelter in non-emergency situations (as our guides don't enforce the bylaws). If the shelter is advertised as available for planned overnight use, there would likely be a rapid increase in numbers and the shelter would no longer be available for people with a genuine emergency.</p> <p>Policy 12(h): Disagree with this proposal. With glacial recession, walking access to the Tasman and Hooker glacier has become unsafe and hazardous due to the state of the moraine walls. We should allow powered watercraft on the Hooker Lake. This will allow mountaineers overnighiting on the Hooker Glacier to access the glacier more safely. Also powered watercraft noise is not noticeable whilst in the Alpine environment, whereas air traffic noise is CONSIDERABLE</p>	<p>Make the following amendments to Policy 12 - Bylaws: (b) - make sure there is an exemption for other alpine huts (f) - Retain (h) - Propose that a provision be placed within the plan to allow concessionaires to operate powered and non powered water craft to facilitate safer access to the glaciers by providing a "taxi" service for overnighiting mountaineers.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aorarokahe Place Policy 13</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/19	<p>Strongly oppose the restrictions and proposed booking system for huts other than Hooker and Mueller Huts. A limit of 2 days would force a dangerous precedent given the difficult high alpine terrain of the Park. The policy is unworkable and unfair where park users will be forced to make decisions on the basis of park policy</p>	Remove Policy 13(b)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	rather than mountain safety considerations.		
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/11	We do not agree to Plateau Hut being included in this policy. We do not agree to limit people to staying more than 2 consecutive nights as this would force people to make unsafe decisions in case of bad weather when people get stuck in huts.	Reword policy 13b) to be specific to Mueller and Hooker Huts. If Plateau Hut is included in this policy - Delete policy	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/11	Charging for parking at road ends would have a chilling effect on local mountaineering. There needs to be an exception for those undertaking multiday activities in the back country.	Amend Policy 13(a) to add : "... Except for those undertaking bona fide multiday back country activities."	
<i>McKenzie, Lachlan</i> 42/14	Support the implementation of parking charges where funds are returned to the environmental and management needs of Aoraki/Mount Cook NP - especially as an interim step to prepare people to pay for mandated Park & Ride solutions	Retain Policy 13	
<i>Feild, Melissa</i> 52/4	Specifically 13b: It is quite common to be weathered in at some of the huts at higher altitudes. This policy needs revisiting to keep safety and sense on the agenda	Reword policy	
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/12	Regarding policy 13 a) Agree that charging for parking makes sense, though this would also create the expectation that parking would be available.		
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/13	Regarding policy 13 b) A two night limit would not be practical for helicopter accessed huts due to unpredictable weather. The expense of accessing huts by helicopter makes a longer stay desirable to allow multiple objectives on a single trip. A booking system would likely require wardens to enforce	Delete policy 13 b)	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/28	Regarding 13 b) Weather issues dictate that a degree of flexibility regarding timing is essential for most high alpine endeavours. Aircraft operators should be required to inform the DOC visitor centre every time they fly back country users into the hills, in order to help DOC maintain good awareness to potential hut numbers.	Remove 13 b) and insert a new policy under recreation that states "Manage hut numbers and reduce the risk of congestion at high alpine huts, whilst maintaining the timing flexibility that users of these huts require for their alpine endeavours, by the Hut Intentions System, the Hut Radio Schedule System, the Hut Occupancy Notice Board System at the AMCNP Visitor Centre.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/23	Policy 13(b) - Bylaws: Bookings for Plateau Hut and high alpine climbing huts is not practical because of the nature of climbing in the high alps	Reword policy to read: "Bookings are required at Hooker and Mueller Huts giving preference to New Zealanders."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/112	<p>Policy 13(a) :Local residents and concessionaires should be exempt from parking fees. This doesn't work for staff on split shifts in the village, or for climbers wanting to access Ball Hut.</p> <p>Policy 13(b) doesn't work with mountain instruction courses or with climbing requirements.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 13(a) and 13(b) Or - Reword Policy 13(b) to read: "Bookings required for Hooker and Mueller huts with preference first to New Zealanders."</p>	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/48	<p>Policy 13(b): This is logistically unrealistic for any climbing or ski touring trip at alpine huts and poses a threat to safety. Access in and out of huts by long walk and only in suitable conditions. There should be no limit on the number of hut nights with the exception of Mueller and the reinstated Hooker Hut. Groups are currently self-regulating by checking with flight operators and DOC re hut occupancy.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 13(b)</p>	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/28	<p>Regarding Bylaw 13 b) Agree that 2 nights should be the limit for Mueller Hut and the reinstated Hooker Hut, but no limit should be applied to high alpine huts (as this would not be realistic given the difficulty in access and the NZ weather).</p>	<p>Make an exception for high altitude huts. Groups are currently self-regulating by checking with flight operators and DOC re hut occupancy.</p>	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/45	<p>Regarding Policy 13 b) This is logistically unrealistic (if not impossible) for any climbing or ski touring trips at high alpine huts and poses a threat to safety. Weather will often dictate that a group stays longer than planned and walking out is simply not an option in bad weather/strong winds/heavy snowfall.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 13 b). Make an exception for high alpine huts. Groups are currently self-regulating by checking with flight operators and DOC re hut occupancy.</p>	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/21	<p>Regarding Policy 13 b) This is logistically unrealistic (if not impossible) for any climbing or ski touring trips at high altitude huts and poses a threat to safety. Weather will often dictate whether a group stays longer than planned and walking out is simply not an option in bad/strong weather. There should be no limit on the number of hut nights (with the exception of Mueller and Hooker huts).</p>	<p>Amend to make an exception for high altitude huts. Groups are currently self regulating by checking with flight operators and DOC re hut occupancy.</p>	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/16	<p>Policy 13(a): Charging for parking would have a chilling effect on local mountaineering and young New Zealanders getting into the hills and enjoying the Park. There needs to be an exception for those undertaking back country activities.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 13(a) by adding: "... except for those undertaking bona fide multiday back country activities."  Remove Policy 13(b)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Policy 13(b): Limiting stays at alpine huts to 2 consecutive nights is ludicrous because the weather can be fickle and parties may not be able to move for 3 days to a week due to stormy weather. A climb involving only two nights from Plateau Hut or Tasman Saddle Hut would be the exception, not the rule.</p>		
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/126</p>	<p>Policy 13(b) should provide for a more egalitarian culture for use of back country huts. Hut booking systems should not be established for any public huts except front-country easy-access huts that are under heavy pressure.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 13(b) to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/9</p>	<p>Policy 13(b): There are two issues of contention: - guides who plan their trips based on weather could not book these more than 1-2 days out - prohibiting people staying longer than 2 nights will severely impact on guiding community. Our hut culture is unique to NZ - such restrictions would erode this away.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 13(b)</p>	
<p><i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/26</p>	<p>Bylaws 13a) require daily and seasonal parking charges. Strongly reject as this is just revenue gathering, not needed, and the NP should not have those powers at any of the sites mentioned. Such charges are inequitable and affect those who are poorer the most, while well off professionals will not be significantly affected. This bias will further dispossess less well off New Zealanders from enjoying their own place. B) Make no provision at all for booking at huts other than Mueller and Hooker. This proposed provision would lower the quality of the experience of freedom of the mountains that many regard as an essential element of their visit, especially New Zealanders. Instead, provide information to make it clear the huts are for all. The second part of 13b) this proposed bylaw shows the lack of understanding of planners of the cultural use of our high huts for climbing i.e. they are out of their depth. Otherwise they wouldn't propose this silly figure. A one week stay limit could be proposed, but I doubt even that is necessary.</p>	<p>Remove all of bylaw 13 for the reasons stated.</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/10</p>	<p>Policy 13(b): Perhaps this is a misinterpretation of the wording but to restrict a two night maximum stay on all alpine huts does not support recreational climbing in the Park. The</p>	<p>Amend Policy 13 b) to add the words, 'at Mueller and Hooker Huts only', on the end of the sentence stating 'two consecutive nights'.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>weather, conditions and plans change, and staying longer or shorted should not be dictated by a piece of paper. Mother Nature needs some allowances.</p>		
<p><i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/27</p>	<p>Policy 13 b) Should this read "Where hut demand exceeds capacity, initiate a booking system. Mueller and Hooker Hut (once relocated) have a booking system" Prohibiting people staying more than two consecutive nights is not workable; bad weather or multiple day trips from the hut would create problems with this bylaw. Alternatives: - Foreign tourists (FTs) book and pay for accommodation. Asymmetric charging should apply; - If huts are full, then people have the option on camping, or sleeping on the floor; - New Zealanders' pay less for huts than FTs; - New Zealanders' can use their backcountry passes for Liebig Hut and other huts which currently don't have a fee.</p>	<p>Reword : As prohibiting people staying more than two consecutive nights is not workable; bad weather or multiple day trips from the hut would create problems with this bylaw. Consider alternatives.</p>	
<p><i>Loomes, George</i> 572/16</p>	<p>This is strongly out of line with the values which DoC is obliged to uphold for the NZ public. People utilising the back-country and remote areas of the park are the highest priority users, being that they are using the park in the most relevant ways. To penalise them with parking fees, limitations on the number of consecutive nights in huts which are not well used, and pre-booking of huts (which is not possible anyway, if for example a party is moving in the back-country they are often late or early to a specific objective). This also defies General Policy for National Parks 2005: 8.1 c) and iv)</p>	<p>Delete Policy 13 a) and b)</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/97</p>	<p>Policy 13a): NZAC would like to be consulted on any proposed parking fees to ensure club members' access is equitable.</p>	<p>Consult NZAC before any amendment to Bylaws</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/98</p>	<p>Policy 13b): Alpine huts of limited use to high alpine users if they cannot stay for more than 2 nights, or have to book in advance. Weather issues require a degree of flexibility for timing of high alpine endeavours. Policy should also require aircraft operators to inform DOC every time they fly back country users into the hills to maintain good awareness of potential hut</p>	<p>Remove Policy 13b) and replace with new policy under "Recreation" to read: 4. Manage hut numbers and reduce the risk of congestion at high alpine huts, whilst maintaining the timing flexibility that users of these huts require for their alpine endeavours, by the Hut Intentions System, the Hut Radio Schedule System, and the Hut Occupancy Notice Board System at the Park's Visitor centre.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	numbers.		
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/32	<p>The CMC sees Policy 13 proposal (a) as purely a revenue gathering exercise so opposes any moves to charge vehicle users for parking within the National Park. This proposal would penalise not only tourists, but all New Zealander's who visit the Park and pay for its protection and access via their taxes.</p> <p>Requiring mountaineers, climbers and backcountry walkers to book to stay at backcountry huts (as proposed in Bylaw 13 b) is not practicable and is potentially unsafe. For mountaineers and backcountry adventurers, trip planning needs to be flexible to allow for unexpected changes in weather or conditions which may require them to use a hut unexpectedly or stay longer than two consecutive nights. In addition, requiring parties to book before staying also creates potential safety issues for mountaineers, climbers and back country walkers needing to unexpectedly use a hut that requires booking.</p> <p>Furthermore, a booking system for remote huts will also encourage tourist operators to blanket book huts to suit their commercial operations penalising private climbing parties.</p>	Delete Policy 13	
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/9	Regarding Policy 13 b) Oppose this as limiting people to staying no more than 2 consecutive nights in alpine huts is not feasible by the nature of the activity and weather dependence.	Delete Policy 13 b) from the plan.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/8	Regarding Policy 13 b) Oppose this as limiting people to staying no more than 2 consecutive nights in alpine huts is not feasible by the nature of the activity and weather dependence.	Delete Policy 13 b) from the plan.	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/8	Regarding Policy 13 b) Oppose this as limiting people to staying no more than 2 consecutive nights in alpine huts is not feasible by the nature of the activity and weather dependence.	Delete Policy 13 b) from the plan.	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/9	Regarding Policy 13 b) Oppose this as limiting people to staying no more than 2 consecutive nights in alpine huts is not feasible by the nature of the activity and weather dependence.	Delete Policy 13 b) from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/12	Regarding Policy 13 a) Oppose parking charges, there should be free and unhindered access to the park for New Zealanders.	Decision not stated	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/12	Bylaws 13 b) Asks if this is a typo: 'Require people to book before staying at huts other than the Hooker and Mueller huts... and prohibit people staying more than 2 nights.' If Plateau hut is indeed included in this statement we do not agree to limit people to staying more than 2 consecutive nights. This policy would force people to make unsafe decisions and is completely unworkable in case of bad weather when people get stuck in huts. There does not actually seem to be any need to implement this policy as crowding is rarely a problem.	Reword policy 2.2.3.13.b) to be specific to Mueller and Hooker huts. If Plateau Hut is included in this policy - Delete policy	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/33	13) A limit of 2 consecutive nights in high huts is completely impractical and will be ignored by the NZ climbing/tramping community who can be expected to follow NZ backcountry etiquette. It may work as an expedient to discourage inexperienced visitors from using these huts but there are implications for safety.		
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/8	Regarding Policy 13 b) Oppose. This has feasibility and safety issues for high-altitude huts. It is not uncommon that weather conditions will make it unsafe to move to alternative accommodation, and that it stays unsafe for three or more consecutive days.	Delete Policy 13 b) from the plan. An alternative could be to further encourage groups to check hut occupancy before deciding whether to enter an area.	
<i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/7	Regarding Policy 13 b) Limiting people to staying no more than 2 consecutive nights in alpine climbing huts is not feasible by the nature of the activity and the weather dependance and safety implications of ingress/egress.	Delete Policy 13 b)	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/42	Policy 13(b): This is logistically unrealistic (if not impossible) for any climbing or ski touring trips at high alpine huts and poses a threat to safety. Unlike Mueller Hut, which is close to the village and has easy egress on foot, the huts at the top of the glaciers are accessed with a long walk in/out or by aircraft, which can only fly in suitable conditions. Weather will often dictate that a group stays longer than planned and walking out is simply not an option in bad weather/strong winds/heavy snowfall (nor is camping or snow-caving a realistic option in those circumstances)! If any booking system were to be implemented, there	Remove Policy 2.2.3 13. b).	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>would need to be a warden to effectively enforce this and additional facilities added to huts to cater for late arrivals/over-stayers (eg. in the way that European huts have a warden, an additional winter/emergency room and very strict policies on cancellation to prevent large/long bookings which don't eventuate).</p> <p>There should be no limit on the number of hut nights (with the exception of Mueller and the reinstated Hooker Huts).Hut users self regulate the numbers in huts anyway by finding out who is at the huts and who has submitted intentions to stay at a hut.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Milestone 1</b>		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/34	The relocation of Hooker Hut - building a new, larger one should have been done years ago.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/67	TIA supports Section 2.2.3 milestone 1 to re-establish Hooker Hut in Hooker Valley as an overnight bookable facility.	Retain Milestone 1 as written	
<i>Ainsworth, Lewis</i> 744/3	Support maintaining Hooker hut. Hooker hut has important historical value and should continue to be available for use near its original location.	Retain this milestone.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/30	Submits that this Milestone indicates that the Department has a pre-determined plan for the location of Hooker Hut. Notes that this has not been subject to Public, Iwi or Conservation Board consultation	Comment	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Milestone 2</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/127	<p>Milestones 2, 3, 5, 6:</p> <p>1) should provide for a more flexible, egalitarian approach to hut booking systems as identified in submission points 125 and 126</p> <p>2) Visitor experience monitoring should be linked to present visitor management zoning.</p>	Amend Milestones to address the matters raised.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/36	<p>Monitoring of use is a separate issue - see patsy milestone 2.</p> <p>DOC has already established that several popular tracks are overused. Improved routes through moraines would increase foot access to more remote areas, increase recreational opportunities, and reduce aircraft movements and enhance safety. Work will be required each season to keep them viable but this will be very worthwhile.</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Milestone 3</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/99	Submissions on 1.2.3 Policy 10, and 2.2.3 Bylaws emphasise the impracticality of booking systems for back country huts	Amend Milestone 3 to read: " Monitored the use ... Recommendations on the need to enhance the Hut Intentions Syatem, the Hut Radio Schedule System, and the Hut Occupancy Notice Board System at the MCNP Visitors Centre."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.2 Aroarokahe Place Milestone 5</b>		
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/13	Oppose the proposal for more walking tracks. The need for this has not been fully evaluated and will potentially just create more demand and result in more pressure on the Park	There needs to be a much more specific issues and options paper completed on this issue within the framework of a regional strategic tourism analysis and the future management of the Park.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/35	More new tracks should be established than one in 5 years, even if only day walks.	Establish more than one new track in 5 years.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place</b>		
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/9	Support general direction	retain policies 3-5	
<i>Armour, Chloe</i> 159/3	Do not support any increase is air access, extent or numbers. There is already enough air access and the associated helicopter buzzing in the park.	Delete any increase in air access, both extent and numbers.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/131	New policy and milestone: Should include new policy and milestones allowing for a new mid-Tasman hut, to be designed and build by the NZAC.	Include a new policy and milestone in Haupapa Place to allow for the establishment of a new mid-Tasman hut.	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/4	Oppose broad flight access to the western side of the Malte Brun Range.	Any flight access to the western side of the Malte Brun Range should only be to a proposed new hut site (and only if this is inaccessible of foot)	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/5	There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall, the existing sites at Lendenfeld Saddle and Cornice Wall should remain.	Do not allow additional landing sites as outlined in the submission.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/74	The NZCA does not support the draft Plan approach to opening up extensive landing zones because they have the potential to create conflict between different user groups and different recreational parties within the Park. With an extensive landing zone there is no guarantee that one can find areas with no aircraft or people. This makes it impossible to plan on finding desired levels of remoteness within an area.		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/76</p>	<p>The NZAC considers there is no justified reason to increase aircraft landing sites on such a widespread basis as is proposed in the Haupapa Place landing zones. The Club does not support the increase.</p> <p>Proposed landing numbers are far too high and in effects place no real restraint on overall landing numbers when compared to the actual landings for 2017-18.</p> <p>No assessment of effects of such landing numbers has been provided in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Any increase in landing limits should be done in an incremental and controlled way, based on the results of monitoring and ongoing analysis as required under the GPNP Policy 10.6(f).</p> <p>The current allocation for landings is sufficient, allowing for significant increases to occur, given that only 50% of allocation was used in 2017-18.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain the landing zones as in the current Plan.</li> <li>2. Avoid landing allocations being used up by scenic flights leaving none for recreational access</li> <li>3. Retain the remote VMZ in the current Plan</li> <li>4. Any increase in landing limits should be done in an incremental and controlled way, based on the results of monitoring and ongoing analysis</li> <li>5. Daily limits should be adjusted to reflect the allocation limits in the current Plan.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/78</p>	<p>The NZAC considers that the designation of a heli-skiing zone is inconsistent with the prescriptions for a 'remote' zone setting for Haupapa place.</p> <p>Instead, recreation by self-sufficient backcountry recreationists is consistent with the remote designation. The Tasman, Murchison and Mannering Glaciers are the "heartland" for readily accessible glacier ski touring in the Southern Alps. Also the western side of malte Brun is expected to quickly develop into the same once the new hut is in place in the area. All these areas are currently within the 'heli-ski zones'shown on Map 7.1.</p> <p>Some backcountry and remote areas should be set aside for self-sufficient recreationists where their activities will not be compromised by heli-skiing.</p> <p>NZAC submits that the proposed continuance of heli-ski in a remote zone should be phased out.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend the proposed heli-skiing zone to set aside some remote areas for backcountry recreation only.</li> <li>2. Phase out heli-skiing within the remote zone areas.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/10</p>	<p>New Milestone. There is a possibility of a shared facility in the future for all concessionaires (Could be a 5-10 year 'Outcome'/'Milestone' in operative management plan. For this to happen DOC would need to eventually require existng concessionairea to utilise this shared facility upon thie renewal of their respective concessions. (additional information attached to submitter's submission regarding existing and new storage structures &amp; shared facility).</p> <p>There is also the option a new concessionaire could operate without a storage facility at the lake edge (facility is only used to store life-jackets). There are</p>	<p>A shared facility for all concessionaires should be a long term 'milestone' or 'outcome' within the final plan.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	possible alternatives e.g. multi-purpose trailer.		
<i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/11	The submitter includes additional information, without specific requests to change the draft Plan, regarding the following: Storage facility at the Lake Edge; Small multi-purpose tractor at the Lake Edge Another jetty for Lake Tasman; Requirements for new concessionaires' boats; A rescue boat to support kayak operators; Competition for power boating concessionaires; Management of the Lake Edge site; The Boat ramp		
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/45	Milestones - general Milestones for Recreation (p 135). As for other Places, this is a short and rather feeble list (8 years to establish walking access around Tasman Lake outlet). They do not represent a concerted effort to offer a wider range of experiences that do not involve aircraft to the increasing number of Park visitors.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/70	New Policy: TIA recommends a specific policy to be included in section 2.3 Haupapa area for the investigation of redevelopment of the Tasman N��v�� huts.	Include a new policy to address the matters raised.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/32	Notes that there is no reference made to the provision, maintenance or refurbishment of the Tasman Saddle or Kelman Huts, which are highly valued recreational assets. Also notes that there is minimal reference to the proposed NZAC mid-Tasman Hut, likely to be located in the Beetham Valley.	Comment	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/52	Why are there no policies about biodiversity protection in this place? It has significant alpine flora and fauna including several threatened species such as the Ranunculus species, kea and rock wren.	Amend to include biodiversity policies.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/16	1. Policies: ECO opposes the approach taken in the draft plan, section 2.3.3 because there are no policies for natural values, while there are outcomes for natural values.  2. Outcomes - Natural values: The 2nd para, beginning "The extensive braided river habitats ..." seems out of place here, and better suited for Management Considerations section for Natural	Amend section 2.2.3 by 1. Adding policies for natural values that address management priorities relating to rare & threatened birds and rare ecosystems (tarn & ephemeral wetlands rare ecosystems), and plant communities as described in section 2.3.1 Description & Values. 2. Amending "Management Considerations - Natural values" to explain how management of river flows and natural ecological succession processes will have a positive	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	values.	impact on braided river habitat.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/45	Outcomes policies and milestones (p132 - 135): Support outcomes, policies and milestones Refer also to "Outcomes - recreation" and "Policy 5" for specific amendments requested	Retain outcomes, policies and milestones, including amendments requested for Outcomes and Policy 5	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Description and values</b>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/12	Recreational values: in the long term, foot access should be seen as the main form of recreation within this area.	Reword the Recreational values section, para 4 to read: " Aircraft activity is, and always has been, ...adjacent Nohoaka place. This is fundamentally in conflict with the goal of fostering sustainable activity within the Park. Aircraft therefore will be decreasingly used for scenic landing. Instead foot access is fostered and encouraged to enable people to take part in a range of alpine activities including cross country skiing, hiking and climbing. As foot access to the back country becomes more limited due to glacial retreat and moraine instability, active measures are taken to promote foot access which is to become the only means of access to all mountain huts."	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/29	Regarding the last paragraph under Recreational Values subheading: the sentence starting "as foot access to the back country becomes" is not true and the sentence should be removed.	Remove the sentence outlined in the submission	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/26	Regarding the passage "Aircraft activity is, and always has been, high within the Haupapa Place, particularly with the Aoraki/Mount Cook Airport being located within the adjacent Nohoaka Place." This is only in recent times and cannot be taken as an excuse to maintain the status quo.	Reduce aircraft activity.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/27	Regarding the statement "As foot access to the backcountry becomes more limited due to glacial retreat and moraine instability, aircraft have become the only means of access to some mountain huts."  Foot access is still very manageable to all huts in the park.	Delete this statement.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/113	Historic values: Request to modify section in relation to the Ball Hut road: The road may have started in 1915 but there has been a track up to the Ball hut site since 1891. It was the Ball Hut track and early climbers used to use this track and	Amend the Historic values section to address the issues raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	either walk it or go by horseback to the Ball hut (the old Ball hut) in these days.		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/18	Recreational activities, last para: Disagree with statement that "aircraft activity is, and always has been, high ..." for the following reasons: - Not long ago there was NO aircraft activity. - there is no direct relation between foot access and glacial recession. There is nowhere in the Park that is impossible to reach due to glacial recession - all mountain huts within the Park are currently accessible by foot - in the long term, foot access should be seen as the main form of recreation within this area.	Reword the Recreational values section to read: "Aircraft activity recently been high within Haupapa Place, particularly with the Aoraki/Mount Cook Airport being located within the adjacent Nohoaka Place. This is fundamentally in conflict with the goal of fostering sustainable activity within the Park. Aircraft therefore will be decreasingly used for scenic landing. Instead foot access is fostered and encouraged to enable people to take part in a range of alpine activities including cross country skiing, hiking and climbing. As foot access to the back country becomes more limited due to glacial retreat and moraine instability, active measures are taken to promote foot access which is to become the only means of access to all mountain huts."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/129	Recreational values: 1) support consideration of a Tasman Loop track, but direction of travel should be optional 2) support investigation of a bridge across lake outlet . Make use of existing hydrologists' reports as well as seeking landscape, ecological and engineering specialists' assessments. 3) Providing easy access to true left of Place requires careful consideration - including supporting access for people on A2O trail, creating ease of access into a currently quiet and semi-remote area, and potential damage to the semi-remote ambience. 4) Encouragement of visitation outside peak seasons and times should be conditional on Departmental multi-disciplinary specialists' support,	Review the Recreational values section to address the matters raised.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/19	Recreation values (last sentence): It is incorrect to state "aircraft have become the only means of access to some mountain huts." - all huts within the Haupapa place remain relatively straightforward and safe to access via foot, especially in spring when much climbing and ski touring activity occurs.	Remove the statement that "aircraft have become the only means of access to some mountain huts." As this is incorrect.	
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/21	recreational values last sentence: The current plan states that aircraft are the only means of access to some mountain huts. This is a false narrative that has been pushed by proponents of increased aircraft access.	Delete line "aircraft have become the only means of access to some mountain huts"	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>From personal experience know that this is untrue and all alpine huts in the Haupapa Place continue to be accessed on foot. Have succeeded in accessing Barron Saddle, Empress Hut, Plateau Hut, Haast Hut, Tasman Saddle, Kelman Hut, Murchison Hut, Centennial Hut, Pioneer Hut all without aircraft access. The attitude that aircraft access is necessary is particularly encouraged by guiding companies, who are incentivised to encourage any advantage necessary to assist their peak bagging clients.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/100</p>	<p>2.3.1 Recreational values: The NZAC has a concession to install a new hut near the site of the former Beetham Hut. This should be mentioned in the 2nd paragraph.</p>	<p>Amend Para 2 to add: "New Zealand Alpine Club plans to install a new hut where indicated on Map 16."</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/101</p>	<p>2.3.1 Recreational values: Page 128, last paragraph - sentence beginning "As foot access to the backcountry becomes more limited ..." is not correct and should be removed. See points raised in Key Submission 8 Park Preservation, Public access and Aircraft</p>	<p>Amend last paragraph to remove sentence beginning "As foot access ..."</p>	
<p><i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/6</p>	<p>Use of jet boats inside the Park boundaries can take place on the Tasman river. The lower reaches of the Tasman River do not have a speed uplifting under the Maritime Transport Act meaning it is effectively closed to powered craft as it can only be navigated at 5 knots. Likewise, the upper reaches of the river are not subject to an uplifting. The upper reaches of the Tasman River have not been jet boated very often (probably no more than 15 times in the last 50 years) because the river characteristics make it very challenging and suitable only for expert adventure boaters.</p>	<p>Amend section 2.3 to recognise non- commercial personal use of jet boats on the Tasman River.</p>	
<p><i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/8</p>	<p>Historic values Objectives from section 1.2.2 are important including b) "engaging more New Zealanders in their heritage" and allowing vehicle access to the historic Ball hut site would meet that objective (as in Policy 4, section 1.2.2). It would also meet objectives under engagement values as it would keep the area open to the community groups to assist with SAR, wilding and animal pest control (as per engagement paragraph 1.2.4).</p>	<p>Allowing vehicle access to the historic Ball hut site.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/37	<p>The Historical and Recreational values sections are both underdone and, as for the other Places, the information mainly should be in Section 1 overview.</p> <p>Perhaps the most telling sentence is: "Aircraft activity is, and always has been, high within the Haupapa Place..." (p128). I do not believe that tangata whenua or colonial tourists had the benefits of air travel or the consequent disturbances of tranquillity!</p> <p>The main purpose of this section appears to be for establishing and promoting very high levels of helicopter movement in the Tasman Valley with largely unrestricted landings especially on the glacier for heli-skiing. There is no attempt at a needs analysis, cost/benefits, impacts or justification. Just take it or leave it. It is barely credible that any analysis of noise levels, objective or subjective, could conclude other than tranquillity will be severely disturbed through the whole valley including Nohoaka Place and further. The overall impression is that the iconic Tasman Glacier and environs is one of the sacrificial lambs to promotion of tourism within AMCNP .</p>	Move historical and recreational information to Section 1 - Overview.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/39	The Recreational values sub-section (p128) again strongly promotes air assisted activities and overstates the case that this is both inevitable and without alternatives in some cases. It makes no attempt at foresight to find ways to decrease the reliance on helicopter travel. An obvious means to reduce demand would be to impose larger fees/taxes on concessionaires.	Include ways to decrease the reliance on helicopter travel.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/40	The paragraph on tracks (p131) is good but should put stronger emphasis on the need for additional tracks.	Add more emphasis on the need for additional tracks.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/41	Engagement values (p131). This is weasel worded but support the sentiment for more spread of the tourism load to areas outside AMCNP.		
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/31	<p>Recreational values</p> <p>Submits that the inclusion of scenic flight and landings as a form of recreation does not reflect the Departments legislative underpinnings which clearly differentiates between recreation and tourism. Scenic snow landings are clearly a tourist activity which should only be allowed in National Park after the requirement to foster</p>	Comment	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	recreation has been satisfied. On the surface, this may appear to be a minor mistake, but NZRA submits that it is an exemplar of a wider undesirable bias and misalignment of interests that prevail throughout the Draft Plan.		
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/21	Last sentence under Recreational values states that aircraft are the only means of access to some mountain huts. This is a false narrative that has been pushed by proponents of increased aircraft access. It is patently untrue and all alpine huts in the Haupapa Place continue to be accessed on foot. I personally know that this is possible based on trips done by myself and my friends in the past 2 years who have all succeeded in accessing our desired destination be it Ball Shelter, Tasman Saddle, Kelman Hut or Caroline Hut without significant difficulty.	Delete line: ",aircraft have become..mountain huts."	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/16	The current plan states that aircraft are the only means of access to some mountain huts. This is a false narrative that has been pushed by proponents of increased aircraft access.	Delete line "aircraft have become the only means of access to some mountain huts."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Management considerations</b>		
<i>Paardekooper, Luke</i> 22/5	Consider a new hut on the Tasman side of Ball Pass, giving more access to the Pass and for people to walk up and back down the same way.	Amend plan to include opportunity for new hut on Tasman side of Ball Pass.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/13	Recreational values section, last para, 2nd bullet point: Support the goal relating to foot access around Tasman Lake.	Keep all references and goals relating to enhancing foot access around Lake Tasman.	
<i>Mackenzie District Council</i> 161/17	Engagement Values - MDC supports this initiative and would like to continue to be minvolved in the Tourism Strategy. Council very much looks forward to continuing their mrelationship with DOC through this work.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/29	Strongly support "developing additional tracks around the lake and lake outlet, including a bridge, to provide access into the lower Murchison valley"	Retain. This should be a combined pedestrian / bicycle bridge, in order to extend the Sea2Alps Cycle Trail all the way to Mt Cook Village.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/24	Support new mid-Tasman Hut and also support more than one possible location for other huts of this nature.	Reword to include looking at future locations for further back country hut sites.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/114	Recreational values: Support paragraph relating to the new mid-Tasman hut. Also support more than one possible location for other huts of this nature.	Amend Recreational values section to look at future locations for back country hut sites.	
<i>Dickerhof, Nina</i> 315/3	Regarding the bullet point "developing additional tracks around the lake and lake outlet, including a bridge, to provide access to the lower Murchison Valley" - I am in favour of the bridge across the Tasman River to access the Murchison Valley	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/23	Recreational values, last para, page 131: Support "developing additional tracks around the lake and lake outlet ...".	Keep all references and goals to enhancing foot access around Tasman Lake.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/128	Refer to general matters raised by submitter on aspects of management consideration relating to natural, recreational and engagement values.	Review Management considerations to reflect the matters raised.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/27	'This has meant some popular trips, such as from the Ball Hut out onto the ice of the Tasman Glacier are no longer possible.' This is factually incorrect. There is currently quite good access down onto the ice of the Tasman Glacier from Ball Hut. I have used it. It is better than Garbage gully was decades ago. Secondly, there are several other relatively safe routes down onto the ice from the old Ball hut Road down valley. I have used one in the last couple of years. At the bottom of the moraine wall the ice itself is visible and readily able to be experienced on foot. It isn't extensive white ice, that's all, but hasn't been for many decades.	Change the statement to reflect the truth. Accessing the ice is entirely practical for climbers and capable walkers.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/28	A bridge is proposed across the Tasman Lake Outlet. I strongly support this proposal. This will benefit many, and provide access to the Murchison Valley on foot. I support the proposed track and bridge and applaud this initiative.	I support the proposed track and bridge and applaud this initiative.	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/18	For all Places within the Park, the protection of natural light is as important as natural quiet and tranquillity.	Include management considerations and policy statements to protect the natural light values of these areas.	
<i>Rattenbury, Mark</i> 525/3	The Plan does not include any intent or priority to minimise A/MCNP impacts on climate change through limiting carbon emissions e.g. through restricting flights	Include a statement that the Plan supports climate change action and achieving low emissions in line with Government intent and policy; Identifies tangible contributions to	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	and aircraft landings. There is no mention of how the Plan aligns with Government initiatives to achieve a low emission economy.	limiting climate change through AMCNP Plan management practice.	
<i>Rattenbury, Rosalind Andrea</i> 545/3	The Plan does not include any intent or priority to minimise A/MCNP impacts on climate change through limiting carbon emissions e.g. through restricting flights and aircraft landings. There is no mention of how the Plan aligns with Government initiatives to achieve a low emission economy.	Include a statement that the plan supports climate change action and achieving low emissions inline with Government intent and policy.	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/33	<p>CMC supports the control of aircraft in the Park as provided for in the current Plan. However, the CMC does not support provisions to increase aircraft traffic within the Park above what is currently provided for. Increasing use of aircraft within the Park will degrade the experience of other user groups within the Park and reduce tranquillity values within the Park. With heightened awareness regarding climate change and anthropogenic impacts on the environment, allowing an increase in aircraft traffic and aircraft access to areas of the Park which previously excluded aircraft, is not considered appropriate or consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments. Moves to increase total aircraft activity should be avoided, or well managed to ensure there are areas that remain devoid of air traffic (i.e. areas classified as "Remote Areas") unless required for scientific research and for rescue/medical rescue. Where foot access is an issue for areas of the Park (such as the Tasman Valley) additional huts should be built along with increased maintenance of tracks and access aids. This will encourage increased foot access to these areas of Park while maintaining the existing tranquillity of these areas. Increasing aircraft traffic and introducing aircraft to areas which previously did not have any aircraft traffic will degrade the existing tranquillity values of that area. Better jurisdiction is required to ensure that commercial aircraft operators remain within their flight boundaries. There appears to be some uncertainty regarding landing sites for heli-ski operators in The Park. Areas where heli-ski operators have been observed landing do not correspond with 'designated landing sites'. The CMC would like to see better transparency</p>	<p>Do not allow increasing aircraft traffic within the Park and allowing aircraft traffic to areas of the Park which previously did not allow any traffic.</p> <p>Retain existing aircraft traffic provisions, as specified in the existing operative Plan.</p> <p>Put further investment in additional huts, tracks and access aids (e.g. Pudding Rock Cables, Tasman River and Murchison River footbridges etc).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	regarding this and whether this practice is allowed for in the heli-ski operator's concessions.		
<i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/7	Support first three bullet points in final paragraph for recreational values on page 131. Concept of loop track gives visitors a feeling of a more relaxed uncrowded experience. Developing additional tracks around the lake and lake outlet, including a bridge to provide access into the lower Murchison valley would relieve pressure on the 2 current tracks as well as opening up access to the other side of lake tasman and the Murchison valley for the general public to explore. Support combining access around and across the lake to provide a more diverse experience.	Retain these options	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/38	Aircraft access maps - The maps here and elsewhere on aircraft access zones by Place are confusing (no code for pale yellow areas) and misleading as the zones often go beyond the arbitrary Place boundaries. For example Map 17 (Haupapa) doesn't seem to correspond to Map 7.1 (whole Park heli-ski zones).	Clarify maps	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/5	Support creating a one way loop track, developing additional tracks around the lake and lake outlet and encouraging people to visit the park outside the peak summer season. Reducing crowding will make for a greater experience for visitors.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/15	Management considerations - Natural values: ECO opposes the approach taken in the draft plan because: a) It doesn't provide management details for Tasman River PEU & Aoraki EMU, in addition to other natural resources. How will braided river ecosystems & their rare birds, plant communities, and tarn & ephemeral wetlands mentioned in Natural Values description section be managed? b) It doesn't make the connection between landscape-scale pest control and the rare & threatened birds, rare ecosystems, & general plant communities mentioned in Natural Values description section. How might above benefit from landscape-scale pest control?	Seek the following additions and clarification to the text: a) Provide details for how the Tasman River PEU & Aoraki EMU will be managed, including how braided river ecosystems & their rare birds, plant communities, and tarn & ephemeral wetlands mentioned in Natural Values description section will be protected & managed. b) Explain how the rare & threatened birds, rare ecosystems, & general plant communities mentioned in Natural Values description section will benefit from landscape-scale pest control. How will landscape-scale pest control protect these biological resources?	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Outcomes - Recreational</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/13	Strongly support creating walking access across lake outlet but this should be made a priority.	Retain	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/31	Add new outcome to Recreational Values	Add the following: It is intended to phase out commercial heliskiing from the entire Tasman Valley (above Murchison Corner) and Mannering Glaciers in order to create the Southern Alps "heartland" backcountry ski touring area.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/32	Generally a booking system is not workable in a backcountry context.	Remove the words "A booking system for the huts ensures that all types of recreationalists have access to the use of the facilities".	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/30	<p>"The combination of aircraft activity with watercraft activity on Tasman Lake and motor vehicles on Tasman Valley Road means that the tranquillity levels throughout much of this Place will be low."</p> <p>This conflicts with the map on page 46, which sets the tranquillity level in the Tasman as medium and also conflicts with General Policy for National Parks, Point 8.1.c) i) "preserve national park values, including natural quiet, as far as possible"</p>	Restrict motorised access up the Tasman to fit with the plan's desired outcome (medium level of Tranquillity), OR remove the map on page 46	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/51	<p>Support bridge across Tasman Lake outlet to facilitate access to an otherwise seldom used area.</p> <p>The impact of camping near Ball Hut will depend on the numbers and how quickly they increase in coming years.</p>	<p>Retain Outcome reference to the bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet.</p> <p>Reword the sentence re camping near Ball Hut to read: "If numbers camping near Ball Hut start to have more than a minimal impact on the environment then introduce a booking system. This would be consistent with other parts of the plan, as Ball Hut is easily accessible on foot."</p>	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/30	Support the statement of "A bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet enables access to the lower Murchison valley." Good to facilitate access to an otherwise seldom visited area.	Retain statement.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/31	Regarding the statement "Camping next to Ball Hut has minimal impact on the environment." This all depends on the numbers of campers.	Reword statement to "If numbers camping near Ball Hut start to have a more than minimal impact on the environment then introduce a booking system."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/47	Support the bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet enables access to the lower Murchison valley. Good to facilitate access to an otherwise seldomly visited area.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/48	Regarding the statement "Camping next to Ball Hut has minimal impact on the environment." It depends on numbers and how quickly they increase in coming years.	Reword this statement to "If numbers camping near Ball Hut start to have a more than minimal impact on the environment then introduce a booking system."	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/22	Regarding the statement "camping next to Ball Hut has minimal impact on the environment" this depends on numbers and how quickly they increase in coming years.	Reword this to: if numbers camping near Ball hut start to have a more than minimal impact on the environment then introduce a booking system.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/130</p>	<p>1) Clarification of "good facility development and design" is required . Should result in modest facilities that ensure the Park's intrinsic natural features predominate. 2) Should include a bridge across the Tasman River outlet id it is supported by Departmental hydrological, ecological, landscape and engineering advice. 3) Outcomes on public hut booking systems should acknowledge the b=need for flexibility and recognising the back country etiquette as an expectation of all huts. See submission point 125. 4) The outcome "Aircraft activity within Haupapa Place is high" is an inappropriate outcome for a national park, which is to be preserved in perpetuity for its intrinsic worth.</p>	<p>Review the Outcomes for Recreational values to address the matters raised.</p>	
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/26</p>	<p>New walking access at Tasman Lake This is a good suggestion as this one of the few locations where it is practical to materially improve walking access to an area that currently is seldom visited. The feasibility of introducing new walking access around Tasman Lake is mentioned in milestones, but does not appear to be the subject of a policy or objective (i.e. on improvement of walking access opportunities additional to those covered under Policy 1 on 'Recreation').</p>	<p>Include a policy or objective confirming commitment to providing new walking access to areas west of Tasman Lake, through methods such as tracks and/or the potential construction of a new bridge.</p>	
<p><i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/6</p>	<p>The plan states: " Aircraft activity within Haupapa Place is high, particularly in ..means that the tranquillity levels throughout much of this Place will be low." The solution to this appears to be to give in and just work out how to tell people not to expect peace and quiet, instead of working to keep it quiet.</p>	<p>Qualities of tranquillity and natural quiet are important features and expectations of the visitor experience and consider the implications of that in a management sense.</p>	
<p><i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/21</p>	<p>Strongly support the provision of a bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet to facilitate walking access to areas such as Gorilla Stream. Suggest a further bridge across the Murchison river mouth would allow access to the lower Murchison.</p>	<p>Retain the outcome of "A bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet". Reword slightly to "A bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet and Murchison River enables access to the lower Murchison valley".</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/103</p>	<p>Add a new outcome to Recreational values to read: "Heli-skiing from the entire Tasman Valley (above the lower Murchison corner) and the Mannering Glacier has been phased out in order to create the Southern Alps 'heartland' backcountry ski touring area."</p>	<p>Amend Outcomes, Recreational values as requested</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/104	1. Consider that a booking system is not workable in a backcountry context. 2. Consider that the outcome that "Aircraft activity within Haupapa Place is high ..." and the designated VMZ settings for this Place are in conflict. The outcomes should be consistent with the VMZs.	Amend the outcomes - Recreational values as : 1. Remove the sentence "A booking system for the huts ... use of facilities." 2. Change the outcome to be consistent with the VMZs given for this Place and change other aircraft access zones so as to give effect to the VMZs for this Place	
<i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/7	The outcomes should be amended to recognise the occasional use of personal motorised watercraft , including jet boats, will have a minor and transient impact on tranquillity from time to time.	Amend	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/42	The listed Outcomes are diverse but do not generally represent much stretch to better accommodate increasing visitor numbers except for increased aircraft access. The effect of this on tranquillity levels is acknowledged (p133) but there are no recommendations for ameliorating or even managing this.	Address effect of increasing tourism numbers on tranquillity levels.	
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/9	Regarding the proposal of a bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet - this is a great idea to facilitate lower-impact access to this area.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/16	On page 133, it states: "The combination of aircraft activity with watercraft activity on Tasman Lake and motor vehicles on Tasman Valley Road means that the tranquillity levels throughout much of this Place will be low." However, on Map 5, the colour coded tranquillity setting for this place appears to be largely "Medium". It needs to be clarified as to whether this place is 'medium' or 'low' tranquillity (and how this is quantified). If there is contradiction between the Draft Management Plan's text and tranquillity maps then it will be difficult to monitor and confirm compliance with or exceedance of the relevant tranquillity setting.  This then has flow on effects in regards to Policies 12(a)&(b) in Section 1.3.3 which could lead to restrictions on the authorised numbers of landings or prevent the granting of additional landing opportunities because a higher tranquillity threshold is imposed unintentionally.	Clarify whether Tasman Lake and Tasman Valley have a "medium" or "low" tranquility setting.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/51	Oppose the low tranquillity and the creation of one large landing zone.	Amend the landing zone to confine landings to specific sites.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/46	Support Outcomes with the addition of improving Tranquillity levels - no private motor vehicles from 1Oct to 1 May	Amend Outcomes to address the issue raised.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/44	<p>1. Support a bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet. Good to facilitate access to an otherwise seldomly visited area. Also reducing flight noise and pollution from Cyclists using helicopters to fly over the river. Link bridge with Alps to Ocean cycleway.</p> <p>2. Camping next to Ball Hut has minimal impact ...: It depends on numbers and how quickly they increase in coming years. Also provide for a provision within the plan to relocate Ball Hut when the time comes due to unstable geological ground to an accessible position for walking access and The Alpine Hut Network.</p>	<p>1. Retain outcome for access across the Tasman Lake outlet</p> <p>2. Re-word this to: "If numbers camping near Ball Hut start to have a more than minimal impact on the environment then introduce a booking system. This would be consistent with other parts of the plan, as Ball Hut is easily accessible on foot."</p>	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/55	<p>The huts at the head of the Tasman are some of the most visited high alpine accommodation in the Park. As it stands, the huts adequately meet demand, however this is likely to change in the next 10 years. These huts will become more costly to maintain as they age, with Tasman Saddle Hut, in particular, getting close to pension age.</p> <p>We seek the future viability of these huts to be investigated over the course of the plan in order to future proof these essential assets for high alpine recreation, not only in Aoraki/Mount Cook but in New Zealand as a whole.</p>	Include a specific policy for the investigation / redevelopment of the Tasman Neve huts.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Outcomes - Waste management</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/105	The Club supports this outcome	Retain the statement	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 1</b>		
<i>Adler, Emily</i> 66/14	It would be good to develop this area further to take pressure off the Hooker Valley. Should be done in conjunction with Policy 3 on page 122.		
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/8	We support the proposal for the development of new walking facilities within the Tasman Glacier	Our priority would be for a bridge across the Tasman Lake outlet to enable access to the lower Murchison valley. The provision of some high-water swing bridges at strategic points across the Murchison River might also be considered.	
<i>Christchurch Tramping Club</i> 604/6	We support the construction of a bridge across the Tasman outlet, allowing for further recreational opportunities in the Eastern reaches of the Park.	Retain Policy, especially support a bridge across the Tasman outlet.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 2</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/20	Support this policy including parts a), b), c), and d)	Retain Policy 2 in its entirety	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/38	Include a clause that limits the number of heli hiking operators. Apply the same "limited supply situation" as for heli hiking areas in the Franz in Westland NP	Reword policy to add: "Limited Supply policies will apply to heli hiking on the Tasman Glacier."	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/52	Policy wording quite vague - 5 parties could be 10 people or 25 people depending on type of trip. It appears in direct contradiction to 1.3.1 Policy 1(c). Preferable to place limit on number of day-tourism related flights as incentive for visitors to spend one or more nights in an alpine hut to gain a greater appreciation of the values of the place.	1. Identify areas free of heli-skiing to cater for more environmentally friendly activity of ski touring: - upper Tasman, Darwin and Bonney Glaciers - upper Murchison Glacier including the Mannering Glacier  2. Reword Policy 2(d) to read: "no more than 5 aircraft landings per concessionaire per day for single day activities in any of the Tasman Glacier landing zones."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/32	Regarding Policy 2 d) This is in direct contradiction of 1.3.10 Policy 1 c) which states no more than one guided group per day per concessionaire. This is going to the other extreme and seems a huge number. The management plan needs to take care to control numbers.	Reword Policy 2 d) to "no more than 5 aircraft landings per guiding concessionaire per day for single day activities in any of the Tasman Glacier landing zones."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/49	Regarding Policy 2 d) This is quite vague, as 5 parties could be 10 people or 25 people dependent on the type of trip. It would be good to instead place a limit on the number of day- tourism related flights.	Reword Policy 2 d) to no more than five aircraft landings per guiding concessionaire per day for single day activities in any of the Tasman Glacier landing zones."  Identify areas free of heliskiing to cater for the more environmentally-friendly activity of ski touring, namely in the upper Tasman, Darwin and Bonney Glaciers and the upper Murchison Glacier including the Mannering Glacier.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/23	Regarding Policy 2 d) This is quite vague, as 5 parties could be 10 people or 25 people dependent on the type of trip. It would be good to instead place a limit on then mber of day-tourism related flights	Reword Policy 2 d) to no more than five aircraft landings per concessionaire per day per single day activities in any of the Tasman Glacier landing zones.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/48	Policy presumes that concessions should be granted. It sets no limit on the number of concessions in each landing zone, or on numbers in each party. Potentially, this will create a situation where endless number of visitors are being ferried each day by helicopter into the Tasman valley.	Reword Policy 2 to read: "All guiding concessions will: a) be consistent with the visitor management zones shown on Map 4 and described in Appendix 2; b) pack out all waste from the Park or dispose of the waste in waste disposal receptacles c) have no more than five parties on the ground per	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	There will be situations where an application will be declined, in areas where increasing numbers of commercial interests compete for limited opportunities.	concessionaire at one time; d) only have maximum of six clients plus one guide in each party; e) will have a maximum of two concessionaires in or adjacent to the aircraft landing zone at one time; and f) have minimal adverse effects on the use and enjoyment of the park by other concessionaires or visitors."	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/132	Policy 2 should be guided by the following points: - that Tranquillity as a tool is substantially incompatible with visitor management zoning. No changes to the visitor management zoning (VMZ) should be undertaken without a publicly-notified review. - a highly conservative approach to aircraft activity is needed until all aspects of tranquillity are resolved and compatibility with VMZ is achieved - that clarification and tightening of guiding activities has been undertaken - see submission point 84	Review and amend Policy 2 to address the matters raised.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/29	I note the inconsistency of the policy proposals and their contradictions of each other. In one place it says 1 party per concession in the park, and here it says no more than 5.		
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/17	Policy 2 d) This is too many parties for all but the Tasman Landing Zone, and perhaps too many for there also. This also defies General Policy for National Parks 2005: 8.1c) i) & iv)	Reword Policy 2 d) "no more than four parties per concessionaire are on the ground at one time in the Tasman Landing Zone and one party per concessionaire in any other landing zone."	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/20	Supports the proposed granting of concessions for guiding in the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier landing zone and Lower Haupapa/Tasman Glacier landing zone. However, submit that Policy 2(d), which specifies no more than five parties per concessionaire on the ice at one time in any one landing zone, is unnecessarily restrictive and may not achieve the intended outcome: Heli-hikers on the lower Tasman are not visible to snow shoers on the upper Tasman. In our view, these should be considered as distinct and separate zones, from a crowding perspective; The policy does not contemplate explain how groups coming in to land, crossing over with groups departing, should be treated, given they are 'on the ground', briefly, at the same time. Interpreted narrowly, the policy could mean that only 2-3 groups can be guided on the glacier at any time, not 5, which we suspect was intended.	Policy 2 d) should have the following words added "..except at the helicopter landing pad, where 5 incoming groups may briefly cross over with 5 departing groups".	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	The Plan should redefine the Tasman Glacier landing zones so that, in practical terms, the upper glacier zone (used for snow shoeing) is treated as distinct from the lower glacier landing zone (used for heli-hiking).		
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/24	MCGG supports the proposed granting of concessions for guiding in the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier landing zone and Lower Haupapa/Tasman Glacier landing zone. However, we submit that Policy 2(d) is unnecessarily restrictive and may not achieve the intended outcome. Heli-hikers on the lower Tasman are not visible to snow shoers on the upper Tasman. These should be considered as distinct and separate zones, from a crowding perspective; The policy does not contemplate explain how groups coming in to land, crossing over with groups departing, should be treated, given they are "on the ground", briefly, at the same time. Interpreted narrowly, the policy could mean that only 2-3 groups can be guided on the glacier at any time, not 5, which we suspect was intended.	The Plan should redefine the Tasman Glacier landing zones so that, in practical terms, the upper glacier zone (used for snow shoeing) is treated as distinct from the lower glacier landing zone (used for heli- hiking). Policy 2 (d) should have the following words added "... except at the helicopter landing pad, where 5 incoming groups may briefly cross over with 5 departing groups".	
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/10	Regarding Policy 2 d) Oppose in part. Limit by number of flights, not number of parties. The largest impact of guided parties is likely to be the flights that are associated with the party. Therefore the policy should set out limits by flights (number and frequency), rather than on number of parties.	Reword Policy 2 d) to "no more than three aircraft landings per guiding concessionaire per day for single day activities in any of the Tasman Glacier landing zones."	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/19	Fully support Policy 2(a)-(d). All specified limitations are achievable and consistent with existing activities of this nature which the applicant is associated with. The only suggested change is to ensure that the Map 4 referred to in this Policy is the additional topographical detail map uploaded following notification of the draft Management Plan.	Ensure that the Map 4 referred to in this Policy is the additional topographical detail map uploaded following notification of the draft Management Plan.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/53	Regarding Policy 2 d) 5 parties per concessionaire is excessive.	Revise numbers downwards.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/59	These numbers imply parties of 20. The remote zone party size is 8.	Specify party size in line with Remote zone.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/45	This is quite vague, as 5 parties could be 10 people or 25 people dependent on the type of trip. It seems like rather a lot and is in direct contradiction to Policy 1.3.10 1(c) [which we assume is a mistake].	To address the concerns raised make the following amendments: 1. Identify areas free of heliskiing to cater for the more environmentally-friendly activity of ski touring, namely in	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	It would be good to instead place a limit on the number of day-tourism related flights ie. Provide an incentive for visitors to spend one or more nights in an alpine hut to gain a greater appreciation of the natural, cultural and historical values of the place. Day-tourism groups on the Tasman Glacier are highly aircraft dependent and create a significant amount of noise impact throughout the Tasman Valley.	the upper Tasman, Darwin and Bonney Glaciers and the upper Murchison Glacier including the Mannering Glacier. 2. Reword Policy 2 d) to read: "no more than five aircraft landings per guiding concessionaire per day for single day activities in any of the Tasman Glacier landing zones."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 3</b>		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/9	There are already enough power boats and non-powered boat activities on the Tasman Lake - limited by nature of launch sites and landing sites, and suitable storage sites	Reword Policy 3 to only permit only one power boat concessionaire and one non-powered watercraft concessionaire	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/10	Policy 3(a): Should allow up to 7 non-powered watercraft per guided group to allow for guide training and supervision	Reword Policy 3(a) to allow for extra boats when guide training	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/115	There is no room for more concessionaires on the Tasman Lake than are already there due to the small amount of land to store gear, maintenance equipment and access to the lake for clients which is safe. Oppose Policy 3(a) as written - Should allow 10 non-powered water-craft per guided group, as current concession allows.	1. Amend Policy 3 to allow no more than 2 separate concessionaires in the current area (one powered and one non-powered), as exists at present. 2. Amend Policy 3(a) to align with current concession	
<i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/8	With the exception of the Tasman and Mueller terminal lakes, the use of jet boats inside the Park boundaries can only take place on the Tasman and Godley rivers.	Add a new policy that allows the use of non-commercial jet boats on the Tasman River.	
<i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/3	For consistency, limit guided non-powered concessionaires to only 2 concessionaires. This allows DOC to monitor any possible impacts over the next 10 year park plan review period. This approach, only 2 concessionaires for both powered and non-powered craft on Tasman Lake, allows growth until the next park plan review whilst avoiding over development within the Park.	Amend Policy 3 to grant only 2 concessions for guided non-powered watercraft on Tasman Lake.	
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/3	Oppose as the number of concessions is unclear. It should be in line with the powered watercraft 2 concession policy.	Amend Policy 3 to state "Should grant no more than 2 concessions for guided non powered watercraft on Tasman Lake only.."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 4</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/11	Policy 4 and 5 Should only allow 1 operator per powered and 1 per non-powered watercraft concession activity	Reword policies to read: Should grant only one non-powered watercraft concession and one powered watercraft concession ...	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/116	There is no room for more concessionaires on the Tasman Lake than are already there due to the small amount of land to store gear, maintenance equipment and access to the lake for clients which is safe.	Amend Policy 4 to allow no more than 2 separate concessionaires in the current area (one powered and one non-powered), as exists at present.	
<b>Section: 2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 5</b>			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/117	There is no room for more concessionaires on the Tasman Lake than are already there due to the small amount of land to store gear, maintenance equipment and access to the lake for clients which is safe.	Amend Policy 5 to allow no more than 2 separate concessionaires in the current area (one powered and one non-powered), as exists at present.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/133	Policy 5(c) should set a maximum operating noise level for powered watercraft, which should be conservative to protect national park values.	Amend Policy 5(c) to set a maximum operating noise level.	
<i>Campbell, Robert</i> 507/1	Support this policy for the following reasons: Industry 'competition' is essential especially in a NP. There is no benefit to conservation, the environment or general public by allowing a monopoly on NZ's only glacial lake used for commercial boating activity. Allowing only two powered concessionaire activities on lake Tasman is a responsible decision from DOC ensuring there is 'competition' and choice for the general public whilst at the same time having the ability to monitor and assess whether there are any unforeseen potential impacts from 2 operators before allowing any further development for commercial use. General public will benefit from competition. From experience can tell that two powered concessionaires can operate effectively and safely on lake Tasman. (note: added more detail in letter added to submission about experience on the lake and reflections on this)	retain Policy 5 a), b) and c)	
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/38	Appreciates that Policy 5 provides an opportunity for competitive business and removes a monopoly situation. Understand that this enables a maximum of up to eight watercraft on the lake at any one time, provided it's split between two concessionaires; doubling current permitted level. The even split between two concessionaires (perception of fairness) is that it restricts	Revision of this policy is required so it still provides for more than one operator, sets an acceptable activity level and yet it enables operators to manage their own business models. Retain Policy 5, 5 a) and 5 c) but review and revise Policy 5 b) and replace with the following or something with the same intent: "Between the two concessions, no more than a	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>both of the concessionaires within an imposed, preconceived business model dictated by the policy. The management considerations discussion within the draft Plan refers only to managing the expectation of visitors to this Place for aircraft. The Outcome for this Place acknowledges the combination of aircraft activity with watercraft activity on the Tasman Lake and motor vehicles on the Tasman Valley Road means tranquillity levels will be low throughout much of the Place. The draft Plan does not distinguish specific adverse effects of watercraft activity on the Tasman Lake and its users. If a policy is proposed to be highly prescriptive for activity level and type, our expectation is that the reasons (effect based) for this are communicated and translated into the management considerations. Currently this is not the case.</p> <p>As alternative the policy, if left as prescribed, should enable an operator to apply for an increase in their activity level by providing evidence that an increase to their activity level would not have significant effects on the Tasman Lake and its users.</p>	<p>total of eight powered watercraft are permitted on the lake at any one time."</p> <p>Or: Reword the policy to include an effects based assessment for an increase in activity levels on Tasman Lake for commercial powered watercraft.</p>	
<p><i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/1</p>	<p>Allowing only 2 powered concessionaire activities on Lake Tasman over the next 10 years is the responsible approach from DOC ensuring there is competition and choice for the general public. This allows DOC the ability to monitor and assess whether there are any unforeseen potential environmental impacts and have the option to amend the plan if required, between park plan reviews.</p> <p>2 powered concessionaires can safely and effectively co-site Lake Tasman without any concern.</p> <p>Additional Information: The lake edge site has been extensively developed over the past 15 years, with commercial boating infrastructure in place for existing boating concessionaires. At present there are a number of sites available where a new concessionaire could position a small (8m2) non-permanent storage structure having little effect on this area.</p>	<p>Retain Policy 5 as it is.</p>	
<p><i>Nielsen, Brad</i> 733/1</p>	<p>Support this policy. Having two concessionaires will allow for people to have a choice and more competitive prices.</p>	<p>Retain text as written.</p>	
<p><i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/1</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 5 a), b) and c) Support all. Regarding 5 b) Ensure new concessionaire has required experience</p>	<p>Retain Policy 5 a), b) and c).</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	to operate in such a place safely. Regarding 5 c) Support that new concessionaire must use a 4 stroke engine as maximum due to quiet operating noise.		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/54	Regarding Policy 5 b) 4 powered boats at one time seems excessive.	Review numbers.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/47	Should require concession for powered watercraft to be a very quiet operation - electrically powered or solar energy?	Reword Policy 5 to add a new clause to read: "(d) Electrically powered craft only with very low noise (less than 40dBA at 5m).	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 6</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/118	Should allow for camping next to Ball hut when an extra toilet is put in.	Amend Policy 6 to reflect the issues raised.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/106	Policy should only address camping next to Ball Hut	Amend Policy 6 as follows: Remove the words "and manage other camping in accordance with 1.3.1 Policy 18."	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 7</b>		
<i>Cradock, Nick</i> 7/2	Support helicopter landings in the Malte Brun Range above the moraine wall, but need to extend to the bottom of Freshfield Glacier above the moraine wall egress from Palteau Hut. These landings would greatly enhance the opportunities for recreation from and to Plateau Hut, in particular good egress for skitouring parties from Plateau Hut.	1. Retain Policy 7 for helicopter landings zone in the Malte Brun Range above the moraine wall 2. Reword Policy 7 to extend landing zone to include landings above moraine wall on Freshfield glacier, opposite Reay Glacier, Tasman white ice landing. 3. Reword Policy 7 to extend landing zone to include landings above moraine wall on Boys Glacier, on the 1600m contour opposite Mt Johnson in the Malte Brun range.	
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/11	Disagree with this being a landing site at Tasman Lake.	Remove 7(c)	
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/5	There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall. The existing sites at Ledenfeld Saddle, Cornice Wall and Kelman Hut should remain. The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone.	Amend Policy 7 to reflect the changes identified.	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/5	The proposed Tasman Glacier Landing Zone includes much new area where aircraft would be allowed to land. Any new landing areas/sites need to be carefully considered, independently, rather than using such a broad brush strokes that are extremely [permissive to aircraft. Any flight access to the eastern side of the Malte Brun	Amend Policy 7 to reflect the changes identified.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Range should only be to a proposed new hut site (and only if this is inaccessible by foot) and above this only to specific strategic locations for back country users.</p> <p>Any commercial interests seeking new landings for sight seeing or heliskiing etc., should be turned down or only be to specific sites.</p> <p>The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone. There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall, but the existing sites at Ledenfeld Saddle and Cornice Wall should remain.</p>		
<p><i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/21</p>	<p>Support the granting of concessions using an allocation process and the landing zones in Map 17.</p> <p>We do not support Policy 7(c) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it is only a short distance from the airport</li> <li>- it creates a new aircraft zone that affects the already limited tranquillity for walkers</li> <li>- with future and upgraded walking zones it is best to keep the helicopters high overhead rather than landing close by.</li> </ul>	<p>Retain Policy 7 but delete 7c)</p>	
<p><i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/12</p>	<p>Due to hazards with moraine walls, it would make sense to allow for aircraft to land on top of moraine walls either side of the Haupapa/Tasman Landing zone</p>	<p>Retain Policy 7 with the inclusion of landings allowed on top of moraine walls either side of the Haupapa/Tasman Landing Zone</p>	
<p><i>Saggers, Eric</i> 48/3</p>	<p>Significant flight movements into the Tasman Lake area will reduce the natural experience for visitors.</p>	<p>Oppose any aircraft landings in the vicinity of Tasman Lake</p>	
<p><i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/3</p>	<p>The proposed Tasman Glacier Landing Zone includes much new area where aircraft would be allowed to land, this is to the detriment of the area as a whole.</p>	<p>Any new landing sites need to be carefully considered, independently.</p>	
<p><i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/5</p>	<p>The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone</p>		
<p><i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/6</p>	<p>There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall, the existing sites at Lenderfeld Saddle and Cornice Wall should remain.</p>		
<p><i>Heliworks Queenstown Helicopters 2012 Ltd</i> 56/3</p>	<p>7 c) Tasman Lake Landing Zone - six landings per day. Six landings can easily be done by one operator alone. We would like this to be considered an allowance per company.</p>	<p>When rewording your policy we would like this to be considered an allowance per operator (six landings per day)</p>	
<p><i>Davidson, L</i> 60/3</p>	<p>The proposed Tasman Glacier Landing Zone includes much new area where aircraft would be allowed to land, this is to the detriment of the area as a whole.</p>	<p>Any new landing sites need to be carefully considered, independently.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/5	The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone		
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/6	There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall, the existing sites at Lenderfeld Saddle and Cornice Wall should remain.		
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/5	Oppose upper limit of 200 landings per day. Aircraft based tourism can hardly be considered a sustainable, carbon neutral recreation opportunity.	reword upper limit to <50 landings per day	
<i>Beikirch, Henriette</i> 69/1	Oppose 200 landings per day on the Tasman Glacier, will severely limit the natural values for anyone outside of the aircraft.		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/33	Policy 7 b): Remove the Haupapa landing zone from the draft plan. The policy 7 b) should be replaced with policies relevant to any revised landing sites and zones that would replace the Haupapa landing zone.	Remove Policy 7 b) and amend in accordance with the submission.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/34	Regarding Policy 7 c) Remove the Tasman Lake landing zone from the draft plan. It is easily reached by walkers and sightseers.	Remove Policy 7 c)	
<i>von Chrismar, Antony</i> 72/3	Mountain access by heli/flight should not be a highlight of NZ, ruining natural appeal and the glaciers and snowline of NZ mountains for short term selfish goals by clients and commercial operators.	Do not open up any new areas/landing zones/flight paths.	
<i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/2	Disagree with adding additional landing zones within the park. New Zealand backcountry should remain a wilderness. There is already helicopter access down the Tasman Valley.	Delete Policy 7.	
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/10	Do not support the proposed increase in landings. 200 is a huge number and would obviously be detrimental to the area.	Change Policy 7 b) to "a more appropriate number of landings, based on real evidence of need and consideration of tranquility outcomes and carbon emissions."	
<i>Nolan, Brooke</i> 164/1	I oppose the potential for 200 helicopter flights per day	Believe there should be a clearly defined total number of day-tourism related landings allowed per day across all aircraft operators in the Tasman Valley. And there shouldn't be more than an average of one flight every 15-20 minutes. Areas that have traditionally been foot accessible only, should also stay this way.	
<i>Button, Margaret</i> 165/3	200 landings per day in Haupapa place is excessive. The current impact of noise by aircraft is excessive.	Reduce landings by 50%.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>White, Mike</i> 179/5	Regarding 7 b) Oppose the number of aircraft landings proposed.	Re-evaluate the proposed limit with requirement to maintain noise levels due aircraft movements at or below the standard to achieve the previously stated medium level of tranquillity as outlined earlier in the draft plan.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/31	Amend to Max 10 landings per day, among all landing sites in the Tasman combined with no landings on Lendenfeld Saddle or in the vicinity of Tasman Lake.	Amend as in submission.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/12	Policy 7(b)(ii): Should require all pilots landing in Tasman landing Zone to shut down on landing	Reword Policy 7(b)(ii) to read: " ... if the pilot leaves the aircraft, within the Tasman Glacier Landing Zone, as shown .."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/13	Policy 7(c): No need for landing site at Tasman Lake for recreation purposes	Delete Policy 7(c)	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/14	Further policy needed for concessionaire work utilising aircraft assistance at Tasman Lake for boats and shed maintenance.	Include new Policy 7(d) to read: "(d) Shall allow approved aircraft landings for watercraft concessionaire operations at Tasman Lake for concessions equipment repositioning and maintenance."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/37	Policy 7(b): Haupapa Landing Zone is too vast. Restrict the area within the Tasman Glacier to below 2200m. There is no need to land everywhere in the Malte Brun Range, up the Darwin Glacier and a long way up Beetham Stream. Have specific places for landing where huts located, or to be located. Only below 2200m from Cornice Wall and Tasman Saddle down the glacier through the existing landing zone to the Murchison corner. See attached Map 1	Reword policy to say "Landings only permitted in the designated areas marked on the map."	
<i>Cox, Rowan</i> 250/3	Regarding Policy 7 b) i) 200 landings is a large amount that will cause unnecessary disturbance on other recreational users in this area. I propose that this number should be significantly reduced.	Reword policy 7 b) i) to reduce the number of landing per day.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/119	Policy 7(b) - Haupapa Landing Zone: Oppose the Haupapa Place Landing Zone as drawn as it is too vast. As proposed will have helicopters and planes dotted all over the glacier, and landing in areas that are inappropriate and most definitely unsafe. It will ruin the	Amend Policy 7(b) Haupapa Place Landing Zone to include the following restrictions: 1. Specific places for landings where huts are located or will be placed 2. On the Tasman Glacier, only below the 2200m elevation	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>experience for visitors. Requirement for aircraft to shut down should apply to all of the Landing Zone.</p> <p>Policy 7(c) - Tasman Lake Landing Zone: Oppose landing zone at Tasman Lake as it spoils the experience of all in the area and it is too close to the front country area.</p> <p>There needs to be policy to allow approved aircraft landings for maintenance of concessionaire operations at Tasman Lake.</p>	<p>from the Cornice Wall and Tasman Saddle strip down the glacier, through existing landing zones to the Murchison corner.</p> <p>3. Landings only permitted in the designated areas as marked on the map ( See Map 1 attached to submission).</p> <p>4. Pilot to shut down aircraft if leaves the aircraft anywhere within the landing zone</p> <p>Delete Policy 7(c)</p> <p>Add new Policy 7(d) to read: "Shall allow approved aircraft landings for watercraft concessionaire operations at the Tasman Lake for concessions equipment repositioning and maintenance."</p>	
<p><i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/44</p>	<p>Policy 7(b)(ii): This only makes sense for scenic flights where shutting down for long period of time. Pilots generally shut down to save fuel. For dropping off climbers or skiers, only short time to unload gear, so would actually increase noise and time exposed to noise, due to additional time required to shut down and start up again. Pilots governed by CAA regulations</p>	<p>Reword Policy 7(b)(ii) to exclude loading/unloading, reflect what most pilots do, and consult with CAA regulations.</p>	
<p><i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/53</p>	<p>Policy 7: Oppose aircraft landings proposed for Ledenfeld Saddle, Tasman Saddle and Darwin Glacier - remove all areas above 2000m between Mt Green (on the west) as far as, but not including, the current Cornice Wall landing site; and above 2400m between Kelman and Tasman Saddle Huts</p>	<p>Reword policy 7(a) to exclude Ledenfeld Saddle as a landing zone Revise Policy 7(b)Haupapa Place Landing Zone to exclude the areas identified above.</p>	
<p><i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/54</p>	<p>Policy 7(b)(i) - Allocation process: Unclear whether the limits refer to 200 aircraft landings or 200people landing per day. 200 aircraft landings per day is completely excessive and will result in constant noise in the Tasman Valley. Each "landing" requires a flight both up and down the valley and may result in 20 aircraft in the air at any one time. Day-only tourism is very aircraft intensive. There should be more incentive for multi-day, hut-based activities. Should be requirement for flights to be fully booked, both in and out.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 7(b)(i) to read: "a total of no more than 100 people landing per day or 20 aircraft landings per day for day-tourism related activities across all aircraft concessionaires."</p> <p>Note any multi-day or non-landing scenic flights would be in addition to this limit.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/55	Policy 7(c): No justification for an aircraft landing at Tasman Lake.	Remove this clause 7(c)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/33	Regarding Policy 7 a) Landings at Lendenfeld Saddle, Tasman Saddle and the Darwin Glacier should not be allowed. All areas above 2000m between Mt. Green on the west and as far as, but not including, the current Cornice Wall landing site AND anywhere above 2400m between Kelman and Tasman Saddle Hut should be removed from the currently proposed landing zones.	Remove Policy 7 a) from the plan. Rework all aircraft landing related policies to better support ski tourers, who have less choice of routes to access than heli-skiers.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/34	Regarding Policy 7 b) i) Oppose the limit of 200 total landings per day. The Tasman Glacier will be no different from a busy city airport with constant noise. We have to aim for quality tourism, not quantity tourism. Remember this is a national park, where people go to experience nature, not the city!	Reword Policy 7 b) i) to no more than 100 people landing per day or 20 aircraft landing per day for day- tourism related activities across all aircraft concessionaires.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/36	Regarding Policy 7 c) See no justification for this landing zone. This site is not far from the airport. Why impact on walkers and lake tourists with yet another landing site.	Remove Policy 7 c) from the plan.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/41	Regarding Policy 7 b) ii) This only makes sense for scenic flights. When dropping off climbers or skiers, the pilot often needs to assist with unloading of gear. If there is only a short stopping period, shutting down would actually increase the noise and time exposed to it, due to the additional time required to start up and shut down the engine.	Reword Policy 7 b) ii) to exclude loading/unloading, reflect what most pilots are already doing and consult with CAA regulations.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/50	Regarding Policy 7 a) Landings at Lendenfeld Saddle, Tasman Saddle and the Darwin Glacier should not be allowed. Similarly, all areas above 2000m between Mt. Green on the west and as far as, but not including, the current Cornice Wall landing site AND anywhere above 2400m between Kelman and Tasman Saddle Hut should be removed from the currently proposed landing zones.	Remove or Reword Policy 7 a) to exclude Lendenfeld Saddle as a landing zone and rework all aircraft landing related policies to better support climbers and ski tourers, rather than day-trippers who are already more than adequately catered for.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/51	Regarding Policy 7 b) i) This needs to be clarified as to whether this is per aircraft concessionaire, then 200 ski plane or heli-landings per day is completely excessive! Or If this is 200 people landing per day. There should be requirements for operators to communicate/work together to limit half-full or unnecessary flights i.e. by combining groups and linking backflights.	Reword to "a total of no more than 100 people per day or 20 aircraft landings per day, for day-tourism related activities across all aircraft concessionaires." This does not include multi-day activity related flights or non-landing scenic flights, which would be in addition to this.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/52	Oppose Policy 7 c). There is no justification for this site.	Remove Policy 7 c) from the plan.	
<i>Jauregui, Christopher</i> 278/3	Regarding Policy 7 a) I believe no landing, except in emergency situations, should be permitted above Tasman Saddle Hut to respect the cultural and environmental significance of the area.	Delete Policy 7 a)	
<i>Jauregui, Christopher</i> 278/5	Regarding 7 b) i) From an environmental standpoint, 200 landings per day gets further away from the goal of a carbon neutral economy.	Significantly reduce the landings limit to less than 50.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/24	Regarding Policy 7 b) i) 200 landings per day is completely excessive! This would result in constant noise in the Tasman Valley Day-only tourism is very aircraft intensive and negatively impacts on the environment and multi-day activities in the area. There should also be a requirement for aircraft operators to communicate/work together to limit half-full or unnecessary flights by combining groups and linking backflights.	Reword Policy 7 b) i) to "a total of no more than 100 people landing per day or 20 aircraft landing per day for day-tourism related activities across all aircraft concessionaires." It does not include multi-day activity related flights or non-landing scenic flights, which would be in addition to this.	
<i>Bradshaw, Simon James</i> 317/2	Oppose additional landings. It proposes 200 landings a day which is 15x the current amount per year.	Delete Policy 7	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/49	<p>The club strongly disagrees with the proposed number of landings in Policy 7. The effect of the policy will be to expose the middle and upper Tasman Glacier to intensive aircraft use. We recognise that the lower reaches are likely have more intensive recreational uses, but the upper glacier should be managed as a "high tranquillity zone".</p> <p>200 landings per day is manifestly excessive. Surveys at Franz Josef Glacier found that many visitors thought that the sound of numerous helicopters detracted from their experience. A similar situation likely to occur in the Haupapa Landing Zone.</p> <p>The proposed policy also presumes that concessions should be granted - it sets no limit on the number of concessions, or on the numbers in each party.</p> <p>Policy 7 does not give effect to Policies 1(e), 8.1(c)(i),(ii) &amp; (iv) of the General Policy for National Parks 2005.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 7 to read:</p> <p>"An application for a new, or replacement, concession for commercial aircraft landings in Haupapa Place will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) be assessed using an allocation process, developed in consultation with kaitiaki rūnaka and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu;</li> <li>(ii) only be allowed in the following landing zones as shown on Map 17, and in accordance with the following limits and criteria:</li> <li>(iii) Ledenfeld Saddle Landing Zone - no more than two landings per day;</li> <li>(iv) Kelman Hut and Tasman Saddle Hut Landing Zones - no more than 10 landings per day at each site; and the aircraft shuts down on landing if the pilot leaves the aircraft; and</li> <li>(v) Lower Tasman Glacier at approx 1260m contour just above junction with the Rudolph Glacier - no more than 5 landings per day between 10am and 4pm only.</li> </ul>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Also consider the policy to be inconsistent with Section 6 of the Conservation Act which gives primacy to the management of the land for conservation purposes. Recreation and tourism activities are not to be inconsistent with the conservation management of natural resources.		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/19	Policy 7(b)(i): The potential for 200 landings per day on the Tasman Glacier is absolutely ridiculous.. Over a 9 hour day that equates to over 20 an hour. I would suggest limiting to at most 10 a day.. The landing zone at Ledenfeld Saddle is totally unnecessary and seriously compromises the experience of others in such a high alpine location.	1. Amend Policy 7(b)(i) to a maximum of 10 landings a day. 2. Remove Ledenfeld Saddle Landing Zone 3. Remove Tasman Lake Landing Zone.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/134	Policy 7 is extremely permissive, given that much of the area it applies to is presently zoned back country remote. Landings should remain at current levels except where recreational access has become genuinely difficult and cable / walkwire access is unfeasible. The Tasman Lake landing zone should not proceed because it is superfluous and would cause unacceptable noise and visual pollution	Amend Policy 7 to address the concerns raised. Remove Policy7(c)	
<i>Stevens, Carole</i> 430/5	Regarding 7 b) i) - Oppose 200 landings in the Upper Tasman per day. Increased noise from landings and overflights will ruin the experience of this area for all.	Reword policy to keep number of landings to status quo.	
<i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/8	Policy 7(b)(i): Retain the status quo. Allowing 200 landings per day is effectively turning the place in to the busiest airstrip in the country.	Remove Policy 7(b)(i) and replace with the current landings.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/30	The link between activities and landing approvals should remain. This recognises long standing cultural recreational use of areas, and differentiates between that and commercial tourism, as it should.	Keep the link between activities and landing approvals.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/31	No increases in aircraft landing zones or numbers/frequency from the previous Park Plan can be approved. On p45 the draft plan says ‘One of the most valued benefits is the ability to experience tranquil places.’ The new proposals to increase Tasman landings to 200 per day completely contradicts that. That DOC or the MCNP Board contemplate that means they are either severely influenced by Tourism NZ or don’t understand their duty to NZ to protect NP values. Either way it is	Rewrite all of the commercial landing concession activities and zones, returning landing zones to those allowed for in the previous plan and nothing more. I note that actual landings last year were only half those allocated. Since this number is already high and their effects on the park severe, the number should be capped at 5000 for the whole park to protect park values, so the 10,000 allocated should be reduced to 5000. The 200 landings suggested in the Tasman should be drastically reduced. Maintain a maximum of the	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the decision of a jellyfish. We need our authorities to stand up and support the values of national Parks, irrespective of the pressures. Currently they are unwilling or unable to. Neither is acceptable.	current limits, or reduce to what is currently being used only. Landings in summer in the upper Murchison should be very low, to maintain the natural quiet enjoyed in this area and restricted to one small site.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/27	The proposed Tasman Lake Landing Zone has no demonstrated need and is incompatible with other park objectives.	Remove the proposed Tasman Lake Landing Zone.	
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/11	Policy 7(b)(i): Huapapa Place Landing Zone The Tasman is already abuzz with aircraft, and that is roughly with about 30 landings per day. Allowing 200? Really?? How on earth does that align with all the words dedicated to tranquillity and soundscapes?	Remove Policy 7(b)(i) Retain the status quo	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/6	200 landings per day across Tasman Glacier landing sites is manifestly inappropriate in light of the ‘desired tranquillity outcomes’ for the area. This manifestly inappropriate policy gives one of the clearest example of why, if the public are to have confidence in this process, it is imperative that issues of drafting influence, drafting legality, and robustness of policy analysis be addressed before aircraft policy is set. - see submission for further discussion on this point. The landing limits in the Draft contemplate landings at a rate approximately an order of magnitude higher than in about 2008 in the Upper Tasman. Landings at that time were around 7,000 annually; the Draft contemplates up to about 73,000. The new limit is, for practical purposes, unbound. Despite all this, Map 5 records the Upper Tasman as a ‘medium tranquillity zone’. If nothing else, this rather raises questions as to the robustness of the TMT tool or its use.	1. Amend Policy 7 with the effect of retaining current landing levels as a cap in the interim. 2. Withdraw Draft and delay further public hearing pending publishing of: - the documents listed in Aircraft landing policies - General; and - the documents listed in Aircraft Noise Regulation and Tranquillity - General	
<i>Frost, Roger</i> 486/1	Regarding 7b) i) I oppose the excessive number of aircraft landings that could be approved in the Haupapa/Tasman Landing Zone. Any increase in landings will cause a loss of tranquillity values.	Replace 200 landings per day with 20 landings per day.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/28	So many. How many of these are the 'quick-fix' tourists?	Delete heli-skiing and heli-hiking activity in the park. Avoid aircraft movements for non-core activities.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Gould, Marion &amp; David</i> 496/4	Regarding 7b) i) 200 landings a day is a huge number where mountains concentrate the sound. Noise pollution, safety, takes away the tranquil experience of the park, goes against the plans proposal to maintain values of the natural quiet.	Reword policy to reduce proposed landing limits.	
<i>Naka, Taichiro</i> 498/2	I support grant concessions for Tasman Lake landing zone.	No specific desicion sought.	
<i>Solbak, Jan &amp; Laura</i> 503/1	Regarding 7 b) i) We wish to object to any increase in aircraft movement limits in Mt. Cook/Aoraki National Park. Our reasons are: Most visitors to the Park come for a 'natural experience' they have invested considerable time and money to do so. Any increase in aircraft traffic will reduce the enjoyment of the Mt. Cook/Aoraki experience possibly resulting in negative feedback from both domestic and international visitors. People who walk/tramp spend far more time in the park than those who fly in for a quick view of the park. Aircraft noise will adversely affect fauna (especially birds) in the Park. Visits to places like Mt. Cook/Aoraki have a spiritual/ redressing effect. The natural sounds/tranquillity play a large part in this. This is recognized in the introduction and on page 45 of The Draft Management Plan under 'Soundscape and tranquillity outcomes'. Mt. Cook/Aoraki National Park is a key magnificent natural asset. Let us protect its tranquillity as much as possible.	Delete Policy 7 b) i). - retain current number of 5000 landings per year.	
<i>Campbell, Robert</i> 507/4	Policy 7 c). Don't support this policy in its current form. Helicopters should not be landing this low down the valley. Helicopters should only be used for access to remote areas you can't get to by road or foot easily. Down beside the Tasman river is NOT one of these places. People can walk to the lake edge they don't need to fly there. There is no reason for it. The noise and disturbance in this area would be unacceptable for a NP. But: If this policy is kept in the final Plan, there should not be just one concessionaire operating flights from this location. The current policy does not stipulate the number of concessionaires. This should be allocated between two concessionaires providing options and choices for the public and avoiding another monopoly in the park. Just one concessionaire would be against 1.3.1 Policy 23 c)	Delete Policy 7 c). Or if this is kept within the plan re-word Policy 7 c) to read: "Should grant ONLY 2 concessions for the Tasman Lake Landings Zone - no more than six landings per day or 3 landings per concessionaire per day, between 10 am and 4 pm only"	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Avoiding the creation of monopoly situations. Landings should be kept a 6 /day (divided between two). Prefer to have no landings at all in the Tasman Lake area.</p>		
<p><i>McCrone, Ash</i> 519/3</p>	<p>Regarding 7 b) The proposed Tasman Glacier Landing Zone includes too much new area where aircraft would be allowed to land. This will be to the detriment of the area as a whole.</p>	<p>Any new landing areas/sites need to be carefully considered, independently, rather than identifying such large zones that are extremely permissive to aircraft</p>	
<p><i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/3</p>	<p>The desire for tranquillity as set out under 1.2.3. Recreation values (pg 45) is contradicted with the opening up the entire Tasman and Murchison Glacier areas, including the Malte Brun range, to a massive increase in aircraft use and landings. Proposing up to 200 ! (the exclamation mark is mine) landings a day in the Haupapa Place Landing Zone. That is getting up there with the number of planes landing at a busy airport such as Wellington. Can expect that from an airport in a big city, it is not what to expect when ski touring on the Tasman Glacier.</p> <p>Further context : (I have ski toured the upper Tasman Glacier and the Murchison Glacier on a number of occasions, and I have valued the solitude and tranquility. I haven't minded the occasional aircraft bringing in or taking out other skiers from the designated spot (and have them myself to get in/out) but I shudder at how disruptive and unpleasant it would be with up to 200 landings a day (not counting the heli skiers), which could be anywhere and not just at 2 sites (drop off and pick up). Plus aircraft only have to turn off the engine if the pilot leaves - they can sit and run on the ground for as long as they like if the pilot is still inside.)</p>	<p>Do not support the suggestion of enormous landing zones, and think landing sites should be much more tightly prescribed as they are at present.</p>	
<p><i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/5</p>	<p>Policy 7 and 8 Support landings in the Tasman Valley and Lendenfield saddle</p>		
<p><i>Hughes, Kelly</i> 548/1</p>	<p>Oppose the landing of up 200 aircraft per day. I enjoy the mountains and having helicopters fly by every few minutes ruins the tranquillity of the locations.</p>	<p>Amend plan todramatically reduce the number of landings per day.</p>	
<p><i>Marshall, Cory</i> (<i>Cory Marshall Photography</i>) 550/1</p>	<p>Oppose the landing of up 200 aircraft per day. I enjoy the mountains and having helicopters fly by every few minutes ruins the tranquillity of the locations.</p>	<p>Dramatically reduce the number of landings per day.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Middlemass, Simon</i> 561/8	Regarding Policy 7 c): Oppose the Tasman Lake landing zone. The Tasman Lake is easily reached by walkers and sightseers. Aircraft landing in this area has detrimental effect on these park users.	Remove Policy 7 c): the Tasman Lake Landing Zone from the draft plan.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/22	Policy 7 a) No justification is given for the need for the Lendenfeld saddle landing zone. This landing zone on the main divide seems unnecessary and would degrade the mana of the area.	Delete 2.3.3 policy 7.a	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/18	Policy 7 c) Tasman Lake is easily accessible and in an area with very high public use, a landing zone is not necessary or warranted here. This also defies General Policy for National Parks 2005: 8.1 c) i) & iv)		
<i>Waetford, Sam Edward</i> 577/19	The proposal allows for 200 landings per day at the proposed landing zone at the upper Tasman. In addition to the allowance for unlimited landings for heli-skiing, this represents a destruction of tranquillity in the valley. It is impossible to conceive that the desired tranquillity outcomes will be achieved with hundreds of helicopter flights per day. Support of a new landing site to be established on the upper moraine at the Mid-Tasman area.	Amend Policy 7 to reduce the number of landings to an appropriate figure following review of desired tranquillity outcomes and likely effects in area.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/107	The conditions of granting concessions as referred to in Policy 7 should also include a requirement that information relating to landing locations, landing activities, numbers of people, waste management and review as stipulated by the Department shall be provided.	Amend the Policy by adding to the required list of conditions and criteria as specified above	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/108	Policy 7(b): 1. The Haupapa Place Landing Zone should be removed from the draft Plan 2. Policy 7b) should be replaced with policies relevant to any revised landing sites and zones that would replace the Haupapa Landing Zone 3. Maximum landing numbers should be calculated for each new site/zone or for the entire Place based on the principle given in submission point Key Submission 8 Park Preservation, Public Access and Aircraft	Amend Policy 7b) as follows: 1. Remove 2.3.3 Policy 7b) 2. Replace Policy 7b) as requested above	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/109	Policy 7 c): Remove Tasman Lake Landing Zone from the draft Plan. Access to this area is easy and landings will have a detrimental effect on other users	Remove Policy 7c)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Christchurch Tramping Club</i> 604/5	Do not support increased aircraft landings in the Park.	Modify Policy 7, to reduce landings to current levels or less. Reinstate user groups.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/27	Strongly support Submission 738 from Totally Tourism in relation to Policy 7(a)-(b)  Policy 7 requires a detailed description of the concession allocation process  Remove any reference to the Tasman Lake Landing Zone	Amend Policy 7 to reflect the concerns raised  Delete Policy 7(c)	
<i>McKellar, Thomas</i> 613/3	The maximum daily number of landings should be greatly reduced in consideration of multi-day park users.	Support an allowance for daily helicopter landings in the Haupapa Place Landing Zone, with the maximum allowance reduced to a level that would give satisfactory tranquillity for all Park users.	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/14	Regarding Policy 7 a) Oppose the landings at Lendenfeld Saddle. Landings in this area impinge on the quiet part of the upper Tasman for ski tourers and climbers.	These landings should be stopped.	
<i>Young, Rob</i> 628/15	Regarding Policy 7 b) Oppose the broad scale of the Tasman Glacier Landing Zone and the total number of landings per day.	This zone needs to be more specific and relate to the current landing zones. There needs to be some proportioning of the landings across these landing zones which relates to the effects of aircraft noise and the expectations of alpine users in the upper Tasman. Lower the number of landings allowed.	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/14	Refers to comments on map 17. Aircraft Landings Zones: Given changes were made, or clarification in regards to those comments (boundary for proposed Haupapa/Tasman landing zone unclear and enable landings on top of the moraine walls on both sides of the Haupapa/Tasman glacier for safety reasons) I support this policy.	Retain policy 7. Aircraft with inclusion of landings allowed on top of moraine walls on either side of the Haupapa/Tasman landing zone.	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/19	Support policy 7 (b) (i) and provides the following context: - Whilst 200 landings per day sounds like a significant number, it should be recognised that in practical terms, this will never equate to 73,000 landings (200 landings x 365 days) per annum; - Weather at Mt Cook means flights are cancelled about 50% of the time. Also, because of visitor patterns, Mt Cook is very busy in peak summer season and much	Support Policy 7 b) i) Request the addition of a clause under Aircraft Policy 7 for aircraft operators to preserve the natural ski plane landing run with helicopter's utilising the upper end of operational runway where applicable. Should remove policy 7 c); or at least require the soundscape effect/visitor impact of such activity to be measured before any concession may be granted	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>quieter in the winter months;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently, it is estimated that on a busy day, current concessionaires cumulatively conduct close to the proposed 200 landings per day limit. However, the current plan contains no such limit.</li> <li>- In this context, the proposed plan does not advocate a significant increase in operating capacity, but rather introduces a daily cap in an environment experiencing significant growth. The policy does not seek to 'open up' the Tasman. It seeks to establish daily limits, where there are currently none.</li> </ul> <p>Concerned that with the change of concession holders as part of the allocation process that there is the potential for helicopters to prevent Ski Planes from being able to land on the Huapapa Zone if they were to park across the landing run.</p> <p>Challenges Policy 7 c)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The zone contemplated is a high tranquillity zone. The introduction of helicopter flights, landing low next to the glacier lake, increases the likelihood of adverse soundscape effects; and may impact upon the visitor experience for lake users.</li> <li>- Any adverse soundscape results will not only affect policy 7 c ) concessionaires, but also, potentially, policy 7 b) concessionaires.</li> <li>- The department should consider the affect of this change, this area has been for many years respected by aircraft operators by way of remaining above 4,500ft. The affect for foot and lake users far outweighs the benefit</li> </ul>		
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/39</p>	<p>Support a landing zone at Tasman Lake, but Policy 7c) won't be commercially viable for any operator. There is a lack of understanding around commercial viability, and lack of purposeful effects based reasoning around the activity limits(see also submission on Policy 5b). The policies within this section of the draft Plan that pertain to commercial powered watercraft on Tasman Lake and aircraft landings at the Tasman Lake Landing Zone have no previous discussion (in the draft Plan) about managing the adverse effects. In fact, the Outcomes for the Recreational values of this Place state that the combination of aircraft activity with watercraft activity on Tasman Lake and motor vehicles on Tasman</p>	<p>Provide further clarification on how Policy 7 c) was developed. What was the basis for which the number of landing and time of day were formulated? Review and reconsider the number of landings per day and the timing of the landings during the day to enable a commercially viable operation for prospective concessionaires.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Valley Road means that the tranquillity levels throughout much of this Place will be low.</p> <p>Believes that if a landing zone is provided at the Tasman Lake, then the policies must reflect an opportunity that is viable for operators to engage and develop. Does not consider that six landings per day, especially for multiple operators, will be feasible. Would like further detail regarding the concept of this landing zone to better understand how it was developed, regarding both the number of landings and the time of day provisions.</p>		
<p><i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/3</p>	<p>Oppose the Haupapa landing zone.</p>	<p>Remove the landing zone from the plan and reinstate a specific landing site at below 1400m altitude only.</p>	
<p><i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/5</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 7 c) Oppose the Tasman Lake landing zone. No reason for this when there is a road with flat access within 500m.</p>	<p>Remove this from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Carla</i> 698/5</p>	<p>Landings at Lendenfeld Saddle should not be allowed</p>	<p>Remove or reword Policy 7 a) to exclude Lendenfeld Saddle as a landing zone.</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Carla</i> 698/6</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 7 b) i) Current proposed maximum is too excessive.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 7 b) i) to "no more than 100 people landing per day or 20 aircraft landings per day for tourism related activities across all aircraft concessionaires."</p>	
<p><i>Air Safaris &amp; Services (NZ) Ltd</i> 703/5</p>	<p>Support retaining Policy 7 b) i) max 200 landings per day.</p> <p>Clearly weather limitations/time of year/tourist numbers will cause variations in actual number of landings. This number would allow for an absolute peak day in Feb in future. (we are unsure of current landing numbers). If the max 200 landings per day includes the guiding concessions (helihike) it may be not enough. Average usage would be much lower annually. By defining a daily limit there is a need to cover the peak situation hence 200 probably appropriate. It may be more palatable to look at some seasonal variation or a certain number of peak days allowed every year. In reality actual landings taking place annually would average a fraction of daily max.</p> <p>Oppose Policy 7 b) ii)</p> <p>Can't see where Upper Neve is clearly defined on Map 17. Do not support requirement to shut down helicopter if pilot leaves aircraft. Companies have well managed Standard Operating Systems (SOP's) / Safety Management Systems (SMS) related to hot loading and</p>	<p>Retain Policy 7 b) i)</p> <p>Delete Policy 7 b) ii) Up to individual operators how to manage unloading/loading within landing zones.</p> <p>Delete Policy 7 c)</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>unloading. Leaving the engine running is standard practise in NZ at operational bases and remote locations when doing turnarounds with passengers. Not being able to start could be a serious issue depending on time of year, time of day and weather. There is also the risk of blade sailing, &amp; possible contact with tail boom in windy/gusty conditions. Some helicopter types are more prone to this issue than others. Pilot needs to be able to make decisions related to this. The landing locations are remote to ground based users so the noise from ground running is not an issue.</p> <p>Oppose Policy 7c) Given the noise sensitive nature of this area, low level movements from the proposed Tasman Lake Landing Zone seems inappropriate and counterproductive to years of trying to maintain minimum heights on flight paths across the Tasman lake/terminal area.</p>		
<i>Whittaker, Susan</i> 710/3	Regarding Policy 7 b) i) Oppose the number of landings per day and want this reduced as it will disturb other park users.	Reword Policy 7 b) i) to significantly reduce the number of landings allowed per day.	
<i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/6	<p>Policy 7 c) - Do not support this policy. DOC have designated this area as a Red Zone, to allow a small 100m area to land within this zone is not right. Unless you are at an airport, you wouldn't expect a helicopter to be landing in a nearby area with public access. A helicopter should be utilised to access remote back country areas that are not easily accessible to the general public at all times or for use in an emergency. Should not be granted at all but definitely not granted to one sole concessionaire to have all 6 landings, creating another monopoly within the Park, even in limited supply situations.</p>	Delete this Policy	
<i>Brookes, June</i> 716/2	Regarding Policy 7 b) i) Oppose the proposed 200 aircraft landings per day in the Tasman Landing Zone. I only support additional aircraft movements for park management and wild animal control purposes.	Remove the increases from the plan.	
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/22	<p>MCGG supports policy 7 (b) (i) for the following reasons: Whilst 200 landings per day will never equate to 73,000 landings (200 landings x 365 days) per annum; Weather means flights are cancelled about 50% of the</p>	Retain	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>time.</p> <p>Mt Cook is very busy in peak summer season and much quieter in the winter months;</p> <p>Currently, it is estimated that on a busy day, current concessionaires cumulatively conduct close to the proposed 200 landings per day limit.</p> <p>However, the current plan contains no such limit.</p> <p>In this context, the proposed plan does not advocate a significant increase in operating capacity, introduces a daily cap in an environment experiencing significant growth.</p> <p>The policy does not seek to "open up" the Tasman. It seeks to establish daily limits, where there are currently none.</p>		
<p><i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/23</p>	<p>MCGG challenges policy 7 (c):</p> <p>The zone contemplated is a high tranquillity zone. The introduction of helicopter flights, landing low next to the glacier lake, increases the likelihood of adverse soundscape effects; and may impact upon the visitor experience for lake users.</p> <p>Any adverse soundscape results will not only affect policy 7 (c ) concessionaires, but also, potentially, policy 7 (b) concessionaires.</p>	<p>The Plan should remove policy 7 (c); or at least require the soundscape effect/visitor impact of such activity to be measured before any concession may be granted.</p>	
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/43</p>	<p>The Policies on Aircraft (7 and 8, p134) are extreme in relation to the numbers of permitted landings per day. There is no limit for heli-skiing - presumably one concessionaire can operate as many helicopters as needed to fill demand . The Plan makes no attempt to justify these numbers.</p>	<p>Justify landing numbers</p>	
<p><i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/11</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 7 a) Oppose Lendenfeld landing zone. This impacts self-powered users. The proposed additional landing sites will negatively impact self-powered multi-day backcountry users</p>	<p>Remove Policy 7 a) from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/12</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 7 b) i) Oppose in part. This severely impacts enjoyment of Tasman Valley. Two hundred landings per day would result in an average of around 20 aircraft airborne within the Tasman Valley at any one time.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 7 b) i) to "a total of no more than 100 people landing per day or 20 aircraft landing per day for day tourism related activities across all aircraft concessionaires". (multiday related flights would be in addition to this.)</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/47</p>	<p>TIA does not support the change from annual to daily aircraft landing limits and strongly advocates for the current annual allocation policy to be retained.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review the allocation limits for landings in the Aroarokahe Place in relation to the concerns raised.</li> <li>2. Carefully consider and act on the feedback from aircraft</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>TIA submits that limits must enable sustainable aircraft operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Moving to a model of allocating landings with daily limit constraints (beyond those which occur naturally) will adversely impact the viability of an aircraft business and could give a misleading impression of very high annual aircraft landing numbers.</li> <li>- Aircraft operators need to utilise their allocated landings when the weather and demand allows - daily limits will seriously impact the ability for an operator to run an economically sustainable business.</li> </ul>	<p>concessionaires, guided mountaineering operators and the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association on the landing limits for particular sites/zones.</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/72</p>	<p>TIA believes that the requirements in the Plan that aircraft shut down on landing goes against industry good practice and could be unsafe. We understand that aircraft user groups already voluntarily expect aircraft to shut down on landing where safe and practicable. IA recommends that DOC continue to work with aircraft user groups to support agreements where operators shut down their machines to manage noise impact on other users whenever safe and practicable to do so.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 7(b)(ii)</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/33</p>	<p>The provision for aircraft landings in Haupapa Place is frankly outrageous if tranquillity outcomes or natural quiet are to be achieved. Additionally, the limits will lead to an unacceptably high level of air traffic releasing carbon emissions - burning ever more fossil fuel to chase the melting ice higher up the mountain. This is counter to principles of sustainability and directly exacerbates the climate change issues that cause glacial retreat.</p> <p>I suggest that a small fraction of the proposed landings would facilitate tourism but keep noise and pollution within some reasonable limit. The proposed 200 landings per day for the Tasman Glacier would mean a landing every few minutes in daylight hours.</p> <p>The proposal to allow unlimited landings in the upper Tasman for heliskiing purposes is so utterly out-of-place for a National Park Management Plan that one wonders if it was accidentally carboncopied from the wish list of whatever tourism concessionaire suggested it. Heliskiing activities should not be treated in a completely different manner to other aircraft landings, and of course their visual and noise pollution should be limited.</p>	<p>Amend 7a: "no more than 4 landings per day."  Amend 7b i: "no more than 10 landings per day."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>It is wholly inappropriate for the Plan to propose such manifestly excessive landing limits, increasing air pollution, noise, and carbon emissions. We are talking about a management plan for an outstanding and fragile natural landscape, not a hub international airport.</p>		
<p><i>Nielsen, Brad</i> 733/2</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 7 c) Oppose, do not support a landing zone at Tasman Lake. There is walking access here and helicopter access is completely unnecessary.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 7 c)</p>	
<p><i>Barnett, Frances</i> 734/5</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 7 b) i) Oppose the number of landings allowed per day. I propose that this number should be significantly reduced.</p>	<p>Amend to state a lower maximum number of landings per day.</p>	
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/8</p>	<p>Support the proposed aircraft landing limits of 6 aircraft landings per day for the Ledenfeld Saddle landing Zone and 200 landings per day on the remainder of the Tasman / Haupapa Landing Zone. The Policy should however refer to the topographical version of Map 17 to illustrate the Landing Zones.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 7 to refer to the topographical version of Map 17 to illustrate the Landing Zones.</p>	
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/11</p>	<p>Policy 7(b)(ii) requires aircraft to shut-down if the pilot leaves the aircraft within the Upper Neve area. There are serious safety concerns relating to the shut-down of aircraft in an alpine environment as follows.</p> <p>The risk of shutting down an engine at altitude at a remote mountainous landing site and not being able to re-start it. If this was to happen near the end of the day, or if weather closed in prior to another machine arriving, then risk of exposure along with other hazards presented by hostile mountainous terrain greatly increases.</p> <p>Regularly during snow landings, aircraft heaters are turned on keeping the cabin warm and dry. The heater is a function of the aircraft engine. If the engine is off, then there is no cabin heating capability. If cold / wet passengers are loaded into a cold machine there is a likelihood of the cabin windows fogging or partially fogging after lift-off which represents a significant risk to the machine and its occupants. This risk would be further exacerbated should the landing site be subjected to bright out, flat light or blowing snow.</p> <p>In addition to the above safety factors: Excessive wear on aircraft engines caused by unnecessary additional starts will undoubtedly lead to an increase in mechanical problems being encountered.</p>	<p>Remove requirement to shut down on landing if the pilot leaves the aircraft.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Additional starts will not only affect engines, but, potentially, other dynamic components also. Further, batteries and starter generators will experience reduced longevity.</p> <p>These issues will increase the financial cost to operators and subsequently visitors who utilise their services. If a pilot is to remain in the machine and keep it running (at the Upper Gieke site) the option of carrying an additional crew member to disembark and embark passengers has also been considered. The submitter confirms that this is too impractical to consider, as this will lead to an increase in costs through restricted passenger carrying capacity.</p> <p>The duration of a scenic snow landing is typically 10 - 15 minutes. The difference in noise effects from leaving an aircraft running will be negligible.</p> <p>It would take a minimum of 45 seconds after the aircraft has landed to reduce the collective fully down and shut off fuel to the engine for complete shutdown in an AS350 Squirrel and approximately 2 minutes from commencement of the start process to throttle advancement to flight idle rotor speed for take-off - all the while generating engine noise. Therefore the difference in 'tranquillity' level between a machine idling and performing shut down and start up procedures is not significant in the context of the short duration of a scenic landing.</p> <p>Tranquillity levels are therefore better achieved through management of the total volume of flights per day to an area than shutting down every machine which is landed.</p>		
<i>Kentish, Rod</i> 752/4	Oppose this landing site. Easy access for walkers.	Delete Policy 7 c).	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/33	Policy 7 c) Does not support the establishment of a Tasman Lake landing zone. Such a zone would clearly only be utilised in the provision of a tourism product.	Do not support Policy 7 c)	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/31	The provision for aircraft landings in Haupapa Place is frankly outrageous if tranquillity outcomes or natural quiet are	Amend 7 a) "no more than 4 landings per day." Amend 7 b) i) "no more than 10 landings per day."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>to be achieved. Additionally, the limits will lead to an unacceptably high level of air traffic releasing carbon emissions. This is counter to principles of sustainability and directly exacerbates the climate change issues that cause glacial retreat.</p> <p>Suggests that a small fraction of the proposed landings would facilitate tourism but keep noise and pollution within some reasonable limit. The proposed 200 landings per day for the Tasman Glacier would mean a landing every few minutes in daylight hours.</p> <p>It is wholly inappropriate for the Plan to propose such manifestly excessive landing limits, increasing air pollution, noise, and carbon emissions.</p>		
<i>McFarlane, Johnny</i> 775/9	Regarding Policy 7 b) Support the proposed landing zone at Beetham Valley for access to the Mid-Tasman Hut.	Retain Policy	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/19	<p>Do not support the approach outlined in the plan. The proposal allows for 200 landings per day at the proposed landing zone at the upper Tasman. In addition to the allowance for unlimited landings for heli-skiing, this represents a destruction of tranquillity in the valley. It is impossible to conceive that the desired tranquillity outcomes will be achieved with hundreds of helicopter flights per day.</p> <p>In support of a new landing site to be established on the upper moraine at the Mid-Tasman area.</p>	Amend Policy 7 to reduce the number of landings to an appropriate figure following review of desired effects on tranquillity outcomes, overcrowding, recreational use, carbon emissions and aviation safety requirements.	
<i>Speck, Walter &amp; Zita</i> 801/5	Regarding Policy 7 b) i) A total of 200 landings per day is hugely excessive. The goal has to be a focus on quality tourism, not quantity tourism.	Reword to allow a total of 20 landings per day in Haupapa Place.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/55	Policy 7 b) i) 200 landings per day even over a largish area is still a massive number. There needs to be a better mechanism for avoiding conflict of use by separating users e.g. scenic landings v positioning of recreationists.	Revise numbers downwards. Investigate options for avoiding conflict of use by separating users.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Doughty, Laura</i> 816/1	Oppose the dramatic increase in helicopter landings to 200 landings per day in Haupapa place. This shift favours tourists and short-term park users, who will then become the most noticeable users of the park.	Support an allowance for daily helicopter landings, with the maximum allowance significantly reduced, to a level that would give satisfactory tranquillity for all park users.	
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/14	Do not support the approach outlined in the plan. It is impossible to conceive that the desired tranquillity outcomes will be achieved with hundreds of helicopter flights per day.  I am in support of a new landing site to be established on the upper moraine at the Mid-Tasman area.	Amend Policy 7 to reduce the number of landings to an appropriate figure following review of desired effects on tranquillity outcomes, overcrowding, recreational use, carbon emissions and aviation safety requirements.	
<i>Brookes, June</i> 878/4	I oppose allowing up to 200 aircraft landings in the Tasman Landing Zone. I only support additional aircraft movements for park management and wild animal control purposes.	Amend Policy 7 to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/46	Policy 7(a): Landings at Lendenfeld Saddle, Tasman Saddle and the Darwin Glacier should not be allowed. There are plenty of other landing sites across the Tasman Glacier. Similarly, all areas above 2000m between Mt. Green on the west and as far as, but not including, the current Cornice Wall landing site AND anywhere above 2400m between Kelman and Tasman Saddle Hut should be removed from the currently proposed landing zones. These areas should be left to self-powered ski tourers and climbers overnighiting in Kelman or Tasman Saddle Huts. SPECIFIC LANDING SITES BE USED AS IDENTIFIED ABOVE. NO DAY TRIPPER LANDINGS. LANDING SITES FOR OVERNIGHT USERS ONLY AT KELMAN HUT, TASMAN SADDLE HUT , UPPER NEVE 2120M, DARWIN CORNER, RED TRACTOR, DE LA BECHE CORNER, LOWER WHITE ICE. NO HELISKIING.	Remove or reword Policy 7 a) to exclude Lendenfeld Saddle as a landing zone and rework all aircraft landing related policies to better support climbers and ski tourers, rather than day-trippers who are already more than adequately catered for.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/47	Policy 7(b): If this is per aircraft concessionaire, then 200 ski plane or heli-landings per day is completely excessive! If this is 200 people landing per day, then this needs to be clarified. Even if it is assumed that this is 200 total landings per day across all concessionaires, it results in constant	Reword Policy 7 b) i) to read: "a total of no more than 100 people landing per day or 20 aircraft landing per day for day-tourism related activities across all aircraft concessionaires" (with 5-6 person occupancy on average)," It does not include multi-day activity related flights or non-landing scenic flights, which would be in addition to this.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>noise in the Tasman Valley. As each "landing" requires both a flight up and down the Tasman Glacier, and each flight takes about 15 minutes, if aircraft can fly for 10 hours each day, this results in an average of 20 aircraft in the air at any one time! This doesn't include any that have landed on the glacier or are in the process of taking off. If the flight time is longer than 15 minutes, it results in even more aircraft in the air at once. I think anyone will agree that this is ridiculous!</p> <p>As per 2.3.3 Guiding 2. (see submission point 45), there should be an incentive for people to have more than just a transient visit of a few hours on the Tasman Glacier. Day-only tourism is very aircraft intensive and negatively impacts on the environment and multi-day activities in the area. It would be better to promote more environmentally sustainable forms of tourism, such as multi-day hut-based tours.</p> <p>There should also be a requirement for aircraft operators to communicate/work together to limit half-full or unnecessary flights ie. By combining groups and linking backflights. Too often I see flights going out empty after dropping off just 2 visitors - this is wasteful and could be avoided by better communication and scheduling. EG. THL/AGL concession pooling, however THL cannot pick up other users under this agreement, thereby increasing flights, noise pollution, etc.</p> <p>A total of no more than 100 people landing per day or 20 aircraft landing per day would equate to 32-40 flights up or down the Tasman Valley each day, which is 1 flight every 15-20 minutes - already quite a lot! This should be the absolute maximum.</p>	<p>Propose NO tourist day trip landings above Darwin Corner to limit noise pollution in upper Tasman.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/48</p>	<p>Policy 7(c): No justification for this site - see reasons given in submission point 43</p>	<p>Remove Policy 7(c)</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 8</b></p>		
<p><i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/8</p>	<p>There should be no commercial heliskiing allowed on the Upper Tasman Glacier and the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range.</p> <p>It is unfair that ski tourers should have to share the relatively few iconic ski touring objectives available with commercial heliskiers - they are not compatible.</p>	<p>Amend policy 8 to reflect the changes identified.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heliskiing.		
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/7	There should be no heliskiing on the upper Tasman Glacier. The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate to the end of their existing permit period, then no further heliskiing allowed in the Upper Tasman.	Amend policy 8 to reflect the changes identified	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/7	There should be no heliskiing allowed to take place on the Upper Tasman (and Murchison) Glaciers and the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range. These areas are the heartland of high glaciated ski touring in NZ and it is unfair that ski tourers should have to share with commercial heliskiers. The two activities are incompatible. The current concessionaires should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heliskiing allowed in these areas.	Amend Policy 8 to reflect the changes identified.	
<i>Moffat, Steven</i> 17/2	No heliskiing concessions to be granted in the Park.	Delete Policy 8	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/7	There should be no heliskiing allowed to take place on the upper Tasman Glacier. This area (with Murchison Glacier) is the heartland for high glaciated ski touring in New Zealand. The two activities are incompatible. The current concessionaires should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heliskiing allowed in the Upper Tasman.	Amend Policy 8 to remove heliskiing concessions in the Upper Tasman.	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/22	We support this policy and that the current 20-year concessions remain in place.	Retain Policy 8	
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/13	One concession per policy is against 1.3.1 General management Policy 23(c)(v) "avoiding the creation of monopoly situations"	Remove Policy or reword Policy 2.3.3.8(a) to remove monopoly situation.	
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/5	Should be no heli-skiing allowed on upper Tasman and Murchison valleys. These areas are the heartland for high glaciated ski touring in NZ. Heli-skiing and ski touring activities are not compatible. The current permit to heli-ski the upper Tasman Glacier should end at the time of implementation of the new plan.	Amend Policy 8 to reflect the concerns raised for heli-skiing activities in upper Tasman	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/7	The should be no heliskiing allowed to take place on the Upper Tasman (and Murchison Glaciers)	The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heliskiing allowed in the Upper Tasman.	
<i>Bosshard, K</i> 57/3	There should be no heliskiing near the great classic skitouring destinations in the park. These should be reserved for skiers who have walked.		
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/7	The should be no heliskiing allowed to take place on the Upper Tasman (and Murchison Glaciers)	The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heliskiing allowed in the Upper Tasman.	
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/7	Oppose heliskiing in the upper Tasman (and Murchison). Fuel intensive, noisy and creates potential for significant conflict with other alpine users. Not enough area to separate powered and non-powered access.	Remove policy 8	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/35	Phase out both of these heliski zones as previously suggested. Replace policy 8 with the following: Should phase out the Upper Haupapa Tasman heliski zone and the Haupapa Tasman heliski zone in order to enhance ski touring and other winter recreational opportunities in these areas by one of the following (listed in order of preference) A) Enacting any clauses in the current concessionaires permit that would allow the permit period to be terminated on implementation of the new management plan. B) Removing the Upper Tasman and the Tasman heliski zones from the Plan but allow the current concessionaires to see out their current permit period. Beyond that there will be no further heliskiing in the Tasman Valley. C) In conjunction with B) the current concessionaires will receive a letter of intent from DOC encouraging them to support the intent of the above new policy.	Replace policy 8 in accordance with the submission.	
<i>von Chrismar, Antony</i> 72/4	Mountain access by heli/flight should not be a highlight of NZ, ruining natural appeal and the glaciers and snowline of NZ mountains for short term selfish goals by clients and commercial operators.	Do not open up any new areas/landing zones/flight paths.	
<i>White, Mike</i> 179/6	Regarding Policy 8 a) Oppose one concessionaire per landing zone and unlimited landings per day.	Set a total daily limit and allow for multiple operators working to a MOU.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/32	Unlimited landings is not acceptable in a National Park plan!	Max 10 landings per day, among all landing sites in the Tasman combined. This includes heli-skiing and any other activities.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/15	Policy wording is misleading. Should clearly say only one heli ski operator per heli ski block as per the CMS policies	Reword policy to say: "Heli Ski blocks shall only have one permitted heli ski operator."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/36	Policy 8(a): Agree with policy if 'landing zone' equates to a 'Heli Ski Block' as per the CMS.	Reword to say: "One concessionaire per heli ski block as per the current CMS."	
<i>Cox, Rowan</i> 250/4	Regarding Policy 8 b) Oppose an unlimited number of landings in this area for Heli-skiing. Not limiting the number of landings/flights a day could cause unnecessary disturbance on other recreational users in this area if an excessive number of landings end up take place on a given day.	Reword Policy 8 b) to limit number of landings per day.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/120	Consider wording of Policy 8 is confusing. It should clearly say only one Heli-ski operator per Heliski block as per CMS policies. The plan should be reworded to coincide with the wording used in the CMS.	Reword Policy 8 to read: "One concessionaire per Heli-ski block as per the current CMS."	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/56	Heli ski sites should be removed from the Upper Haupapa/Tasman area. Should be encouraging multi-day visitors and catering for self-powered skiers and ski mountaineers who can access areas from huts. Heli-skiing should be restricted to terrain not readily accessible from huts to avoid conflict and provide an enjoyable experience for all users. Once the mid-Tasman hut installed this will provide foot access for ski tourers into these areas, and should be seen as more carbon-neutral form of recreation.	Remove Policy 8, or reword to allow for multi-day visitor landings only. Remove heli-skiing from the western side of Malte Brun Range. Give priority to multi-day ski touring over heliskiing in this area.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/35	Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Upper Haupapa/Tasman area altogether. There are already plenty of heli-ski opportunities in the surrounding areas and heli-skiers are more than adequately catered for. Their form of recreation is incompatible with Back-country skiers and ski mountaineers.	Remove or reword Policy 8 to allow for multi-day visitor landings only. In particular remove heliskiing from the western side of the Malte Brun Range.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/53	Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Upper Haupapa/Tasman area. There are already plenty of heli-	Remove Policy 8 from the plan or reword to allow for multi-day landings only. In particular remove landings from the	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	ski opportunities in the surrounding areas and heli-skiers are more than adequately catered for.	western side of the Malte Brun Range.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/25	Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Upper Haupapa/Tasman area. Heli-skiing should be restricted to terrain NOT readily accessible from huts to avoid conflict and provide an enjoyable experience for all users.	Remove Policy 8 from the plan or reword to allow for multi-day visitor landings only.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/20	Heliskiing is an incredibly intrusive activity which involves use of large noisy motor vehicle and should not be permitted in a national park.	Remove Policy 8 and all allowances for heli ski operations within the Park.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/135	Policy 8 is extremely permissive in its approach to aircraft activity in this area. The policy needs to be rewritten to be in accordance with the Act, to recognise the remote backcountry zoning, and to support non-commercial self-reliant recreation. In line with these points, aircraft landing concessions should be phased out. Letters of intent not to renew concessions should be sent to concessionaires.	Rewrite Policy 8 to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Stevens, Carole</i> 430/6	Regarding 8 b) - Oppose an unlimited number of landings for heli-ski in the Upper Tasman, it will completely ruin the remote experience.	Reword policy to read no heli-ski landings specifically. Keep the status quo.	
<i>Tiong, Sarah</i> 460/7	Unlimited landings for single concessionaires for Tasman Glacier heliskiing is manifestly inappropriate in light of the desired tranquillity outcomes for the area.	Delay setting of landing numbers pending publishing of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the documents listed in Aircraft landing policies – General;</li> <li>and</li> <li>• the documents listed in Aircraft Noise Regulation and Tranquillity – General.</li> </ul>	
<i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unlimited landings for single concessionaires for Tasman Glacier heliskiing is manifestly inappropriate in light of the desired tranquillity outcomes for the area.</li> <li>2. Clearly, an unlimited policy represents an abdication of key management tools required to deliver on National Park Act purposes.</li> <li>3. This policy and others also make no attempt to articulate why they should only apply to commercial rather than private flights, therefore failing to show how even the public use and enjoyment elements of statutory purposes, which of course are secondary to the core preservation element, are catered to.</li> <li>4. The inclusion of an unlimited policy like this is perhaps the best example of the Draft reflecting a volume-based model un-examined either as to merits or legality.</li> </ol> Comments in previous submission points as to setting	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Apply moratorium as for previous submission points</li> <li>2. Withdraw Draft and delay further public hearing pending publishing of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the documents listed in Aircraft landing policies - General; and</li> <li>- the documents listed in Aircraft Noise Regulation and Tranquillity - General.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	landing numbers, to considerations in that process, to OIA responses and to Map 5 apply identically to this policy.		
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/4	<p>The proposed numbers and scale of the landings sites contradict the desire for tranquillity as prescribed in the plan.</p> <p>The plan proposes unlimited numbers of landings for heli skiing in the Upper Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone and the Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone.</p> <p>Do not support the idea of commercial heliskiing within the Park at all, especially not on the western faces of the Malte Brun Range, and think existing concessions should be phased out. Heli skiing is a noisy activity for the rich which can equally well happen on land outside National Parks.</p>	review and prescribe landings zones much more tightly	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/23	<p>Strongly disagree with heli-ski operators being allowed to land in areas where other recreational users are not. See submission on map 7A on this. Also disagree with heliskiers having unlimited landings. I have experienced heli ski operations while I am climbing and ski touring in the Haupapa Place found it intensely annoying that landings were permitted in so many places which I was not permitted to fly to, and which degraded the experience of accessing these areas by foot.</p> <p>In general feel that helicopter use in the park should be discouraged due to it's large negative effects on the park and the environment in general. Heli-skiing is particularly bad due to the repeated shuttling each ski group requires and the stunning locations it takes place in (and spoils). Feel heli-skiing should be banned in the park. In particular opposed to helicopter access to summits as this degrades the mana of the summits concerned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delete the designated heli-ski landing zone.</li> <li>- Cease to allow heli-skiing within the park.</li> <li>- If heli-skiing is to be allowed then limit heli-ski landings to the same landing zone as for other use types.</li> <li>- Exclude summits from allowed landing zones.</li> </ul>	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/19	<p>This Policy is poorly worded and unclear. Is just one concessionaire allowed into the Tasman Landing Zone for Heli-skiing on a given day - this would establish a monopoly. Or is each concessionaire only allowed one party in each landing zone at a given time.</p> <p>Limit the number of landings.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 8 a) and b)</p> <p>a) Concessionaires to have a maximum of 2 parties per Heli-ski landing zone at any given time (Map 7.1); and</p> <p>b) 40 landings maximum for a concessionaire per landing zone per day. (Applies only to landing zones shown in Map 7.1 Heli-ski landing zones).</p>	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/6	<p>There should be no heliskiing allowed to take place on the Upper Tasman (and Murchison Glaciers). These areas are the heartland for high glaciated ski touring in</p>	<p>Remove Policy 8 and amend plan to state the phasing out of heli-skiing in the Upper Tasman.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>NZ. Even though many ski tourers will use aircraft to access their huts, it remains unfair that they should have to share the relatively few iconic ski touring objectives available with commercial heliskiers. The two activities are not compatible. The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heli skiing allowed in the Upper Tasman.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/110</p>	<p>Should phase out these heli-ski zones. Policy 8 should be replaced to reflect this.</p>	<p>1. Remove Policy 8 2. Replace Policy 8 with the following: "Should phase out the Upper Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone and the Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone" or words to that effect.</p>	
<p><i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/14</p>	<p>There appears to be some uncertainty regarding landing sites for heli-ski operators in The Park. Areas where heli-ski operators have been observed landing do not correspond with 'designated landing sites'. The CMC would like to see better transparency regarding this and whether this practice is allowed for in the heli-ski operator's concessions.</p>	<p>Improve transparency regarding heli-ski landing sites and whether landing outside 'designated landing sites' is allowed for in the heli-ski operator's concessions.</p>	
<p><i>McKellar, Thomas</i> 613/4</p>	<p>Allowing an unlimited number of landings per day per concessionaire in the Heli-ski Landing Zone is completely inappropriate.</p>	<p>Support an allowance for landings in the Haupapa / Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone, as long as a sufficiently low finite daily allowance is imposed.</p>	
<p><i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/15</p>	<p>Policy 8 a) One concession per policy is against your 1.3.1 13 iv 'avoid creation of a monopoly situation'.</p>	<p>Remove Policy or reword Policy 2.3.3.8a. to remove monopoly situation</p>	
<p><i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/7</p>	<p>Oppose heliskiing in the park. Heliskiing on the head of Tasman Glacier is in direct conflict with ski touring. There is plenty of better places just outside the park.</p>	<p>Remove this from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>Braun-Elwert, Carla</i> 698/7</p>	<p>Heli-ski landing areas should be removed from the Upper Haupapa/Tasman area as they are already catered for in the surrounding areas. Multi-day visitors should be encouraged instead.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 8 or reword to allow for multi-day visitor landings only.</p>	
<p><i>Whittaker, Susan</i> 710/4</p>	<p>Regarding Policy 8 b) Oppose unlimited landings in this area for heli-skiing. Keep the number at current levels.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 8 b) to keep the current number of landings per day.</p>	
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/44</p>	<p>The Policies on Aircraft (7 and 8, p134) are extreme in relation to the numbers of permitted landings per day. There is no limit for heli-skiing - presumably one concessionaire can operate as many helicopters as needed to fill demand . The Plan makes no attempt to</p>	<p>Justify aircraft landing numbers.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	justify these numbers.		
<i>Williman, Kate</i> 725/13	Oppose as this impacts self-powered users. The proposed limits incentivise each concessionaire to make as many heliski flights as possible to their zone, in order to compete with other concessionaires. Self-powered users of the Tasman would be likely be significantly impacted by such an increase of heli-skiers, who already have many zones available to them nearby.	Remove Policy 8 from the plan or reword to allow for multi-day visitor landings only.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/34	<p>The provision for aircraft landings in Haupapa Place is frankly outrageous if tranquillity outcomes or natural quiet are to be achieved. Additionally, the limits will lead to an unacceptably high level of air traffic releasing carbon emissions - burning ever more fossil fuel to chase the melting ice higher up the mountain. This is counter to principles of sustainability and directly exacerbates the climate change issues that cause glacial retreat.</p> <p>I suggest that a small fraction of the proposed landings would facilitate tourism but keep noise and pollution within some reasonable limit. The proposed 200 landings per day for the Tasman Glacier would mean a landing every few minutes in daylight hours.</p> <p>The proposal to allow unlimited landings in the upper Tasman for heliskiing purposes is so utterly out-of-place for a National Park Management Plan that one wonders if it was accidentally carboncopied from the wish list of whatever tourism concessionaire suggested it. Heliskiing activities should not be treated in a completely different manner to other aircraft landings, and of course their visual and noise pollution should be limited.</p> <p>It is wholly inappropriate for the Plan to propose such manifestly excessive landing limits, increasing air pollution, noise, and carbon emissions. We are talking about a management plan for an outstanding and fragile natural landscape, not a hub international airport.</p>	Amend 8 b: "5 landings per zone per day."	
<i>Barnett, Frances</i> 734/6	Regarding Policy 8 b) I oppose an unlimited number of landings in this area for Heli-skiing. This could cause unnecessary disturbance on other recreational users in this area if an excessive number of landings end up take place on a given day.	Reword Policy 8 b) to limit the number of landings per day.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/4	Policy 8 should specifically refer to the additional topographical heli ski map 7.1 with amendments to the map that illustrate the potential additions to the Park and include the Heli Ski zone and high use aircraft landing sites at Brass Peak, Liebig Dome and Liebig Range.	Amend Policy 8 as follows:  8. Should grant concessions for aircraft landings to enable heli-skiing in the Upper Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone and Murchison Heli-ski Landing Zone only as illustrated on topographical Map 7.1 and in accordance with the following limits and criteria: a)one concessionaire per landing zone; and b)un-limited landings per landing zone per day.	
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/32	The proposal to allow unlimited landings in the upper Tasman for heliskiing purposes is so utterly out-of-place for a NPMP that one wonders if it was accidentally carbon copied from the wish list of whatever tourism concessionaire suggested it. Heliskiing activities should not be treated in a completely different manner to other aircraft landings, and of course their visual and noise pollution should be limited. It is wholly inappropriate for the Plan to propose such manifestly excessive landing limits, increasing air pollution, noise, and carbon emissions.	Amend 8 b) "5 landings per zone per day."	
<i>Doughty, Laura</i> 816/2	Oppose unlimited heli-ski landings.	Support an allowance for landings in the Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski landing zone, as long as a sufficiently low daily limit of landings is imposed.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/49	Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Upper Haupapa/Tasman area. There are already plenty of heli-ski opportunities in the surrounding areas and heli-skiers are more than adequately catered for. Multi-day recreationalists should be encouraged instead, as they have a much lower environmental and noise impact and sufficient time to absorb the environment they are in, reinforcing the natural, cultural and historical values of the place. Back-country skiers and ski mountaineers, although they may use aircraft to gain access to a hut, they are from then on self-powered and their enjoyment is significantly affected in a negative way by heli-skiing activities. It is important that self-powered skiers are also catered for in the Plan. Heli-skiing should be restricted to terrain NOT readily accessible from huts to avoid conflict and provide an enjoyable experience for all users, ie. NOT IN THE TASMAN or MURCHISON VALLEYS	Remove Policy 8. or reword to allow for multi-day visitor landings only. In particular remove heliskiing from the Tasman and Murchison Valleys. With the installation of a mid-Tasman Hut this area will become well used by ski tourers and this more carbon neutral form of recreation should be given priority over heliskiing.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 10</b>		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/16	Policy 10(a): Policy should also include ATV vehicle and 4WD vehicle that can tow a trailer or fuel tanker, Also include a covered vehicle to protect workers checking the site during severe storms. A refuelling vehicle or tractor is also necessary.	Reword policy to read: "Concessionaire to use the appropriate vehicles as per their safety plan and policies for the specific equipment and maintenance requirements."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/17	Policy 10(c): Not operating between 5pm and 9am is not practical to avoid people traffic on the track. Guides are required to carry out checks and maintenance before 9am and after 5pm in many circumstances.	Reword policy to read: "The vehicle does not operate between the hours of 9pm and 6am if possible except in an emergency and also when priority maintenance is required and during storm cycles when close monitoring of lake levels is required."	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/121	<p>Oppose Policy 10(a). This should also include ATV vehicle and also 4WD vehicle that can tow a trailer or fuel tanker and also covered in vehicle to protect workers checking the site during severe storms etc. A refuelling 4WD vehicle or tractor is also necessary.</p> <p>Oppose Policy 10(c) as it is not practical. Guides are required to carry out storm checks and boat repairs and maintenance before 9am and after 5pm in many circumstances. No more than 2 trips per day is unworkable.</p> <p>Oppose Policy 10(e) as no more than 2 trips per day is unworkable.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 10 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend 10(a) to replace "4WD motor bike" to "4WD vehicle"</li> <li>2. Concessionaire to use the appropriate vehicles as per their safety plan and OSH policies for the specific equipment and maintenance requirements.</li> <li>3. Reword 10(c) to read: "The vehicle does not operate between the hours of 9pm and 6am if possible except in an emergency and also when priority maintenance is required and during storm cycles when close monitoring of lake levels is required."</li> <li>4. Delete 10(e)</li> </ol>	
<i>Campbell, Robert</i> 507/3	<p>In Policy 10 a) it states: the use of a 4wd four wheel quad bike &amp; trailer 'only'. This should include a small tractor trailer unit as there is already one in use by current concessionaire. The tractor superseded the quad bike in bringing in fuel and launching boats, Policy 10 d) The existing concessionaire vehicles (quad bike and tractor) were never stored in the village overnight. The tractor is stored at the lake edge and only stored overnight in the Blue Lakes carpark on occasion, the quad bike was stored overnight at the Blue Lakes carpark. The kayak company has no requirement for any vehicle use at the lake for their non powered activity so they have NO vehicle stored at the lake.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 10 a) "the vehicle is limited to either one 4WD motor bike &amp; trailer or a small tractor &amp; trailer. Reword Policy 10 d) "the vehicle is stored overnight at the 'lake edge' or 'Blue lakes carpark'</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/40</p>	<p>Broadly supportive of the management considerations, outcomes, policies and milestones of this Place. Considers Policy 10 (Vehicle Use) to be extremely prescriptive for a 10 year management plan, especially for a location identified as an Icon Destination and is expected to grow in visitor numbers. In the preceding management considerations discussion and the Outcomes section, there is no mention of any management issues regarding vehicle use on the Tasman Lake Track nor of the intended limitations regarding use. In this Place, potential growth for recreation opportunities is included, as Policy 1 (Recreation) provisions are for new or redeveloped walking facilities. This may also in the future give reason for other use of vehicles on the new or redeveloped track that are currently unknown. Policy 10 (does not suggest more than one concession, or proscribe a certain number) is prescriptive in its regulation of vehicle use on the Tasman Lake Track. Given the management plan's lifespan of no less than 10 years (but often more), this seems extremely restrictive for a location identified to be expecting an increase in visitor numbers. Considers it more appropriate to include a policy that enables concession conditions to prescribe specific provisions of the activity. This policy does not give much forethought to any other track system(s) that may be integrated into this Place and site during the life of the management plan, provided for by Policy 1.</p> <p>On occasion it is necessary to provide assistance to visitors who could be our guests, those of other concessionaires or members of the public. In these circumstances provision needs to be made for appropriate vehicles to be used to transport visitors to the road, to facilitate their evacuation and/or treatment. The current proposed policy is silent on this circumstance.</p> <p>Moreover, the realities of activities over the lifespan is that they change. This policy removes any likelihood of that.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 10 as it is currently worded. Review and reconsider the policy provisions to manage vehicle use but to enable the more prescriptive management to occur within a concession document.</p> <p>As an example;</p> <p>Should allow concessionaire vehicle use on walking tracks only in accordance with the following;</p> <p>a) Passengers are not permitted, except in the case of an emergency;</p> <p>b) Vehicle speed does not exceed 10km/h;</p> <p>c) Concession conditions specific to the track and vehicle operations which may include the following, but not necessarily be limited to;</p> <p>-The number of vehicle(s) and type;</p> <p>-Hours of operation;</p> <p>-Storage of the vehicle(s)</p> <p>-Number of trips</p>	
<p><i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/4</p>	<p>Support Policy 10 a) in part but would like it reworded to allow for the existing use of a small tractor and for any new concessionaire to use either a 4WD quadbike or a tractor. (additional information attached to submission)</p>	<p>Reword 10 a) to read: the vehicle is limited to either one 4WD motor bike and trailer OR a small 4x4 tractor (no more than 75hp &amp; no more than 2 metres wide) with trailer.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Ward, Bede</i> 714/5	Support Policy 10 but does not support 10 d) of this Policy. Neither of the existing concessionaires vehicles are stored back in the village overnight. They are either stored overnight at the blue lakes carpark or at the lake edge. Allowing a tractor to be stored at the lake ensures the tractor does not need to be transported back and forth along the blue lakes track as much.	Re-word 10 d) to read: the vehicle is stored overnight at the lake edge or Blue Lakes carpark.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 11</b>		
<i>Watson, Jason</i> 12/12	Strongly agree with policy. This road is vital access route for climbers/trampers to access backcountry with use of helicopters.	Retain Policy 11	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/32	I support the road being maintained to Husky Flat for public 4wd.	Agree.	
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/12	As more and more break-ins seem to be occurring (as the place gets busier), allowing climbers to park their cars up the Ball Road creates a natural barrier to opportunists. And as access up the Tasman (if walking) is already compromised, being able to drive to Husky Flat makes the whole experience far more enjoyable than crunching along a 4WD track.	Retain Policy 11	
<i>Waetford, Sam</i> <i>Edward</i> 577/20	Support the approach outlined in the plan for maintaining a 4WD track to Husky Flat.		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook</i> <i>Alpine Village</i> <i>Limited</i> 693/41	Concerned about this policy. AMCAVL operates a 4x4 concession activity on the 4WD track in the Tasman River valley from Blue Lakes to Husky Flat. It's a popular, year round activity. Therefore the policy to maintain the road until it is no longer viable due to natural processes is worrying. The detail within the draft plan is not extensive as to why and how the natural processes are having an effect on the route/track. The management considerations (recreational values) discusses the destabilisation and slumping of the moraine walls resulting in limiting access to and from the glacier to the surrounding lands. The example is valid. However, it does not specify the resulting effect on the track beside the moraine. The impact this policy will have on AMCAVL as a concessionaire is unknown at this point. This raises questions, how long until it is no longer viable? What other opportunities will there be for visitors to experience this part of the Park by this	Reconsider what options are available to the management of the track for operating 4x4 vehicles by investigating if there are other options for maintenance of the 4WD track, by means of a concessionaire for example.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>current method. It is an affordable option, and for some the only option, to get a different perspective of the environment and see first-hand what is occurring within it.</p> <p>The draft Plan states that foot access will be available as far as Ball Hut and camping next to Ball Hut may be a possibility. Therefore, AMCAVL surmises that the natural processes that will affect the vehicular access and result in no maintenance of the 4WD track, does not pose a safety threat to visitors of the area.</p>		
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/20	Support the approach outlined in the plan for maintaining a 4WD track to Husky Flat.		
<i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/15	Support the approach outlined in the plan for maintaining a 4WD track to Husky Flat.	Retain Policy 11.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Policy 12</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/136	Support Policy 12 in principle but should be conditional on the environment's ability to cope with numbers camping.	Amend Policy 12 to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/138	Support Policy 12 in principle. But should be conditional on the environment's ability to cope with numbers camping	Amend Policy 12 to address the concerns raised,	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Milestone 1</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/137	Milestones generally: Amend the milestones to reflect the matters raised in relation to the outcomes and policies. See submission points 130 - 136.	Amend the milestones to address the matters raised for the outcomes and policies for Haupapa Place..	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Milestone 2</b>		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/24	Support retaining this milestone.		
<i>Ainsworth, Lewis</i> 744/4	Support access across the tasman as it will enable backcountry users to access eastern parts of the park more easily and reduce air traffic from cyclist relocations if linked up to the A2O trail.	Retain this milestone.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.3 Haupapa Place Milestone 4</b>		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/25	Support retaining this milestone.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place</b>		

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Cromwell, Edward</i> 137/7	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Armour, Chloe</i> 159/4	Do not support any increase in air access, extent or numbers. There is already enough air access and the associated helicopter buzzing in the park.	Delete any increase in air access, both extent and numbers.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/35	Regarding 3 c) Liebig Dome landing zone - no landings allowed.	Change to No landings	
<i>Mee, Donald</i> 239/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas	
<i>Johns, Lorraine</i> 240/9	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/4	There is no cost on the Dept. of Conservation to keep these huts. They are now of historical significance.	Keep huts as is maintained by South Canterbury Branch NZDA	
<i>Gardiner, Ian</i> 253/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Low, Tyrone</i> 259/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Rainey, Heath</i> 275/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>King, Bill</i> 310/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Scott, Ben</i> 318/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Ford, Aaron</i> 319/9	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Stevenson, Dr. Anthony</i> 330/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Wilson, Dan</i> 331/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Murphy, Daniel</i> 341/9	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Elliot, John</i> 367/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Poetschke, Alexandra</i> 386/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/139	General: Consider that the management change proposed for this Place is unrealistic and will create tension with the spirit, intent and letter of the statute and General Policy		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/141	New policy: A policy should be written to allow for the outcome for re-establishment of the Murchison Hut.	Add a new policy to allow for the re-establishment of the Murchison Hut	
<i>Saggers, Eric</i> 473/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Torok, Tomas</i> 484/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Watson, Elinor</i> 502/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Shinnamon, Anu</i> 535/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Fishman, Tana</i> 546/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Fishman, Charles</i> 547/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Hudson, Joshua</i> 553/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Daws, Peter</i> 556/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Mason, Sam</i> 558/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Ross, Mary</i> 565/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Parsons, Kieran Douglas</i> 566/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/77	The NZAC considers there is no justified reason to increase aircraft landing sites on such a widespread basis as is proposed in the Pae Tata Place landing zones. The Club does not support the increase.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain the landing zones as in the current Plan.</li> <li>2. Avoid landing allocations being used up by scenic flights leaving none for recreational access</li> <li>3. Retain the remote VMZ in the current Plan</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Proposed landing numbers are far too high and in effects place no real restraint on overall landing numbers when compared to the actual landings for 2017-18. No assessment of effects of such landing numbers has been provided in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Any increase in landing limits should be done in an incremental and controlled way, based on the results of monitoring and ongoing analysis as required under the GPNP Policy 10.6(f).</p> <p>The current allocation for landings is sufficient, allowing for significant increases to occur, given that only 50% of allocation was used in 2017-18.</p>	<p>4. Any increase in landing limits should be done in an incremental and controlled way, based on the results of monitoring and ongoing analysis</p> <p>5. Daily limits should be adjusted to reflect the allocation limits in the current Plan.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/79</p>	<p>The NZAC considers that the designation of a heli-skiing zone is inconsistent with the prescriptions for a 'remote' zone setting for Pae Tata place. Instead, recreation by self-sufficient backcountry recreationists is consistent with the remote designation. The Tasman, Murchison and Mannering Glaciers are the "heartland" for readily accessible glacier ski touring in the Southern Alps. Also the western side of malte Brun is expected to quickly develop into the same once the new hut is in place in the area. All these areas are currently within the 'heli-ski zones'shown on Map 7.1. Some backcountry and remote areas should be set aside for self-sufficient recreationists where their activities will not be compromised by heli-skiing. NZAC submits that the proposed continuance of heli-ski in a remote zone should be phased out.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend the proposed heli-skiing zone to set aside some remote areas for backcountry recreation only.</li> <li>2. Phase out heli-skiing within the remote zone areas.</li> </ol>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/131</p>	<p>New Policy: A new policy needs to be added to provide for a replacement hut should the Murchison Hut site be proved to be unstable and the hut removed. The Club wishes to be involved.</p>	<p>Add new policy in 2.4.3 Policies - Huts as follows: "In consultation with the NZAC establish a new hut to replace Murchison Hut should it be removed."</p>	
<p><i>Rhynd, Keeley</i> 642/6</p>	<p>Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.</p>	<p>Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.</p>	
<p><i>McGregor, Lucy</i> 658/6</p>	<p>Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.</p>	<p>Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Rowden, Murray</i> 669/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Adank, Charlotte</i> 671/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Mitchell, Josh</i> 687/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Garden, Tom</i> 705/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/69	New policy: TIA submits that the re-establishment of Murchison Hut be included in the policies and milestones of the Plan.	Add a new Policy to provide for the re-establishment of Murchison Hut.	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/10	Map 19: Map 19 does not illustrate the proposed inclusion of the Burnett Mountains into the National Park and what landing limits would be applicable if this were to occur.	Amend Map 19 to show proposed inclusion of the Burnett Mountains into the National Park and what landing limits would be applicable if this were to occur.	
<i>DeRoy, Mary</i> 739/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Moyle, Nicholas</i> 741/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Ellis, Ben</i> 768/6	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Nicol, Ryan</i> 810/7	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/34	Fully support foot access around the Tasman Lake. Do not support any air access into the Murchison, especially not the proposed levels. With air access to the upper Tasman, and foot access around Tasman Lake, the Murchison will be very accessible without landings.	Retain all references to foot access around the Tasman Lake into the lower Murchison, and remove all policies that support air access into the Murchison and the Liebig Range.	
<i>Bouterey, Les J.</i> 833/7	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>Leder, Jakob</i> 834/11	Support CMC submission regarding the proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	Investigate proposed addition of the Liebig Range and the Godley Valleys to the Park and the World Heritage Area, provided DOC has the resources to administer these areas.	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/48	Support Outcomes, Policies and Milestones	Retain Outcomes & Policies & Milestones	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Intro</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/111	Photo page 13628/06/2020 Photo appears to be a view up the Tasman Valley towards Haupapa/Tasman Glacier	Check photo location and replace with photo of the Murchison Place as necessary.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Description and values</b>		
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/122	Historic values: Murchison hut is in this vicinity and is an historic hut.	Amend wording of Historic values to include reference to the Murchison Hut	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Assn, Nelson Branch</i> 306/5	Support proposed access over both the Tasman and Murchison rivers	Retain text as written.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/18	References to "pest control" should be amended for accuracy and clarity to "pest and wild animal control". The distinction should always be made between "pests" and "wild animals", consistent with the definition of wild animals in the Wild Animal Control Act 1977.	Amend the plan to distinguish between "pest" and "wild animals" for control purposes.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/33	Landing zone in the upper Murchison. No increase in the landing area in the upper Murchison should be allowed. An increased landing zone decreases tranquillity and remoteness of the valley, and both of these have been long standing values protected here. That should not change. Foot access to the upper Murchison is arduous, but not difficult. I support the	Keep old landing zones with small adjustments as necessary. I support a bridge over the Tasman Lake outlet. I support equal access for hunters and other recreationalists to fly to Liebig hut. No increase from current landing permit numbers.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	proposal to increase walking opportunities into the Murchison valley. I support air access to Liebig hut being available for other recreationalists as well as hunters. I support a bridge over the Tasman Lake outlet. I support equal access for hunters and other recreationalists to fly to Liebig hut. No increase from current landing permit numbers.		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/26	Recreational values Other access from the Godley Valley to the east should also be mentioned. For example, the popular 'symphony on skis' route via armadillo saddle.	Reword the sentence starting "Other access has been by foot from.." to include mention of foot/ski access from the Godley Valley to the east.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/112	Consider some of the wording in paragraph 1 to be inaccurate: 1.The description wording "upper slopes" of the Malte Brun should instead refer to "ridgeline" 2. The wording "neves along the Main Divide" is mainly incorrect, and instead would be more appropriately referred to as neves along the Malte Brun Range.	Amend the 1st paragraph as requested	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/113	Cultural values: 1st para , 2nd sentence should be written as " When seen in conjunction with ..."	Amend to correct grammatical error as identified	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/114	Recreational values: 1. There is inconsistency in statements relating to the VMZ setting and the values statements, including: - The current Plan identifies this Place as a "Backcountry Remote setting" - the draft Plan identifies this Place as a "remote" VMZ - the 1st paragraph states "This Place has been managed as a semi-remote alpine location ..." - the 6th paragraph also refers to "Opportunities exist for greater use ... without losing the sense of semi-remoteness ..." 2. The GPNP sets out requirements for determining management objectives, based on "intrinsic worth and value of place, consistent with the purposes for which it is held, which need to be preserved and protected." 3. the Club does not support the whittling down of the remoteness values of this place 4. Recreational values are not clearly identified	1. Amend the text in accordance with the submission 2. State the values of this Place consistent with its intrinsic worth as a remote zone 3. Include a statement to read: "This Place is isolated from sights, sounds and activities of other people, where visitors can expect few interactions with other groups, and need considerable reliance on backcountry skills."	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/115	Recreational values: 1. The Onslow Hut is a NZDA facility. The Club does not support aircraft landings at this site as well as at Liebig Hut 2. Correct the spelling of Liebig Dome in last sentence of 1st paragraph 3. Liebig Dome is a local name - the site should be identified as point 2405 metres. 4. In paragraph 6, replace "hiking" with "tramping"	Amend the Recreational values section as requested in submission	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/46	The challenging nature of the terrain in the Murchison Valley mean that this is the least visited area in AMCNP.	Under Historic values it would be worthwhile to include at least one account of early colonial exploration and achievement in the Murchison Valley e.g. early ascents of Malte Brun.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/47	Recreation. Some marked routes could be formed to diversify and expand the range of visitor experiences without significantly affecting the wild nature of this Place. Increased helicopter access (p139, p141) is a narrow view of the opportunities. Access across the Tasman River should be a priority (it is first in Outcomes, p142 but does not appear in Milestones, p143).	Provide for increased routes Prioritise access across the Tasman River	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Management considerations</b>		
<i>Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association</i> 10/2	The Onslow Hut and Liebig Hut landing zones need to be redefined as "all-aircraft landing zones."	Include reference to Onslow Hut and Liebig Hut "landing zones" to "all-aircraft landing zones".	
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/14	Support the concept of replacing Murchison hut	Include a policy stating Murchison hut may be replaced in a safe location	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/37	Regarding the "investigate options to re-establish a hut in the Upper Murchison Glacier" The re-establishment of a viable hut is crucial as the other huts in the area become increasingly busy at peak season.	Retain this sentence.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/123	Recreational values: It is difficult to see how sensitive areas and tranquillity zones can be protected with such huge landing zones allowed for aircraft, as illustrated on Map 19, page 140 and Map 7 page 63. Support the re-establishment of a hut in the Murchison Glacier area.  Waste management:	1. Recreational values: Ensure that a specific area is designated for landing aircraft rather than having a zone that covers all of the Murchison and Tasman right up the sides of mountains. Include a policy stating Murchison hut may be replaced in a safe location. 2. Waste management: Look at option to fine visitors \$500 or more with an on-the-spot fine for anyone relieving themselves along any of these	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	It is difficult to see how this can be controlled in wilderness areas when many front country areas such as the Hooker and Tasman Lake walks are not well controlled.	walking tracks in the MCNP, and also in the vicinity of Lake Pukaki.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/57	"Investigating options to re-establish a hut in the upper Murchison Glacier area": The Upper Murchison, Mannering and Aida Glaciers and surrounding areas are arguably the best alpine ski touring in New Zealand. The Main Divide crossing in this area is foot accessed and reliant on the alpine hut network on either side of the Divide for multi-day ski touring and mountaineering trips. Without a hut in the upper Murchison, it will be difficult or impossible to undertake such activities due to the severity of the weather.	Include a policy stating that consideration will be given to replacing the Murchison Hut.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/54	The Upper Murchison, Mannering, Aida Glaciers and surrounding areas are arguably the best alpine ski touring In the Southern Alps. Multiple ski touring and mountaineering opportunities exist in the area, which without a hut, would be difficult or impossible to undertake due to the severity of the weather in the area.	Include a policy stating that consideration will be given to replacing Murchison Hut.	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/9	Natural values: Dispute the statement regarding the presence of other "pest" animals in the Park - wapiti, wallaby, pigs and other deer. Consider this sensationalist and extreme.	Review the reference to other potential pest incursions to address the concerns raised.	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/19	References to "pest control" should be amended for accuracy and clarity to "pest and wild animal control". The distinction should always be made between "pests" and "wild animals", consistent with the definition of wild animals in the Wild Animal Control Act 1977.	Amend plan to distinguish between "pest animals" and "wild animals"	
<i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/10	Recreational values - "investigating options to re-establish a hut in the upper Murchison Glacier area":  The head of the Murchison is arguably the pearl in the ski touring crown. It is also part of the East to West crossing of the Main Divide Without a hut climbing opportunities are difficult to engage in due to the severity of the weather and the remoteness of the place.	Include a policy stating that consideration will be given to replace Murchison Hut.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/34	I support maintaining high tranquility levels of Murchison catchment. Trampers and hunters are perfectly capable of working together at the same hut. The dept should not be trying to manage them. No booking system should be introduced at Liebig. I strongly support investigating options to re-establish a hut in the upper Murchison. I applaud the dept for the intention of re-establishing Murchison Hut. This would be a very useful replacement for the closed old Murchison Hut and enable more people to enjoy the remote feel of this area.		
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/19	For all Places within the Park, the protection of natural light is as important as natural quiet and tranquillity.	Include management considerations and policy statements to protect the natural light values of these areas.	
<i>NZ Hunter Magazine Ltd</i> 511/9	Page 141, I do not support the eradication of tahr from the Park. They're a valued recreational asset and should be managed as a low number, high quality, bull biased population in conjunction with the preservation of the somewhat delicate alpine environment with its unique plant species.	No specific decision sought.	
<i>New Zealand Game Animal Council</i> 514/8	Support the continued access to landing sites in Pae Tata Place for recreational hunters and their ability to contribute to management of tahr.	Retain as written	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/117	Natural values: Refer to submission on section 1.2.1 Natural Values Policy 9 The Himalayan Thar Control Plan correctly notes the zero-density target for tahr. Reference should also be made to the National Parks Act 1980 requirement of eradication of introduced animals as far as possible.	Amend the text as requested	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/118	Recreational values - 4th bullet point: The re-establishment of a viable hut to replace the Murchison Hut is crucial for the following reasons: 1. The MurchisonHut has always been one of the mosr popular bases for glacier ski touring in the Southern Alps 2. The Murchison Hut provides a safety net in periods of heightened avalanche hazard, ensuring backcountry travellers do not need to feel committed to having to climb the avalanche prone Murchison Headwall to find	Retain the 4th bullet point	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	shelter		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/119	Waste management The Club supports the issues and actions as written	Retain as written	
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/34	<p>Section 2.4.2 of the draft Plan indicates the Department's intentions to allow increased aircraft access to the Murchison and Liebig Ranges. The CMC supports maintaining existing aircraft provisions as laid out in the existing Plan.</p> <p>Increasing aircraft traffic or allowing aircraft traffic to areas of the Park where there has previously been no traffic is not considered to be consistent with New Zealand's climate change targets and commitments.</p> <p>The CMC advocates for a footbridge across the Tasman River and Murchison Rivers to provide greater and easier access to these river valleys and also to the Liebig Range. An additional positive benefit, in the case of a Tasman River bridge, would be providing useful access for the A2O cycle way located on the true right bank of the Tasman River.</p>	<p>Do not increase aircraft traffic within the Park or allow aircraft traffic to areas of the Park which previously did not allow any traffic.</p> <p>Retain existing aircraft traffic provisions, as specified in the existing operative Plan.</p> <p>Invest in additional huts, tracks and access aids (e.g. bridges across the Tasman and Murchison Rivers and a foot track into the lower Murchison Valley).</p>	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/16	Support the concept of replacing Murchison hut. (pg 114 under recreational values)	Include a policy stating Murchison hut may be replaced in a safe location.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/34	Recreation values Submits that "investigating options to re-establish a hut in the upper Murchison Glacier area" should appear in the Milestone section of this chapter.	Add milestone or relocate within plan to milestones.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/18	<p>Natural values: ECO opposes the approach taken in the management considerations because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- :it doesn't provide management details for Aoraki EMU as described in the Description and values section, or how glacial ecosystems, grasslands, threatened species, geckos &amp; skinks will be managed &amp; protected. Will this happen solely through landscape scale pest control? And what are the impacts on sensitive areas by human use, and how will they be managed?</li> <li>- it isn't clear how landscape-scale pest control programme will deal with corridor encroaching pest plants/animals and new incursions of pests.</li> <li>- it isn't clear how increased human use will impact</li> </ul>	<p>Seek the following text additions and clarifications to "Management considerations - Natural values":</p> <p>a) Provide management details for Aoraki EMU within this place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Explain how glacial ecosystem, grasslands, threatened species, and geckos &amp; skinks will be protected and managed for.</li> <li>- Clarify if the landscape-scale pest control programme is meant to protect above biodiversity. If so, explain exactly how.</li> <li>- Also explain what the impacts on sensitive areas by human use are and how they will be minimised and managed.</li> </ul> <p>b) Provide details and clarification as to how landscape-</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	sensitive areas. What are the sensitive areas in this place?	scale pest control programme will deal with corridor encroaching pest plants/animals, and new incursions of pests. c) Explain how "increasing recreational use can result in impacts on sensitive areas". Also need to clarify what the sensitive areas are within this place.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/19	Management considerations - Waste management: ECO does not consider the plan approach to be a proactive plan for waste. It isn't clear what the specific plan behind the idea of "encouraging the responsible management of all waste" is. Who will do this?	Amend the section "Management considerations - Waste management" to explain what "encouraging the responsible management of all waste" means. Specify how this will actually be carried out and who is responsible for it.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/50	Recreational values - "investigating options to re-establish a hut in the upper Murchison Glacier area." : The Upper Murchison, Mannering, Aida Glaciers and surrounding areas are arguably the best alpine ski touring in the Southern Alps. They are also an integral part of the increasingly popular Symphony on Skis (NZ's equivalent to the Haute Route). This Main Divide crossing from East to West is foot-accessed and reliant on the alpine hut network. Multiple ski touring and mountaineering opportunities exist in the area, which without a hut, would be difficult or impossible to undertake due to the severity of the weather in the area.	Include a policy in section 2.4.3 stating that a hut in the Upper Murchison, Ada Glacier confluence be built to retain the upper alpine hut network.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Outcomes - Natural</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/120	Reference should also be made to the National Parks Act 1980 re eradication of introduced species	Amend the text as requested	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/56	Include that the place is weed-free.	Amend as in submission.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Outcomes - Recreational</b>		
<i>Moffat, Steven</i> 17/6	I support the concept of replacing Murchison Hut	Include a policy stating Murchison Hut may be replaced in a safe location.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/20	Support the re-establishment of a hut in the Murchison Glacier area.	Include a policy stating Murchison hut may be replaced in a safe location.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/14	Would like to see footbridges across both the Tasman River and Murchison River to improve access, and established tracks up the Tasman Valley.	Review the Outcomes to address the matters raised	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/140	<p>1) The outcome concerning Tasman Lake outlet access should prompt investigation of hydrological, ecological, landscape and engineering aspects.</p> <p>2) Question the outcome statement "Guided activities encourage increased appreciation of the spectacular scenery and natural values, and enjoyment of the area while also protecting the experience of other users." Submitter questions how increased commercial, aircraft-assisted activities could protect the experiences of recreational users who have accessed the area on foot.</p> <p>3) the statement "Visitors experience high tranquillity in the majority of the Pae Tata place ..." is at odds with the increase in aircraft use.</p>	Review the outcome to reflect the concerns raised. Remove or rewrite in accordance with the statute and General Policy.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/9	A foot-bridge across the Tasman River would be useful in providing access to the Huhs Veil, up the Murchison to Onslow Hut while opening up the potential for day hikes and camping across the river.		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/121	<p>The Club has identified the following issues to address:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reference to foot access which may be necessary in future belies the proposal to substantially increase aircraft access</li> <li>2. The reference to "backcountry" character should be to "remote" character.</li> <li>3. There is reference to the Murchison Hut and the difficulty of the site. However there is no policy response to this. Need to insert the following new policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- that the department, in consultation with NZAC, will re-establish the Murchison Hut in a safe location to provide accommodation for overnight use in the upper glacier area; and</li> <li>- include policy to provide for building of the hut if an appropriate site found.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. There is conflict between the outcome and the VMZ for this Place: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A stated outcome is that "visitors experience high tranquillity in the majority of Pae Tata Place ...".</li> <li>- the VMZ identified for the place is remote</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p>Amend the recreational values section as requested:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Replace the term "backcountry" with "remote"</li> <li>2. Add new policies as requested</li> <li>3. Change the outcomes to be consistent with the VMZ given for this Place, including replacing "high tranquillity" with "very high tranquillity"</li> </ol>	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/10	Support the statement "The Murchison Hut has been re-established in a safe location to provide accommodation for overnight use of the upper glacier area."	Retain text as written.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/9	Support the statement "The Murchison Hut has been re-established in a safe location to provide accommodation for overnight use of the upper glacier area."	Retain text as written	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/9	Support the statement "The Murchison Hut has been re-established in a safe location to provide accommodation for overnight use of the upper glacier area."	Retain text as written	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/10	Support the statement "The Murchison Hut has been re-established in a safe location to provide accommodation for overnight use of the upper glacier area."	Retain text as written	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/57	This is a remote area. There should be no increased air access.	Change "back country" to "remote" and "high tranquillity" to "natural quiet". Change "Increased access, including new foot access around the Tasman Lake outlet" to "New foot access around the Tasman Lake outlet".	
<i>Steward, Tim</i> 829/8	Support the statement: "The Murchison Hut has been re-established in a safe location to provide accommodation for overnight use of the upper glacier area."	Retain this statement.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Outcomes - Waste management</b>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/122	The Club supports this section	Retain as written	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Policy 1</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/23	Do not support this policy - see submission to 1.3.1 Guiding, Policy 1. The policy discriminates against people who choose to be accompanied by a professional guide. Section b) is possibly related to heli-ski numbers which we support. While our current concession states unlimited numbers we are happy to restrict to 40 clients/day.	Rewrite 2.4.3 Policy 1 to reflect the points raised, but include part b) in the new revision.	
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/15	Limiting party number to two guided parties is too few. As it is, more than two parties use the area at times and guided parties are generally the only parties in the region anyway. This will limit the scope for guiding opportunities and discriminate against people choosing to employ guides.	Remove Policy 1(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Cotter, Guy</i> 27/16	It would seem odd to have 2 parties with 40 clients. Is this policy only considering winter and summer heli-skiing and forgetting summer guiding or ski touring activities with smaller groups?	Remove policy 1(b)	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/38	The draft designates the entire Pae Tata place as remote and therefore it seems inappropriate to be used as an area for commercial helihiking as appears to be proposed in policy 1. Also no helihiking should be permitted within the Liebig Hut landing zone.	Remove policy 1.	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/18	Policy 1(b): policy is just considering winter heli skiing or summer heli hiking and forgetting summer guiding or ski touring activities with smaller groups.	Remove Policy 1(b), or reword to allow other guided activities: "No more than 40 heli hiking clients per day per concessionaire. Other guiding activities per the VMZ appendix 2."	
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/19	Policy 1(a): Limiting party numbers to two guided parties is too few. More parties use the area at times and guided parties are generally the only parties in the region. This will limit future guiding opportunities if a new hut is placed in the Murchison.	Remove Policy 1(a)	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/58	Policy 1(a): The policy as stated discriminates against people choosing to employ guides. If a new hut is placed in the Murchison, this policy will limit the scope for guided activities. Public who choose to go guided should not be excluded. It would be better to make a distinction between day tourism and multi-day guided activities	Remove Policy 1(a)	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/37	Regarding Policy 1 a) If a new hut is placed in the Murchison this will limit the scope for guiding opportunities and this policy discriminates against people choosing to employ guides	Remove Policy 1 a) from the plan.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/55	Regarding Policy 1 a) If a new hut is placed in the Murchison this will limit the scope for guiding opportunities and this policy discriminates against people choosing to employ guides. It would be better to make a clear distinction between day tourism and multi-day guided trips.	Remove Policy 1 a) from the plan.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/26	Regarding Policy 1 a) This policy discriminates against people choosing to employ guides. Members of the public who choose to go guided for their additional	Remove Policy 1 a) from the plan.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	safety should not be excluded. It would be better to make a clear distinction between day tourism and multi-day guided trips.		
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/51	<p>The proposed policy presumes that concessions should be granted. It also sets no limits on the number of concessions in each landing zone. There will be situations where applications may be declined.</p> <p>40 clients per day per concessionaire is excessive and likely to lead to numerous helicopter flights which will detract from the high tranquillity outcomes sought by the plan.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 1 to read:            "All alpine guiding concessions in the Murchison Glacier and Liebig Hut Landing Zones will:            a) be managed in line with 1.3.10 Policy 1;            b) have no more than two parties per concessionaire on the ground at any one time in the Remote Zone; and            c) only have a maximum of six clients plus one guide in each party."</p>	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/142	<p>Policies 1 and 2:            These policies should be in accordance with principles applying to remote zoning, as no evidence that a review of the remote VMZ setting has taken place.</p>	<p>Amend Policies 1 and 2 to apply to the remote VMZ setting as identified</p>	
<i>New Zealand Mountain Guides Association</i> 443/11	<p>Policy 1(a):            Allowing only two guided parties to be on the ground in the area is discriminating against guided groups.</p>	<p>Remove Policy 1(a)</p>	
<i>Loomes, George</i> 572/20	<p>There should be no commercial activity in this area of the Remote Zone utilising aircraft. (Shown as orange in Map 19). Keeping with the General Policy for National Parks 2005: 8.1(c) i &amp; iv), the use of helicopter should not be considered just because reduced foot access is an issue, this is not recognised in our National Parks Plan or General Policy for National Parks, by-passing these documents is negligent.            Would prefer a foot bridge to access the Murchison Valley.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 1</p>	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/123	<p>The Club considers that Policy 1 is inconsistent with the remote VMZ setting for this Place for the following reasons:            1. the draft Plan designates the entire Pae Tata Place as Remote            2. Policy 1 is subject to 1.3.10 Policy 1 which states that " a) the activity is consistent with the visitor management zones ..."            3. Policy 1 b) states "no more than 40 clients per day per concessionaire are guided within the remote zone." This theoretically allows up to two groups of 40 clients on the ground at any one time. This is inconsistent with</p>	<p>1. Amend Policy 1 in accordance with the submission            2. Maintain the "remote" Pae Tata Place as an area where any guiding is only of small, self-sufficient groups on multi-day trips, and concessions are granted on a basis that ensures the maintenance of the prescriptions for remote zone in Appendix 2 of the draft Plan.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	prescriptions for a remote zone.		
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/11	Regarding Policy 1 a) Limiting parties to two guided parties is too few and discriminates against guided groups.	Delete Policy 1 a) from the plan.	
<i>Strong, Carla</i> 615/12	Regarding Policy 1 b) Oppose this as it seems excessive and unnecessary.	Delete Policy 1 b) from the plan.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/10	Regarding Policy 1 a) Limiting parties to two guided parties is too few and discriminates against guided groups.	Delete Policy 1 a) from the plan.	
<i>Aspiring Guides</i> 616/11	Regarding Policy 1 b) Oppose this as it seems excessive and unnecessary.	Delete Policy 1 b) from the plan.	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/10	Regarding Policy 1 a) Limiting parties to two guided parties is too few and discriminates against guided groups.	Delete Policy 1 a) from the plan.	
<i>Sprung, Ross</i> 617/11	Regarding Policy 1 b) Oppose this as it seems excessive and unnecessary.	Delete Policy 1 b) from the plan.	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/11	Regarding Policy 1 a) Limiting parties to two guided parties is too few and discriminates against guided groups.	Delete Policy 1 a) from the plan.	
<i>Marriott, Jessica</i> 618/12	Regarding Policy 1 b) Oppose this as it seems excessive and unnecessary.	Delete Policy 1 b) from the plan.	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/17	Guiding 1 a) Is the wording of the policy to suggest only two parties, commercial and private? Or is it meant to state two guided parties? Limiting party number to two guided parties is too few. As it is, more parties than that use the area at times and guided parties are generally the only parties in the region anyway. If a new hut is placed in the Murchison this will limit the scope for guiding opportunities and this policy discriminates against people choosing to employ guides.	Remove policy 2.4.3.1.a)	
<i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/18	Guiding policy 1 b) It would seem odd to have 2 parties with 40 clients. Is this policy just considering winter heli skiing or summer heli hiking and forgetting summer guiding or ski touring activities with smaller groups?	Remove policy 2.4.3.1.b)	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED,</i>	The Murchison glacier will be a zone reserved for lower volume, more niche activity. Considers this policy approach appropriate and support it.	Support the policy approach taken.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/22			
<i>Mt Cook Glacier Guiding</i> 717/25	MCGG supports this policy. It is appropriate for the Murchison glacier to be a zone reserved for lower volume, more niche activity.	Retain	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/62	TIA is concerned at the impact on the alpine guiding sector of the proposed limits for guiding in the Murchison Glacier and Liebig Hut areas as stated in section 2.4.3 Policy 1 a). We support the submission from Adventure Consultants Ltd which states "Guiding has been part of the history at Aoraki Mt Cook for a long time and that guiding history is celebrated. Use of guides encourages safety and respect and protection for the environment. If we had only one group per concessionaire as this policy promotes the guiding industry would be destroyed. Existing limitations on guided concessions are sufficient and appropriate."	Delete or amend Policy 1(a) to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/20	Support with the exception that the link to Policy 1.3.10(c) provides a level of inconsistency because Policy 1.3.10(c) requires no more than one guided group per Concessionaire for 'alpine guiding' which is less than currently authorised.	Remove requirement for "no more than one guided group per Concessionaire for 'alpine guiding'"	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/35	Policies for Guiding and Aircraft (Policy 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) Submits, that taken as a whole, these policies represent a significant shift towards catering to the commercial tourism industry, specifically heli-skiing, heli-hiking and scenic snow landings. NZRA does not support the proposed combination of landing zones, landings per day and clients per concessionaire.	Do not support these policies.	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/58	These numbers imply parties of 20. The remote zone party size is 8.	Specify party size in line with Remote zone.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/51	If a new hut is placed in the Murchison Policy 1(a) will limit the scope for guiding opportunities and this policy discriminates against people choosing to employ guides. For example, a party doing the Symphony on Skis Traverse will not know until the day before when exactly they will traverse the Murchison Glacier - it depends on the weather and avalanche conditions!	Remove Policy 1(a)	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Members of the public who choose to go guided for their additional safety should not be excluded.</p> <p>It would be better to make a clear distinction between day tourism (high aircraft impact and zero contribution to hut fees for covering the maintenance of alpine huts) and multi-day guided trips (significantly lower aircraft impact, more in-depth user experience, smaller groups, and a greater user appreciation of conservation values).</p> <p><b>NO DAY TRIPS TO BE ALLOWED IN THE MURCHISON GLACIER.</b></p> <p>Reasonable limits on numbers of multiway recreationalists, ie ski tourers and climbers to protect the environment and prevent ecological impact.</p> <p><b>REMOVE</b> the large landing zone in the Murchison glacier. Allow Landing sites at Murchison/Ada confluence; the end of the lower white ice; Onslow and Liebeg Huts for overnighing recreationalists.</p>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Policy 2</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/24	<p>Do not support this policy - see submission to 1.3.1 Guiding, Policy 1. The policy discriminates against people who choose to be accompanied by a professional guide.</p> <p>Section b) is possibly related to heli-ski numbers which we support. While our current concession states unlimited numbers we are happy to restrict to 40 clients/day.</p>	Rewrite Policy 2 to reflect the points raised, but include b) in the new revision.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/39	Potentially large groups of guided helihikers are inappropriate within the remote zone.	Remove Policy 2	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/15	<p>Oppose against one group per concessionaire. Most concessionaires have (&amp; have done for decades) multiple trips running concurrently.</p> <p>These may be similar activities (Heli hikes/ heli ski, trekking groups) or insular but more than 1 group on instruction, ascents etc.</p> <p>Although remote, there may be a time where two independent parties from the same concessionaires coincide.</p>		
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/124	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reference to Liebig Landing Zone should be corrected to "Liebig Dome Landing Zone"</li> <li>2. Potentially large groups of guided heli-hikers as allowed for in Policy 2 are inappropriate within the remote zone.</li> </ol>	Remove Policy 2	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/21</p>	<p>Support with the exception that the link to Policy 1.3.10(c) provides a level of inconsistency because Policy 1.3.10(c) requires no more than one guided group per Concessionaire for 'alpine guiding' which is less than currently authorised.</p> <p>In addition, it is noted that while there is a definition of 'alpine guiding' there is no definition confirming what 'guiding' in Policy 2 is. It is assumed that this is 'glacier day walking/heli hiking'. In that case, it is considered that the restrictions in this Policy as they relate to such an activity within the Remote visitor management setting of the Liebig Landing Zone only, are appropriate.</p>	<p>Remove requirement for "no more than one guided group per Concessionaire for 'alpine guiding' Clarify definition of 'guiding'</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Policy 3</b></p>		
<p><i>Button, Ray</i> 14/2</p>	<p>There should be no landings on the Aida Glacier or upper Murchison neve. An alternative site could be at the foot of Mt Cooper, or at the site of a new hut</p>	<p>Remove Policy 3(a) and replace with landing site at foot of Mt Cooper or at site of new hut if rebuilt.</p>	
<p><i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/5</p>	<p>Any flight access to the western side of Malte Brun range should only be to a proposed new hut site. If any flight access over and above this is to be provided, it must only be to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above the moraine wall. Any commercial interests seeking additional new landings in this area (for sight seeing and helihiking etc) should be turned down, or should only be to specific sites so they can be avoided by those seeking a different type of exxperience, on foot.</p> <p>The Lower Darwin should be a no landing zone.</p> <p>There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall. The existing sites at Ledenfeld Saddle and Cornice Wall should remain.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 3 to reflect the issues raised.</p>	
<p><i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/25</p>	<p>We support commercial aircraft landings and an allocation process as written</p>	<p>Retain Policy 3 in its entirety</p>	
<p><i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/4</p>	<p>Any flight access to the western side of the Malte Brun Range should only be to a proposed new hut site (and only if this is inaccessible of foot). If any flight access over and above this is to be provided, it must onlt be to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above the moraine wall. Any commerical interests that are seeking additional new landings in this area for sightseeing and helihiking etc should be turned down, or</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	if landings are granted, these again must be to specific sites, so that they can be avoided by those seeking a different type of experience on foot.		
<i>Heliworks Queenstown Helicopters 2012 Ltd</i> 56/4	3 b) Six landings per day can easily be done by one operator alone. We would like this to be considered an allowance per company. Hunters prefer do be dropped off at an earlier time than 8am.	When rewording the policy We would like this to be considered an allowance per company (six landings per day), also allowance for different timeframe of landings to take place.	
<i>Heliworks Queenstown Helicopters 2012 Ltd</i> 56/5	3 c) Lie Big Dome - 20 landings a day can be easily done by one operator alone. We would like this to be considered an allowance per company	When rewording the policy, we would like this to be considered an allowance per company (20 landings a day)	
<i>Heliworks Queenstown Helicopters 2012 Ltd</i> 56/6	3 a) We think this is a suitable amount of landings across all operators.	Retain policy	
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/4	Any flight access to the western side of the Malte Brun Range should only be to a proposed new hut site (and only if this is inaccessible of foot). If any flight access over and above this is to be provided, it must onlt be to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above the moraine wall. Any commerical interests that are seeking additional new landings in this area for sightseeing and helihiking etc should be turned down, or if landings are granted, these again must be to specific sites, so that they can be avoided by those seeking a different type of experience on foot.		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/40	The Pae Tata Murchison landing zone should be removed from the draft plan. Policy 3 a) should be replaced with policies relevant to revised landing zones that would replace the Pae Tata landing zone.	Remove policy 3 a) and replace in accordance with submission.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/41	Regarding Policy 3 c) Maximum landing numbers should be calculated for Liebig Dome based on the principles of Key Submission Maximum Aircraft Landings.	Amend policy 3 c) in accordance with the submission.	
<i>von Chrismar, Antony</i> 72/5	Regarding Policy 3 a) and 3 c) Mountain access by heli/flight should not be a highlight of NZ, ruining natural appeal and the glaciers and snowline of NZ mountains for short term selfish goals by clients and commercial operators.	Do not open up any new areas/landing zones/flight paths.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Button, Margaret</i> 165/4	Do not agree with proposed landing numbers per day. Impact of noise by aircraft is excessive.	Reduce landings by 50%	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/33	Regarding 3 a) Murchison Glacier landing zone needs to be amended to state specified landing sites only. Lower total number of landings per day.	Revert from Murchison Glacier Landing Zone to specified landing sites only Change to No more than 4 landings per day total among all authorised in the Murchison Valley.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/34	Regarding 3 b) Onslow Hut and Liebig Hut landing zones - no landings allowed.	No landings allowed, other than for tahr hunters during hunting season, max one landing per week.	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/124	Review the landing zones in the Tasman and Murchison glacier areas. Look at option for designated locations to protect tranquillity and sensitive plants.	Review Policy 3 to address the concerns raised for landing zones.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/59	Policy 3(a):: This is too many landings per day in a Remote area. Should be encouraging multi-day visitors to support more carbon-neutral recreation activities.	Reword Policy 3(a)(i) to read: "No more than 10 landings per day"	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/38	Regarding Policy 3 a) i) 35 is far too many landings per day in an area which is otherwise remote, especially in the upper regions of the glacier. Mannering Glacier and Starvation Saddle should be excluded from this landing zone as these are prime ski touring areas. Heli skiers have plenty of other choices.	Reword to "no more than 10 landings per day."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/56	Regarding Policy 3 a) i) This is too many landings per day in an area which is otherwise remote, especially in the upper regions of the glacier. Mannering Glacier and Starvation Saddle should be excluded from this landing zone as these are prime ski touring areas.	Reword to read no more than 10 landings per day.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/27	Regarding Policy 3 a) i) This is too many landings per day in an area which is otherwise remote, especially in the upper regions of the glacier. Mannering Glacier and Starvation Saddle should be excluded from this landing zone as these are prime ski touring areas	Reword to read "no more than 10 landings per day."	
<i>Kirkwood, Rod</i> 307/3	Partially oppose landings in the Murchison Glacier, need to be lower numbers of landings allowed. Unlimited access to extensive areas would adversely impact on the unique value of this high mountain region.	Lower the number of landings allowed in the Murchison Glacier.	
<i>Bradshaw, Simon James</i> 317/3	Oppose additional landings, the tranquility will be massively damaged	Delete Policy 3	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/52	<p>Strongly oppose the proposed number of landings in Policy 3. The effect will be to expose the upper Murchison Glacier to intensive aircraft use. The upper névés and surrounding peaks have outstanding landscape values and high degree of natural quiet.</p> <p>The policy presumes that concessions should be granted which is at odds with the general approach to protect the high tranquillity of the Pae Tata area.</p> <p>We consider the policy to be inconsistent with Section 6 of the Conservation Act which gives primacy to the management of the land for conservation purposes. Recreation and tourism activities are not to be inconsistent with conservation management of natural resources.</p>	<p>Reword Policy 3 to read: "An application for a new, or replacement, concession for commercial aircraft landings in Pae Tata Place will: a) be assessed using an allocation process, developed in consultation with kaitiaki rūnaka and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu; b) only be allowed in the following landing zones as shown on Map 17, and in accordance with the following limits and criteria: (i) Murchison Glacier Landing Zone - no more than 10 landings per day and the aircraft shut down on landing if the pilot leaves the aircraft ; ..."</p>	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/14	<p>Reduce the number of chopper landings to Onslow and Liebig huts and on the Murchison Glacier. Recognise that this is a national park for all Nzers. Helicopter emissions are contributing to climate change. Make landing fees higher.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 3 to include: 1. Reduce the number of chopper landings on Murchison Glacier to 5 or 10 per day 2. Reduce the number of chopper landings to Onslow and Liebig Huts to two each per day 3. Charge higher fees for helicopter operators.</p>	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/143	<p>Policy 3 is very permissive of aircraft activity and needs considerable adjustment to be in accordance with the Act and General Policy. Landings should remain as at present except where access has become genuinely difficult and cable / walkwire access is unfeasible. Policy 3(b) is inappropriate as it would put excessive pressure on Onslow and Leibig huts and their surrounds.</p>	<p>Revise Policy 3 to retain landings as at their present levels as identified above.</p>	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/35	<p>There should be no more than 10 landings in the Murchison Glacier landing zone per day max. This is to ensure minimum disturbance to natural quiet. Onslow and Liebig huts, no more than 6 landings per day total between them.</p>		
<i>Morris, Jane</i> 452/13	<p>Policy 3(a) - Murchison Glacier Landing Zone: Keep it as per the other landing limits - to 10. Allowing 35 landings seems massive. On top of the already busy Tasman (with aircraft noise), it's another erosion into the semi-remoteness of the Murchison.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 3(a)(i) to 10 landings per day.</p>	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/29	<p>Appalled that landing zones will be in the Murchison Valley for recreational activities. In 2014 walked up the Murchison Valley (after getting a lift across Tasman</p>	<p>Leave the Murchison Valley alone. Do not allow any concessions for recreational flights. Create more walking tracks. Provide a formal bookable service to transport people across Tasman Lake. People</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Lake) on the way to Arthurs Pass. After a day's walk we were surrounded by 'natural quiet' at Liebig Hut. To think that we would be arriving to experience 20 landings per day would have totally destroyed the experience. We worked hard to earn the serenity; negotiating the lateral moraine between Tasman Lake and Murchison River, then walked up the valley. In ten years time there will be proposed landings zones in the Godley Valley.</p> <p>For DOC to even suggest that they want to maintain 'natural quiet', or whatever words are used is a complete contradiction when expanding the noise footprint is proposed.</p> <p>You have to be joking; 35 landings per day!</p> <p>If people can't walk to Liebig Hut, they shouldn't be going their, leave it for people who enjoy the serenity, enhanced knowing that they have worked hard to get here.</p>	<p>could then walk down the Tasman Valley, or negotiate the lateral moraine to walk to Liebig Hut.</p> <p>Look at placing footbridges to cross the Murchison River when flowing high. Although in late November crossing the Murchison River posed no problem.</p>	
<p><i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/28</p>	<p>Policy 3 c) See submission on map 19. No justification for the Liebig Dome landing zone.</p>	<p>Delete 2.4.3 policy 3.c</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/125</p>	<p>Poicy 3 a):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Pae Tata Murchison Landing Zone should be removed from the draft Plan</li> <li>2. Policy 3 a) should be replaced by policies relevant to the revised landing zones that would replace the Pae Tata Landing zone (see submission point for Map 19)</li> <li>3. Maximum numbers should be calculated for each new site/zone, based on our Key Submission 8: Park Preservation, Public access and Aircraft.</li> </ol>	<p>Remove Policy 3 a) and replace it in accordance with submission</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/126</p>	<p>Policy 3 b):</p> <p>There is no need for landings at both Liebig and Onslow Huts.</p> <p>Onslow Hut should not be a place where commercial aircraft landings are granted.</p>	<p>Remove the words "Onslow Hut and" from Policy 3 b)</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/127</p>	<p>Policy 3 c):</p> <p>Maximum landing numbers for Liebig Dome hut should be based on the principles given in Key Submission 8: Park Preservation, Public Access and Aircraft</p>	<p>Amend Policy 3 c) in accordance with submission</p>	
<p><i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/28</p>	<p>Policy 3(c):</p> <p>The allocation of 20 landings per day is inadequate. This is a well-used landing site.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reword Policy 3(c)(i) to increase the allocation at Liebig Dome Landing Zone to 100/day</li> <li>2. Include a detailed description of the allocation process in</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
611/28	<p>The Canterbury Waitaha CMS 2016, page 144 identifies the Liebig Dome area as a green zone site for frequent scenic landings.</p> <p>Do not support the shutting down of aircraft as specified - this is costly and not practical.</p> <p>Strongly support the Submission 738 from Totally Tourism in relation to Policy 3.</p>	<p>Policy 3</p> <p>3. Remove Policy 3(c)(ii) to shutting down the aircraft</p>	
<p><i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i></p> <p>688/21</p>	<p>The Liebig Dome Landing Zone to have no more than 20 landings per day. This policy approach is very restrictive, this is a high altitude landing and used for all Haupapa Landing Zone landings on inclement weather days. The soundscape affects to the greater park are far reduced with this landing zone given its high-altitude nature.</p>	<p>The department should consider the ability for concessionaires to ‘transfer’ their landing rights from the Haupapa zone to the Liebig Dome zone only on those days where the Haupapa zone is inaccessible due weather.</p>	
<p><i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i></p> <p>697/10</p>	<p>Oppose heli-hiking in the Murchison Valley</p>	<p>Amend the plan to state no heli-hiking in the Murchison Valley.</p>	
<p><i>Air Safaris &amp; Services (NZ) Ltd</i></p> <p>703/4</p>	<p>Support the Murchison Glacier Landing Zone in general. It offers good landing areas and an alternative to the Tasman glacier where there is more ground based activity (especially upper part of Tasman glacier) Although in Jan/Feb/March limited landing options within area depicted due crevasses / avalanche danger and surface conditions.</p> <p>Should have higher landing limits in the Murchison &amp; at Liebig Dome (traditional landing site with a large number of operators).</p> <p>Oppose Policy 3 a) i) Not sure how max 35 landings per day was arrived at. Perhaps needs to be max 50 landings per day. Some mechanism to allow for a limited number of peak days. I.e. peak season, a busy day after several bad weather days.</p> <p>Oppose Policy 3 a) ii) Do not support the requirement to shut down helicopter when pilot leave the aircraft during brief stops. Companies have well managed Standard Operating Systems (SOP’s) / Safety Management Systems (SMS) related to hot loading and unloading of passengers.</p> <p>Oppose policy 3 c) i) We don not support only 20 landings per day across all operators. Liebig Dome (apart from summer limitations with snow) is an</p>	<p>Higher landing limits in the Murchison &amp; at Liebig Dome. Amend Policy 3 a) i) to read max 50 landings per day. Delete Policy 3 a) ii) Up to individual operators how to manage unloading/loading within landing zones. Amend Policy to show Liebig Dome as green zone. Delete Policy 3 c) ii) Up to individual operators how to manage unloading/loading within landing zones.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>ideal/popular location for landings. It is well removed from noise sensitive areas and allows for higher altitude flightpaths. As an operator based at Lake Tekapo we can use flightpaths from the Cass, Fork &amp; Jollie Valleys to access a snow landing at Liebig Dome without leaving a noise footprint in Lower Tasman or Lower Murchison. Liebig is generally a good site for 9 months of the year. The current Concessions are under the Canterbury CMS and Liebig Dome is understood by many as not being in the AMCNP. Is it not in the Liebig Range/Upper Jollie/Cass Conservation Area? Canterbury CMS also includes both the Ridge Glacier &amp; Brass Peak landing sites both of which are regularly used. Is this suggesting that Liebig Dome is to be incorporated in the AMCNP? Oppose Policy 3 c) ii) Do not support requirement to shut down helicopters when pilot leaves aircraft during brief stops</p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Professional Hunting Guides Association</i> 713/8</p>	<p>Continued access to aircraft landing sites in the Pae Tata Place is very important to recreational hunters and their ability to contribute to management of tahr, as provided for in the draft NPMP (page 140).</p>		
<p><i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/48</p>	<p>The Policies for Aircraft (p143) enable large numbers of flights/landings on Murchison Glacier and Liebig Dome (effectively 2 - 4 per daylight hour) and are unacceptable for this essentially wilderness area. Again there is no analysis of needs/demand but concessionaires will undoubtedly promote use to reach these limits sooner rather than later.</p>	<p>Reduce numbers of landings</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/48</p>	<p>TIA does not support the change from annual to daily aircraft landing limits and strongly advocates for the current annual allocation policy to be retained. TIA submits that limits must enable sustainable aircraft operations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Moving to a model of allocating landings with daily limit constraints (beyond those which occur naturally) will adversely impact the viability of an aircraft business and could give a misleading impression of very high annual aircraft landing numbers.</li> <li>- Aircraft operators need to utilise their allocated landings when the weather and demand allows - daily limits will seriously impact the ability for an operator to run an economically sustainable business.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review the allocation limits for landings in the Aroarokahe Place in relation to the concerns raised.</li> <li>2. Carefully consider and act on the feedback from aircraft concessionaires, guided mountaineering operators and the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association on the landing limits for particular sites/zones.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/73</p>	<p>TIA believes that the requirements in the Plan that aircraft shut down on landing goes against industry good practice and could be unsafe. We understand that aircraft user groups already voluntarily expect aircraft to shut down on landing where safe and practicable. IA recommends that DOC continue to work with aircraft user groups to support agreements where operators shut down their machines to manage noise impact on other users whenever safe and practicable to do so.</p>	<p>Delete Policy 3(a)(ii) and 3(c)(ii)</p>	
<p><i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/35</p>	<p>The provision for aircraft landings in Pae Tata Place is frankly outrageous if tranquillity outcomes or natural quiet are to be achieved. Additionally, the limits will lead to an unacceptably high level of air traffic releasing carbon emissions - burning ever more fossil fuel to chase the melting ice higher up the mountain. This is counter to principles of sustainability and directly exacerbates the climate change issues that cause glacial retreat.</p> <p>I suggest that a small fraction of the proposed landings would facilitate tourism but keep noise and pollution within some reasonable limit.</p> <p>It is wholly inappropriate for the Plan to propose such manifestly excessive landing limits, increasing air pollution, noise, and carbon emissions. We are talking about a management plan for an outstanding and fragile natural landscape, not a hub international airport.</p>	<p>Amend 3a i: "no more than 4 landings per day." Amend 3b: "no more than 4 landings per day." Amend 3c i: "no more than 6 landings per day."</p>	
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/9</p>	<p>Support in part the landing limits proposed for the Pae Tata Place in Section 2.4.3 Policy 3 with the following exceptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Policy should refer to the topographical version of Map 19 to illustrate the landing zones.</li> <li>2. Policy 3(c) restricts aircraft landings in total to 20/day at Liebig Dome. Department of Conservation have issued scenic landing Concessions to THL at a landing site referred to as Liebig Dome on the basis of such a site having been located outside of Aoraki Mt Cook National Park. It is not clear whether the Liebig Dome landing site illustrated on Map 19 is the same landing site referenced in these existing Concession documents or if it is a new site with the same name. If the sites are one and the same then the existing Concessions have been issued in error. However, if it is</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Amend Policy 3 to refer to the topographical version of Map 19 to illustrate the landing zones.</li> <li>2. Increase landings at Liebig Dome to at least that authorised in the existing Concessions issued by the Department of Conservation i.e. up to 40 landings per day and no annual limit at this site.</li> <li>3. Amend Policy 3 to provide direction on the landing sites/numbers should the Burnett Mountains land transfer occur during the lifetime of the plan.</li> <li>4. Landings at Brass Peak should be 20/day and 2000 per annum.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>a new landing site intended to replace the existing site referenced in the existing Concessions, then the landing frequencies should replicate that already authorised in this area. Between the two existing aircraft landing Concessions held by THL for Liebig Dome there could be up to 40 landings per day and no annual limit at this site. The proposed 20 landings per day for all Concessionaires in Policy 3(c)(i) is a significant decrease in the historical aircraft landing activity authorised at this site. The maximum daily landing numbers should be increased to at least that authorised in the existing Concessions issued by the Department of Conservation.</p> <p>3. Policy 3 contains no direction on the landing sites/numbers for the Burnett Mountains, should this land transfer occur during the lifetime of the plan.</p> <p>4. Scenic aircraft landing limits already provided at landing sites within the Burnett Mountains by existing Concessions such as Brass Peak where 20 landings per day and 2000 landings per annum are authorised, should be identified and referenced in Policy 3. Such landings have occurred for many years and these sites are important high use landing sites when weather conditions don't allow scenic / snow landings at other locations or as is the case in the current scenario - aircraft landings for scenic purposes in Aoraki Mt Cook National Park are held in a monopoly by another Concessionaire.</p>		
<p><i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/12</p>	<p>Policy 3(a)(ii) &amp; (c)(ii) requires aircraft to shut-down if the pilot leaves the aircraft. There are serious safety concerns relating to the shut-down of aircraft in an alpine environment as follows.</p> <p>The risk of shutting down an engine at altitude at a remote mountainous landing site and not being able to re-start it. If this was to happen near the end of the day, or if weather closed in prior to another machine arriving, then risk of exposure along with other hazards presented by hostile mountainous terrain greatly increases.</p> <p>Regularly during snow landings, aircraft heaters are turned on keeping the cabin warm and dry. The heater is a function of the aircraft engine. If the engine is off, then there is no cabin heating capability. If cold / wet passengers are loaded into a cold machine there is a</p>	<p>Remove reference to shutting down if the pilot leaves the aircraft.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>likelihood of the cabin windows fogging or partially fogging after lift-off which represents a significant risk to the machine and its occupants. This risk would be further exacerbated should the landing site be subjected to bright out, flat light or blowing snow.</p> <p>In addition to the above safety factors: Excessive wear on aircraft engines caused by unnecessary additional starts will undoubtedly lead to an increase in mechanical problems being encountered. Additional starts will not only affect engines, but, potentially, other dynamic components also. Further, batteries and starter generators will experience reduced longevity.</p> <p>These issues will increase the financial cost to operators and subsequently visitors who utilise their services. If a pilot is to remain in the machine and keep it running (at the Upper Gieke site) the option of carrying an additional crew member to disembark and embark passengers has also been considered. The submitter confirms that this is too impractical to consider, as this will lead to an increase in costs through restricted passenger carrying capacity.</p> <p>The duration of a scenic snow landing is typically 10 - 15 minutes. The difference in noise effects from leaving an aircraft running will be negligible.</p> <p>It would take a minimum of 45 seconds after the aircraft has landed to reduce the collective fully down and shut off fuel to the engine for complete shutdown in an AS350 Squirrel and approximately 2 minutes from commencement of the start process to throttle advancement to flight idle rotor speed for take-off - all the while generating engine noise. Therefore the difference in 'tranquillity' level between a machine idling and performing shut down and start up procedures is not significant in the context of the short duration of a scenic landing.</p> <p>Tranquillity levels are therefore better achieved through management of the total volume of flights per day to an area than shutting down every machine which is landed.</p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/33	As submission under section 2.3.3 Policy 7 and 8, these aircraft landing limits are outrageously high.	Amend 3 a) i) "no more than 4 landings per day." Amend 3 b) "no more than 4 landings per day." Amend 3 c) i) "no more than 6 landings per day." Amend 8 b) "5 landings per zone per day."	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/60	Regarding Policy 3 a) i) 35 landings a day on Murchison Glacier is too high.	Remove or minimise the number of landings.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/52	Policy 3(a)(i) - Murchison Glacier Landing Zone: This is too many landings per day in an area which is otherwise remote, especially in the upper regions of the glacier. The Large landing zone is not workable. Remove the large landing zone and have specific identified landing sites as above. NO HELI SKIING ANYWHERE IN MURCHISON VALLEY, AND NO DAY TRIPS IN UPPER MURCHISON VALLEY.	Reword Policy 3(a)(i) to read : "no more than 10 landings per day"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Policy 4</b>		
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/9	There should be no commercial heliskiing allowed on the Upper Murchison Glacier. It is unfair that ski tourers should have to share the relatively few iconic ski touring objectives available with commercial heliskiers - they are not compatible.	Amend Policy 4 to remove heliskiing from the upper Murchison valley once the current concession expires	
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/8	There should be no heliskiing on the upper Murchison Glacier. There should be no heliskiing on the western side of the Malte Brun Range. The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate to the end of their existing permit period, then no further heliskiing allowed in the Upper Murchison.	Amend Policy 4 to reflect the changes identified.	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/6	Heliskiing should be phased out on the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range. If the proposed new hut in the area goes ahead, this will open up massive opportunities for ski touring in this range. Ski touring and commercial heliskiing are not compatible. There should be no further heliskiing in this area once the existing permit for the current concessionaire expires.	Amend Policy 4 to reflect the points raised.	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/26	We support Policy 4 and the current terms in the existing 20-year concessions.	Retain Policy 4	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Tierney, Peter</i> 53/8	Heliskiing should be phased out on the Western side of the Malte Brun Range. Ski touring and commercial heliskiing are not compatible.	The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit and then there should be no further heliskiing on the western side of the Malte Brun Range.	
<i>Davidson, L</i> 60/8	Heliskiing should be phased out on the Western side of the Malte Brun Range. Ski touring and commercial heliskiing are not compatible.	The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit and then there should be no further heliskiing on the western side of the Malte Brun Range.	
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/8	Oppose heliskiing in the Murchison, significant overlap with existing ski touring terrain, unlimited landings will also add substantial noise pollution	Delete policy	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/42	Regarding Policy 4 b) Remove Haupapa/Tasman heliski zone.q	Remove policy 4 b) and revise Map 7.1 heliski zones to exclude Mannering Glacier from the Murchison heliski zone.	
<i>von Chrismar, Antony</i> 72/6	Mountain access by heli/flight should not be a highlight of NZ, ruining natural appeal and the glaciers and snowline of NZ mountains for short term selfish goals by clients and commercial operators.	Do not open up any new areas/landing zones/flight paths	
<i>White, Mike</i> 179/7	Regarding Policy 4 a) Oppose one concessionaire per landing zone and unlimited landings per day.	Set a total daily limit and allow for multiple operators working to a MOU.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/36	regarding 4 a) Unlimited landings for heli-skiing - Change to "No more than 4 landings per day total among all authorised sites in the Murchison Valley"	Change to "No more than 4 landings per day total among all authorised sites in the Murchison Valley"	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/60	Remove heli-ski landing sites from the upper Murchison Glacier area altogether. In particular, exclude Mannering Glacier and Starvation Saddle, Aida Glacier, Mt Sydney King and Mt Phyllis from this landing zone as they deserve to remain as iconic ski touring areas. There are already plenty of other heli-skiing opportunities elsewhere.	Reword Policy 4 to read: "Should grant concessions for aircraft landings to enable access for multi-day recreationists in the Murchison Landing Zone and the Haupapa-upper Tasman Glacier area, but discontinue the upper Tasman Glacier/Haupapa landing sites for heliskiing." Allow for ski tourer/climber access.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/39	Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Upper Murchison Glacier area altogether, in particular the Mannering Glacier and from there on up. There are already plenty of heli-ski opportunities in the surrounding areas. DOC needs to show they mean it when they state they encourage "sustainable, carbon neutral recreation opportunities".	Should grant concessions for aircraft landings to enable access for multi-day recreationists in the Murchison Landing Zone and the Haupapa - upper Tasman Glacier area, but discontinue the upper Tasman Glacier/Haupapa landing sites for heliskiing, Allow for ski tourer/climber access.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/57	Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Upper Murchison Glacier area altogether, in particular the Mannering Glacier and from there on up.	Reword to read: Should grant concessions for aircraft landings to enable access for multi-day recreationists in the Murchison Landing Zone and the Haupapa - Upper Tasman	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		Glacier area, but discontinue the upper Tasman Glacier/Haupapa landing sites for heliskiing. Allow for ski tourer/climber access.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/28	Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Upper Murchison Glacier area altogether, in particular the Mannering Glacier and from there on up. There are already plenty of heli-ski opportunities in the surrounding areas.	Reword to read: "Should grant concessions for aircraft landings to enable access for multi-day recreationalists in the Murchison Landing Zone and the Upper Tasman Glacier but discontinue the upper Tasman Glacier/Haupapa landing sites for heliskiing." Allow for ski tourer/climber access.	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/144	Policy 4 takes an extraordinarily permissive approach to aircraft activity in this area zoned backcountry remote. The policy needs to be rewritten in accordance with the Act, to reflect the zoning, to support non-commercial recreation, and reflect tranquillity settings. Aircraft landings covered by Policy 4 should be phased out.	Rewrite Policy 4 to reflect the matters raised.	
<i>Stevens, Carole</i> 430/7	Regarding 4 a) Oppose unlimited landings in the Murchison Heli-ski zone. This area has a special remote feel and should only allow a few landings per day.	Reword policy to keep number of landings to status quo.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/36	Retain heliski levels at current levels.		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/29	See submission on map 19. Disagree with heli-skiers being allowed unlimited landings and landings outside the other landing zones.	Delete 2.4.3 policy 4	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/7	Heliskiing should be phased out on the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range. If the NZAC's proposed hut in the area goes ahead, this will open up massive opportunities for ski touring in this range. With the exponential growth of interest in ski touring in NZ over the past 5 years this area will become increasingly valuable and is well suited for this activity. Ski touring and commercial Heli Skiing are not compatible. The current concessionaire should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heli skiing on the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range.	Remove Policy 4 and amend plan to state the phasing out of heli-skiing on the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/128	Heli-hiking should be phased out in the remote zone by agreement or otherwise, which includes modifications to policies and heli-ski zones. Refer to Key Submission 8	Amend Policy 4 in accordance with submission	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Canterbury Mountaineering Club</i> 602/15	There appears to be some uncertainty regarding landing sites for heli-ski operators in The Park. Areas where heli-ski operators have been observed landing do not correspond with 'designated landing sites'. The CMC would like to see better transparency regarding this and whether this practice is allowed for in the heli-ski operator's concessions.	Improve transparency regarding heli-ski landing sites and whether landing outside 'designated landing sites' is allowed for in the heli-ski operator's concessions.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/49	The unlimited heli-skiing limit is in conflict with the glacier limit of 35 landings per day.	Reduce landing numbers.	
<i>Morris, Dr Jaz N.</i> 730/36	<p>The provision for aircraft landings in Haupapa Place is frankly outrageous if tranquillity outcomes or natural quiet are to be achieved. Additionally, the limits will lead to an unacceptably high level of air traffic releasing carbon emissions - burning ever more fossil fuel to chase the melting ice higher up the mountain. This is counter to principles of sustainability and directly exacerbates the climate change issues that cause glacial retreat.</p> <p>I suggest that a small fraction of the proposed landings would facilitate tourism but keep noise and pollution within some reasonable limit. The proposed 200 landings per day for the Tasman Glacier would mean a landing every few minutes in daylight hours.</p> <p>The proposal to allow unlimited landings in the upper Tasman for heliskiing purposes is so utterly out-of-place for a National Park Management Plan that one wonders if it was accidentally carboncopied from the wish list of whatever tourism concessionaire suggested it. Heliskiing activities should not be treated in a completely different manner to other aircraft landings, and of course their visual and noise pollution should be limited.</p> <p>It is wholly inappropriate for the Plan to propose such manifestly excessive landing limits, increasing air pollution, noise, and carbon emissions. We are talking about a management plan for an outstanding and fragile natural landscape, not a hub international airport.</p>	Amend 4 b: "5 landings per zone per day."	
<i>Totally Tourism Limited</i> 738/5	Policy 4 should specifically refer to the additional topographical map 7.1 with amendments to the map that illustrate the potential additions to the Park.	Amend Policy 4 as follows: 4. Should grant concessions for aircraft landings to enable heli-skiing in the Murchison Heli-ski Landing Zone and the Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone only as	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
		<p>illustrated on topographical Map 7,1, and in accordance with the following limits and criteria:</p> <p>a)Murchison Heli-ski Landing Zone - one concessionaire and unlimited landings per day; and</p> <p>b)Haupapa/Tasman Heli-ski Landing Zone - as per 2.3.3 Policy 8.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/53</p>	<p>Heli-ski landing sites should be removed from the Murchison Glacier area altogether, in particular the Mannering Glacier and from there on up. There are already plenty of heli-ski opportunities in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Multi-day visitors should be encouraged instead as they have a much lower environmental and noise impact and sufficient time to absorb the environment they are in, reinforcing the natural, cultural and historical values of the place. Back-country skiers and ski mountaineers, although they may use aircraft to gain access to a hut, they are from then on self-powered and their form of recreation is completely incompatible with heli-skiing. It is important that self-powered skiers are also catered for in the Plan. The Mannering Glacier, Aida Glacier, Mt Sydney King and Mt Phyllis deserve to remain iconic ski touring terrain for those who "earn their turns"!</p> <p>The Plan must show that it will stand by and uphold the statements relating to the encouragement of "sustainable, carbon neutral recreation opportunities" in policy 1.3.1 on page 56.</p>	<p>1. Reword Policy 4 to read: "Should grant concessions for aircraft landings to enable access for multi-day recreationists in the Murchison Landing Zone and the Haupapa - upper Tasman Glacier area, but discontinue the upper Tasman Glacier/Haupapa landing sites for heliskiing".</p> <p>2. Allow for ski tourer/climber access. As per identified landing sites above</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Policy 5</b></p>		
<p><i>Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association</i> 10/3</p>	<p>The Policy 5 restriction of recreational landings to 10 landings per annum is both unlawful and dangerous. This policy contravenes the Conservation Act Section 6(e).</p>	<p>Change Section 2.4.3 Policy 5 to read: " ... and where no more than 30 (or more) landings per year (1 January - 31 December) per hut occur."</p>	
<p><i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/145</p>	<p>Consider this policy appropriate to support non-commercial recreation. Concessions should use landing sites rather than landing zones.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 5 to require aircraft to use landing sites rather than zones.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/129</p>	<p>There is no need for landings at both Liebig and Onslow Huts. Onslow Hut should not be a place for which concessions for non-commercial aircraft landings are granted.</p>	<p>Remove the words " the Onslow Hut and " from Policy 5</p>	
<p><i>Young, Rob</i> 628/16</p>	<p>Oppose the 20 non-commercial aircraft landings at Onslow and Liebeg Hut landing zones. This group of</p>	<p>Remove this from the plan</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	users can be catered for within the allowed commercial landings. It is inconsistent with the other aircraft use prescriptions.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Policy 6</b>		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/43	Provison needs to be made for establishing a replacement for Murchison Hut should the site of the current hut be proved to be unstable.	Add new policy as follows: In consultation investigate with the NZAC a new hut to replace Murchison Hut.	
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/9	The booking facility should extend to include all huts in the valley after consultation with other owners.	Amend plan as per submission	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/146	Policy 6 is inappropriate and unnecessary.	Remove Policy 6	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/37	No booking system for Liebig Hut. The quality of the visitor experience actually would go down with a booking system, due to loss of freedom to arrive unplanned. Under Bylaws.	Liebig hut to remain open and public but not bookable.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/130	<p>The Club considers that the booking of backcountry huts is impractical.</p> <p>Refer to submissions raised in relation to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1.2.3 Policy 10</li> <li>- 1.3.1.Policy 12</li> <li>- Bylaws 13 b)</li> <li>- Aroarokaeha Place - Milestone</li> <li>- 2.3.3 Outcomes Recreational values.</li> </ul>	Delete Policy 6	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Policy 7</b>		
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/10	Maximum booking periods should be determined after considering demand; two nights is not sufficient for hunting trips.	Increase maximum booking period	
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/147	Policy 7 is unnecessary	Remove Policy 7	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.4 Pae Tata Place Milestone 1</b>		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/148	Milestone 1 is unnecessary	Remove Milestone 1	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/132	Changes to the Milestones are requested in relation to the following issues: 1. The Club does not support a booking system for backcountry alpine huts. Refer to submission on 2.4.3 Policy 6 2. A replacement hut is needed if the Murchison Hut site is proven to be unstable and the hut removed.	Make the following changes to the Milestones: 1. Delete Milestone 1 2. Add new Milestones: - "1. Established whether or not the Murchison Hut site is safe (Year 1) - "2. If the Murchison Hut site is not safe, determine a new site and establish a replacement hut in conjunction with the NZAC (Year 5)	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/50	The sole milestone for Recreation of investigating a booking system for Liebig Hut is entirely inadequate. The Plan has made other suggestions that need action/ milestones.	Add more actions/milestones.	
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/36	Submits that the inclusion of only one single Milestone in this section is inconsistent with the Departments legal requirement to foster Recreation. Whilst not legally operative, the Milestones in a National Park Management Plan are perceived as important and concrete commitments by the Department to the recreational community. Submits that the Department should utilise the Milestones section to signal its enthusiasm for fostering Recreation on Public Conservation Land.	Add more milestones in this section	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place</b>		
<i>Gordon, Douglas</i> 245/5	Red Stag Hut and Eade Memorial Hut- There is no cost on the Dept. of Conservation to keep these huts. They are now of historical significance	Keep huts as is maintained by South Canterbury Branch NZDA	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/49	Support Outcomes, Policies and Milestones	Retain Outcomes & Policies & Milestones	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Intro</b>		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/44	Applaud the protection of the Godley area as a place for self-sufficient back country travellers only.	Retain all of 2.5.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Description and values</b>		
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/10	Support the protection this Plan places on the Upper Godley Valley and Glaciers.	Retain management approach	
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/125	Historic values: Consider that there are historic values in the Godley. See references provided.	Amend Historic values section as requested.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/149	Recreational values: The statement "Commercial hunting ... still occurs and the Godley catchment is viewed as a critical location for these business opportunities." is inappropriate for a backcountry remote location in a national park.	Remove the statement identified.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/30	First sentence: "Geographically ..valley". Ski tourers regularly cross between the Godley and Murchison basins - including the 'symphony on skis' route from the Godley river, up Rutherford Stream to Armadillo saddle, and in the upper glaciers via Classen Saddle.	Reword the first sentence of 2.5.1 to recognise that there are some foot access routes used between the Godley and Murchison catchments.	
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/31	recreational values: Climbing, tramping and ski touring are all important recreational activities which occur within Pae Tawhiti Place and should be mentioned here	Reword 2.5.2 recreational values to mention tramping, mountaineering and ski touring.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/133	The Club applauds the protection of the Godley area as a place for self-sufficient backcountry travellers only	Retain all of 2.5.1 as written	
<i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/9	Use of jet boats inside the Park boundaries can take place on the Godley river. The Godley River is navigable to around 7.5km upstream from the boundary of the Park in high flow conditions for expert adventure jet boaters. Above that point the river has a very steep gradient and is fast flowing with a number of submerged boulders. It has therefore seldom been attempted. The Godley River is subject to a speed uplift under the Maritime Transport Act to McKinnon Stream and can be boated to this point at speeds greater than 5 knots within 200m of the shore.	Amend section 2.3 to recognise non-commercial personal use of powered watercraft, including jet boats, on the Godley River and the minor and transient impact on tranquillity from time to time.	
<i>Holland, Patrick</i> 718/51	Although the upper Godley is remote, it is a prime destination for dedicated trampers, climbers and hunters.  Historic values could usefully record early colonial explorations and climbs in the Godley.  The Place could be developed and promoted to reduce the visitor load in the rest of AMCNP (another hut or two. Transport options).There are good opportunities for alpine valley tramping. High passes offer more demanding backcountry adventures to local peaks (Darchaic; Mt Acland) or into the Murchison.	Add early colonial explorations and climbs in the Godley to the Historic Values section,  Develop and promote recreational opportunities in this place.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/20	ECO oppose the approach in the draft plan because: a) It doesn't provide management details for Godley River PEU, or how braided river habitat, threatened species, alpine habitat for threatened bird species, and geckos & skinks will be protected and managed. b) It doesn't specify if there are special protections and management practices given this place contains a priority ecosystem unit. c) There is no mention of waste management anywhere for this place. Even though this is a more remote area of the Park, it seems like waste management would still be applicable since there is clearly human use here (tramping, skiing, hunting, hut use).	Seek the following additions to the text : a) Explain how Godley River PEU will be managed within this place. Explain how braided river habitat, threatened species, alpine habitat for threatened bird species, and geckos & skinks will be protected and managed. b) Specify if there are special protections and management practices for this place since it is located within a priority ecosystem unit. c) Write a statement explaining what the waste management plan is for this place, given the various types of human use.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Management considerations</b>		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/45	Regarding Paragraph 3 under the Natural Values subheading: Regardless of any changes to the legal status of the unformed legal road, I submit that the plan: should not jeopardise public access through Lillybank Station. Should continue to allow 4wd access as far as Separation Stream. Should minimise the impact on indigenous values through appropriate buyt minimal markings of the route (waratahs?)	Amend in accordance with the submission.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/61	4WD access: The current 4WD track up the Godley Valley to Separation Stream is currently indistinct, with several variations. It should be clearly marked to avoid vehicles straying from the track and risking damage to nesting birds.	Reword the last paragraph to read: "Vehicles are required to remain on the track, which is marked as far as Separation Stream, but are not allowed beyond this point, so that the indigenous values of the area are protected."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/40	Regarding 4WD access - Because of birds nesting on the riverbed of the Godley riverbed the 4WD track as far as Separation Stream should be marked out with warratahs to avoid vehicles straying from the track.	Reword to state: "Vehicles are required to remain on the track, which is marked as far as Separation Stream, but are not allowed beyond this point, so that the indigenous values of the area are protected."	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/58	Regarding 4WD access: The Godley riverbeds a seasonal nesting site for several protected bird species. The 4WD track up the Godley Valley to Separation Stream is currently indistinct. with several variations, and should be clearly marked out to avoid vehicles inadvertently straying from the track.	Reword to: Vehicles are required to remain on the track which is marked as far as Separation Stream, but are not allowed beyond this point, so that the indigenous values of the area are protected.	
<i>Payne, Dr K. W.</i> 287/29	Regarding 4WD access The Godley riverbed is a spring and summer nesting site for several protected bird species. The 4WD track up the valley is indistinct with many branches and options. The track should be	Reword to "vehicles are required to remain on the track, which is marked as far as Separation Stream, but not allowed beyond this point, so the indigineous values of the area are protected.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	marked out more clearly to avoid vehicles inadvertently straying from the official track.		
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/150	<p>1) Submitter considers that the statement "Tahr are present in large numbers in this area and pose an issue for control without aircraft access for hunters." obscures Departmental responsibility for extermination of introduced pest animals in accordance with the Act.</p> <p>2) Godley Valley Road should remain freely open to the public regardless of its designation.</p> <p>3) Marking a single vehicle route up the Godley valley to Separation Stream will help maintain a functional route and minimise negative effects on other parts of the riverbed.</p>	Amend the outcomes to address the matters raised.	
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/20	For all Places within the Park, the protection of natural light is as important as natural quiet and tranquillity.	Include management considerations and policy statements to protect the natural light values of these areas.	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/6	<p>Allowing recreational access to the upper Godley which will enable Policies 7,8,9 and 10 from section 1.2.1 Natural Heritage, to be undertaken (hunting, pest control by volunteers groups etc).</p> <p>Policy 5 under 1.2.3. Recreational Values, would make four wheel driving in the upper Godley a suitable recreational activity as there is little or no conflict with other tourist users and hunters, botanists, climbers, photographers will have access to this area.</p> <p>Four wheel access would allow community groups to assist with SAR, wilding and animal pest control (as per 1.2.4. engagement paragraph)</p>		
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/37	Supports the management of this place as a remote recreational zone, free from aircraft landings.		
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/54	<p>Natural values - 4WD access;</p> <p>The Godley riverbed is a seasonal nesting site for several protected bird species. The 4WD track up the Godley Valley to Separation Stream is currently indistinct, with several variations, and should be clearly marked out to avoid vehicles inadvertently straying from the track.</p>	<p>Reword last para to read:</p> <p>"Vehicles are required to remain on the track, which is marked as far as Separation Stream, but are not allowed beyond this point, so that the indigenous values of the area are protected."</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section: 2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Outcomes - Natural</b>			
<i>The Old Mountaineers Property Ltd</i> 254/126	Work in liaison with hunters to cull tahr,	Prohibit the use of 1080 and other toxic poisons in the national park.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/135	Unclear whether submission refers to Outcomes or Management considerations The following issues are raised: 1. The Plan's intent on Godley Valley 4WD access is unclear 2. The NZAC uses 4WD access to provide maintenance for the publicly open and available Godley Hut. 3. Regardless of the changes to the legal status of the unformed legal road, we submit that the plan: - should not jeopardise public access through Lilybank Station - should continue to allow 4WD access as far as Separation Stream - should minimise the impact on natural values through appropriate, but minimal marking of the route.	Amend the Outcomes in accordance with the submission	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/61	Management of this Place as a remote area and focus on biodiversity issues is supported.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/22	The paragraph beginning "The extensive braided rivers ..." and the statement about "biodiversity management & monitoring programmes" should be in the "Management considerations" section. Paragraph lacks detail about what the biodiversity management & monitoring programmes entail.	1. Move the paragraph about braided river habitats and statement about 'biodiversity management & monitoring programmes' to the management considerations section. 2. Provide substantial detail about what the biodiversity management & monitoring programmes entail, whether there are target species and habitat, and what its goals/objectives are.	
<b>Section: 2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Outcomes - Recreational</b>			
<i>Marsden, Jason</i> 43/1	Support the continuation of 4WD access up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream. - well used by hunters and recreationists to access this area - gives persons with limited mobility and/or disabilities an opportunity to experience this magical place	Retain as written	
<i>Wilson, Wayne</i> 44/1	Support the continuation of 4WD access up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream. - well used by hunters and recreationists to access this	Retain as written	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	area - gives persons with limited mobility and/or disabilities an opportunity to experience this magical place		
<i>McMillan, Ken</i> 45/1	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Houghton, Justin</i> 46/1	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Radley, John</i> 47/1	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/13	Support allowing vehicle access only as far as Separation Stream.  Would like to see retention of vehicle riverbed access up the Godley	Retain as written to maintain vehicle access up the Godley as far as Separation Stream.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Policy 1</b>		
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/27	We do not support this policy as written with only one guided group/day/concessionaire.	Rewrite Policy 1 to be consistent with the plan.	
<i>McLachlan, W</i> 59/1	Support the continuation of four wheel drive access along the unformed road up the Godley Valley as far as Separation Stream		
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/16	Oppose against one group per concessionaire. Most concessionaires have (& have done for decades) multiple trips running concurrently. Although remote, there may be a time where two independent parties from the same concessionaires coincide.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Policy 2</b>		
<i>Jet Boating New Zealand Inc</i> 649/10	With the exception of the Tasman and Mueller terminal lakes, the use of jet boats inside the Park boundaries can only take place on the Tasman and Godley rivers. Continued use of the Godley River should be allowed.	Add a new Policy 2 a) Allow the use of non-commercial jet boats on the Godley River.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Policy 3</b>		
<i>Marsden, Jason</i> 43/2	Support the continuation of 4WD access up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain Policy as written	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- well used by hunters and recreationists to access this area</li> <li>- gives persons with limited mobility and/or disabilities an opportunity to experience this magical place</li> </ul>		
<i>Wilson, Wayne</i> 44/2	<p>Support the continuation of 4WD access up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- well used by hunters and recreationists to access this area</li> <li>- gives persons with limited mobility and/or disabilities an opportunity to experience this magical place</li> </ul>	Retain as written	
<i>McMillan, Ken</i> 45/2	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Houghton, Justin</i> 46/2	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Radley, John</i> 47/2	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed legal road up the Godley River through to the end of the road at Separation Stream.	Retain as written	
<i>Price, Alistair</i> 49/1	Support the continuation of four wheel drive access up the Godley River valley, past the Red Stag Hut, through to the end of the legal road at Separation Stream		
<i>Clark, Glenn</i> 51/1	Support the continuation of four wheel drive access up the Godley River valley, past the Red Stag Hut, through to the end of the legal road at Separation Stream		
<i>Canterbury Land Rover Owners Club Inc.</i> 55/1	Support the continuation of four-wheel drive access along the unformed legal road up the Godley Valley as far as Separation Stream		
<i>Appleton, Dr Clive</i> 62/6	Agree with not allowing vehicle access beyond Separation Stream		
<i>Canterbury Combined 4WD Clubs Group</i> 63/1	Support the continuation of 4WD access along the unformed road up the Godley River Valley as far as Separation Stream		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/46	Support policy 3 in that there should be no 4wd access beyond Separation Stream. However, 4wd access should remain open as far as Separation Stream.	Amend in accordance with the submission.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Canterbury Recreational 4WD Club</i> 299/2	We support the continuation of four wheel drive access along the unformed legal road up the Godley Valley as far as Separation Stream.	Retain text as written.	
<i>Sheppard, Mike</i> 300/2	I fully support the continuation of four wheel drive access along the unformed legal road up the Godley Valley as far as Separation Stream.	Retain text as written.	
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers Assn, Nelson Branch</i> 306/4	Support the retention of vehicle access up the Godley	Retain text as written	
<i>NZDA, Upper Clutha Branch</i> 309/11	Provision must be made to allow vehicle access, but not beyond Separation Stream.	The hut booking proposal should be extended to include NZDA huts in this area, but only on terms acceptable to them. Aircraft access is critical for hunting activity to be practical and effective.	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/38	Vehicle Use. I support vehicle access as far as Separation stream. Support.		
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/31	Marking of vehicle track in Godley valley: To minimise impacts of vehicle traffic, especially if usage rates were increase, marking the vehicle traffic could have practical advantages. It is currently obscured or ill-defined in several critical places along the valley. This leads to the traffic fanning out over much larger sections of riverbed than is necessary. In turn this also means that the amount of effort contributed by volunteers on their travels for maintaining and improving the track surface is spread out and and diluted. Encouraging one main access route that is clearly marked and becomes the focus for maintenance will help to reduce impacts on the surrounding riverbed and improve track maintenance. Recognise mechanised vehicles routes that have a long history of usage such as the main vehicle track along valley floor on the true left to the north bank of Separation Stream. Together with side routes this has been the main form of access to several huts that been established and maintained in association with road-ends for recreational access. These road-ends also have their own historical and cultural values. The huts affected include Red Stag, Eade Memorial, Godley Hut, and other private huts in the valley.	1. Recognise mechanised vehicles routes that have a long history of usage and provide access to huts established for recreational access. 2. Recognise that the road-ends and huts have their own historical and cultural values, and that vehicle access has been historically used for their maintenance and establishment. 3. Encourage one main access route that is clearly marked and becomes the focus for maintenance to help to reduce impacts on the surrounding riverbed and improve track maintenance.	

<b>Submitter and submission point</b>	<b>Submission summary</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Response</b>
<i>Backhouse, Luke</i> 559/3	Oppose the restriction of vehicle access past separation stream.	There should be more 4wd access routes in the park looked after by DOC to assist hunters in controlling tahr.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/136	The Club supports Policy 3, however access should remain open as far as Separation Stream	Amend Policy 3 to reflect the submission	
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/28	Should not maintain or allow for vehicle access beyond Separation Stream. Disagree and request access further up the valley as community work can not happen if members can not have vehicle access.	Access beyond Separation Stream.	
<i>Purdie, Dr Jennifer</i> 697/11	Support 4WD access as far as Separation Stream.	Retain 4WD access as far as Separation Stream.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>2.5 Pae Tawhiti Place Policy 4</b>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/14	Support this policy.	Retain Policy 4 as written.	
<i>Button, Margaret</i> 165/5	Support this policy	Retain text as written.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/24	Support keeping this part of the Park aircraft free.	Retain Policy 4	
<i>Spearpoint, Geoff</i> 449/39	Support		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Part Three</b>		
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/5	Lack of detailed methods for implementation. The identification and inclusion of detailed (and effective) methods for the implementation of policies, objectives, and milestones etc is one of the major aspects of any plan. Without these the Plan becomes more of a strategy document that might articulate intentions that in hindsight, cannot be implemented, or for other reasons, do not actually become implemented due to a lack of commitment or resources to do so. This is a common situation often referred to as the 'implementation gap' between policies and practice. In comparison to the existing Plan, the new draft Plan takes a far weaker approach to implementation methods. There is a major change in style and material content with hardly any methods having been included within the sections that state the specific objectives and milestones, with the exception of references to concessions which are a method of control for commercial activities only. Instead		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>there is a rather generic separate section on the use of other implementation methods that are not clearly related to specific policies or objectives. This creates considerable uncertainty with regards to outcomes. Yet certainty over outcomes is extremely, especially the given magnitude of the proposed changes.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/88</p>	<p>The NZAC raises a number of matters related to monitoring:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The General Policy for National Parks has an overall policy requirement for monitoring - Policy 12(d) The NZAC considers that this policy is not implemented in the draft Plan in many areas. The Club recommends that the draft Plan be audited against this requirement.</li> <li>2. The Introduction refers to ' monitoring and reporting, using the milestones ... ' to determine the success of the provisions. The Club considers that what needs to be monitored is progress against the objectives, outcomes and policies, all of which are legally binding. The milestones are not legally binding and provide an inadequate basis for monitoring of the Plan.</li> <li>3. The NZAC also considers that reporting to the Board and, kaitiaki runaka and Te runanga o Nagi Tahu on progress achieving the milestones as a means of monitoring the implementation of the Plan is unsatisfactory. Much more is needed, as identified above, for the Board to provide an independent view of how the Park and its values are being preserved.</li> </ol>	<p>NZAC submits that the draft Plan incorporate the recommendations made and that it be consistent with the GPNP requirements for monitoring and reporting to the Board.</p>	
<p><i>Royal Forest &amp; Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated</i> 700/14</p>	<p>An obvious omission in Part Three is an evaluation of policies and objectives and what could be carried through to the next generation plan.</p>	<p>Include evaluation of policies and objectives in all future iterations of the management plan.</p>	
<p><i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/50</p>	<p>Support Policies and Milestones</p>	<p>Retain Policies &amp; Milestones</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/59</p>	<p>A number of concerns raised with respect to monitoring and how the current plan has informed proposed changes in the draft plan :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft Plan fails to articulate the value of monitoring and - by virtue - public involvement in Park management. The monitoring work, especially with aircraft operations, goes largely unmentioned .</li> <li>2. A robust monitoring programme should be retained in</li> </ol>	<p>Review the plan to include robust monitoring programmes that address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	the Plan and a discussion of how the current monitoring programme has informed the need for changes in Pasrk management.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Part Three Intro</b>		
<i>Aoraki Mount Cook Alpine Village Limited</i> 693/42	The implementation and monitoring milestones of the draft Plan do not include reporting on the use of the Plan. The electronic version will be readily available via the Department of Conservation's website, and AMCAVL may suggest be the preferred option for users of the document. Would it be worthy to report on how often the document is being uploaded/downloaded from the Department of Conservation's website? Additionally, ensure the electronic copy is as user friendly as possible. Inclusion of hyperlinks to other external documents where they are specified (if possible) but especially links to other internal references made within the document.	Consider a reporting Milestone for the use of the electronic Plan from the Department's website. Consider including appropriate electronic links within the document to other resources and documents specified within the Plan.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/8	There should be a stated expectation that park plans will be amended during their lifetime. The current paradigm seems to be that Park plans are not expected to change , and where a change is required a partial plan review can occur. This sets up a totally unrealistic expectation that plans can incorporate the detail required to manage the park and also remain fit for purpose for ten years. DOC should commit to amending plans as required during their lifetime, and that this is states in the Plan itself.	1. Amend the plan to include a stated expectation that the park plan will be amended during its lifetime. 2. Ensure there is a fit for purpose change mechanism to amend plans, and that this includes consultation with key stakeholders including tourism operators, resourcing within DOC and responsive timelines.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Part Three Policy 2</b>		
<i>Meagher, Lucy</i> 578/8	Regarding reporting, at least annually, to the Canterbury Aoraki Conservation Board on changes, additions, and updates.	Change reporting annually to reporting quarterly.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Glossary</b>		
<i>Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association</i> 10/1	There is no definition for "Landing Zone". The term "landing area" needs to define whether such areas are for the use of fixed wing and/or rotary wing aircraft..	Insert the following definition: "Landing zone means an area where commercial and recreational fixed wing and rotary wing aircraft may land."	
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/21	a number of changes are requested: 1. Definitions of "game" and "game animals" should be included in full. A cross-reference to statute is not enough	Amend the Glossary to address the issues raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>2. Include a definition (non statutory) of "pest"</p> <p>3. Oppose the lumping together of "wild animals" with "pests",</p> <p>4. The definition for the Roar period is incorrect. This should be amended to extend to mid-April or later if Easter occurs after 16 April</p> <p>5. Cannot understand the definition for "priority ecosystem unit"</p> <p>6. Include definitions for "resource", "spatial plan", "stretch goal, "whānui expression".</p>		
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/33</p>	<p>Currently, there is no definition of 'heli-skiing' provided in the Plan. For inclusivity, it is also import to ensure that the provisions for 'heli-skiing' are inclusive of non-commercial recreationalists wanting the access the same locations by helicopter.</p>	<p>Include a definition for the term 'heli-skiing' that is inclusive of non-commercial recreationalists wanting the access the same locations by helicopter.</p>	
<p><i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/21</p>	<p>Include a definition for Natural Light Cycle</p>	<p>Add: Natural light cycle - Natural ambient conditions of light from day/night, seasonal and lunar variations, unchanged by artificial light sources.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/137</p>	<p>1. Cross-referencing definitions in grey is frustrating and unnecessariky time consuming for readers. The definitions should be in full, maintaining the references as well. The Glossary of the current Plan and the Paparoa NPMP are models on both counts.</p> <p>2. New definitions required for the following terms:</p> <p>1) "Human waste" - which is understood to mean faeces, urine and menstrual waste</p> <p>2) "Approved waste receptacle" - which, for human waste, is understood to mean public toilet or other receptacle specifically designed and labelled as being for human waste.</p> <p>3) "Pack-out" - which is understood to mean carrying one's own human waste out from a tramp or climb to an approved waste receptacle for human waste, rather than leaving it in the outdoors.</p> <p>4) "Bolts" which are used by climbers for the purpose of recreation</p> <p>5) "Heli-skiing" and Heli-hiking"</p> <p>6) Key terms such as "intrinsic worth" and "consultation"</p>	<p>1. Include all critical terms and definitions as identified in submission</p> <p>2. Repeat definitions from legislation and GPNP</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	3. Definitions given only by reference to legislation and General Policy should be included in full		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/62	Regarding the header "Destination Management" - The phrase "how the destination is marketed" is a tourism promotion phrase. DoC should be considering how information about the destination is presented and disseminated.	Rephrase how information about the destination is presented and disseminated.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Appendix 1</b>		
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/37	Regarding Cultural materials - The gathering and the use of 'cultural materials' in a national park is against the law, as all plants and animals are protected.	Remove any reference to a gathering and use of 'cultural materials' collected in a national park.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/38	Regarding Freshwater Fisheries - Eels are endangered, and any eel harvest is unsustainable.	All eeling to be strictly prohibited, whether 'customary', 'recreational' or 'commercial', since it is not sustainable.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Appendix 2</b>		
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/11	Oppose as the prescriptions fail to appropriately provide for people with disabilities.	Amend wording of Accessibility settings for Urban, Rural and Front country from "most ages and abilities" to "all ages and abilities"	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/18	<p>Visitor Management Zone prescriptions - Concession operations, page 178:</p> <p>TIA endorses the statement that "Concessionaire client activities should not be advantaged or disadvantaged compared with non-concessionaire visitors, unless there is a specified reason for different management"</p> <p>TIA supports the above mentioned statement in Appendix Two and submits that it be included as a cornerstone statement in Section 1.2.3 Recreational Values.</p>	<p>Retain the "Concessions operations" statement identified above</p> <p>Amend section 1.2.3 to include this statement as a cornerstone statement.</p>	
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/63	Desired visitor experience for back country walk-ins - claiming that noise is "generally accepted" is not valid except for those having food parcels dropped in.	Delete "Generally accepting of occasional intrusion of noise"	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Appendix 4</b>		
<i>Conning, Linda</i> 802/64	It is not clear whether the items referring to "future" actions e.g. deer control are intended in the life of this plan.	Clarify as in submission.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Appendix 5</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Hargreaves, Lynley</i> 732/3	The list of sites with geological significance is short, arbitrary, and is full of errors.	The list of geopreservation sites in the park need to be properly proof read and typographical errors corrected. The place names should also be updated to include Māori names. Also include the glaciers in the list of geopreservation sites.	
<b>Section: Appendix 7</b>			
<i>Aoraki Mackenzie International Dark Sky Reserve &amp; Royal Astronomical Societ</i> 493/22	This is a good overview of the AMIDSR.	Add: "Astro-tourism has attracted many people to Lake Tekapo which will soon boast an astro-feature sundial and an International Astronomy Centre in the village."	
<b>Section: Maps</b>			
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/5	General - the management plan fails to provide a map of existing and proposed access for people with a disability	Include an additional map that identifies existing and proposed access points for people with a disability including, but not limited to, an accessible trail to a Lake Tasman viewpoint, accessible toilet facilities, improved access to Hooker valley track and access in and around the village.	
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/1	General concern about poor quality of maps - poor clarity and specifics	Amend maps to address concerns raised.	
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/1	Maps are too small and hard to read/discern boundaries		
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/2	Submits that many of the maps contained in the Draft were of insufficient resolution and detail for stakeholders to easily interpret. Acknowledge that later in the process, more detailed Maps were provided online. Also acknowledge that the interactive map is an excellent tool and encourage the Department to utilise it in future planning processes.	Use interactive maps in future planning processes.	
<b>Section: Maps Map 1: Overview</b>			
<i>Federated Mountain Clubs</i> 424/9	Maps, appropriately show areas of significance, but they lack definition. Broad context is important to show the Aoraki/Mount Cook National Park within the nationwide system of national parks and World Heritage areas.	Amend to ensure all maps have high definition. Include further mapping that shows Aoraki/Mount Cook NP within the nationwide systems of national parks and World Heritage areas..	
<b>Section: Maps Map 2: World Heritage Area and Dark Sky Reserve</b>			

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/8	Mount Cook National Park needs stand out on the map. The idea is to show AMCP in context. The current map fails in this respect.	Highlight Mt Cook National Park in a standout colour. Remove the heavy boundary, as this is implied if it is correctly highlighted.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 3: Ecosystem priorities</b>		
<i>van den Bersselaar, Sue (NZDA)</i> 336/10	EMUs span areas that fall both within and outside the Park, but no explanation as to how they are to be managed in an integrated way. For example how will tahr be managed consistent with the Thar Management Plan?	Amend plan to consider NP border issues as part of the general management of tahr.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/9	AMCNP is a more detailed map. Not sure what is attempted to be shown here.	Reword to clarify what this map is trying to illustrate.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 4: Visitor management zones</b>		
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/2	This remote designation is inconsistent with the proposed 'opening up' of the valley to flight access during summer with a landing site at Pudding Rock	Retain the 'remote' designation for the Upper Hooker Valley	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/3	The eastern side of the main divide, North of the Minarets, up to and including Mt Elie de Beaumont and the Anna Glacier are designated as remote. This is appropriate, but this is inconsistent with the Upper Tasman Heliski Zone. An area is not remote when a group of commercial heliskiers might land within 500m of you.	Retain the remote designation. Remove this area from the Upper Tasman Heliski Zone or remove the Upper Tasman Heliski Zone from the draft.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/4	The eastern flanks of the Minarets and Mt De la Beche have been excluded from the remote zone. There is no reason for their exclusion.	Add the eastern flanks of the Minarets and Mt De la Beche area to the remote zone.	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/5	The ridge from Lendenfeld Saddle to Mt Aylmer is in the remote zone. This is inconsistent with its inclusion in the Upper Tasman Heliski Zone. An area is not remote If heliskiers can land within 500m of you.	Remove the Upper Tasman Heliski Zone from the area identified.	
<i>von Chrismar, Antony</i> 72/1	Oppose the expansion of the "Backcountry and walk in zone".	Retain current zoning.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/5	Several changes have been proposed to the current Visitor Management Zones, without any justification.	Reinstate the current Visitor Management Zones - without relaxing them. Add better maps, clearly showing the boundaries for each zone.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/4	Significant changes have been proposed to the Visitor Management Zones without any justification, e.g. removal of much of the Tasman valley from the Remote	Reinstate the previous visitor management zones.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	Zone. These changes have a significant impact on the natural values of the park and represent further encroachment of commercial values.		
<i>Taylor, Ryan</i> 439/4	Strongly against any remote/wilderness areas being demoted to backcountry. This seems to be to enable more air access. Makes more sense to increase air access in areas where there is already high impact.		
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/3	Changes to Visitor Management Zones. Major changes have been proposed to the Visitor Management Zones that are not clearly justified and with little supporting documentation or impact assessment. For example, a large tract of land in the Tasman valley has been removed from the Remote zone into the Backcountry accessible and walk-in zone. This has major consequences. For example, in the Remote zone, the desired visitor experience and interactions include reasonable expectation of isolation from sights, sounds and activities of other people, and considerable reliance on backcountry skills. In the Backcountry zone the desired visitor experience includes acceptance of greater noise levels in addition to many other differences. This directly contradicts the purpose of national parks under Act which require natural features, biodiversity, and other characteristics of the natural environment to be preserved along with the experiences people associated with them. The idea of incremental development that increases the level of human impact is clearly incompatible and undermines the purpose and ethos of having established national parks in the first place. These proposals call into question New Zealand's view of protected areas and their management as defined against international benchmarks, particularly those of the IUCN.		
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/10	Visitor Management Zones. Major changes have been proposed to the Visitor Management Zones that are not clearly justified and with little supporting documentation or impact assessment. For example, a large tract of land in the Tasman valley has been removed from the Remote zone into the Backcountry accessible and walk-in zone. Such changes have major consequences on the maintenance of park values and directly contradict purposes of the National Parks Act. In particular, section 4 of the Act states: It is hereby declared that the	1. Reinstate the existing Visitor Management Zones. 2. Provide updated maps that clearly show the boundaries of the Visitor Management Zones. 3. Within the Plan, clearly state the rationale for not changing the Visitor Management Zones. 4. Make any other consequential changes necessary in the text.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>provisions of this Act shall have effect for the purpose of preserving in perpetuity as national parks, for their intrinsic worth and for the benefit, use, and enjoyment of the public, areas of New Zealand that contain scenery of such distinctive quality, ecological systems, or natural features so beautiful, unique, or scientifically important that their preservation is in the national interest. Important phrases include 'preserving in perpetuity' and 'areas of New Zealand'. How could an area be preserved in perpetuity through the application of management zones that provide control over human impacts but are then switched to a different arrangement of the same management zones for which the controls are much reduced for the very same human impacts? The answer is: it cannot. For this reason alone the reinstatement of the current Visitor Management Zones, or close equivalent is absolutely mandatory to prevent undermining of the National Parks Act.</p>		
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/7</p>	<p>Refer to detail in Key submission 8 Park Preservation, Public Access and Aircraft , and Key Submission 9 Visitor Management Zones. A number of issues for inconsistency of VMZ settings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Map 4 lacks detail of where over flights expected to occur - this is provided in Fig 4 of the current plan.</li> <li>2. Air access into the upper Hooker is inconsistent with the current Plan and the Remote VMZ setting.</li> <li>3. The heliskiing area is inconsistent with the "Remote" designation over the eastern side of the Main Divide, including the Summits of Elie de Beaumont, the Anna Glacier and Divers Col.</li> <li>4. No reason has been given for excluding the E flanks of the Minarets and Mt De la Beche from the "Remote" zone</li> </ol>	<p>Retain the "Remote" designation for the areas as identified Phase out the upper Tasman Heli-ski Zone from the draft plan, or remove the "Remote" setting over this area. Add the E flanks of the Minarets and Mt De la Beche to the "Remote" zone.</p>	
<p><i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/10</p>	<p>The area of the upper Godley is zoned Back Country and Remote which suggests it is suitable for recreational activity. I appreciate this area is set aside for natural quiet. However aircraft are in a different league with overhead reverberation while the Godley valley absorbs ground noise.</p>		
<p><i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/8</p>	<p>Has concerns about the relationship between the Visitor Management Zones, and Aircraft Landing Zones. It appears that several Visitor Management Zones have been significantly altered from the previous plan,</p>	<p>Support in principle the concept and use of Visitor Management Zones (VMZ). However, the VMZ's as described in the Draft Plan seems to exhibit inconsistencies and misalignment with the Aircraft Landing Zones and the</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	although this not be apparent to a casual reader. It also appears that the new Visitor Management Zones are misaligned with the Aircraft Landing Zones	Desired Tranquillity outcomes.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/6	Map 4 lacks details on where expected overflights are likely to occur in the Park,	Add a polygon showing expected overflights that are likely to occur in the park on top of recreation zoning and landing zones	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/7	Air access into the upper Hooker Valley, as provided in the draft Plan with the Pudding Rock Landing Zone, is inconsistent with the current Plan and the Remote VMZ setting.	Retain the 'Remote' designation for the upper Hooker Valley' and do not permit any air access.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/8	Summits of Elie de Beaumont, the Anna Glacier and Divers Col are included within the Upper Tasman Heli-ski Zone. This should be retained as a 'Remote' designation.	Retain the 'Remote' designation. Remove the upper Tasman Heli-ski Zone from the draft Plan.	
<i>Teutenberg, Emma</i> 790/9	The eastern flanks of the Minarets and Mt De la Beche have been excluded from the 'remote' zone.	Add the eastern flanks of the Minarets and Mt De la Beche area to the remote zone.	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/7	Support showing the VMZ in Maps 4 and 4.1, as well as the inclusion of the management prescriptions for each zone. However, it is a shame that these prescriptions are hidden in Appendix 2. As they are the primary means of zoning within the park, they should be more visible.	Retain maps 4 and 4.1. Include the management prescription information in the main body of the plan instead of the appendix.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 5: Desired tranquillity outcomes</b>		
<i>de Wilde, Tanja</i> 147/2	Map 5 is very unclear, it is impossible to tell which huts and valleys are intended to be high or low tranquillity areas using this map.	Redraw Map 5, specifically labelling the Tasman, Hooker and Mueller valleys, the huts and Aoraki.	
<i>White, Mike</i> 179/4	The map needs to be amended to reflect that tranquillity levels in Haupapa place will be low and is stated as much in the plan: "Aircraft activity within Haupapa Place is high, particularly in the middle of the day, and visitors can expect to see and hear aircraft when undertaking activities on the ground. The combination of aircraft activity with watercraft activity on Tasman Lake and motor vehicles on Tasman Valley Road means that the tranquillity levels throughout much of this Place will be low."	The map needs to be amended to reflect that tranquillity levels in Haupapa place will be low.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/20	Strongly disagree with the proposed "medium" tranquillity outcome for the whole of the Tasman Glacier. The outcome will be to expose the upper glacier to intensive aircraft use. The upper névés and surrounding peaks have outstanding values and a high	1. Reclassify the upper Tasman Glacier above the 2,100m contour as a "High Tranquillity zone" 2. Make consequential amendments to Maps 7 and 7.1	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>degree of natural quiet.</p> <p>Recognise the more intensive recreational use likely in the lower reaches of the Tasman Valley. This can be achieved by rezoning the upper glacier as a "high tranquillity zone"</p> <p>The "medium" tranquillity outcome for the whole glacier does not give effect to the GPNP policies 1(c) and 8.1.</p> <p>The proposed tranquillity zoning is inconsistent with the draft plan Recreation Values Policy 7 (p.48) and Sec 6 of the Conservation Act which give primacy to management of the land for conservation purposes.</p>		
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/7	<p>Good to see "natural quiet" is valued highly in the management plan., though the approach taken is virtually meaningless and lacks any real teeth in terms of addressing the loss of natural quiet within the park. The tranquillity scale is pure nonsense and totally subjective.</p> <p>What is needed is a robust plan in terms of actual numbers of overflights per day and an objective measure.</p>	Remove Map 5	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/11	<p>The inclusion of Map 5 effectively creates a new form of planning zone due to its content being to state the (supposedly) 'desired' levels of tranquillity. These have been derived using the concept of soundscapes and associated tranquillity mapping tools. However, the zones identified are not clearly integrated with other established zoning methods (such as Visitor Management Zones, as above). Their inclusion has the effect of adding confusion to the interpretation of the established management zoning methods and thereby undermining purposes of, inter alia, the National Parks Act. Importantly, the draft plan lacks detail and provisions for the more relevant concept of managing impacts on park values. The way in which the new 'soundscape' and 'tranquillity level' concepts have been included in the draft plan appears to be contributing to this serious shortcoming. Two important points are: i) The assessment of adverse impacts that appear to be the focus of the soundscape and tranquillity tools (i.e. the effects of noise from mechanised forms of transport) do not require these tools, albeit that they may be useful techniques for monitoring in the future (see below). For example, using the impacts of aircraft movements for illustration, the impacts in question could be directly</p>	<p>1. Remove Map 5 from the Plan. 2. Any map of soundscape or tranquillity levels that is included in the Plan must show the baseline conditions that the national park is designed to preserve. Additional maps could be used to show deterioration or improvement in these parameters against the above baseline. If included in the Plan, such maps would logically be accompanied by policies, objectives and methods to address the changes so identified. 3. In the text, change all reference to tranquillity levels to reflect a description of the values of the park to be preserved. Note that in the draft Plan, descriptions that reference tranquillity levels occur within all of the Place sections (and elsewhere). All of these need to be amended as above. It would also be relevant to provide a description of whether conditions have deteriorated (or perhaps improved) against the baseline to be preserved.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>assessed through the evaluation of flight paths, landing locations, and frequencies; yet this assessment is not provided and does not appear to have been done as part of the plan review. Going back to basics is the key here. For example, the relevant impacts can be readily quantified in terms of basic concepts such as the number and duration of aircraft movements through a given area. Such impacts must be directly addressed and appropriate provisions made for their management, in the plan. ii) The methodologies that have been developed for the measurement or modelling of soundscapes and tranquillity appear to offer useful tools for monitoring. If these are to be usefully applied to the subject of national park management there would need to be a robust baseline established (in terms of these tools and underlying concepts), against which monitoring or modelling results could be compared. This does not appear to have been done. However, this piece of work could be extremely useful to demonstrate the effectiveness of park management over time. However, this is not a trivial exercise and is likely to require a significant amount of ground-truthing to 'get it right'. This might include the compilation of local knowledge and historical records that are relevant to the ground-truthing of any assessment model that depicts the conditions that the national park is designed to preserve.</p>		
<p><i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/5</p>	<p>Contradictions between what the plan is aiming for and what it is proposing delivering. The tranquillity map 5 suggests that the Murchison Glacier area would be high tranquillity, but then in map 7 of aircraft access zones that same area is zoned orange, which is basically your 'open slather' to aircraft zone.</p>	<p>Review landing zones</p>	
<p><i>Novis, Phil</i> 564/2</p>	<p>Distinguishing the colour coded zones according to the legend is quite difficult. Pasting the colours from the key onto the map shows that the shades correspond poorly. In the best faith, I found it difficult to actually determine which zone was which from the legend.</p>	<p>Amend the map to use unambiguous labelling as in other maps.</p>	
<p><i>Horn, Dr Chrys</i> 594/2</p>	<p>The map of tranquillity zones is vague and difficult to understand. Specifically, it is not clear how the tranquillity zones (maps 5) fit with the heliski and aircraft landing zones. I could not find maps that described proposed flight paths. I am surprised, for</p>	<p>Include a summary document explaining the proposed changes in plain language with highlighting what the changes are from the current situation.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	example that there seems to be an overlap between heliski landing zones and high tranquillity areas. Is this really the case		
<i>McPhail, Helen</i> 661/11	<p>The upper Godley area is set aside for natural quiet. However aircraft are in a different league with overhead reverberation while the Godley valley absorbs ground noise.</p> <p>The map has a low level for the Aoraki massif, the tapu site while outlying areas have greater tranquillity zoning. Would like to see less commercial aircraft activity in the whole National Park, so that all visitors can appreciate the natural quiet without the thudding of helicopters and the drone of small planes. This is a place of recreation and awe - a chance to appreciate nature in its grandeur not rampant commercialism.</p>	Less commercial aircraft activity, more natural quiet.	
<i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/2	<p>The tranquillity maps presented in this section are unclear and this affects the ability to comment properly on the appropriateness of the tranquillity outcome areas. In terms of the process used, the tranquillity tracking and mapping appears to be logically applied, but what is less clear is how these data points have been translated to 'desired tranquillity outcomes'. Hence, Map 5 apparently represents "the anticipated future state of tranquillity in the Park that the Plan sets out to achieve" (p.47), yet there is no information about how 'desirability' has been determined / benchmarked or what time period over which this 'future' might be arrived at.</p> <p>The Westland Tai Poutine NP draft plan refers to "the desired future state of natural soundscapes (p 58), whereas the AMC NP draft refers to "anticipated future state of tranquillity". There is an important difference between "desired" and "anticipated", and the two plans need to be consistent in this regard.</p>	<p>Improve detail associated with the TR mapping. Increased transparency is needed in the Plan to make clear how 'desired tranquillity outcomes' have been determined. Consistency across both plans in description: "desired' versus "anticipated".</p>	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/6	<p>The desired tranquillity outcomes in the plan are driven by a newly developed unknown process with limited engagement and no proof of concept. Until further work is done this is a significant risk. Agree that natural quiet/tranquillity is a value and support the concept that it should be sought and encouraged in certain areas, but it needs to be tempered with reality. Appreciate the Department's first pass at taking an effects-based approach in effectively managing aircraft activity and its</p>	<p>Needs full review.</p> <p>Need to understand and openly discuss the process that has led to the Desired Tranquillity Outcomes.</p> <p>Need to quantify the effects we know will continue such as flights for the purpose of conservation, Wild Animal Recovery etc.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>effect on park users.</p> <p>Support the use of helicopters for the purpose of conservation, Wild Animal Control, Search and Rescue etc but informs if they are included (tracked and quantified) in the baseline for tranquillity.</p> <p>Most troubling part is the newly created tool referred to as desired tranquillity outcomes, and how it became an extremely blunt tool resulting in massive red zones that effectively eliminated the opportunity to land in a majority of the park.</p> <p>Tried to get an understanding of how this was created with the hope of being able to provide an educated and informed submission, but unfortunately didn't received answers to my request for information from DOC via the Official Information Act at the time of this submission.</p> <p>Want more transparency about the process of developing tranquillity outcomes.</p> <p>The proposed plan will not reduce overflights - as DOC states in its Topic Paper on Aircraft Landings - 'It is important to note: while an area may have no, or limited landings, this does not mean no overflights occur; and in some instances, overly limited landings can result in the adverse effects of increased overflight noise, e.g. where scenic flights are the only means of viewing the park.'</p> <p>This appears to be at odds with the proposed policies and mapping, which have resulted in applying a red zone to the majority of the park.</p> <p>Note that submission includes the 12 questions that are answered via OIA 18-E-1070 (7 February 2019).</p>		
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/10</p>	<p>Aspects of the tranquillity map are completely disconnected with reality, in the context of the wider Plan. Other areas of the Plan would permit around 70,000 landings per annum (every few minutes in daylight) on the Tasman Glacier, a 10-fold increase on current limits. If this level of aircraft activity is corresponds to a 'medium' level of tranquillity (Map 5) then one can have no faith whatsoever in the legitimacy of this planning tool.</p> <p>Priority tranquil areas should be areas currently zoned remote, and the Hooker glacier. The entire Hooker should be zoned for</p>	<p>Rezone the Hooker glacier to 'very high' tranquillity.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>'very high' tranquillity values. A large area of the area zoned for 'high tranquillity' or 'medium tranquillity' in Map 5 overlaps broad heliski areas in an orange (generally permitted) landing zone (Map 7.1) where unlimited daily landings for heliskiing are proposed (Section 2.3.3 policy 8). These outcomes are utterly incompatible and reflect a serious disjoint between the stated aims of preserving natural quiet/tranquillity and the actual effects of this Plan.</p>		
<p><i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/9</p>	<p>Map 5: Desired tranquillity outcomes is obviously predetermined by what it's trying to influence, namely, where landings should occur, rather than the other way around.</p>	<p>Remove Map 5 and remove all reference to new Desired Tranquillity Outcomes. Instead re-write this section of the Plan to refer instead to the desired visitor experience and interactions for each of the Visitor Management Zones.</p>	
<p><i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/11</p>	<p>Aircraft and 'Tranquillity' As a national park, AMCNP should have a very high level of genuine tranquillity. I feel that the proposed landing zones and approaching aircraft within the park to be problematic. Compared to the current plan, it is clear that the draft plan would allow many more flights and many more landings over a far bigger area of the park. Until now there have been many parts of the park where natural quiet and wilderness has been the norm. If the draft plan was accepted in its current state what are the guarantees genuine tranquillity can be sustained and so ensure that AMCNP a "world class" experience? How will you monitor the tranquillity of the park to ensure that the limits are not breached? How will you manage visitor zoning with aircraft activity? In the present plan the Aircraft and Airports policy 4.3.3(c) says No approval should be given that would increase aircraft activity or aircraft noise within the park" All concessions for taking off from or landing at Mount Cook Aerodrome (or anywhere else) should be subject to flight movement provisions that improve aural tranquillity and disruption of the environments that they land in.</p>	<p>Review the plan and maps to address the concerns raised</p>	
<p><b>Section:</b></p>	<p><b>Maps Map 6: Potential additions to the Park</b></p>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/3	Support the addition of additional conservation land within MCNP	Retain Map 6	
<i>Meridian Energy Limited</i> 175/1	The Aoraki National Park is in the vicinity of the Waitaki Hydro Electric Power Scheme, the draft plan notes to include part of the Tasman delta in proximity of Lake Pukaiki in the proposed additions to the National Park.	Meridian requests that proper consultation is carried out before extension of Park Boundaries to provide for and to understand for boundaries that don't impact on the Waitaki Hydro Electric Power Scheme.	
<i>Miles, Clint</i> 571/1	<p>I oppose the additions to the National park: 4, 9 &amp; 10. The land isn't being managed properly in the park at the moment and adding to this will not help at all.</p> <p>4. there is a legal road that is the alps to ocean cycle way in that, and mt cook station has legal rights to use it for stock movements and farm management use. This hasn't been indicated on the maps at all.</p> <p>10. I disagree with this as well, as all this is doing is increasing pressure on Mt Cook station with scenic viewing, and will also increase trespassers and poachers as well, With the inclusion of this land also means 0 tahr in the park, this is a well hunted area by many people on foot, if everything is gone then it will increase the poaching on our property.</p> <p>9. This should not be included into the park, as it is already conservation land and has controls on it already, If this is included into the park then there will be less areas to drop hunters and recreationalist off in the area.</p>	Remove the proposed additions (4, 9,10) to the National Park.	
<i>Glentanner Station Ltd &amp; Glentanner Park (Mount Cook) Ltd</i> 611/12	<p>We question the need to extend the Park. There are conservation covenants on adjacent Glentanner Station and adequate protection over the existing conservation areas.</p> <p>There has always been recreational boating on both the Tasman and Godley Rivers - this should be allowed to continue.</p> <p>We support additions 2 (Table 4.1) and 8 (Table 4.3) We do not support any of the other additions listed.</p>	Amend Table 4.1-4.3 and Map 6 to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/7	To better protect the unique ecosystems of the Hooker and Tasman braided river valleys, and the Godley braided riverbed and valley floor, I support their inclusion in the national park. I also support the proposal to seek UNESCO Te Wahi Pounamu World Heritage Status for new additions to the National Park.	I support the addition of all proposed areas, especially the braided river habitat to the National Park and support seeking UNESCO World Heritage Status for all new additions.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 7: Aircraft access zones</b>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Gilmour, Milo</i> 5/2	Allow for helicopter landings at Pudding Rock and Betham Valley	Amend Map 7 to include provision for helicopter landings at Pudding Rock and Betham Valley	
<i>Leong, Ryan</i> 8/1	Opposes the new landing site at Pudding Rock in the Hooker Valley. Feels it is important to keep this valley free from helicopter access to retain the isolated and remote nature of it.	Delete the landing area of Pudding Rock.	
<i>Mulvany, Dr Stanley</i> 9/2	Object to proposed new landing zones at Leibig and Onslow Huts and on Pudding Rock on the grounds of noise pollution, degrading the present Tranquility Zone and altering the spiritual values of Aoraroakehe and Pae Tata.	Amend the plan to address concerns raised in submission.	
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/3	The proposed concept of "landing zones" instead of specific "sites" within the Park should not be adopted.	Remove landing zones and replace with landing sites.	
<i>Goddard, Penny</i> 15/2	The adoption of huge "Landing Zones" instead of landing "sites" within the Park should not be allowed. Landing zones will make it impossible to seek different levels of remoteness within those areas of the Park.	Replace Landing Zones with specific landing sites.	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/3	The adoption of huge "Landing Zones" instead of landing "sites" within the Park should not be allowed. Landing Zones mean that it becomes impossible to seek different levels of remoteness within those areas of the Park	Remove Landing Zones and replace with specific Landing Sites	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/2	The adoption of huge "Landing Zones" instead of landing "sites" should not be allowed. These will make it impossible to seek different levels of remoteness within those areas of the Park.	Replace Landing Zones with specified landing sites.	
<i>McCartney, John</i> 38/2	<p>Do not support the adoption of huge "Landing Zones" instead of landing "sites" within the park. This means it is impossible for people on the ground to seek different levels of remoteness within these large zones. The proposed new zones are extremely permissive to aircraft.</p> <p>Specific submissions on landing zones within specific Places within the park:  Haupapa/Tasman -  - restrict access to western side of Malte Brun to specific hut landing site. No further landings provided for sight seeing and heliskiing in this area  - Lower Darwin glacier should be no landing zone  - no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall. Retain existing sites at</p>	Consider new landing areas/sites independently, rather than using a broad brush approach to reflect the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Ledenfeld Saddle and Cornice wall</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- no heliskiing in upper Tasman and Murchison Glaciers - iconic value for high glaciated ski touring in NZ. The two activities are not compatible</li> <li>-</li> </ul>		
<i>Macfarlane, Paula</i> 39/2	<p>Do not support the adoption of huge "Landing Zones" instead of landing "sites" within the park. This means it is impossible for people on the ground to seek different levels of remoteness within these large zones. Any new sites should be carefully considered, independently, rather than using such a broad brush approach that is extremely permissive to aircraft.</p> <p>Any flight access to western side of Malte Brun should only be to specific hut landing site. Any further landings must be only to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above the moraine wall.</p> <p>Any commercial interests for sight seeing or heliskiing should be turned down, or limited to specific sites so they can be avoided by those seeking a different type of experience on foot.</p>	Amend the landing zones to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/2	<p>Adoption of huge "Landing zones" should not be allowed. This will mean it becomes impossible to seek different levels of remoteness. For people on the ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Any new landing areas in Tasman valley should be considered independently rather than a broad-brush approach</li> <li>- any new access to western side of Malte Brun range should only be to proposed new hut site if inaccessible by foot. Any further access only to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above moraine wall.</li> <li>- Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone,</li> <li>- No additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall</li> <li>- existing sites at Ledefeld and Cornice wall should remain</li> </ul>	Amend Landing zones to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Keys, Harry</i> 67/1	Oppose proposed Pudding Rock landing zone	Remove proposed Pudding Rock landing zone	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/15	The adoption of landing zones is inappropriate due to: the vast new areas opened up to landings, the lack of	Remove Haupapa Place and Pae Tata Place landing zones, replace with specified landing sites or small zones as per	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	aircraft free space between landing areas, the inability to know where aircraft might land within the zone.	current management plan model. Revise the Grand Plateau landing zone as submitted, remove Pudding Rock landing zone.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/13	Noise levels in the park are currently too high, and right-out unacceptable.	Turn all 'orange zones' on maps 7 and 7.1 to 'red zones'.	
<i>Mellish, Diane</i> ( <i>Peninsula Tramping Club</i> ) 338/33	<p>Strongly disagree with the proposed Orange zones in Maps 7 and 7.1. This applies a broad brush approach to the Tasman And Murchison glaciers . The outcome will be to expose the middle and upper Tasman Glacier to intensive aircraft use. Much of the alpine terrain included is clearly unsuited to fixed wing aircraft landings.</p> <p>As alpine conditions change in response to climate change, there will be increasing commercial pressure to allow more helicopter landings, 'helitours' etc.</p> <p>We believe there is sufficient knowledge to designate specific landing sites on the Tasman and Murchison Glaciers. Specific landing sites will avoid aircraft landings posing an inadvertent risk to other outdoor recreational users.</p> <p>Tasman Lake landing zones seems unnecessary. The noise will be especially disturbing in a tranquil environment. The role of the plan should be to ensure that the park's natural values are protected, and visitors to Tasman Lake are not subjected to the sound of constant aircraft takeoffs and landings.</p>	<p>Replace the Orange Zone with specific designated landing sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ledenfeld saddle LZ</li> <li>2. Tasman saddle LZ - 100m</li> <li>3. Grand Plateau LZ</li> <li>4. Kelman Hut LZ at approx. 2,400m</li> <li>5. Murchison Glacier at approx 1,700m</li> <li>6. Onslow Hut LZ - 100m</li> <li>7. Leibig Hut LZ - 100m</li> <li>8. Leibig Dome LZ</li> <li>9. Lower Tasman Glacier at approx 1260m above junction with Rudolph Glacier</li> <li>10. Pudding Rock LZ</li> <li>11. Barron Saddle Hut LZ - 100m</li> </ol> <p>Delete Landing zone at Tasman Lake</p>	
<i>Spiire, Jeremy</i> 339/9	<p>Make the land south of the Liebig Range a red zone for aircraft access.</p> <p>The Jollie River is very easy to access on foot. Choppers fly in hunters to areas where other hunters have walked in creating conflict.</p>	Amend Map 7 so that land south of the Liebig Range is a red zone for aircraft access.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/14	The Plan proposes the establishment of large 'landing zones'. In some cases these are situated in the general location of existing landing sites, but in other cases they open up aircraft access to quite different areas. This will be associated with negative impacts on some park users, for example, people using self-powered travel modes and those seeking remoteness or natural quiet experiences. It is therefore important to only to introduce new areas for landing that are compatible with other objectives and consistent with the purposes of the Act. Arguably, this would seem to be the case only	1. Create more detailed maps for all landing zones.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>where glacial recession and the growth of moraine walls in the lower valleys has made access to those areas virtually impossible such that they were no longer being visited. However, alternative options include installing fixed cables to improve security on moraine walls and walkwires for difficult traverse sections and in-cut streams. The Plan devotes little attention to exploring these options despite their potential usefulness for recreational access in the context of national parks.</p>		
<p><i>Mackenzie Guardians Inc.</i> 541/11</p>	<p>The National Park guardians should be leading the way by reducing the use of fossil fuels - one of the causes of climate change - by limiting the numbers of powered flights in the Park. It could be setting a 'global example' of how to manage the adverse effects of climate change on biodiversity and the landscapes, instead of exacerbating the problem by allowing increased flights within the Park.</p>	<p>Oppose the increase of powered aircraft flights within the Park. Oppose powered aircraft flights to locations where they have been previously restricted.</p>	
<p><i>Novis, Phil</i> 564/3</p>	<p>I do not agree with the landing zones at Barron Saddle and Pudding Rock, given the tranquility goals stated for the associated valleys on map 5, and the Department's stated strategy (p. 62: "The Department only controls aircraft landings in the Park, not the airspace and flight paths over the Park, but it works closely with the aviation industry to mitigate the effects of overflights.") The plan appears to state that these new landing sites will be established, but access routes by aircraft consistent with the plan's values cannot be enforced.</p>	<p>It seems wrong to say that the Department cannot control flight paths in the Park, in the case of flights to landing sites. The flight path simply has to be specified as a condition in the landing concession.</p>	
<p><i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/13</p>	<p>Made comments on landing zones within the different 'places'. Refer to those.</p>		
<p><i>Sherratt, Duncan</i> 596/1</p>	<p>Oppose increased landing zones in Map 7. If landing zones and numbers are allowed to increase this will happen to the significant detriment of other users.</p>	<p>Remove the increases from the plan.</p>	
<p><i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/40</p>	<p>The adoption of large, all-encompassing Landing Zones is inappropriate due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the vast new areas opened up to landings</li> <li>- the lack of aircraft-free space between landing zones</li> <li>- the inability for anyone to know where aircraft might land within the zone.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Remove the all-encompassing Haupapa Place and Pae Tata Place Landing Zones and replace with specified landing sites or small zones as per the current management plan model.</li> <li>2. Retain the Grand Plateau Landing Zone as given in the current Plan (see submission on Map 15)</li> <li>3. Remove Pudding Rock Landing Zone</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>INFLITE Group (SKI PLANES LIMITED, CHARTERS LIMITED, WEST COAST LIMITED)</i> 688/11</p>	<p>The Aircraft access zones (Maps 7 and 7.1) would be more useful if an overlay showing the desired tranquillity zones was added.</p>	<p>Add an overlay showing the desired tranquillity zones to Maps 7 and 7.1 (or provide this elsewhere in the Plan).</p>	
<p><i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/43</p>	<p>TIA is supportive of the shift from landing sites to landing zones. The small size and exact location of snow and ice landing sites has long been a safety concern for operators. The Park is a dynamic environment and pilots need to be able to adjust their landing location to stay safe. Crevasses open up, and slopes and surface conditions change. These changes are becoming more of an issue as the ice and snow fields recede.</p> <p>TIA does, however, have a number of concerns in relation to the development of these Landing Zones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The exact size and boundaries of the proposed zones could have impacts on aircraft safety and on the visitor experience of other users of the Park, and that in some cases this could outweigh the value of the increased size of the zone. See specific submission on 2.4.3 Pae Tata Place - Murchison Glacier Landing Zone</li> <li>2. Pilots have very concise and agreed 'routes' into and out of existing landing sites; this enables them to confidently predict where other aircraft will be. The size of the proposed zones and the resulting unpredictability of helicopter movements could present a safety risk and this must be carefully assessed and mitigated.</li> <li>3. The current landing SITE model enables Park users to predict where they can expect to encounter aircraft and experience aircraft noise. They can then plan their experience in the Park around their desired level of interaction with aircraft. A risk of the proposed landing zone model is that it could make this difficult.</li> <li>4. In some areas of the Park the level of existing/historical aircraft activity, particularly overflights, is such that a large landing zone does not have a significant impact - visitors would already expect to have higher levels of interaction with aircraft. Other areas of the Park have a low level of existing/historical aircraft activity. Visitors have traditionally gone to these areas for an experience which has relatively little interaction with aircraft. A broad landing zone model in</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review the size and location of landing zones to address the concerns raised above.</li> <li>2. Before new landing zones are operationalised, DOC must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) consult with aircraft user groups on the boundaries of the landing zones to ensure they enable acceptable levels of safety;</li> <li>(ii) consult with affected parties to ensure the size and location of proposed landing zones does not inadvertently impact opportunities for visitor experience with low levels of interaction with aircraft - particularly in areas which currently offer this experience and are highly valued by these user groups. Affected parties should include aircraft, guided mountaineering and heliski concessionaires, recreational groups and the NZ Mountain Guides Association.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	these places, even if there are relatively low numbers of allocated landings, could make it challenging to predict where an aircraft will land and therefore to plan this kind of trip.		
<i>New Zealand Recreation Association</i> 756/18	Does not support the inclusion of broad landing zones as detailed in the Draft Plan. The vast size of the proposed zones is a huge and uncalled for change from the previous plan. NZRA is sympathetic to the rationale that landing sites could be expanded slightly for safety reasons, this could be achieved without allowing free-range pilot discretion over vast tracts of the National Park.	Does not support the inclusion of broad landing zones as detailed in the Draft Plan.	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/4	Necessary to understand the Department's current view of the effects of a temporary activity and how it differs to regular or ongoing activities. For the Milford Dart Tunnel concession application, DOC concluded that because the project was temporary - that being 24 hours a day for 2 to 5 years - the effects were therefore determined to be minor. Can the Department please clarify its current view on this assessment. We do not agree with this assessment, but it is appropriate to establish clarity and a consistent view on this. This is of particular interest to determine how we gauge the effects on an activity that may take 1 to 10 hours a year/decade in a particular place as opposed to 365 day a year concessionaires or Conservation activity. If this is DOC's current view, then logic would dictate that the entire plan would become an orange zone (with the exception of any gazetted wilderness areas) and that truly temporary one off activities should be considered in these zones subject to an agreed upon set of criteria.	Explain effects of temporary activity. Consider if whole of park should become 'Orange zone'	
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/34	Refers to topic paper: Aircraft landings. Under 4. considerations e) Aircraft access and landing zones- Please acknowledge the film industry as an established user and the difference between the quantity and duration as opposed to other concessionaires. E.g. the cumulative effect of use by the film industry is historically very minimal and should be considered differently to ongoing concessionaires with unlimited or very high landing numbers.	Amend topic paper for aircraft: considerations aircraft access and landings zones to acknowledge film industry.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/16	Remove Pudding Rock landing zone - see submission under 2.2.1 - Policy 10b)	Remove Pudding Rock landing zone	
<i>Frost, Robert Graham</i> 811/24	If the new "Aircraft Access Zone" tool is retained, it would be absurd to retain tiny pockets of orange "zone" within the red zone. Let's be honest: these are clearly landing sites within the red zone. It's not a "zone" if it's only 100m across.	Replace small areas of orange zone within red zone with landing sites within the red zone.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/10	<p>Aircraft and 'Tranquillity'</p> <p>As a national park, AMCNP should have a very high level of genuine tranquillity. I feel that the proposed landing zones and approaching aircraft within the park to be problematic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The presence of aircraft and their noise, visual disturbance, both in flight and parked next to a hut undermines the parks intrinsic worth.</li> <li>-I feel that the effects of aircraft on wildlife in the park needs to be properly understood</li> </ul> <p>The current plan P4.3.3(c) and (d) states that the effects on the enjoyment, inspiration, recreation and other benefits that visitors gain from the Park, including knowing one is in a place into which aircraft are not allowed to fly or land should be sustained. Any deviation from this is in breach of National Parks Act 1980 section 4 (2) (1) (a) stated at the beginning of my submission.</p> <p>Compared to the current plan, it is clear that the draft plan would allow many more flights and many more landings over a far bigger area of the park. If the draft plan was accepted in its current state what are the guarantees genuine tranquillity can be sustained and so ensure that AMCNP a 'world class ' experience? How will you monitor the tranquillity of the park to ensure that the limits are not breached? How will you manage visitor zoning with aircraft activity? In the present plan the Aircraft and Airports policy 4.3.3(c) says No approval should be given that would increase aircraft activity or aircraft noise within the park</p> <p>All concessions for taking off from or landing at Mount Cook Aerodrome (or anywhere else) should be subject</p>	Review the aircraft landing zones to address the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	to flight movement provisions that improve aural tranquillity and disruption of the environments that they land in.		
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/1	<p>We are not opposed to aircraft access to key areas to facilitate recreation opportunities. We are however, opposed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad landing zones replacing well defined landing sites, as this removes a valuable form of control over aircraft and aircraft use patterns. AMCNP must retain a means to control aircraft to avoid a free-for-all;</li> <li>- Excessive expansion of aircraft intensive day trips, especially into areas which have traditionally been free of such mass tourism;</li> <li>- Little to no restriction on day-tourism related aircraft flights and landings;</li> <li>- Intensive day trip aircraft access to popular hut-accessible climbing and ski touring areas and routes. Aircraft use and access is now a part of life and daily operations in this area. It can successfully continue to provide a range of experiences for different user groups, provided that everyone has a clear understanding of aircraft landing sites and the terrain they provide access to.</li> </ul>	Review aircraft access and access zones in the Plan to address the concerns raised.	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/1	<p>We are not opposed to aircraft access to key areas to facilitate recreation opportunities. We are however, opposed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad landing zones replacing well defined landing sites, as this removes a valuable form of control over aircraft and aircraft use patterns. AMCNP must retain a means to control aircraft to avoid a free-for-all;</li> <li>- Excessive expansion of aircraft intensive day trips, especially into areas which have traditionally been free of such mass tourism;</li> <li>- Little to no restriction on day-tourism related aircraft flights and landings;</li> <li>- Intensive day trip aircraft access to popular hut-accessible climbing and ski touring areas and routes. Aircraft use and access is now a part of life and daily operations in this area. It can successfully continue to provide a range of experiences for different user groups, provided that everyone has a clear understanding of aircraft landing sites and the terrain they provide access to.</li> </ul>	Review aircraft access and access zones within the Plan to address the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Pengelly, Stuart</i> 882/3	In particular, the huge increases in both the aircraft landing zone areas and the allocated landings (10 fold), while at the same time retaining a separate category for heli-ski landing zones with unlimited landings, will impact enormously. This, combined with no distinction between tourist landings and those, say, for climber drop-offs on the Grand Plateau, will extend tourism in the park. Climbers and other recreationalists will be competing with tourists for flights, tranquillity will be diminished and overflights will increase. I do not support these increases.	Review the management of aircraft to address the concerns raised	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 7.1: Helsiski landing zones</b>		
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/6	There should be no heliskiing allowed on the upper Tasman and Murchison Glaciers.	Amend Map 7.1 to reflect the changes identified.	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/6	There should be no heliskiing allowed to take place on the Upper Tasman (and Murchison) Glaciers and the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range. These areas are the heartland of high glaciated ski touring in NZ and it is unfair that ski tourers should have to share with commercial heliskiers. The two activities are incompatible. The current concessionaires should be allowed to operate until the end of their existing permit period and then there should be no further heliskiing allowed in these areas.	Amend Map 7.1 to reflect the changes requested.	
<i>Alpine Guides (Aoraki) Ltd</i> 26/5	Support the current heliski landing zones	Retain the existing heli-ski landings	
<i>McCartney, John</i> 38/3	Should not allow heliskiing in upper Tasman and Murchison Glaciers. These areas are heartland for high glaciated ski touring in NZ. The two activities are not compatible. The current concessionaire's permit to heli-ski the upper Tasman Glacier should be ended at the time of implementation of the new management plan. Phase heli-skiing out on western side of Malte Brun to allow for massive opportunities for ski touring in this area once the proposed NZAC's new hut is established. The current concessionaire's permit to Heli-ski on the western side of Malte Brun should be ended at the time of implementation of the new plan.	Amend Heli-ski Landing zones to take into account the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/4	<p>Should be no heli-skiing allowed on upper Tasman and Murchison valleys. These areas are the heartland for high glaciated ski touring in NZ. Heli-skiing and ski touring activities are not compatible.</p> <p>The current permit to heli-ski the upper Tasman Glacier should end at the time of implementation of the new plan.</p> <p>Heli-skiing should be phased out on western side of Malte Brun Range. A proposed new hut in the area will open up massive new opportunities for ski touring in this range - this area will become increasingly valuable and is well suited to this activity. Ski touring is not compatible with commercial heli-skiing activities. The current concession to heli-ski the western side of the Malte Brun Range should be ended at the time of implementation of the new plan.</p> <p>There should be no heli-skiing in the Mannering Glacier</p>	Amend the Heli-ski landing zones to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/16	Ski touring and commercial heliskiing are incompatible, at least from the perspective of the ski tourer. The Murchison heliski zone is appropriate area for heliskiing as mostly unfrequented by other user groups during the winter except for the Mannering Glacier catchment which must be removed from this heliski zone.	Remove Upper Haupapa Tasman Heliski zone and Haupapa Tasman Heliski zone from Map 7.1. Revise the Murchison Heliski zone's boundaries so as to exclude the Mannering Glacier catchment.	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/22	Heli-skiing is not an appropriate activity to be undertaking in a national park.	Remove Map 7.1	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/19	Map 7.1 showing the proposed Heli ski landing zones is unclear which makes their consideration difficult for plan readers. However, comparison with the existing Park plan shows that the proposed zones are the same, or similar, to current arrangements. The effect of this is to further entrench the acceptance of commercial heli skiing in areas of the Park that popular for (amateur) ski touring and mountaineering. In addition, the provisions referencing the heli-skiing zones allow for commercial access only. Therefore the Plan authorises non-parity for air access opportunities.	Remove all Heli-skiing zones from the Plan, and instead introduce a number of new aircraft access zones available to all, and with provisions that are inclusive of commercial heli-skiing (and other commercial guiding activities) as appropriate.	
<i>Drake, Mike &amp; Spence, Heather</i> 491/19	<p>Oppose : Planned increase in heli-skiing and aircraft use for tourism in a national park, especially over such a large zone.</p> <p>Not sure why heli-skiing/hiking have such a high priority and such a large zone. Is a national park the best place to allow a highly mechanical activity? It contradicts all the</p>	Reduce heli-skiing and aircraft use	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	words at the front of the document; natural quiet, serenity.		
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/3	Support Heliski Terrain and expecting to include any existing Heliski terrain in the Liebig, Gammock or Burnett Ranges to be added to permitted areas. Long standing historical precedent		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/14	<p>Feel strongly that heli-ski concessionaires should not have permission to land helicopters in locations where amateur skiers and climbers are not allowed to access by helicopter. This two-tier system where those who can afford to heliski are allowed access which degrades the quality of experience of others should not be allowed to continue. Heli-skiing is not environmentally sustainable and is not consistent with the aims or principals of national parks. For example, heli skiing is inconsistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-1.2.3 policy 7 &amp; 9</li> <li>- 1.3.1 policy 26b</li> </ul> <p>In particular opposed to helicopter access to summits as this degrades the mana of the summits concerned. There are plenty of areas outside of national parks where heli-skiing is possible. Ceasing to allow heli-skiing in the park would be consistent with most other national parks around the world. For example, in France heli-skiing is not allowed in parks and in Switzerland helicopter drop off locations are severely restricted and pick up is not allowed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delete the designated heli-ski landing zone.</li> <li>- Cease to allow heli-skiing within the park.</li> <li>- If heli-skiing is to be allowed then limit heli-ski landings to the same landing zone as for other use types.</li> <li>- Exclude summits from allowed landing zones.</li> </ul>	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/41	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upper Tasman Heli-ski Zone - permits landings on all of the frequently sued ridge crest ski touring objectives for back country skiers and snowboarders based out of Kelman Hut or Tasman Saddle Hut. This creates a visitor management conflict in one of the most popularly accessed parts of the Park's backcountry.</li> <li>2. Lower Haupapa Tasman Heli-ski Zone - NZAC is planning a new hut in the Malte Brun Range (mid-Tasman Hut) which will facilitate more ski touring in this area. Ski touring and heli-skiing are incompatible from the perspective of the ski tourer. A forward-thinking amendment would phase out heli-skiing from the western side of the Malte Brun Range.</li> <li>3. Upper Murchison Heli-ski Zone - this is the busiest heli-ski area in the Park. The Mannering Glacier catchment should be removed from this zone as it is</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide for the phase out of the Upper Tasman Heli-ski zone by agreement or otherwise.</li> <li>2. Provide for the phasing out of the Haupapa Tasman Heli-ski Zone by agreement or otherwise</li> <li>3. Revise the Murchison Heli-ski Zone boundary to exclude the Mannering Glacier catchment and phase out heli-skiing from this area.</li> </ol>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	widely viewed as a pre-eminent ski-touring venue that is easily accessible from Tasman Saddle, Kelman and Murchison Huts.		
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/3	<p>We are not opposed to aircraft access to key areas to facilitate recreation opportunities. We are however, opposed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad landing zones replacing well defined landing sites, as this removes a valuable form of control over aircraft and aircraft use patterns. AMCNP must retain a means to control aircraft to avoid a free-for-all;</li> <li>- Excessive expansion of aircraft intensive day trips, especially into areas which have traditionally been free of such mass tourism;</li> <li>- Little to no restriction on day-tourism related aircraft flights and landings;</li> <li>- Intensive day trip aircraft access to popular hut-accessible climbing and ski touring areas and routes. Aircraft use and access is now a part of life and daily operations in this area. It can successfully continue to provide a range of experiences for different user groups, provided that everyone has a clear understanding of aircraft landing sites and the terrain they provide access to.</li> </ul> <p>Heli-skiing at the head of the Tasman Glacier, should cease at the time of implementation of the new plan. An exception could be made for Alpine Guides' "Ski the Tasman" product (with a sensible upper limit), which provides a unique experience to lower-ability skiers, and being predominantly ski plane assisted, has an historical precedent in that area.</p> <p>Commercial interests should not be given free reign over the Malte Brun Range, as this would negatively impact the remote experiences of other user groups.</p> <p>There should be no concessions granted for aircraft-intensive day-tourism activities in the western Malte Brun Range, above the moraine walls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Once the NZAC's proposed Beetham Hut is installed, phase out heli-skiing on the western side of the Malte Brun Range.</li> </ul> <p>Remove the Mannering Glacier catchment from the Upper Murchison Heli- Ski Zone and modify current concessions to reflect this. It is easily accessible from Kelman and Tasman Saddle Huts (or the replacement of</p>	Review the Heli-ski Zones to address the concerns raised.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/3</p>	<p>Murchison Hut if that eventuates).</p> <p>We are not opposed to aircraft access to key areas to facilitate recreation opportunities. We are however, opposed to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Broad landing zones replacing well defined landing sites, as this removes a valuable form of control over aircraft and aircraft use patterns. AMCNP must retain a means to control aircraft to avoid a free-for-all;</li> <li>- Excessive expansion of aircraft intensive day trips, especially into areas which have traditionally been free of such mass tourism;</li> <li>- Little to no restriction on day-tourism related aircraft flights and landings;</li> <li>- Intensive day trip aircraft access to popular hut-accessible climbing and ski touring areas and routes.</li> </ul> <p>Aircraft use and access is now a part of life and daily operations in this area. It can successfully continue to provide a range of experiences for different user groups, provided that everyone has a clear understanding of aircraft landing sites and the terrain they provide access to.</p> <p>Heli-skiing at the head of the Tasman Glacier, should cease at the time of implementation of the new plan. An exception could be made for Alpine Guides' "Ski the Tasman" product (with a sensible upper limit), which provides a unique experience to lower-ability skiers, and being predominantly ski plane assisted, has an historical precedent in that area.</p> <p>Commercial interests should not be given free reign over the Malte Brun Range, as this would negatively impact the remote experiences of other user groups.</p> <p>There should be no concessions granted for aircraft-intensive day-tourism activities in the western Malte Brun Range, above the moraine walls.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Once the NZAC's proposed Beetham Hut is installed, phase out heli-skiing on the western side of the Malte Brun Range.</li> </ul> <p>Remove the Mannering Glacier catchment from the Upper Murchison Heli- Ski Zone and modify current concessions to reflect this. It is easily accessible from Kelman and Tasman Saddle Huts (or the replacement of Murchison Hut if that eventuates).</p>	<p>Review the Heli-ski Zones to address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/60	Submit that heli-skiing operations be considered in the same way as other aircraft access and recreation for private and commercial visitors. This would improve consistency within the overall management framework while making it easier for the public to understand acceptable use and expected use in AMC.	Review the management of heli-skiing operations to address the concerns raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 9: Nohoaka Plce</b>		
<i>NZDA South Canterbury Branch</i> 323/2	Note that the locations for Thar Lodge and Wynn Irwin Lodge are incorrect - they have been interchanged.	Amend Map 9 to show correct location of club lodges	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 10: Aircraft landing zones - Nohoaka Place</b>		
<i>Regional Film Offices of New Zealand</i> 761/33	Colours are inconsistent. Does not make sense to have a Red Zone adjacent to the airport.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 11: Village and front country spatial plan</b>		
<i>Smith, Quentin</i> 21/4	Oppose the map as it fails to provide any opportunities for facilities for people with disabilities	Amend Map 11 to include areas that are accessible	
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/6	Not one opportunity provided for people with disabilities within the spatial plan map	Amend the map to add accessible areas including tracks, trails, toilet facilities and carparks	
<i>MacKenzie, James B</i> 871/38	Support the Map 11 - provides an excellent summary	Retain Map 11 as presented	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/3	The major redevelopment with the park village should not take place. Any further development could take place at Birch Hill or further away from the National Park. The village zoning plan needs to be enforced.	Amend the spatial plan to address the concerns raised	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/2	I support in principle the village zoning plan and front country spatial plan. Development of the village area is already significant. It is already crowded and busy in many months of the year and no longer feels like a small community. New developments should occur outside of Aoraki Mount Cook National Park in the wider Mackenzie District towns, which would protect the "mountain village" character of Aoraki Mount Cook National Park and preserve its natural and amenity values.	No further major development or redevelopment within the village should be permitted.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/5	Due to the very high tourist visitor numbers, it is essential that vehicle entry to the national park is restricted. I support in principle the restrictions, although instead of overnight facilities at Birch Hill,	Tourism vehicular access should be restricted but overnight facilities should not be developed at the park entrance. It is not the Department of Conservation's role to provide commercial tourism facilities.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	visitors should stay at commercially available facilities at Glentanner or Twizel.		
<i>New Zealand Deerstalkers' Association Incorporated (NZDA)</i> 890/8	The so-called "spatial plan" on p. 95 and discussion box (pp. 94, 96 and 97) contain no statistics at all as to numbers of vehicles, length of roads, capacity of carparks, numbers of visitors arriving by different means of transport, and number and size of vacant sites available for new development in the village. Nowhere is there any indication of how many DOC staff and other people live in the village, how many beds are available in public accommodation, or how many private dwelling houses or baches there are.	Amend the spatial plan to address the issues raised.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 12: Village zoning plan</b>		
<i>Southern Alps Guiding Ltd &amp; Aoraki Mt Cook Guiding Co Ltd</i> 233/27	Commercial zone: Oppose the exclusion of our authorisation projects in the planning, especially beside the Café site for the Inn and Office project.	Reword the plan and redraw the map to include approved building projects.	
<i>Grand Properties (2011) Ltd</i> 686/3	There is an obvious shortage of commercial eating operations within the Village. There is plenty of scope within the existing Amenities area to create commercial zones which will help to alleviate this problem. We have identified the land at the confluence of Bowe Drive and State Highway 80 as an ideal spot for a commercial activity such as a Café/Restaurant. It is proposed to be zoned Amenity Open Space due primarily to a now outdated assessment of the area from a flood risk perspective.	Change the zoning for the proposed Amenity Open Space for land at the confluence of Bowe Drive and State Highway 80 to Commercial Zone.	
<i>Doy, Tony</i> 873/4	The major redevelopment with the park village should not take place. Any further development could take place at Birch Hill or further away from the National Park. The village zoning plan needs to be enforced. Removal of the multi-storied hotel would be an improvement. It is an inappropriate design for the area and from a distance it looks like a prison building!	Amend the zoning plan to reflect the concerns raised.	
<i>Ralston, Mary</i> 874/3	I support in principle the village zoning plan and front country spatial plan. Development of the village area is already significant. It is already crowded and busy in many months of the year and no longer feels like a small community. New developments should occur outside of Aoraki Mount Cook National Park in the wider Mackenzie District	No further major development or redevelopment within the village should be permitted.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	towns, which would protect the "mountain village" character of Aoraki Mount Cook National Park and preserve its natural and amenity values.		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 13: Village flood vulnerability</b>		
<p><i>Grand Properties (2011) Ltd</i> 686/4</p>	<p>The draft plan clearly is using flood hazard zones identified over 20 years ago for planning purposes which is fundamentally incorrect. Refers to an attached Geotech Consulting report (commissioned by submitter) that states the flood hazard zone, as identified within the 1998 report, was originally proposed in order to determine the beneficiaries of the proposed work and therefore appropriately allocate the cost of the protection works. The author clearly states on page 5, section 5 Zoning Intention, that the purpose of another earlier report (EBA report from 1997) was NOT for long term planning.</p> <p>The flood hazard maps and therefore proposed underlying zones of this draft plan, have not been updated to reflect work that has been completed as a result of the 1998 study. On page 3, section 3 Flood Hazard, it is strongly suggested that two areas of defined flood hazard need to be downgraded. In particular the area of high flood hazard across the lower fan should now be scaled back. This is crucial in being able to utilise this area for our proposal (commercial zone). There is no compelling reason for this land to not be developed. In addition, the report refers to our existing motel site which also sits within this High-Risk zone for flood risk. As part of our development here we had to mitigate any flood risk. This was achieved through raising the ground level, raising floor heights and bunding the entire site. The proposed zoning map now shows this land as mitigated flood risk.</p> <p>Grand Properties (2011) Ltd has un-successfully requested an area of land of approximately 2,000m<sup>2</sup> in front of our motels on the northern side of the Glencoe Road and bounded by Bowen Drive, for a proposed Café/Restaurant (application reference 62308-SER). We have been refused based on the zone not being appropriate, that the area is in a high flood risk and finally because the management plan was up for review. We therefore would like the Department to re-consider our much-needed proposal via this plan review.</p>	<p>Reconsider an area in front of motel for commercial zone</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<b>Section: Maps Map 14: Aroarokahe Place</b>			
<i>Williams, Jezza</i> 35/7	Trails to the Tasman Lake lookout and Hooker valley track plus so much more can and should be accessible to all. (See submission point on Map 11)	Amend map to add accessible areas such as trails, accessible toilet facilities and carparks	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/20	Haast Hut is missing from the map	Add Haast Hut to the map.	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/12	ECO opposes the approach taken in the draft plan to the description of natural values, including: Map 14 doesn't include anything mentioned in the natural values section: Hooker & Aoraki ecosystem management units, rare moraine ecosystems, herbfields, shrublands, populations of alpine plant species, and habitat for threatened fauna located within boundaries of this place.	Seek the following amendment to Map 14: Revise Map 14 to include the following natural values located within the place's boundaries: Hooker and Aoraki ecosystem management units, rare moraine ecosystems, herbfields, shrublands, populations of alpine plant species, habitat for threatened fauna.	
<b>Section: Maps Map 15: Aircraft landing zones - Aroarokahe Place</b>			
<i>Thornton, James</i> 36/9	Oppose any helicopter landing zones within Aroarokahe Place	Remove all landing sites from Aroarokahe Place.	
<i>McCartney, John</i> 38/1	There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker valley at Pudding Rock. Retain the protection that the current plan places on the Upper Hooker valley.	Remove Pudding Rock landing zone	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/22	Remove Pudding Rock landing zone for reasons previously stated in this submission. The Plateau Landing zone should be broken into two zones, one to only include the current ski plane landing site and the second to give sufficient area for helicopter landing flexibility in the vicinity of the hut for climbers. The second zone should be reserved for climber pick up and drop offs only.	Remove Pudding Rock landing zone from Map 15. Revise Map 15 in accordance with the submission.	
<i>Comeskey, Matthew</i> 160/6	the option of heli landings at Empress Hutt should be included in the event that the trade routes to the summit of Mt Cook from Grand Plateau are significantly restricted or made significantly hazardous due to glacial recession	Include option for a landing site at Empress Hut	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/42	Support the aircraft landing zones as shown on Map 15.	Retain aircraft landing zones in Map 15, Aroarokahe Place as identified	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/14	There should be no helicopter landing zones within Aroarokahe Place :	Remove the helicopter landing zone at Barron Saddle and at Pudding Rock.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Barron Saddle Hut is easily reached on foot</li> <li>- the Hooker Valley should remain a place where the values of remoteness and tranquillity are maintained</li> <li>- these two landing sites are inconsistent with the large Red Zone that surrounds them</li> <li>- those wanting to access the Park using mechanical means are already extremely well catered for in the Tasman valley</li> </ul>		
<p><i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/18</p>	<p>Grand Plateau landing zone. The limitation to 10 landings per day may be around the minimum number on a busy day if there are several groups in the area. It may be sensible to introduce a system that prioritise parties needing to leave by aircraft. Otherwise the available landings could be used up by new parties arriving. In any event, it would be important to have a system of coordinating flights in and out to ensure the most benefit is achieved from the number of landings available.</p>	<p>For Grand Plateau Landing Zone include provisions for a system to coordinate flights in and out to ensure the most benefit is achieved from the number of landings available.</p>	
<p><i>Brent, Allan</i> 462/5</p>	<p>The Draft does not contain a serious discussion of why a Pudding Rock landing zone has now become necessary. That is not acceptable where it involves the disestablishment of a long-standing no-landing zone. Safety arguments for alpine helicopter landings are well known. Those arguments merit general concern, but even with the loss of Gardiner Hut, a new landing site at Pudding Rock is not a logical local response. Obvious replies include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- first that parties have the option of avoiding the Hooker if one of their number is not up to the area's challenges, and would be exposed to unacceptable levels of risk in that place.</li> <li>- secondly, park-wide opportunities for 'safe access' and guiding will significantly increase based on Draft landing policies for other areas of the park.</li> <li>- thirdly, parties can also elect to land immediately west of Harper Saddle in Westland National Park, based on draft landing provisions for that park.</li> </ul> <p>Other issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the influence from third-party commercial aircraft and guiding operators, and the legality of that</li> <li>- the wider discussion of huts needing to be self-funding. It has been irresponsible for DOC to the level of detailed policy-setting</li> <li>- DOC's refusal to enforce park policies or concession</li> </ul>	<p>Delete Orange Zone at Pudding Rock</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>conditions to the extent, for example, of preventing 'landing-site creep'. A Pudding Rock landing site will undoubtedly see landings much closer to Empress Hut, beginning with "just over that next big slot".</p>		
<p><i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/11</p>	<p>There should be no new flight access permitted into the Hooker Valley at Pudding Rock.</p>	<p>Remove landing site at Pudding Rock</p>	
<p><i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/2</p>	<p>Support for limited aircraft access to or near the Old Gardiner hut site above Pudding Rock. Not specifically supporting access to Empress Hut site, but would not oppose. Foot access is becoming problematic and likely to become more so. By having a drop off zone at Pudding Rock there is still an exclusion /Wilderness zone to keep the upper valley a quiet zone (if overflights are well managed).</p>		
<p><i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/16</p>	<p>Pudding rock landing zone: I am an active climber who has made several trips into the Hooker valley in recent years. Whilst the increased tranquillity of reduced helicopter flights is nice, the main reason I appreciate the current ban on landings in the Hooker is that it increases the quality of experience available due to the effort and challenge required to access the area. Particularly appreciate the Hooker Valley because of the high quality of the climbing and the effort required to get there (because it is not possible to fly) which increases the satisfaction of a successful climbing trip. Recognise that traditional access routes up the valley have been rendered more difficult by changes to the lake and glacier, however alternative access options are being developed, for example using pack rafts to approach up the hooker lake and avoid the moraine walls, or approaching from the Copland Valley to Baker Saddle. Realise there is pressure from guides to open up the hooker valley for air access, but strongly feel that air access is already available to many parts of the park and that allowing air access to the Hooker Valley would spoil much of its appeal. Even though it may not be possible to access the Hooker Glacier at certain times of year, I do not feel that this is justification to take away much of the value and appeal of the valley as a climbing destination. Also note that the draft Westland Tai Poutini National Park plan proposes to allow air access close to Harper</p>	<p>Map 15 is changed to remove the Pudding Rock landing zone. The Westland Tai Poutini Plan is changed to be consistent with the Hooker valley being free of air access by removing areas near Harper and Baker saddle from the allowed landing zones.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	saddle and Baker saddle, both of which would allow easy access to the upper Hooker. This seems inconsistent with the AMCNP plan and needs revision.		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/17	Barron Saddle landing zone: There is no need for the allowed landing zone at Barron Saddle as foot access is possible and commonly used. By removing this landing zone it would increase the satisfaction of having completed the walk in (i.e. at the moment it feels like a slog to walk in, purely because there is the option to take a helicopter).	Map 15 is changed to remove the Barron Saddle landing zone.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/63	There reasons given in the Plan provide no justification for the proposed new landing site at Pudding Rock. The extent of the Plateau Landing Zone should be the same as the current plan. Also specific provisions should be made for climber drop offs and pick-ups	1. Remove Pudding Rock Landing Zone from Map 15 2. Amend the Plateau Landing Zone in accordance with the submission.	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/52	TIA supports the Grand Plateau landing zone. TIA recommends that DOC explore whether ground based access be secured to the area of the old Gardiner Hut site. If this is not practicable we support the Pudding Rock landing zone. TIA submits that DOC's planning for accessing backcountry huts and climbing areas be informed by alpine guiding concessionaires, the New Zealand Mountain Guides Association and recreational groups.	Retain the Grand Plateau Landing zone Review the Pudding Rock Landing zone in light of the issues raised	
<i>Waetford, Dr James Napier</i> 792/17	The pressure for helicopter access comes from several groups with different reason for not walking. None of those reasons constitute a valid prerogative for allowing helicopter access. Access as proposed will remove the natural quiet that has been effectively preserved in this area for many years and drastically change the spirit of mountaineering in this valley. Coupled with proposed changes in the Westland-Poutini Draft Plan, helicopter access to the Hooker sees the entire Main Divide and all 3000m peaks in the park laid wide open to helicopter access. It destroys all existing wilderness areas in our most prestigious alpine environment (the 3000m+ peaks). Helicopter operators already violate restrictions throughout the park in many ways and frequently display a flagrant disregard for landing restrictions and tranquillity levels (flight below allowed ceiling around the Hooker valley, particularly over Harper Saddle and along the upper Empress Shelf, landing in prohibited	Do not support the approach outlined in the plan.  Remove Pudding Rock landing zone	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>areas such as the Malte Brun Pass).</p> <p>Remove Pudding Rock landing zone - see submission under 2.2.1 - Policy 10b)</p>		
<p><i>Dare, Ben</i> 822/13</p>	<p>Oppose Pudding Rock landing zone.</p>	<p>Amend Map 15 to delete reference to Pudding Rock landing zone</p>	
<p><i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/5</p>	<p>We are in favour of keeping the current no-fly zone in the Hooker Valley. Our first preference would be to reinstate a Gardner Hut, however, this may not be realistic or possible in the terrain. With consideration to the changes that have occurred in the Hooker Valley and increased difficulty of access, we would be open to restricted flights to the proposed Pudding Rock Landing Site only with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The flight access is considered temporary until such a time that a Gardner Hut is reinstated (if ever), and/or safe walking access avoiding the dangerously unstable moraine walls is established. This may include watercraft access across Hooker Lake to the Glacier.</li> <li>- Flights are restricted to multi-day users only (strictly no allocation for single- day activities which includes, but is not limited to: snow landings, heli-hikes, heli-skiing)</li> <li>- Flight operators are encouraged to combine groups to fill the allowed capacity of the machine</li> <li>- The flight path to access the landing site is restricted to cross the Mount Cook Range at Billikin Pass (not Ball Pass).</li> <li>- Reduce the impact of aircraft in the vicinity of the Ball Pass route, Kaitiaki Peak, Ball Glacier and Ball Ridge by imposing a minimum required distance or buffer zone. This area is frequented by entirely foot-accessed visitors, whose numbers have progressively increased over the past 10-15 years. Their enjoyment of the natural quiet must be taken into consideration. It is unnecessary for aircraft operators to fly as close over this area as they currently do.</li> </ul>	<p>Review the aircraft landing zones - Aroarokaehe Place, to address the concerns raised.</p>	
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/5</p>	<p>We are in favour of keeping the current no-fly zone in the Hooker Valley. Our first preference would be to reinstate a Gardner Hut, however, this may not be realistic or possible in the terrain. With consideration to the changes that have occurred in the Hooker Valley and</p>	<p>Review the aircraft landing zones - Aroarokaehe Place, to address the concerns raised.</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>increased difficulty of access, we would be open to restricted flights to the proposed Pudding Rock Landing Site only with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The flight access is considered temporary until such a time that a Gardner Hut is reinstated (if ever), and/or safe walking access avoiding the dangerously unstable moraine walls is established. This may include watercraft access across Hooker Lake to the Glacier.</li> <li>- Flights are restricted to multi-day users only (strictly no allocation for single- day activities which includes, but is not limited to: snow landings, heli-hikes, heli-skiing)</li> <li>- Flight operators are encouraged to combine groups to fill the allowed capacity of the machine</li> <li>- The flight path to access the landing site is restricted to cross the Mount Cook Range at Billikin Pass (not Ball Pass).</li> <li>- Reduce the impact of aircraft in the vicinity of the Ball Pass route, Kaitiaki Peak, Ball Glacier and Ball Ridge by imposing a minimum required distance or buffer zone. This area is frequented by entirely foot-accessed visitors, whose numbers have progressively increased over the past 10-15 years. Their enjoyment of the natural quiet must be taken into consideration. It is unnecessary for aircraft operators to fly as close over this area as they currently do.</li> </ul>		
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 16: Haupapa Place</b>		
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/14	ECO opposes Map 16 because it doesn't include Tasman River PEU & Aoraki EMU. Also doesn't include braided river ecosystems and plant communities, and tarn & ephemeral wetlands, located within boundaries of this place.	Revise Map 16 to include the Tasman River PEU & Aoraki EMU, and locations of braided river habitat and plant communities, as well as tarn & ephemeral wetlands within the place's boundaries.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 17: Aircraft landing zones - Haupapa Place</b>		
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/3	Oppose use of "Landing Zones" - The proposed new Tasman Glacier Landing Zone includes much new area where aircraft would be allowed to land, this is to the detriment of the area as a whole..	Any new landing sites need to be carefully considered, independently, rather than using broad brush approach.	
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/5	There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall. The existing sites at Ledenfeld Saddle, Cornice Wall and Kelman Hut should remain. The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone.	Amend Map 17 to reflect the changes identified	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>Button, Ray</i> 14/4	There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall. The existing sites at Ledenfeld Saddle, Cornice Wall and Kelman Hut should remain. The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone.	Amend Map 17 to reflect the changes identified.	
<i>Wilson, Geoff</i> 16/4	<p>The proposed Tasman Glacier Landing Zone includes much new area where aircraft would be allowed to land. Any new landing areas/sites need to be carefully considered, independently, rather than using such a broad brush strokes that are extremely [permissive to aircraft.</p> <p>Any flight access to the eastern side of the Malte Brun Range should only be to a proposed new hut site (and only if this is inaccessible by foot) and above this only to specific strategic locations for back country users.</p> <p>Any commercial interests seeking new landings for sight seeing or heliskiing etc., should be turned down or only be to specific sites.</p> <p>The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone. There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall, but the existing sites at Ledenfeld Saddle and Cornice Wall should remain.</p>	Amend Map 17 to address the changes as identified.	
<i>Moffat, Steven</i> 17/3	<p>Revisit the orange zone in the Malte Brun Range. Only two or three landing spots need to be allocated for climbing / ski touring access - these need to be on top of the moraine walls, not at the base.</p> <p>Use better quality maps to show the zone boundaries.</p>	Amend Map 17 to reflect the changes identified	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/3	Any new landing areas / sites need to be carefully considered, independently, rather than using such broad brush strokes that are extremely permissive to aircraft.	Amend the Haupapa/Tasman Landing Zone to consider new landing sites rather than landing zones.	
<i>Bosshard, Andrea</i> 41/3	<p>Adoption of huge "Landing zones" should not be allowed. This will mean it becomes impossible to seek different levels of remoteness. For people on the ground:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Any new landing areas in Tasman valley should be considered independently rather than a broad-brush approach</li> <li>- any new access to western side of Malte Brun range should only be to proposed new hut site if inaccessible by foot. Any further access only to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above moraine wall.</li> </ul>	Amend the landing zones in Map 17 to reflect the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone,</li> <li>- No additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall</li> <li>- existing sites at Ledenfeld and Cornice wall should remain</li> </ul>		
<i>Miller, Harriet</i> 68/6	Map difficult to interpret but landing zone appears to include the Malte Brun/Darwin bowls areas - potential for conflict with traditional users	Reformat: exclude landing outside of existing sites to retain terrain for non-powered access	
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/30	Submit that the Haupapa Tasman Glacier landing zone be removed. It be replaced with an increased number of landing sites or small zones reflecting the currently permitted landing locations. Any landing zones be restricted to the Tasman Glacier Ice below 2400m. Any landing zones be modelled for size and spacing on the current WNPMP Maps 4 and 4 a). There be no new landings on the Tasman nerve between Mts Green/Walter to the west and Cornice Wall to the east between the elevations of 2000-2400m. There be no new landings in the lower Darwin Glacier. There be no new landings on the western side of the Malte Brun Range apart from a new hut should it be inaccessible on foot. Any new landing sites/zones be assessed on a case by case basis and specified in the plan. There be no new Tasman Lake landing zone.	Remove Map 17, replace it with a new map that shows landing site and zones in accordance with the submission.	
<i>Hegg, Danilo</i> 222/28	Lendenfeld saddle landing zone - would have a major impact on climbers accessing Mt Elie de Beaumont. Haupapa landing zone - not consistent with the vision for the National Park.	Remove Lendenfeld landing zone. Remove Haupapa Landing Zone; allow landings at specified sites only. Decrease number of allowed landings to no more than 10 per day in the whole Tasman Valley.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/49	<p>Tasman Lake Landing Zone: This landing zone would severely reduce the quality of visitor experience for those on the Tasman lake trying to hear their guide's interpretation. Does not make sense when trying to encourage foot access into lower Murchison by means of a footbridge near the lake outlet.</p>	Remove the Tasman Lake Landing Zone.	
<i>Alpine Recreation Canterbury Ltd</i> 269/50	<p>Oppose a giant landing zone for all of upper half of Tasman Glacier and western side of Malte Brun Range. Would be impossible for on-foot recreationists to work out where to go to escape aircraft noise. Identify a number of smaller, defined zones:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- only for multi-day recreationists on Malte Brun Range</li> <li>- day tripping scenic flights or heli-hikes should be</li> </ul> </p>	<p>Identify specific landing sites within this zone to avoid conflict between different user groups:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- only the Beetham hut site on the Malte Brun Range</li> <li>- redraw the Upper Tasman Landing Zone to exclude Mt Eli de Beaumont and the Anna Glacier, Divers Col, Hochstetter Dome, Mt Aylmer and Aylmer Col, Bonney and Turnbull Glaciers and Darwin Bowls.</li> </ul> </p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	limited to the Tasman Glacier ice		
<i>Braun-Elwert, Anne</i> 271/29	Tasman Lake landing zone would severely reduce the quality of the visitor experience for those on the Tasman Lake trying to hear their guide's interpretation. This site is not far from the airport. Why impact on walkers and lake tourists with yet another landing site.	Remove the Tasman Lake landing zone.	
<i>Braun-Elwert, Elke</i> 272/46	<p>Regarding the Tasman Lake landing zone this site is not far from the airport. Why impact on walkers and lake tourists with yet another landing site?</p> <p>We oppose having one giant landing zone for all of the upper half of the Tasman Glacier and the western side of the Malte Brun range. This would create a "free-for-all". Rather than one huge landing zone, identify a limited number of smaller but defined zones.</p>	Remove the Tasman Lake landing zone. Identify specific landing sites within this zone. Redraw the upper Tasman landing zone to exclude Mt. Elie de Beaumont and the Anna Glacier, Divers Col, Hochstetter Dome, Mt. Aylmer and Aylmer Col, Bonney and Turnbull Glaciers and Darwin Bowls.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/47	<p>Strongly disagree with the proposed Haupapa Landing Zone depicted in Map 17. The outcome will be to expose the upper Tasman Glacier to intensive aircraft use. The upper névés and surrounding peaks have outstanding values and a high degree of natural quiet.</p> <p>We believe there is sufficient knowledge and practical experience to identify and designate three specific landing sites on the Tasman Glacier. These can be reviewed in 10 years and relocated if changing conditions make the site unsuitable for landings.</p>	<p>Delete the Haupapa Landing Zone and the Tasman Lake Landing Zone, and replace them with specific landing sites at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Tasman Saddle hut - 100m</li> <li>2) Kelman Hut at approx 2,400m contour;</li> <li>3) Lower Tasman Glacier at approx 1,260m contour just above the junction with the Rudolph Glacier.</li> </ol>	
<i>Thornton, James</i> 340/21	The expansion of this landing zone is nowhere justified in this document.	Restore the Tasman Glacier Landing Zone to the extent in the previous management plan.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/15	The massive new zone proposed is not justified or needed. However the existing Plan only shows the landing sites as small aircraft icons. Therefore it would make sense to more clearly define these areas. This could be done in the form of polygons centred on these locations with appropriate maximum dimensions (e.g. 1 km). On the western side of the Malte Brun range the establishment new landing zones seems justifiable (with reference to the National Parks Act) where moraine walls have made foot access so difficult that access is effectively precluded, and perhaps also to include the location of any new hut (as is proposed). Examples of potentially suitable locations include benches in the Beetham and Reay Valleys. These locations could be	Remove the proposed Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone and replace with a series of smaller new zones centred on the location of the existing landing sites. Map these as polygons with an appropriate maximum dimension (e.g. 1 km). In addition, on the western side of the Malte Brun range establish new landing zones only where moraine walls have made foot access difficult, and at the location of any new hut (as is proposed). Examples of potentially suitable locations include benches in the Beetham and Reay Valleys.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	identified as new landing sites (in addition to the other adjustments suggested above for the Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing Zone). ** note that there is some inconsistency in the wording used to refer to this zone in the draft Plan at present.		
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/16	The proposed Tasman Lake Landing Zone has no demonstrated need and is incompatible with other park objectives	Remove the proposed Tasman Lake Landing Zone.	
<i>Ballance, Alison</i> 523/10	The Lower Darwin Glacier should be a no landing zone. There should be no additional landings above 2000m between Mt Green and Cornice Wall. The existing sites at Lendenfeld Saddle and Cornice Wall should remain.	Amend	
<i>McKinley, Dave</i> 543/1	Support aircraft access to the Malte Brun Range at or about the 1700 - 1800 m contour line. Foot access in this zone is vastly more dangerous than a decade or so ago. It is also within the normal flight paths of the existing plan.		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/20	No justification is given for the need for the Lendenfeld saddle landing zone. This landing zone on the main divide seems unnecessary and would degrade the mana of the area. As discussed in submission on map 7A disagree strongly with the heli-ski landing zone	Delete the Lendenfeld Landing zone from Map 17. Delete the designated heli-ski landing zone from map 17.	
<i>Nixon, Garry</i> 575/3	The proposed Tasman Glacier Landing Zone includes much new area where aircraft would be allowed to land, this is to the detriment of the area as a whole. Any new landing areas/sites need to be carefully considered, independently, rather than using such broad brush strokes that are extremely permissive to aircraft.	Any new landing areas/sites need to be carefully considered, independently before they are added to the plan.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/102	Do not support new Haupapa/Tasman Glacier Landing zone as identified as it would allow for landings in areas currently designated as a remote setting and the plan needs to recognise the importance of keeping considerable areas free from aircraft landings. Request a number of changes to the landing zone within Haupapa Place: 1. Remove the proposed Haupapa /Tasman Glacier Landing zone and replace with an increased number (over the current plan) of landing sites or small zones reflecting the currently permitted landing locations 2. Any Landing zones should be restricted to the Tasman Glacier ice below 2400m 3. Any Landing Zones be modelled for size and spacing	1. Remove current Map 17 2. Replace with new Map 17 showing landing sites and zones as requested	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>on the Westland National Park Management Plan Maps 4 and 4(a) "Approved Aircraft Landing Sites"</p> <p>4. There should be no new landings on the Tasman between Mts Green/Walter to the west and Cornice Wall to the east between the elevations of 2000-2400m</p> <p>5. There should be no landings in the lower Darwin Glacier</p> <p>6. Any new landings on the west side of Malte Brun Range should be very limited in number and at very strategic sites only</p> <p>7. Any new landing sites for climbers,skiers, guided groups and sightseers should be either specified in the Plan, or strict guidelines for number of sites</p> <p>8. No new Tasman Lake landing zone</p>		
<p><i>Ogle, Caroline</i> 664/13</p>	<p>Because of the poor quality of the maps used in the draft plan it is impossible to see the boundary's that are proposed for the Haupapa/Tasman landing zone. Due to the hazards with moraine walls these days and the high number of aircraft in the area anyway it would make perfect sense to enable landings on top of the moraine walls on both sides of the Haupapa/Tasman glacier for safety reasons. To force people to ascend or descend the moraine walls to get to an aircraft pick-up zone would be ludicrous.</p>	<p>Enable landings on top of the moraine walls on both sides of the Haupapa/Tasman glacier for safety reasons.</p>	
<p><i>Air Safaris &amp; Services (NZ) Ltd</i> 703/6</p>	<p>Important to consider where concessionaires operate from as some will have a much greater noise footprint in Lower Tasman ( i.e. operations to/from Mount Cook Airport) than others who access landing areas using flight paths that stay away from Tasman terminal area. As an operator based at Lake Tekapo we can use flightpaths from the Cass, Fork &amp; Jollie Valleys to access a snow landing on the mid/upper Tasman glacier and have no noise footprint around the Tasman terminal and reduced footprint on lower part of valley when utilizing climb and descents in mid / upper reaches of Tasman &amp; Murchison. The Tasman provides safe landing options for multiple operators and provides good lower level alternative to Liebig Dome.</p> <p>Can't see where Upper Neve is clearly defined on Map 17.</p>		
<p><i>Harris, Peter J.</i> 771/21</p>	<p>The Orange Zone is too broad and permissive to excess aircraft activity in a large area of the Park's alpine</p>	<p>Note the zone mentioned in submission are in WTP!!</p>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	terrain.	Rezone Orange Zone to encompass only the lower Fox and Franz Josef glacier valleys (the current icefalls) and current permitted landing sites. All other areas to be Red Zone.	
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/2	We are not opposed to aircraft access to key areas to facilitate recreation opportunities. We are however, opposed to the following: - Broad landing zones replacing well defined landing sites, as this removes a valuable form of control over aircraft and aircraft use patterns. AMCNP must retain a means to control aircraft to avoid a free-for-all; - Excessive expansion of aircraft intensive day trips, especially into areas which have traditionally been free of such mass tourism; - Little to no restriction on day-tourism related aircraft flights and landings; - Intensive day trip aircraft access to popular hut-accessible climbing and ski touring areas and routes. Aircraft use and access is now a part of life and daily operations in this area. It can successfully continue to provide a range of experiences for different user groups, provided that everyone has a clear understanding of aircraft landing sites and the terrain they provide access to.		
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/2	We are not opposed to aircraft access to key areas to facilitate recreation opportunities. We are however, opposed to the following: - Broad landing zones replacing well defined landing sites, as this removes a valuable form of control over aircraft and aircraft use patterns. AMCNP must retain a means to control aircraft to avoid a free-for-all; - Excessive expansion of aircraft intensive day trips, especially into areas which have traditionally been free of such mass tourism; - Little to no restriction on day-tourism related aircraft flights and landings; - Intensive day trip aircraft access to popular hut-accessible climbing and ski touring areas and routes. Aircraft use and access is now a part of life and daily operations in this area. It can successfully continue to provide a range of experiences for different user groups, provided that everyone has a clear understanding of aircraft landing sites and the terrain they provide access to.	Amend the landing zones for Haupapa Place to reflect the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<p>Our suggestions for the management of these places would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There should be a clearly defined total number of daytourism related landings allowed per day across all aircraft operators in the Tasman Valley, which does not result in more than an average of one flight per 15-20 minute period.</li> <li>- Create a number of smaller, but well-defined landing zones on the Tasman Glacier, which are still large enough to allow for fluctuations in both weather and seasonal conditions. Each zone is associated with sensible foot access to a hut or specific area of the glacier.</li> <li>- Tasman Glacier landing zones should not include areas that are commonly accessed by foot from nearby huts (with the exception of hut access points as defined above) and should not include high elevation non-traditional landing areas. Specifically, the following areas should be excluded from the currently proposed zone: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Areas above 2000m in the Upper Tasman Glacier area</li> <li>o Anywhere above 2400m in the area between Kelman and Tasman Saddle Huts</li> <li>o The Darwin Bowls, Darwin and Bonney Glaciers, Hochstetter Shoulder</li> <li>o Tasman Saddle and Lendenfeld Saddle</li> <li>o The western side of the Malte Brun Range (see below)</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Heli-skiing at the head of the Tasman Glacier, should cease at the time of implementation of the new plan. An exception could be made for Alpine Guides' "Ski the Tasman" product (with a sensible upper limit), which provides a unique experience to lower-ability skiers, and being predominantly ski plane assisted, has an historical precedent in that area.</li> <li>- Commercial interests should not be given free reign over the Malte Brun Range, as this would negatively impact the remote experiences of other user groups. There should be no landing "zone" on the western Malte Brun Range, rather a number of specific landing sites that give access to above the moraine walls, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Any new hut site would have an associated and sensibly placed landing site</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The lower Beetham Valley</li> <li>o The lower Reay Valley</li> <li>o Bivvy terraces below the Malte Brun Glacier</li> <li>o No more than 5 landing sites, all of which are below 1700m</li> </ul> <p>- There should be no concessions granted for aircraft-intensive day-tourism activities in the western Malte Brun Range, above the moraine walls.</p> <p>- Once the NZAC's proposed Beetham Hut is installed, phase out heli-skiing on the western side of the Malte Brun Range.</p>		
<p><i>Alderson, David</i> 881/43</p>	<p>1. A Tasman Lake landing zone would severely reduce the quality of the visitor experience for those on the Tasman Lake trying to hear their guide's interpretation. This site is not far from the airport. Why impact on walkers and lake tourists with yet another landing site? It does not make sense if you are going to encourage foot access into the lower Murchison Valley by means of a footbridge near the lake outlet, and in light of your Tasman Glacier Walks Icon destination.</p> <p>2. We oppose having one giant landing zone for all of the upper half of the Tasman Glacier and the western side of the Malte Brun Range. This would create a "free-for-all", making it impossible for recreationists on foot to work out where to go to escape aircraft noise. Rather than one huge landing zone, the plan should provide for a small number of specifically identified landing zones.</p> <p>3. For the Malte Brun Range any heli access should be for multi-day recreationists only, NOT for day tripping scenic flights or heli-hikes, or HELI SKIING.</p> <p>4. REMOVE ALL LANDING SITE CONCESSIONS FOR HELI SKIING IN THE TASMAN AND MURCHISON VALLEYS. There are plenty of great areas south of the Liebeg Range. This area should be for overnighiting ski mountaineers &amp; climbers</p>	<p>1. Remove the Tasman Lake landing zone</p> <p>2. Identify specific landing sites within the Tasman zone to avoid conflict between different user groups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Kelman Hut,</li> <li>- Tasman Saddle Hut,</li> <li>- Upper Neve at 2120m</li> <li>- Darwin Corner</li> <li>- Red tractor</li> <li>- De La Beche Corner</li> <li>- Lower part of white ice.</li> </ul> <p>3.</p>	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 18: Pae Tata Place</b>		
<p><i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of</i></p>	<p>ECO opposes the approach taken in the draft Map 18 because it doesn't include the following which are all</p>	<p>Revise Map 18 to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- glacial ecosystems (glacial moraines, névés, glacier, and</li> </ul>	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
<i>New Zealand</i> 841/17	mentioned in natural values description text: - glacial ecosystems, - gecko & skink habitat, and - grasslands.	glacial lakes), - gecko & skink habitat, - grasslands. We recommend that very specific locations of gecko and skink not be provided to prevent poaching.	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 19: Aircraft landing zones - Pae Tata Place</b>		
<i>Grant, Callum</i> 13/4	Flight access to eastern side of Malte Brun range should only be to a proposed new hut site. Any flight access over and above this must only be to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above the moraine wall.	No new landings for commercial interests, except to specific sites.	
<i>Crampton, Peter</i> 18/4	Any flight access to the western side of Malte Brun range should only be to a proposed new hut site. If any flight access over and above this is to be provided, it must only be to specific strategic locations for back country users, just above the moraine wall. Any commercial interests seeking additional new landings in this area for sight seeing and helihiking etc should be turned down, or should only be to specific sites so they can be avoided by those seeking a different type of experience, on foot.		Aircraft access zones and the allocation of landings are used to manage adverse effects of aircraft on the values and other users of the park. Most often these effects relate to the frequency of the activity, safety concerns, and its effect on the tranquility of an area. For these reasons, allocations relate only to the number and frequency of landings - they are not associated with the particular activity occurring on the ground once the aircraft has landed.
<i>Bosshard, Sam</i> 71/36	The Pae Tata landing zone should be broken down into 2 smaller zones both below 1900m. Site A: existing landing site below Murchison Hut spanning elevation range of 1720-1780m approx. Site B: at the mouth of Mannering Glacier 1300-1400m approx.	Remove the Pae Tata landing zone and replace with 2 smaller zones or sites in accordance with the submission.	
<i>Mellish, Diane (Peninsula Tramping Club)</i> 338/50	Strongly disagree with the proposed Murchison Landing Zone. The outcome will be to expose the upper glacier to intensive aircraft use. The upper névés and surrounding peaks have outstanding landscape values and a high degree of natural quiet, and given the confined shape of the valley there is little capacity to absorb the sound of aircraft noise.. There is sufficient knowledge to identify and designate a specific landing site on the Murchison Glacier - this can be reviewed in 10 years and relocated if changing conditions make the site unsuitable.	Delete the Murchison Landing Zone and replace it with a specific designated landing site on the Murchison Glacier at approx 1,700m contour.	
<i>Orchard, Shane</i> 450/17	The proposed Murchison Glacier Landing Zone is very large in relation to existing landing site but it is difficult to see the exact boundaries on the map provided. To avoid impacts on self powered recreationalists it should not be extended higher into the neve than the existing	Reduce the size of the Murchison Glacier Landing Zone to ensure there are no landings permissible higher on the neve than the location of the landing site, or in the Mannering Glacier.	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	land site, and not include any part of the Mannering Glacier. The bottom end of the landing zone could include the confluence with the Mannering thereby providing a potential exit option for parties skiing or walking out from higher terrain via the Mannering or the Murchison Glaciers.		
<i>Measures, Richard</i> 568/27	See no justification for the proposed Liebig Dome landing zone. Can only presume it is for scenic landings, which is unnecessary given the extent of the area available for scenic landings in the Tasman Glacier. The Cass and Jolie valleys are both used by ski tourers and these experiences would be degraded by this landing zone. As discussed previously, strongly disagree with heli-skiers being allowed landings outside the areas permitted for other users, especially on summits.	Delete the Liebig Dome landing zone from map 19. Delete the heli-ski landing zone from map 19.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/116	<p>1. Pae Tata Landing Zone should be broken down into two smaller zones similar to the status quo, both below 1900m:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Site A - existing landing site below Murchison Hut spanning elevation range of 1720-1780m</li> <li>- Site B - at the mouth of Mannering Glacier 1300-1400m approx.</li> </ul> <p>2. There should be no landings at the toe of the Aida Glacier</p>	Remove the Pae Tata Landing Zone and replace with two smaller zones or sites as requested	
<i>Air Safaris &amp; Services (NZ) Ltd</i> 703/7	See submission on Policy 3 c) i). Show Liebig Dome as green zone	Amend Liebig Dome zone to green	
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/44	<p>TIA does have concerns that the exact size and boundaries of the proposed zones could have impacts on aircraft safety and on the visitor experience of other users of the Park, and that in some cases this could outweigh the value of the increased size of the zone. We consider that this may be the case for the extension of the aircraft landing zone into the upper areas of the Murchison Glacier. While aircraft access to Murchison Hut is appropriate, the rest of the upper Murchison Glacier is a highly valued relatively quiet back country area and is particularly utilised for ski touring. TIA doubts that extending the aircraft landing zone into the upper Murchison Glacier will provide an overall gain for recreational opportunities and visitor experience in the Park. We submit that DOC carefully consider</p>	Review the Murchison Glacier Landing Zone to reflect the concerns raised	

Submitter and submission point	Submission summary	Decision Sought	Response
	submissions on this point, particularly from recreational groups and the New Zealand Mountain Guide Association.		
<i>Tourism Industry Aotearoa</i> 728/53	TIA supports the landing sites at Onslow and Liebig Huts, and at Liebig Dome.	Retain the identified landing zones	
<i>Hughes, Catherine Dr</i> 880/4	Divide Pae Tata Landing Zone into three smaller zones/sites, all below 1900m, leaving the upper glacier aircraft-free.	Amend the Murchison Glacier Landing Zone to reflect the concerns raised	
<i>Alderson, David</i> 881/4	Divide Pae Tata Landing Zone into three smaller zones/sites, all below 1900m, leaving the upper glacier aircraft-free.	Amend the Murchison Glacier Landing Zone to reflect the concerns raised	
<b>Section:</b>	<b>Maps Map 20: Pae Tawhiti Place</b>		
<i>Rogers, Ian</i> 276/5	The map shows the route goes to Red Stag Hut when it should show it go to the mouth of Separation Stream.	Edit the map to show the rest of the route.	
<i>The New Zealand Alpine Club Inc.</i> 600/134	The Map only shows the route going as far as Red Stag Hut - in fact it continues up to the mouth of Separation stream.	Amend the Map 20 to address the submission	
<i>Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand</i> 841/21	Map 20 doesn't include the following: Godley River PEU within place boundaries, braided river habitat, and alpine habitat for threatened bird species, as discussed in description.	Revise Map 20 to include Godley River PEU located within the place's boundaries, braided river habitat, and alpine habitat for threatened bird species.	