

**BEFORE THE MANAWATU-WANGANUI REGIONAL COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource  
Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of submissions and  
further submissions  
made by **the OIL  
COMPANIES** on the  
Proposed Horizons  
One Plan – General  
Hearing: Air

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF DAVID LE MARQUAND ON  
BEHALF OF THE OIL COMPANIES: GENERAL HEARING: AIR**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 My name is David le Marquand and I am a Director of Burton Planning Consultants Limited. My qualifications are a Bachelor and Master of Arts degree in Geography from Auckland University. I have practised resource management for over twenty-nine years: fifteen of those years in Central Government including six years as a Scientist in the Planning Section of the Water and Soil Directorate (MWD) Wellington, and two years as a Policy Analyst and five years as a Senior Policy Analyst with the Ministry for the Environment in Auckland. I have spent the last fourteen years as a Resource Management Consultant with Burton Consultants.

1.2 I have been the Burton's Account Manager for the Oil Industry Working Group (OIEWG) for more than twelve years. OIEWG currently comprises of Shell New Zealand Limited, BP Oil New Zealand Limited, Chevron New Zealand and Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited (the Oil Companies). As the Account

Manager, I have been responsible for providing resource management advice to the Oil Companies on a national basis, on relevant district and regional plan provisions and various environmental issues of collective interest including contaminated land, air and water discharge provisions, hazard substances and risk management provisions.

## **2.0 BASIS OF EVIDENCE**

- 2.1 My evidence supports the submissions lodged by the Oil Companies to the Proposed One Plan on the Air section.
- 2.2 I have read and am familiar with the Proposed One Plan provisions, and with the staff report on Air in relation to the Oil Companies submissions. My evidence primarily focuses on the recommendations in the Planners Report on Chapter 14 Air, namely provisions 14-2 and 14-8.
- 2.3 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses issued as part of the Environment Court Practice Notes. I agree to comply with the code and am satisfied the matters I address in my evidence are within my expertise. I am not aware of any material facts that I have omitted that might alter or detract from the opinions I express in my evidence.

## **3.0 SUBMISSIONS**

### **Guideline for Managing Noxious, Dangerous, Offensive and Objectionable. (submission 267/13)**

- 3.1 The Oil Companies sought the retention of section 14-2 without further modification. The only change proposed by the staff recommendations relates to making reference to the January 2002 updated Workplace Exposure Standard version. The retention of the provision, subject to the staff recommendation, is supported and commended to the Committee.

### **Miscellaneous Discharges 14-12 (submission 267/14)**

- 3.2 The Oil Companies sought the retention of Rule 14-12 without further modification, and in particular sections (c) and (u) which permit the discharge into air of contaminants from retail and wholesale distribution of automotive

fuels and development, maintenance, use repair and demolition of industrial and trade premises. These provisions are subject to conditions. These include that the discharge shall not result in a breach of any National Environmental Standard, or be offensive, objectionable, noxious or dangerous. Additional amendments proposed in the staff report to the conditions relate to not causing any reduction in visibility and to determining whether any discharge is offensive, objectionable, noxious or dangerous, having reference to the guidelines in section 14-2. The retention of the provision, subject to the proposed changes as detailed in the staff report, is supported and the recommendation is commended to the Committee.

David le Marquand

17.04.09