

# Committee Recommendations on Threshold Test for Invited Private Plan Change Requests, Use and Value and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps

Under Section 83 of the Local Government Act

**Adopted as Council Decision**



Caring for Northland  
and its environment

**NORTHLAND  
REGIONAL  
COUNCIL** 



# **Committee Recommendations on Threshold Test for Invited Private Plan Change Requests, Use and Value and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps**

**Under Section 83 of the Local Government Act**

**Adopted as Council Decision**

April 2008

---

Northland Regional Council

Private Bag 9021  
Whangarei  
Telephone 09-438 4639

[www.nrc.govt.nz](http://www.nrc.govt.nz)

Regional Offices: Dargaville  
Opua  
Kaitaia

Cover photo: Waiheuehu Channel

# Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION .....	3
KEY MATTERS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS.....	3
COMMITTEE REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS .....	15
INTRODUCTION .....	15
SECTION 1 STAGE 1: THRESHOLD TEST FOR ALL PLAN CHANGE REQUESTS .....	16
SECTION 1.1. THE REQUEST, OR PART OF THE REQUEST, IS FRIVOLOUS OR VEXATIOUS.....	17
SECTION 1.2 THE SUBSTANCE OF THE REQUEST, OR PART OF THE REQUEST, HAS BEEN CONSIDERED AND GIVEN EFFECT TO, OR REJECTED BY, THE NORTHLAND REGIONAL COUNCIL OR THE ENVIRONMENT COURT WITHIN THE LAST TWO YEARS.....	18
SECTION 1.3 THE REQUEST, OR PART OF THE REQUEST, IS NOT IN ACCORDANCE WITH SOUND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PRACTICE.....	19
SECTION 1.4 THE REQUEST, OR PART OF THE REQUEST, WOULD MAKE THE REGIONAL COASTAL PLAN INCONSISTENT WITH PART 5 OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 .....	24
SECTION 1.5 MORE THAN ONE PERSON HAS REQUESTED A CHANGE TO ESTABLISH AN AQUACULTURE MANAGEMENT AREA IN THE SAME AREA OF THE REGION AND THE COUNCIL HAS ADOPTED ANOTHER REQUEST .....	25
SECTION 2. COMPARATIVE EVALUATION FOR PLAN CHANGE REQUESTS INVOLVING PROPOSALS FOR THE SAME PHYSICAL LOCATION.....	26
SECTION 2.1 INVITEE'S COMPETENCE TO SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE THE PLAN CHANGE PROCESS .....	27
SECTION 2.2 INVITEE'S DEMONSTRATED UNDERSTANDING OF AND ABILITY TO OPERATE A COMMERCIALY VIABLE AQUACULTURE ACTIVITY.....	29
SECTION 2.3 INVITEE'S DEMONSTRATED COMPETENCE ON A RANGE OF COLLATERAL ISSUES.....	30
SECTION 3 THE ADOPTED PROCESS FOR INVITED PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE REQUESTS .....	32
MAPS: GENERAL .....	35
MAPS: EXCLUDED AREAS.....	39
MAPS: HOUHORA HARBOUR (3A/B) .....	41
MAPS: WHANGAROA HARBOUR/CAVALLI ISLANDS (6A/B).....	42
MAPS: BAY OF ISLANDS AREA (7A/B, 8 A/B, 25 A/B).....	44

MAPS: WHANGARURU HARBOUR-WHANANAKI (9A/B) .....	48
MAPS: TUTUKAKA/NGUNGURU/HORAHORA (10A/B, 11A/B).....	48
MAPS: WHANGAREI HARBOUR (12A/B, 26 A/B, 27 A/B).....	49
MAPS: BREAM BAY – HEN AND CHICKEN ISLANDS (13A/B) .....	51
MAPS: KAIPARA HARBOUR-MANGAWHAI (14 A/B, 15 A/B, 16 A/B).....	52
GENERAL: PROCESS .....	52
GENERAL: MISCELLANEOUS .....	55
ORAL SUBMISSIONS AND EVIDENCE PRESENTED AT THE HEARINGS .....	58
INDEX OF SUBMITTERS BY NUMBER .....	60
INDEX OF SUBMITTERS BY NAME .....	65

# Introduction

This report presents a summary of submissions on the Threshold Test for Invited Private Plan Change, Use and Value and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps for Northland. This report discusses the submissions (grouped by subject matter or individually) and includes recommendations by the Committee on what amendments (if any) should be made. The recommendations have been adopted by Council as its decision.

## Key matters raised in submissions

A discussion of the main issues raised in submissions and the Committee recommendations is included at the front end of this report – including those for Plan Change 4.

A discussion of the main issues raised in submissions is included at the front end of this report to assist with understanding the Committee recommendations. Note that many of the issues relate to the Plan Change but are included here for information purposes. Only the first three issues contain recommendations specific to this report. The issues are:

1. Use and Value Maps Changes
2. Threshold Test and Evaluation Criteria Changes
3. Adequacy and Location of Maps
4. Exclusion Areas
5. Location of Threshold Test and Evaluation Criteria
6. Importance of Aquaculture to Northland
7. Register of Interested Parties and Notification in General
8. Iwi Preferences
9. Customary Aquaculture
10. Derelict Marine Farms
11. Local Economic Development
12. Reverse Sensitivity

### 1. Use and Value Maps Changes

The Committee heard submissions from many submitters requesting a wide range of changes to the Use and Value Maps. Due to a number of submissions raising similar issues the Committee wish to clarify the following matters from the outset:

- The Use and Value Maps are not a mechanism through which future aquaculture can be excluded but is rather a mapped record of verifiable information/knowledge about the uses and values of the coastal marine area and adjacent land of Northland.
- Submissions that addressed Resource Management Act issues can only be addressed through decisions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland and not through the decision on the content of the maps which is made under the Local Government Act.

Some of the more significant changes recommended by the Committee include:

- That all buffer zones surrounding different uses and values be removed from the Use and Value Maps. The original intention of the buffer zones was to provide a degree of recognition that the effects of, or effects on, the use or value are not confined to the site. The Committee noted a large number of submissions were received on the inadequacies of these buffers, disputing whether there is any justification for the distances and requesting the buffer distances be extended.

The Committee in considering submissions and the original intent of the buffers concluded they are inadequate to indicate an area within which aquaculture could have a potential impact on uses and values and vice versa. While work could be undertaken to identify a more robust buffer

distance it would require a significant amount of time and resources and is something that should be undertaken on a case-by-case basis when AMA applications are considered.

- That Maori Oyster Reserves be shown on the Use and Value Maps as identified in regulation 9 of the Fisheries (Auckland and Kermadec Areas Amateur Fishing) Regulations 1986. This is a verifiable use and value of the coastal marine area and as such should be shown on the Use and Value Maps.
- Department of Conservation land was shown on the Use and Value Maps however District Council land was not. The Committee considers that both land sets have similar attribute, such as public access and recreational value and therefore District Council land should also be shown on the maps.
- Historic and Wahi Tapu sites and areas within the coastal marine area that have been verified by and are registered with the Historic Places Trust should be identified on the Use and Value Maps.

#### **Key Recommendations:**

1. *That all buffers around use and values be removed.*
2. *That Maori Oyster Reserves be shown on the Use and Value Maps.*
3. *That District Council owned land adjacent to the coastal marine area be shown on the Use and Value Maps under a common category with Department of Conservation land as “Parks and Reserves”.*
4. *That registered historic and Wahi Tapu sites and areas within the CMA be identified on the Use and Value Maps.*

## **2. Threshold Test and Evaluation Criteria Changes**

Some submitters sought an Expression of Interest stage. The Committee concurs with the Officers' view that the Council is currently not able to undertake an Expression of Interest (EOI) process under the existing provisions of the RMA because there is no provision enabling it to limit the plan change invitation to pre-selected or pre-qualified organisations or individuals.

There were submissions requesting that there should be evidence of relevant planning documents recognised by an iwi authority having been taken into account. The Committee agrees with these submissions and has recommended its inclusion.

#### **Key Recommendations:**

Add the following to: **1.3 The request, or part of the request, is not in accordance with sound resource management practice:**

*Evidence that relevant planning documents recognised by an iwi authority have been taken into account.*

## **3. Adequacy and Location of Maps**

The Committee noted that many submitters were concerned about the adequacy and location of the maps.

The Plan Change proposed two types of maps: the “Use and Value” maps and the “Aquaculture Evaluation” maps. The “Use and Value” maps spatially identify various uses and values within the coastal marine area. The “Aquaculture Evaluation” maps are derived from the “Use and Value” maps and classify the uses and values as either ‘critical’, ‘significant’ or ‘potential’ in respect to their possible conflict with aquaculture.

#### **Use and Value Maps**

The Committee recognises the practical utility of the Use and Value Maps as providing a ‘visual’ representation of many of the uses and values on Northlands Coast.

The Committee notes the many submissions and evidence which either support inclusion of the Use and Value Maps in the Plan Change, or recommend keeping them outside. There were also submissions and evidence that called for the removal of all policy reference to the maps if they were located outside the Plan Change. The Committee is recommending keeping the maps outside the Plan Change and the removal of all policy reference to the Use and Value Maps for the following reasons:

- Although the Use and Value Maps are a useful reference source, it is considered that on balance too much weight has been given to them. In particular, this relates to an element of inconsistency and confusion generated by having policy reference to the maps, but not including the maps in the Plan.
- It is unlikely that the Use and Value Maps would meet the legal tests for being included by reference in the Regional Coastal Plan.
- The maps are unlikely ever to be the up-to-date reference source that many submitters would like them to be. They would need to be updated regularly at considerable cost for every plan change and even then would not necessarily be entirely accurate.
- The uncertain spatial and temporal resolution of the maps means that there is an element of doubt in relying on them.
- The Maps imply that the uses and values are not compatible with aquaculture. However, the uses and values are indicative only and there is no way of robustly evaluating them.
- Having the maps in the plan would create significant delay and cost as a plan change would be required to include them now, as well as every time they were changed in the future.
- The Committee has recommended amendments to the policies to address all the uses and values shown on the Use and Value Maps. Specific reference to the Use and Value Maps is not therefore required.

As a result the Committee considers that the Use and Value Maps should remain outside the Plan Change as a resource for the Council, proponents of coastal activities and the public generally, but that all policy reference to them be deleted.

### **Aquaculture Evaluation Maps**

The Aquaculture Evaluation Maps were developed using the information from the Use and Value Maps. They classify various uses and values under three broad categories of 'critical', 'significant' or 'potential', depending on the extent to which the uses and values identified are likely to adversely affect, or be adversely affected by, aquaculture activities. Their purpose was to provide further guidance on the appropriate location of aquaculture activities within the coastal marine area of Northland.

The proposed plan change contains policies referring to the 'critical', 'significant' and 'potential' uses and values. The policies identify that there should be no adverse effects on all the identified uses and values and:

- For 'critical' uses and values, that it would be *extremely difficult* for aquaculture not to have adverse effects on the identified use and values (old Policy 27.4.16).
- For 'significant' uses and values, that it *may be possible* for aquaculture to occur in these areas and not to have adverse effects on the identified use and values (old Policy 27.4.19).
- For 'potential' areas, that it is *reasonably likely* aquaculture can occur within these areas without having adverse effects on the identified uses and values (old Policy 27.4.20).

In addition to the concerns outlined for the removal of policy reference to the Use and Value Maps (also relevant to the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps), the Committee has the following comments in relation to the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps:

- The rewording of the policies, specifically new policies 27.4.6, 27.4.7 and 27.4.8 achieve what the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps were seeking to achieve, but more effectively as they do not rely on the uses and values being shown on the maps and they allow for site/application specific variations. Additionally, the new policies are clearer about the hierarchy of 'protection' to be afforded to each of the uses and values.

- The Aquaculture Evaluation Maps were considered overly prescriptive, not necessarily effects-based or defensible, did not take into account the variation in scale and types of aquaculture currently available, and did not allow for different techniques developed in the future.
- Some of the uses and values had buffer areas identified in an attempt to recognise that the impacts of aquaculture on uses and values can occur by being within the reasonable vicinity of a use or value, not just at the location of the use or value. However, the buffers were relatively arbitrary in their extent, did not take into account site-specific variations, and did not adequately provide for the graduated reduction in impact that generally occurs as an activity becomes more remote from an affected use or value (and vice versa).

Accordingly, the Committee is recommending that the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps be deleted in their entirety (note this decision is made under the Local Government Act process and is not part of the plan change), and all policies in Plan Change 4 (or those parts of policies) referring to them are deleted.

### **Recommendation**

*That the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps be deleted.*

## **4. Exclusion Areas**

(Note: Unless stated otherwise, the words “excluded areas” are used in this discussion as a general descriptor for areas from which AMAs will be restricted,)

The Committee heard submissions from many submitters who expressed a preference for specific locations to be excluded from consideration as Aquaculture Management Areas (AMAs). The requests for excluded areas ranged from the entire Northland coastline to specific locations. Some submitters requested that the originally identified “18 areas” be used as the basis for excluding all other areas. Submissions in favour of excluded areas were also received from some organisations and individuals involved in the industry as the view was it would give them more certainty about those areas not suitable for aquaculture activities.

As a result of the feedback and comments received in submissions, the Officer’s report recommended that the Committee adopt the use of Section 165W of the RMA to identify excluded areas. The approach as recommended by officers was to identify areas that may be appropriate for aquaculture and then make everywhere else an excluded area. The emphasis therefore was on ‘justifying’ the appropriateness for aquaculture in non-excluded areas as opposed to the alternative of ‘justifying’ the inappropriateness of excluded areas.

The Committee agrees with the many submitters and the planning officers that excluding areas has considerable merit as it provides a higher level of certainty to both the community and aquaculture developers and is a better resource management option. That certainty includes knowing that particular areas will be protected from aquaculture in the meantime, as well as acknowledging other areas where aquaculture may be appropriate.

Having agreed to recommend excluding areas in principle, there are then two separate aspects to consider:

- 1) What areas should be “excluded”, and
- 2) What mechanism should be used to identify excluded areas.

### **a) What areas should be excluded?**

The Committee was made aware that the operative Regional Coastal Plan already contains a suite of areas where aquaculture is explicitly excluded (prohibited):

- Marine 1 (Protection) Management Areas,
- Specific locations in Marine 2 (Conservation) Management Areas
- Marine 4 (Mooring) Management Areas

- Marine 5 (Port Facilities) Management Areas
- Marine 6 (Wharves) Management Areas

The prohibition on marine farming in these areas was part of the development of the original Regional Coastal Plan. Despite a number of submitters wanting other locations excluded, the Committee is of the opinion that there is no real basis for excluding them all due to difficulties in defining the exact spatial areas as well as evaluating some of the arguments made in favour of exclusion. Notwithstanding this, the Marine 1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 Management Areas have been through a robust public process, with the specific issue of marine farming prohibition having been considered, and consequently 'accepted' by the community. It is the Committee's view that these excluded 'zones' are logical and defensible.

Additionally, the Committee notes that other significant values of the marine environment have been identified through statute or regulation, such as marine reserves, registered Historic Places, Historic Areas, Wahi Tapu and Wahi Tapu Areas. Aquaculture of any plausible scale would conflict with these values.

**b) What mechanism should be used to identify excluded areas?**

As a result of the Hearing and the submissions made, the Committee considers that there are three possible mechanisms suitable for excluding AMAs from particular areas. The mechanisms are discussed as follows:

i) Section 165W

Section 165W provides an explicit mechanism for excluding AMAs. This was the approach recommended by officers. However, the Committee has some concerns with the use of Section 165W.

Under the Section 165W provisions, there is a requirement to consult the community on proposed excluded locations. However, there is no right of submission or appeal under Section 165W, and the Council decision on excluded areas would be final, subject to the possibility of judicial review on points of law/process only.

Furthermore, the use of Section 165W is very definite. This means that if an area is excluded then no AMAs can be applied for in those areas.

Finally, the Committee has concerns about the mechanics of S165W excluded areas. The RMA does not provide clear direction as to how excluded areas can be revoked, and whether or not they need to be renewed prior to every invitation for plan change. Consequently, the Committee is concerned that the risk of legal challenge may be high.

ii) Limit the spatial extent of IPPCs

An alternative is to limit the spatial extent of the invitation for private plan changes. The law is not clear as to how a council could determine the spatial extent of the invitation. Notwithstanding this, it could work, for example, by identifying the East Coast of the Northland Region as suitable for Aquaculture but not Whangarei Harbour, Whangaroa, and Bay of Islands. However, at the present time and until guidance is in place, this approach is not considered to be developed enough for Council to be able to commit to this approach. This approach is also only applicable to the invited private plan process.

iii) Policy-based approach

The mechanism preferred by the Committee is to introduce policies in the Coastal Plan on the appropriateness, or inappropriateness, of particular areas for AMAs in the Plan. The benefits of policies are that they provide flexibility such as restricting certain types of AMAs while allowing others. Additionally, it gives the community more opportunity to be involved in the process of determining the suite of areas that are potentially suitable for aquaculture. Lastly, the Coastal Plan policies apply to the three plan change types, not just invited private plan changes.

Notwithstanding this, it is noted that policies can also be changed through a plan change process; however, the Committee is of the view that policies are a proven technique for

managing effects and achieving outcomes, and are the most suitable option for managing the effects of aquaculture.

## **5. Location of Threshold Test and Comparative Evaluation Criteria**

Many submitters sought that the Threshold Test and Comparative Evaluation Criteria for Invited Private Plan Changes be included as a part of the Plan Change so that they were subject to the provisions of the RMA.

It appears that a number of submitters misunderstood the reason for developing the Threshold Test and Evaluation Criteria. In effect, they are administrative matters, not substantive RMA matters.

The Committee concurs with the Officers' report and agrees that the Council is not required to have a Threshold Test – it was developed to assist the Council in deciding whether an invited private plan change request should be accepted, and is then able to go through the plan change process, or be rejected. At the same time it provides further guidance to plan change applicants as to what should be addressed in a private plan change. The Threshold Test simply expands on the private plan change tests already stipulated under cl 25(4) of the First Schedule, RMA, and are not exclusive criteria.

It is important for people to understand that accepting a plan change at this point is not an approval of the plan change. It is simply determining whether it is of a sufficient standard that it can go through the normal plan change process (i.e., notification, submissions made, hearing, and decision). The full weight of the RMA is then applied.

The Committee agrees with the officers' recommendation that there is no benefit in incorporating the Threshold Criteria into the Coastal Plan. It would make it unnecessarily onerous to undertake any changes to the criteria.

Similarly, the Comparative Evaluation Criteria (Stage 2) provides guidance in deciding between competing plan change applications made for the same physical location. That is, the criteria will aid in deciding which of potentially several invited applications will then be able to proceed through the plan change process, and which will be rejected. This situation should not normally arise because it is unlikely more than one party would be directly interested in requesting the same private plan change for the same location. This is a situation brought about by the specific aquaculture provision enabling Invited Private Plan Changes – but which provides no further statutory guidance on how to then choose between competing applications.

Again, including the Comparative Evaluation Criteria in the Coastal Plan would make it unnecessarily onerous to undertake any changes to the criteria, and the Committee agrees with the Officers' recommendation that there is no benefit in including them in the Coastal Plan.

Overall, the Committee support the planning officers' recommendation.

## **6. Importance of Aquaculture to Northland**

The Committee notes the submissions relating to the introductory parts of the plan change, particularly the paragraphs relating to the importance of aquaculture in Northland. Some of the submission comments were discussed further at the Hearing by submitters.

Several submitters queried the level of importance of aquaculture to the Northland economy and questioned its relative significance compared to tourism and farming. Various estimates were given in submissions and at the Hearing with regard to the contribution of aquaculture to the economy, and there was a wide-ranging view as to the precise numbers.

The Committee acknowledges that aquaculture does not match the size of other important Northland industries such as tourism and farming. It is, however, identified in the Regional Growth Strategy as having the potential to make a significant contribution to the regional economy, especially in the more remote parts of the region with limited opportunities for economic growth.

In light of the submissions, further submissions and elaboration provided at the Hearing by various submitters, the Committee has modified the introductory text of the plan change to elaborate further on the relative importance of aquaculture in Northland.

Furthermore, it was highlighted to the Committee, through submissions and evidence presented at the hearing, that there are no policies explicitly recognising the benefits that aquaculture can provide to Northland. The benefits are highlighted in the introductory text but not translated into policy. The Committee considers it important that the benefits are recognised.

## **7. Register of Interested Parties and Notification in General**

Many submitters expressed the view that there should be a register of interested parties for the purpose of AMA and aquaculture notifications and that they should be included on it. Some submitters were concerned that they may not be properly informed about future aquaculture proposals and that their views would not be taken into account.

The Committee agrees with the comments in the Officers' Report. Administratively, creating such a Register of Interested Parties has a number of practical difficulties – not the least of which is ensuring that it remains current and reliable (both as to names and addresses). Such a register may also create the mistaken impression that only those groups/individuals and/or organisations on the register are interested in submitting on aquaculture proposals – with the very real risk of people or groups being missed out. Nevertheless, the Council website could be used as one point by which the public and/or interest groups could add their name to such a register.

The Committee confirms that all plan change applications to establish an AMA will be publicly notified. Notification is undertaken via the public notices section of local newspapers, the Council website, through the erection of signage (where practicable), and by post to adjacent land owners.

Notwithstanding the above, both the RMA and LGA place obligations on the Council to identify Iwi and various government departments with whom consultation is necessary. The Council has a list of Maori groups that it advises consultation to be undertaken with.

Although plan changes for an AMA must be publicly notified, notification of a Coastal Permit is a different matter, one for consideration by the Council on a case-by-case basis, and regulated by the Resource Management Act 1991. Under the Act some classes of activity are non-notified by default under the RMA, for example activities with a controlled activity status. Legally, the Council is unable to require mandatory notification of such applications – although it can decide that on a case-by-case basis.

## **8. Maori Aquaculture Settlement**

The Officer's report provided an overview of the issues raised by Maori which, in particular, included the following points:

- Some submitters wanted to see the 20% AMA allocation of AMA space to Iwi be made on a location basis. A considerable number of submissions related to Customary Aquaculture and Customary Kaimoana harvests (see next Issue).
- The primary issue raised in the submissions related to the allocation of the 20% (or more) of the AMA to Te Ohu Kai Moana Trustee which, submitters contended, should be allocated on a location by location basis - and to the Iwi and/or Hapu located closest to the AMA.

The Committee concurs with the Officers' report that submitters need to appreciate that the Council will play little role in determining the recipients of AMA space. The AMA settlement process is set out in the Maori Commercial Aquaculture Claims Settlement Act 2004. In practice, the Council will allocate the identified reserved proportion of the AMA to the Trustee. It is the Trustee (Te Ohu Kai Moana) that will be responsible for managing the AMA settlement process, including facilitating agreement between Iwi on the proportions of settlement space allocated to Iwi within a region. The Plan change will have no meaningful influence over that process.

In light of the requirements of the Act, the Committee agrees that there is nothing of any consequence that can be done by the Council in relation to the allocation of AMA space to Iwi/Hapu. However, it can note concerns of Maori and bring these to the attention of the government when appropriate. Given that the allocation of Iwi/Hapu space is made by another authority, the Committee recommends no changes to the statements in the Plan Change about the allocation of AMA space to Iwi/Hapu.

## 9. Marae-based Aquaculture and Kaimoana Harvesting

Officer's identified customary aquaculture and kaimoana harvesting as a key concern of Maori.

A number of submitters (primarily from, or representing, Maori organisations) sought the inclusion of provisions for *customary aquaculture*. Customary Aquaculture, in the sense that it was raised by submitters and discussed in the proposed plan change, is generally understood to refer to catering for ancillary Marae activities in order to meet and satisfy expectations of *kawa* and *mana* of the Marae and its tangata whenua, and is of a non-commercial nature.

Because of the non-commercial nature of this activity, submitters sought the introduction of an enabling provision whereby they would either not be required to apply for an AMA for this purpose or, if they were required, that the process was not so onerous as to be effectively precluded.

The Committee considers that 'Customary aquaculture and kaimoana harvesting' would be more appropriately phrased as 'Marae-based aquaculture and kaimoana harvesting' as the earlier terminology is imprecise. While recognising the traditional activities of Maori, the Committee considers that the term 'customary aquaculture' has the potential to cause confusion, particularly as other provisions in the Resource Management Act, and other legislation, use the term 'customary' in ways that are not necessarily the same as the ways in which they have been discussed during the hearing (e.g., 'customary fishing' and 'customary rights orders'). The Committee view is that 'Marae-based aquaculture' encapsulates relevant traditional 'customary' aquaculture activities as well as aquaculture using modern techniques and management practices.

The Officers' recommendation suggested that submitters with an interest in this issue should provide further detailed information on such an approach. As a result, the Committee heard a number of submitters discuss their submissions in detail and expand on how non-commercial aquaculture could work, particularly in relation to Marae-based non-commercial aquaculture.

As a result of the submission process and the information conveyed at the Hearing, the Committee is recommending the addition of a new issue, objective, and policy to provide for Marae-based non-commercial aquaculture.

The reasons for the recommendation are:

- Small scale Marae-based non-commercial aquaculture activities recognise historical practices and will help Maori provide for their customary needs. The key component of such activities is that they are small and the produce is not for commercial gain.
- Marae-based aquaculture will still have to comply with the requirements of the plan change in terms of environmental assessment, but they are not commercial operations.
- Marae-based aquaculture is considered to be consistent with the sustainable management focus of the Resource Management Act 1991. In particular this refers to the sustainable management of resources which enables people and communities to provide for their cultural wellbeing.

It is also noted that the recommendation for introducing an issue, objective, and policy is limited to Marae-based aquaculture because there were no submissions received in relation to other non-commercial activities. The Committee are of the view that they were able to suitably consider the merits of non-commercial Marae-based aquaculture based on submissions, further submissions and the associated evidence presented at the Hearing, to enable the development of a suitable provision for non-commercial Marae-based aquaculture.

There were no submissions on other forms of non-commercial aquaculture.

## **10. Derelict Marine Farms**

Derelict Marine Farms were listed as a matter of concern to many submitters. The Committee is of the view that the Council considered this issue carefully when they developed the plan change and that the objectives, policies, methods and rules in the plan change will provide the appropriate mechanism to manage the effects of derelict marine farms.

The principal matter raised in submissions sought a bond or security in favour of Council from consent holders. The purpose of this would be to ensure that marine farms are not left derelict when/if the activity ceased operation, in particular if activities ceased suddenly as a result of financial difficulties.

The Committee notes the commentary provided in the Officers' Report that the Council is presently in discussions with aquaculture industry representatives to introduce new conditions on existing resource consents to better manage the state of marine farms. One option under consideration is the use of a bond. The ability to require a bond payment to the Council at the outset of an aquaculture activity being commenced would help provide a level of certainty around the management and removal of derelict farms.

Under Council's proposed Policy 27.4.18 (proposed new numbering, old Policy 27.4.27) a mechanism is proposed to cover potential costs associated with the repair or removal of abandoned or derelict farms, including reinstatement of the environment. It is considered that this wording provides for a number of possible responses by the Council and recognises that discussions are still being held between the Council and Industry representatives.

The Committee also notes the secondary issue discussed in the Officers' report, which is the question of making subsequent AMA authorisation holders responsible for the removal of any structures "left over" from any preceding activity. The Committee considers that each situation would need to be assessed on its relative merits and that a blanket policy (and associated rule) to this effect would be inequitable.

The Committee heard a number of submitters speak in relation to the issue of derelict marine farms and the need for removal of such activities. The Committee recommends that several minor changes are made to remove any perceived/actual ambiguity and provide further clarity to the relevant policies.

## **11. Local Economic Development**

The Committee notes the view of some submitters that the benefits of aquaculture should be returned to the local community.

The Committee also notes the issue of whether or not preferential weighting should be given to those aquaculture activities that propose to encourage local economic development, whether it be through local employment or through profits being retained within Northland, is an important matter for local rural communities because opportunities are often limited in terms of economic growth.

The Committee is mindful of the advantages of local/regional economic development, and notes that criteria have been included as a part of the assessment process to clarify the extent to which a development will benefit the local community.

Provision for a 'weighted attributes' tendering process in the methods clarifies and enables weight to be given to particular attributes when tendering the rights to apply (authorisation) for coastal permits for aquaculture within an AMA. Particular attributes could include types of benefits to the local communities. It is noted that this approach does not apply to AMA's created through the IPPC process.

A review of the classification of Parengarenga Harbour has been signalled as the Committee recognised that of all the places designated as Marine 1 (Protection) Management Areas, the

Parengarenga Harbour is one where aquaculture could provide significant opportunities for the local community in an area where there are few other opportunities.

## **12. Reverse Sensitivity**

The Committee notes that reverse sensitivity is an important matter to consider as a part of aquaculture activities. The Committee carefully considered the submissions relating to reverse sensitivity; the many requests that it be specifically referred to in policy; and, the Officers' recommendation. Inclusion of reverse sensitivity is linked to the wider issue of whether specific effects should be listed in every relevant policy. One approach is to list all effects with the view that if they are listed then they will be considered. The other approach is to list none of them or provide an 'umbrella' wording, because they will be considered as a matter of course via the plan change/consent process.

The Committee considers that restricting the list to a general statement encompasses all potential adverse effects without needing to specify each one, for example, 'Adverse Effects'.

On balance, the Committee is recommending not to include reference to reverse sensitivity as recommended by officers.

This is consistent with the wider decision to remove other suggested amendments to the policies which listed a number of specific types of effect.

## Notes

1. Comments contained within square parentheses, e.g. [Threshold Test], are paraphrased from the primary submission to aid interpretation of the relief sought, or provide a cross reference to another relevant part of the report.
2. Multiple submission numbers are not listed individually, but are listed collectively under the relevant 'pro forma' comment.
3. In many cases there is '*no specific relief sought*' and these submissions have only been noted in the recommendations. If submitters consider that their submission points have not been interpreted correctly, please advise Council officers at the hearing.
4. All submitters are encouraged to elaborate their concerns at the hearing if they choose to attend.
5. As this assessment report represents a summary of decisions requested, the actual submissions should be referred to for a fuller understanding of the particular concerns of each submitter.
6. A representative sample section of the report, with an associated explanation, is contained on page 5 of this document.
7. The following abbreviations are used in this summary:

<b>Abbreviations used in this document</b>	
<b>AEE</b>	Assessment of Environmental Effects
<b>AMA</b>	Aquaculture Management Area
<b>ARC</b>	Auckland Regional Council
<b>DOC</b>	Department of Conservation
<b>IPPC</b>	Invited Private Plan Change
<b>LGA</b>	Local Government Act
<b>MAF</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
<b>Mfish</b>	Ministry of Fisheries
<b>NRC</b>	Northland Regional Council
<b>PC4</b>	Plan Change 4
<b>RCP</b>	Regional Coastal Plan
<b>RMA</b>	Resource Management Act 1991 and its amendments
<b>'the Act'</b>	Resource Management Act 1991 and its amendments
<b>The Regional Council/ The Council</b>	Northland Regional Council

Other abbreviations may also appear where they have been used by submitters.

**Report Section Example: Explanation**

The following example of a section of the report provides an explanation of the different parts contained within the table

<b>Section Heading</b>	
<b>Sub-section heading</b>	
<b>Submissions:</b> These are listed by submission number only	
<b>RELIEF SOUGHT</b>	
Topic heading (where relevant)	Submitter name/s and submission point/s
<p>Detail of relief sought- This is taken from the relevant submission</p> <p>[In some places square brackets are used which contain background information from the relevant submission that may be useful for clarification purposes and may also refer the reader to other sections of the report]</p> <p>Detail of relief sought</p>	Submitter name/s and submission point/s
<b>Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of the issues raised</li> <li>• Discussion on different submission points is separated by a bullet point;</li> <li>• In some cases the discussion is collective for a number of submission points</li> </ul>
<b>Recommendation</b>	<p>A combination of one of more of the following recommendations and notes are used:</p> <p>Accept submissions</p> <p>Accept in part submissions</p> <p>Reject submissions</p> <p>No specific relief sought in submissions</p>

## Proposed Threshold Test and Maps

### Committee Report with Recommendations

<b>Introduction</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 090, 187		
<b>General</b>	NRC should publicly notify any request for IPPCs and allow submissions and public hearings before making its threshold decision, and allow Environment Court appeal rights in respect of such decisions. This needs to be made clear in the fourth Paragraph of the introduction.	Keys, David and Alison 090.2
	Delete the third paragraph of Section 1 "...shall not limit the ability of Council to adopt and consider....at the time." and reword the first paragraph of the item to read " <i>In deciding whether to reject a Plan Change request under section 165ZE of the RMA 1991, Council will consider the following matters:</i> "	Keys, David and Alison 090.3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Delete the paragraph in the introduction and first paragraph of Stage 1 "The criteria...shall not limit the ability of council to adopt and consider any other criteria it deems relevant at the time" as it leaves total discretion to Council.</li> <li>– Include a definition of "request" upfront in the document. Cross reference this to the RCP.</li> <li>– Amend introductory words to provide more certainty that Council "<i>will invite parties to consider preparing a joint case</i>"</li> </ul>	Britton, Robin 187.1, 187.5, 187.6
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relief sought in submission 090.2 is not the current legal process. The RMA requires the public notification of all plan changes after a request has been accepted. However there is no statutory provision for public notification between the invitation for plan change requests and acceptance/rejection of those requests;</li> <li>• The matters for consideration for a Private Plan Change Request are prescribed in the First Schedule of the Act;</li> <li>• Under the RMA, the Council is entitled to consider any matter it deems relevant. This statement is consistent with the provisions of the Act and its removal is not supported. A definition of "request" is not necessary. The existing wording in the introduction is also considered acceptable.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	The Committee concurs with the Officers Discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 090.2; 090.3; 187.1, 187.5 and, 187.6</b>	

<b>Section 1 Stage 1: Threshold Test for All Plan Change Requests</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 008, 009, 013, 152, 179, 180, 181, 248		
<b>General</b>	The IPPC process gives large companies a distinct advantage over small local enterprises.	Panckhurst, D.J. 008.2
	The Threshold Test should include a priority for local people who wish to own and operate marine farms over outsiders.	Banfield, Gordon 009.1
	Amend Stage 1 to allow a thorough evaluation of all IPPCs to the highest standard – i.e. those criteria under Stage 2.	Stowell, Anne 013.1
	The process devolves all costs and responsibilities onto the applicant, and sees this as unfairly prejudice to those who are not on equal financial footing.	Chetham, Juliane 152.2
	The procedures need be replaced or at least significantly modified to include an affordable cost structure for local people.	Hicks, Margaret 179.1
	There needs to be a separate cost structure to enable local community groups to engage in economically viable small scale aquaculture.	Milner, C.M 180.1; Milner, David 181.1
	Add a new category (6); the request has adverse effects on Tangata whenua customary uses and values. In applying this category, Council along with the affected iwi, will consider whether; (a) The request, or part of it, would adversely effect customary practices (b) The request, or part of it, would adversely effect mahinga kai and customary gathering (c) The request, or part of it, would adversely affect customary management practices.	Pivac, AM 248.4
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Act makes no provision for small and large operators nor is there the ability for preferential treatment to be given to local people and/or smaller businesses. Whilst the Council is mindful of the advantages of local/regional economic development and has included appropriate criteria as a part of the assessment process, it cannot pre-determine applications in favour of local initiatives/benefits or small businesses;</li> <li>The additional category suggested in submission 248.4 is an evaluative test which is not the purpose of this test. This test assesses formal adequacy rather than merits.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 008.2; 009.1; 013.1; 152.2 ;179.1; 180.1 and, 181.1; and 248.4</b>	

<b>Section 1.1. The request, or part of the request, is frivolous or vexatious</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 014, 148, 150, 167, 187, 189, 194		
<b>General</b>	[Supports category] No specific relief sought.	Brierley, Peter 148.2
	[Points (a) to (d) do not establish a frivolous or vexatious request, and point (e) restates Schedule 1.] No specific relief sought.	Volkerling, Keir 167.1
	Amend to read " <i>In applying this category, Council will require applicants to have fulfilled the following.</i> "	Bellingham, Mark 194.3
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The points are not exclusive of other frivolous or vexatious considerations but indicate some of the particular matters that are to be satisfied;</li> <li>The suggested rewording to the introductory sentence is not appropriate as it will not align with every point that requires consideration (see matter (e) under Category 1).</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 194.3</b> <b>No specific relief sought in submissions 148.2; and 167.1</b>	
1.1.2 (b)	Delete (b) and add new (b) " <i>Council will reject any request not received within the specified time frame.</i> "	Britton, Robin 187.2
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose of the criterion is that it is one factor to be considered and balanced against other criteria. Whether the application will be rejected or not is not for consideration in this criterion. The degree of 'lateness' may well be a factor in the consideration but it is inappropriate for it to be a critical factor for rejection or acceptance of a proposal.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 187.2</b>	
1.1.4 (d)	Clarify what the full cost is likely to be and what form of surety Council is prepared to accept in order to maintain consistency. Request an explanatory note to this point.	Gillard, Mark 014.1
	Supports this subclause and states that every applicant should be in a position to put up a bond of several thousand.	Smeal, Douglas 150.2
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not possible to detail the full cost of an application as each one will be different, based on the actual and reasonable costs of processing the application. It is noted that the Council has set the deposit amount at \$6,000 (NRC Charging Policy 07-08).</li> </ul>	

<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 150.2;</b> <b>Reject submission 014.1</b>	
1.1.5 (e)	Clarify this point, and request that Council prepare guidelines and criteria for determining if (e) applies to a particular Plan Change request.	Gillard, Mark 014.2
	Delete (e). This will be extremely difficult to assess or prove.	Britton, Robin 187.3
	Reword and clarify the matters raised to state how this will be adjudicated.	Kapa, Remarie 189.3
	Delete this criterion as it is too subjective.	Bellingham, Mark 194.4
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Reporting Officers disagree that this criterion is too difficult to substantiate. As with any normative criterion an evaluation will be required that is itself reviewable at law.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 014.2; 187.3; 189.3; and, 194.4</b>	

<b>Section 1.2 The substance of the request, or part of the request, has been considered and given effect to, or rejected by, the Northland Regional Council or the Environment Court within the last two years</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 189, 194		
<b>Submissions generally in opposition:</b>		
<b>General</b>	Reword as the wording is ambiguous.	Kapa, Remarie 189.4
	Amend to read " <i>In applying this category, Council will require applicants to have fulfilled the following:</i> "	Bellingham, Mark 194.5
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording of the matter for consideration is considered appropriate as it addresses directly the statutory text.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	

<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 189.4; and, 194.5</b>
---------------------------------	---------------------------------------------

<b>Section 1.3 The request, or part of the request, is not in accordance with sound resource management practice</b>
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Submissions:** 006, 008, 014, 068, 069, 070, 088, 090, 092, 148, 150, 152, 173, 177, 182,183, 185, 187, 189, 194, 195, 196-206, 209, 211-238, 248, 252, 253, 254

<b>General</b>	Amend section 1.3 to include: <i>“Council will consider whether:</i> <i>(f) The application preserves the natural character of the coastline as required by the Resource Management Act and the Regional Coastal Plan.</i> <i>(g) The habitat of wading birds has been adequately considered and provided for (both feeding and roosting areas) and whether buffer zones are adequate.</i> <i>(h) The information provided by the applicant on the ecological effects is scientifically based and provided by a reputable independent authority.”</i>	Panckhurst, D.J. 008.7
	Add a new criterion (f) under category 3 as follows: <i>(f) The proposed AMA would have significant adverse effects on the coastal environment which could not be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i>	Jenkins, Chris 183.2
	Amend category 3 to require the council to consider whether the AMA(s) identified in any plan change request are located within a protected anchorage, and if so to asses to what extent the request will affect the capacity of the anchorage.	Brabant, Jeremy 185.4
	Amend to read <i>“In applying this category, Council will require applicants to have fulfilled the following:”</i>	Bellingham, Mark 194.6
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a threshold criterion not an evaluation of the Plan Change, for which there will be many more substantive matters to be considered;</li> <li>The threshold test provides the opportunity for high level consideration of applications through the invited private plan change process. The additional criteria are considered to be a part of the matters listed in Category 3. The listing of very specific targeted criteria is not appropriate;</li> <li>It is not appropriate to require all the matters to be fulfilled as there may be situations where this is not necessary and the Council needs to be able to exercise its discretion when making its assessment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	

<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 008.7; 183.2; 185.4; and, 194.6</b>	
1.3.1 (a)	When carrying out community consultation, the applicant for an IPPC for an AMA should have to contact all members of the community by means of a mail out rather than through advertisements in local newspapers.	Haydon, G & S 006.1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Expand to take into account the result of such consultation and that if consultation demonstrates overwhelming and justified evidence of negative effects and community opposition, the council will reject the change.</li> <li>– Amend so that 'community' and 'consultation' are defined to include consultation with all legitimate community interest groups including ratepayers associations.</li> </ul>	Keys, David and Alison 090.4
	This phrase requires qualification and clarification to avoid any attempt to frustrate an applicant by, for example, refusing to meet to consult or setting unrealistically high consultation fees.	Brierley, Peter 148.3
	Amend category 3(a) to include " <i>there is an agreement from the relevant hapu/iwi that an adequate partnership has been formed</i> ".	Chetham, Juliane 152.1
	Seek that the category be amended to read " <i>...and government agencies and the community, whether the views raised by those consulted are adequately documented, and whether there is sufficient response provided to those views.</i> "	Kippenberger, Jane 173.2
	Clarify what consultation is required to be undertaken with the Iwi and what constitutes "Sufficient"	Kapa, Remarie 189.5
	The applicant needs to provide documentation of the consultation. Amend to read " <i>...agencies and the community, including issues raised from interested parties and responses from the applicant to those issues, the time period over which the consultation took place and whether sufficient information and time was provided for effective consultation to have occurred.</i> "	Bellingham, Mark 194.7
	The need to 'consult' is a weak requirement. Amend to read " <i>There is an agreement from the relevant iwi that a process is developed to address the issue of the affected iwi and hapu</i> ". Other 'interest groups' should be grouped separately."	Brockway, Marion 248.2
Support for consultation with Iwi/Hapu.	Walker, Shannon 252.1; Smith, Bryce 253.1; Walker, Violet 254.1; Douglas, Ray 256.1	
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a threshold criterion not an evaluation of the Plan Change, for which there will be many more substantive matters to be considered;</li> <li>• It is up to the Council to determine on a case-by-case basis the best approach to consult with the community. In some cases a mail-out may be the preferred approach, but at other times a public notice, public meeting, or combination of methods may be the best approach;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording of the first matter for consideration is considered appropriate. The suggested amendments to the wording will either make no difference to the intent of the matter, or will take it in an unintended direction;</li> <li>The matter of 'unreasonableness' in consultation can be an issue. If consultation has, in the view of the applicant, been thwarted, the applicant should show evidence of attempts to consult with various parties such as copies of letters and consultation material and so forth. There is no need to reword the criteria to reflect this;</li> <li>There is no need to require a notice of agreement with an Iwi/Hapu. The re-allocation of the Settlement space is undertaken by the Trustee, not the Council. Evidence of consultation with Iwi/Hapu where appropriate would be useful. There is no need to specify this requirement in the matter for consideration;</li> <li>The level of consultation to be undertaken and whether it is 'sufficient' is up to the applicant to prove to the Council. Evidence of this would be a part of the information conveyed to the Council in the application.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Accept submissions 252.1, 253.1, 254.1, and, 256.1</b></p> <p><b>Accept in part submission 173.2 to the extent that the relief is sought is appropriate</b></p> <p><b>Reject submissions 006.1; 090.4; 148.3; 152.1; 189.5; 194.7; and 248.2</b></p>	
1.3.2 (b)	Any potential environmental changes should be clearly stated, by applicants, for public comment.	Haydon, G & S 006.2
	This is relatively self explanatory and covered in the Proposed Plan Change 4. Suggest that Plan Change application could be accepted when effects from a particular type of marine farming are clearly defined. For example long line bivalve culture or net pen finfish culture, whereby the differentiation of technology and equipment for each is relatively minor for similar species.	Gillard, Mark 014.3
	[Submission is in support]. Amend "sufficient" to read "appropriate and proportionate for the proposed undertaking".	Brierley, Peter 148.4
	This is an inappropriate level of detail and potentially difficult to assess. Delete (b). Add reference to alignment with Objectives and policies on the RCP.	Britton, Robin 187.4
	This criterion is inadequate. Amend to read "...in the proposed AMA, as detailed in Section 27.6 of the Coastal Plan Change 4 (as amended by the RFBPS submission).	Bellingham, Mark 194.8
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a threshold criterion not an evaluation of the Plan Change, for which there will be many more substantive matters to be considered;</li> <li>The policy is considered to be worded appropriately and the suggested amendments will make no material difference to the wording of the matter for consideration or will take it in an unintended direction.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	

<b>Discussion</b>		
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 006.2; 014.3; 148.4; 187.4; and, 194.8</b>	
1.3.3 (c)	Support criterion as it is a step towards assisting iwi into sustainable aquaculture and will bring about much needed increased financial stability into Northland	Haydon, G & S 006.3
	Further clarify the implications of (c). How will Council determine what is 20% representative space.	Gillard, Mark 014.4
	Reword to clarify that an agreed process exists for ensuring the 20% allocated is then transferred to the Tangata Whenua.	Kapa, Remarie 189.6
	The term 'representative' space is ambiguous and contestable. Relevant iwi should be involved in determining what is deemed 'representative' within their iwi rohe.	Pivac, A.M. 248.3
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a threshold criterion not an evaluation of the Plan Change, for which there will be many more substantive matters to be considered.</li> <li>The Council will “approve” the spatial aspects and “representativeness” of the 20%, but they will not determine the 20% allocation to Iwi. This allocation task is undertaken by the Trustee - Te Ohu Kai Moana.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept submission 006.3 Reject submissions 014.4; 189.6; and, 248.3</b>	
1.3.4 (d)	Agree with the council's position of contestable use of area whilst predicating the level of potential conflict.	Gillard, Mark 014.5
	[Refer also Maps-General] The FNDC and WDC outstanding/significant landscape maps should be overlaid on to the 'Use and Value maps' and 'Aquaculture Evaluation' maps. The overlays designating outstanding/significant landscapes should then be eliminated from AMA consideration or be designated as critical.	Thompson, Parata 068.1; Anlauf, Jeffrey 069.1; King, Dwayne 070.1; Anlauf, Debbie 088.2; Hehape, Sid 092.2; Dobier, Nick 182.1; Reid, Ian & Marie 195.3; 196-206, Watene, Robert (Jnr) (209.3), 211-238
	Sheltered bays and harbours are raised from "significant" to "critical".	Smeal, Douglas 150.1

	Delete the two references to 'critical' areas as they are inappropriate and inconsistent.	Kippenberger, Jane 173.3
	Amend after both of the references to "...'critical' or 'significant' areas" by the addition of the words " <i>or an existing marine farm area</i> ", or establish the existing marine farm areas as 'critical'.	McCallum, Callum 177.5
	[The maps are inadequate for this purpose.] No specific relief sought.	Kapa, Remarie 189.7
	Amend to read "...in the Northland Regional Council's Aquaculture Evaluation Maps or an Excluded Area and, if so..."	Bellingham, Mark 194.9
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a threshold criterion not an evaluation of the Plan Change, for which there will be many more substantive matters to be considered;</li> <li>The maps are an interpretive aid and are one method used in the consideration of appropriate locations for AMAs. It is noted that Method 3 in the Plan Change provides for the maps to be reviewed and updated every 5 years and also prior to commencing an AMA process;</li> <li>The RMA states that Plan Change requests cannot be made for excluded areas.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee recommends that 1.3.4 be removed from the Threshold Test as a consequential amendment resulting from the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Remove paragraph 1.3.4 from the Threshold Test.</b></p> <p><b>Reject submissions 068.1, 069.1, 070.1, 088.2, 092.2, 182.1, 194.9, 195.3, 196-206, 209.3, and 211-238; 150.1; 173.3; and, 177.5</b></p> <p><b>No specific relief is sought in submission 189.7</b></p>	
<b>Further Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission 167.2 suggested that recognition of iwi planning documents should be included in Stage 2 (The Comparative Evaluation). Under Section 66(2A) of the RMA, "Matters to be considered by regional council", requires that relevant planning documents recognised by an iwi authority are taken into account. The Committee therefore considers that such documents should be taken into account during the Stage 1 (Threshold Test) rather than Stage 2 (The Comparative Evaluation).</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addition to the Threshold Test of: 1.3.5 <i>"Evidence that relevant planning documents recognised by an iwi authority have been taken into account."</i></li> </ul>	

<b>Section 1.4 The request, or part of the request, would make the Regional Coastal Plan inconsistent with part 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 151, 166, 194, 189		
<b>General</b>	NRC should reconsider the potential for IPPCs to amend objectives, policies and rules, with a view to limiting their scope to the establishment of new AMAs.	Jarvis, H.D. 151.1
	Supports this category. However it should be expanded to specifically include requests that are inconsistent with Part II of the RMA and/or the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Richmond, Chris 166.1
	Amend to read "In applying this category, Council will require applicants to have fulfilled the following:"	Bellingham, Mark 194.10
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invitations for plan changes will be limited to location and area only. One of the basic principles of Plan Change 4 is to provide the policy, rule etc framework for AMAs, such that plan changes only need to address the location and area;</li> <li>• The requests fall under Plan Change 4 which will already have satisfied Part II of the RMA, and also requires the whole Regional Coastal Plan for its context. The changes requested are not necessary;</li> <li>• It is not appropriate to require all the matters to be fulfilled as there may be situations where this is not necessary and the Council needs to be able to exercise its discretion when making its assessment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 151.1; 166.1; and, 194.10</b>	
1.4.1 (a)	Amend to read "... ( <i>Policy and Regulatory Regime for Aquaculture Management Areas</i> ), the Northland Regional Policy Statement and the NZ Coastal Policy Statement." To make the RCP inconsistent with Part 2 & 5 of the RMA, the NZ Coastal Policy Statement and Northland Regional Policy Statement.	Bellingham, Mark 194.11
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requests fall under Plan Change 4 which will already have satisfied Part II of the RMA, and also requires the whole Regional Coastal Plan for its context. The changes requested are not necessary.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the Committee concurs with the Officers discussion, the Committee also recommends that an advice note is added for clarification in response to submission 151.1.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>That an advice note be added as follows:</b></p> <p><i>"(Note, this criterion is applicable only to standard private plan changes i.e. not invited private plan changes as they will be limited to location and area only.)"</i></p> <p><b>Reject submission 194.11</b></p>	

1.4.2 (b)	Reword and provide certainty of language. "Sufficiently material" and "substantial" need to be defined	Kapa, Remarie 189.8
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording used is well understood and does not need to be specifically defined in the Threshold Test. Future case law may interpret these terms further.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of this submission.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 189.8</b>	

<b>Section 1.5 More than one person has requested a change to establish an aquaculture management area in the same area of the region and the council has adopted another request</b>		
<b>Submissions: 194</b>		
<b>General</b>	Amend to read " <i>In applying this category, Council will require applicants to have fulfilled the following:</i> "	Bellingham, Mark 194.12
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not appropriate to require all the matters to be fulfilled as there may be situations where this is not necessary and the Council needs to be able to exercise its discretion when making its assessment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of this submission.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 194.12</b>	
1.5.1 (a)	Amend to read " <i>The Council may accept requests that propose different but compatible...</i> "	Bellingham, Mark 194.13
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change sought is unnecessary as it is implied because AMAs have to be for a specified purpose.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of this submission.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 194.13</b>	

<b>Section 2. Comparative Evaluation for Plan Change Requests Involving Proposals for the Same Physical Location</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 014, 090, 167, 189, 194, 247		
<b>General</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– In the case of marine finfish farming it is generally unwise to have farms in close proximity to each other for disease and other bio-security type reasons.</li> <li>– Unless the two competing parties can come to a mutually acceptable business arrangement then it will be necessary to select the best deal for Northland and New Zealand and carry out a subjective comparison of the key attributes and criteria against those attributes.</li> </ul>	Gillard, Mark 014.6
	Items should be added such as: "The extent of apparent adverse affects of the proposal." & "The extent of apparently legitimate community opposition to the proposal."	Keys, David and Alison 090.6
	Add new criterion requiring any AMA applicant to consult with the relevant territorial authority to ensure that any proposed AMA is consistent with the territorial authorities strategic development of the adjacent land. Any alternative, further or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully give effect to the relief sought above.	Waanders, Paul 126.4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Provide detail of how such prioritising would be achieved and the level of commitment from NRC to provide adequate capacity to process numerous applications.</li> <li>– Show weightings to be given to each criterion.</li> <li>– Clarify who the stakeholders are</li> <li>– Clarify whether any policy changes to criteria will go through the LGA or RMA Process, what development contributions regime will be applied, and whether it will be an AMA or Coastal Permit granting.</li> </ul>	Kapa, Remarie 189.9, 189.10, 189.12 & 189.13
	Delete Stage 2 as this part of the test is not in accordance with sound resource management practice.	Bellingham, Mark 194.14
	Support current comparative evaluation criteria. Suggest adding the following under Key Attribute 4 " <i>Impact on other Parties</i> "; (a) <i>Visual impact of farm structures</i> (b) <i>responsibilities of removal of abandoned or deteriorating farm structures and disposal of shell debris</i> (c) <i>Potential siltation</i> (d) <i>impacts on feeding activity of wading birds</i> (e) <i>Impact on tourism industry</i> (f) <i>Impact on safety of navigation and anchorage of small craft both commercial and private.</i>	Godbert, Derry 247.1
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comments about not locating finfish farms closely together are noted. The submitter may like to provide comment on what threshold of farm size would start to cause concern, i.e. it is possible that a number of small farms located relatively closer would have no greater chance of disease than one larger farm or a number of small farms run by the same operator;</li> <li>• The suggested additional criteria relating to adverse effects and community feedback are not appropriate for inclusion at this stage as they are a part of Stage 1 of the threshold test;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no need to specify that an applicant must consult with the territorial authority. This is up to the applicant and would form a part of the considerations by the Regional Council. This does not exempt the applicant from their responsibility for compliance with any relevant regulations of a territorial authority;</li> <li>• The Council will provide an appropriate level of resources in relation to the work required. The weightings given to the various criteria will depend on the circumstances of each AMA and will be assigned at the time of formal notification of any invitation. Likewise the stakeholders may also be different for each AMA and it is not appropriate to specify those people and/or organisations at this stage. Changes to criteria will be undertaken via the LGA. Development contributions do not apply to the CMA;</li> <li>• The submitter may like to provide further details at the Hearing in relation to submission point 194.14;</li> <li>• The suggested additional impact criteria are not appropriate as these are covered in Stage 2 of the threshold test.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 014.6, Reject submissions 090.6; 126.4; 189.9, 189.10, 189.12 &amp; 189.13; 194.14; and, 247.1</b>

<b>Section 2.1 Invitee's competence to successfully complete the Plan Change process</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 090, 105, 148, 152, 167, 187, 189, 248		
2.1.4	Key stakeholders should expressly be stated to include the community i.e. all legitimate community interest groups including ratepayers associations.	Keys, David and Alison 090.5
	This attribute needs to specifically exclude any undertaking where the party being consulted stands to gain commercially from such an application.	Brierley, Peter 148.5
	Object to being grouped as a "key stakeholder". A new criteria should be added; <i>'The extent to which a meaningful and satisfactory agreement has been undertaken with tangata whenua'</i> .	Pivac, A.M. 248.5
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The term "key stakeholders" is very common terminology and its meaning is generally well understood and is considered to be an appropriate descriptive term when referring to the main organisations and individuals being consulted;</li> <li>• Pecuniary interest does not automatically rule a party out as a key stakeholder. That is a matter to be weighed subsequently.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 090.5; 148.5; and, 248.5</b>	
2.1.8	Add a requirement that applicants must demonstrate having taken iwi planning documents into account and/or	Chetham, Juliane 152.2

	draft amendments to similar effect.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– There needs to be a requirement to demonstrate having taken iwi planning documents into account</li> <li>– The requirement that 'recognised' iwi planning documents have been taken into account needs to be made explicit as applicants for plan change may be unfamiliar with the implementation of this requirement.</li> </ul>	Volkerling, Keir 167.2
	The criterion regarding “Iwi planning documents” is misleading. It is NRC not the applicant that is required to take such documents into account. No specific relief sought.	Kapa, Remarie 189.11
	Some iwi have chosen not to formalize strategic documents, however this should not be unduly prejudicial towards them or their involvement at the initial planning stages. No specific relief sought.	Pivac, A.M. 248.6
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Under this criterion the applicant would need to show how they have taken iwi planning documents into account. It considers the extent to which these have been taken into account, which suggests that those applicants who have undertaken extensive consideration of such documents will be positively considered against the criteria. The suggested amendments are not appropriate as they do not change the intent of the criteria;</li> <li>• No prejudice is incurred simply because an iwi planning document is unavailable.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 152.2 to the extent that the relief sought is appropriate No specific relief is sought in submissions 189.11; and 248.6</b>	
2.1.9	This attribute is completely irrelevant. No specific relief sought.	Brierley, Peter 148.6
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Department of Conservation has a statutory interest in the CMA and is, therefore, relevant.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>No specific relief is sought in submission 148.6</b>	
2.1.10	This phrase is far too inconspicuous (in relation to Whangaroa Harbour)	Walker, Vivienne 105.1
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The point being made is unclear. The submitter may like to expand on this at the Hearing.</li> </ul>	

<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 105.1</b>	
2.1.11	Delete this provision. Financial contributions should be included in the RCP.	Britton, Robin 187.7
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This provision is appropriate and simply seeks an understanding of any interest or, in the case of land-based activities, service provision by or in consultation with the territorial authority.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 187.7</b>	

<b>Section 2.2 Invitee's demonstrated understanding of and ability to operate a commercially viable aquaculture activity</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 187, 189, 248		
2.2.1	Delete reference to any need for a past track record.	Britton, Robin 187.8
	Delete as this is discriminatory to new entrants to the industry.	Kapa, Remarie 189.14
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst it is accepted that the inclusion of a track record may make it harder for new operators to establish, it may be that other factors can be used to establish a track record, such as the work experience of employees of a new company. Detailed explanations in other parts of these criteria, such as an understanding of the industry and the commercial risks, will assist in developing a track record. It should be remembered that this is a test developed to enable a choice between competing bids for the same activity in an AMA. No single criterion will be definitive in that assessment.</li> </ul>	
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 187.8; and, 189.14</b>	
2.2.3	What is deemed 'appropriate'? Research and development needs to be all inclusive of the environment and the community, this would provide an avenue for local and traditional knowledge.	Pivac, A.M. 248.7
<b>Officers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The word "appropriate" is a well understood concept and recognises that what is acceptable in one location may not necessarily be so in</li> </ul>	

<b>Discussion</b>	another location. The point is to understand how the applicant has determined the research and development.
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 248.7</b>

<b>Section 2.3 Invitee's demonstrated competence on a range of collateral issues</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 001, 167, 186, 248		
General	Add a new criterion as follows: " <i>The extent to which the invitee has addressed any cross boundary and reverse sensitivity issues.</i> "	Manley, Clive 186.4
	<p>This section should be divided into:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Effects/Benefits, which would include the following criteria; Availability of land-based requirements, addressed public access and uses, and the potential for their farm to require infrastructural developments benefiting the local community. Also add a new section to read '<i>The extent to which the invitee has conducted a Cultural Impact Assessment</i> (which should have particular focus on iwi, the criteria for which will be decided on a case-by-case basis).</li> <li>Environmental Issues, which would include the following criteria; Insecurity/indigenous species, species requirements, water quality effects, requirement of vehicles along foreshore</li> <li>Other Interests and Uses; which would include the following criteria; Assessment of effects on existing uses of that coastal space (including customary, commercial, recreational etc.) consultation with TOKM, consultation with MFish, meaningful consultation with tangata whenua.</li> <li>Tangata Whenua Favourable Treatment in Customary Areas; if one of the applicants happens to be tangata whenua and the area under dispute is of customary significance, preferential status should be granted to the tangata whenua applicant.</li> </ol>	Pivac, A.M. 248.9
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reverse sensitivity is considered to be covered in Stage 1 of the Threshold Test as part of Category 3;</li> <li>It should be remembered that this is for the AMA, not the activity itself. It is the latter application that needs to address this matter specifically.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 186.4 Reject submission 248.9</b>	

2.3.3	This should explicitly state it is addressing the Maori Claims Settlement Act. This should be done by the Council in conjunction with the relevant tangata whenua.	Pivac, A.M. 248.8
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council will “approve” the spatial aspects and “representativeness” of the 20%, but they will not determine the 20% allocation to Iwi. This is undertaken by the Trustee - Te Ohu Kai Moana. It would be very unusual if this did not also involve the Council and tangata whenua. It is considered appropriate that the Maori Claims Settlement Act is referred to within the criterion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and proposed additional test.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Accept in part submission 248.8</b>  <b>That 2.3.3 read as follows:</b>  “The extent to which the invitee has addressed and identified the matter of representative and economic space <u><i>in accordance with the Maori Commercial Aquaculture Claims Act 2004.</i></u>”</p>	
2.3.6	Reword as follows: " <i>The extent to which the invitee has addressed the availability of associated land-based facilities necessary to operate any subsequent aquaculture activity</i> ".	Manley, Clive 186.3
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The suggested amendment replaces the word “requirements” with “facilities”. The existing wording, by definition, includes ‘facilities’ and may allow for other circumstances.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 186.3</b>	
2.3.10	Develop criteria and guidelines to define what constitutes "benefits" to the Northland region generally and the particular locality.	Millichamp, Simon 001.1
	<p>While this intent can be supported, it can be strengthened.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Benefits could be short term, particularly if ownership restructuring of the company occurs.</li> <li>- commitment to long term regional development benefits is appropriate</li> <li>- similar comments are relevant to rule 27.6.1 (g) (ii)</li> </ul>	Volkerling, Keir 167.3
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not appropriate to provide a definition of what comprises a benefit. Benefits will vary from location to location and it is up to the applicant to demonstrate that a particular outcome is a benefit and that it does not cause an adverse effect;</li> <li>The additional suggestions to strengthen the provision are supported in principle but not for inclusion in the criteria as they would be expected to be a part of the consideration under that criterion.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	

<b>Discussion</b>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 167.3 to the extent that the relief sought is acceptable</b> <b>Reject submission 001.1</b>

<b>Section 3 The Adopted Process for Invited Private Plan Change Requests</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 005, 010, 014, 038, 063, 068, 069, 070, 088, 090, 092, 113, 120, 126, 128, 131, 132, 146, 148, 151, 177, 182, 187, 189, 195, 196-206, 209, 211-238, 248		
General	Add a preliminary assessment of possible adverse effects and community views as issues to be taken into account in making "threshold decisions".	Keys, David 010.1
	The process should include a statement that all requests for IPPC will be subject to full public notification, submission, cross submission, hearing and Environment Court appeal rights.	Keys, David and Alison 090.7
	Supports the process outlined, and supports competing applications being given equal priority.	Brierley, Peter 148.7
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A consideration of the adverse effects is made at Stage 1 of the threshold test process;</li> <li>The process provides for public consultation in an appropriate manner. It is important that an appropriate balance is struck between ensuring that the public have the opportunity to make their views heard while avoiding the possibility of using public notification to slow the process down to the point where the industry (and the public) have little confidence in the process being able to produce a decision.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept submission 148.7</b> <b>Reject submissions 010.1; and, 090.7</b>	
3(b)	All AMA requests should be publicly notified without exception at all stages. Not to publicly notify *all* AMA requests is diametrically opposed to Plan Change` 4 Section 27.3.5 (Issues 6, 9, 10, 11).	005.4, 038.2, 063.2, 068.3, 069.3, 070.3, 088.1, 092.1, 113.2, 120.1, 126.5, 128, 131, 132, 146, 182, 195-206, 209, 211-238
	Clarify the sort of timeframe Council will be considering.	Britton, Robin 187.10
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notwithstanding the requirements for notification in the RMA, it is considered relevant to note that the process provides for public consultation in an appropriate manner. It is important that an appropriate balance is struck between ensuring that the public have the opportunity to make their views heard while avoiding the possibility of using public notification to slow the process down to the point</li> </ul>	

	<p>where the industry (and the public) have little confidence in the process being able to produce a decision;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The timeframe will depend on the circumstances of the invitation (e.g. location).</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 005.4, 038.2, 063.2, 068.3, 069.3, 070.3, 088.1, 092.1, 113.2, 120.1, 126.5, 128, 131, 132, 146, 182, 195-206, 209, 211-238; and, 187.10</b>	
3(c)	Further clarification of 3(c) is required.	Gillard, Mark 014.7
	Retain Procedure 3(c) as this will enable regional councils to advise competing applicants of any competing applications and to encourage them to present a combined request before the final deadline.	Jarvis, H.D. 151.2
	The potential powers conferred should be widened, e.g. allow for reiterations of that process, clarifications re confidentiality, and power to request more details than those specified.	McCallum, Callum 177.6
	Delete this provision.	Britton, Robin 187.11
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Criterion 3(c) indicates the Council may request locational details of the proposed AMA to determine whether there is competition for the same area. Doing so will enable the Council to advise the relevant parties and possibly suggest a joint application;</li> <li>It is important that the process be as streamlined as possible. The Reporting Officers are satisfied that the discretion is sufficiently wide.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept submission 151.2;</b> <b>Accept in part submission 014.7 to the extent that the relief sought is appropriate</b> <b>Reject submissions 177.6; and, 187.11</b>	
3(d)	There should be a solution whereby a full application with all of its inherent costs is not required until confirmation of being the successful applicant.	Gillard, Mark 014.8
	Add definition of what is meant by a "complete" request.	Britton, Robin 187.12
	Steps (d) and (h) are in conflict. Delete (d).	Kapa, Remarie 189.15
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The statement in submission 014.8 is one of the benefits of the two-stage approach;</li> <li>It is not appropriate to add a definition of what is meant by "complete". This relates to whether the application has any deficiencies that may prevent full assessment in accordance with the criteria specified by the Council;</li> <li>Provisions (d) and (h) are not in conflict. Provision (d) states that the requests must be complete. This means that they need to be complete for the purpose of assessment. If the assessment indicates that further information/clarification may be required then</li> </ul>	

	provision (h) can be used to request further information from the applicant.	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept submission 014.8 to the extent that the relief sought is appropriate</b> <b>Reject submissions 187.12; and, 189.15</b>	
3(e)	Define NRC's role and what is meant by "AMAs will not be adopted". Define what is expected of applicants in undertaking the process.	Britton Robin 187.13
	The Council should be prepared to provide some of the funding necessary to achieve the Plan Change Process.	Pivac, A.M. 248.10
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording used is consistent with the Act. The Council has determined that it will not "adopt" private plan changes but will only "accept" a proposal. This distinction is important as the applicant is expected to manage the process, not the Council;</li> <li>The question of funding will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, however generally applicants will be required to fund their plan changes.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 187.13 to the extent that the relief sought is appropriate</b> <b>Reject submission 248.10</b>	
3(g)	Clarify and state that the implications of a late request to other applications for the same area if allowed should also be addressed.	Gillard, Mark 014.9
	Restate that any late applicant will not be accepted.	Britton, Robin 187.14
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The wording of this paragraph is considered appropriate. It relates to priority in time, which has been determined to be the one that is formally notified first, not the one necessarily received first (although in the latter case, this is most likely);</li> <li>It would not be appropriate to have a blanket rejection of late applications as there may be extenuating circumstances.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion and therefore does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 014.9; and 187.14</b>	

<b>Maps: General</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 003, 004, 008, 015, 026, 068, 069, 070, 087, 088, 092, 120, 125, 126, 148, 161, 162, 164, 173, 176, 177, 182, 183, 185, 186, 188, 195-209, 211-238		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Require proof beyond doubt that all concerned are going to be satisfied with the outcome of this proposal.</li> <li>- Proof that this project will not affect any living thing in and around all areas concerned.</li> </ul>	Shepherd, Paul 003.1, 003.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Show recreational boating routes</li> <li>- Amend the Use and Value Maps to take account of scenic, aesthetic and high natural landscape values, recreational use, tourism and wildlife.</li> <li>- Elevate many areas on maps from 'significant' to 'critical'. The following significant level constraint uses and values should be given a higher level of recognition; areas of important conservation value, landscape character, landscape buffer 1000m, popular beach buffer 500m, tourist charter route 50.</li> <li>- The Use and Value Maps need to become an integral part of Proposed Plan Change 4.</li> <li>- Increase the buffer zones (especially in Areas of Significant Conservation Value)</li> </ul>	Clarkson, David 004.1
	Amend the Use and Value Maps to take account of scenic, aesthetic and high natural landscape values, recreational use, tourism and wildlife.	Blowers, David 026.1
	Elevate many areas on maps from 'significant' to 'critical'. The following significant level constraint uses and values should be given a higher level of recognition; areas of important conservation value, landscape character, landscape buffer 1000m, popular beach buffer 500m, tourist charter route 50.	Waanders, Paul 126.3
	The Use and Value Maps need to become an integral part of Proposed Plan Change 4.	Brabant, Jeremy 185.2
	Increase the buffer zones (especially in Areas of Significant Conservation Value)	Banfield, Gordon 008.4; Chandler, Donald 125.1; Jenkins, Chris 183.4
	Provide more protection for habitat of migratory birds.	Panckhurst, D.J. 008.5
	The maps need to better reflect land uses and their potential impacts on the water. Consequential amendments to account for buffer sources and thresholds required.	Neal, Brendon 015.3
	[Refer also to 1.3.4] The FNDC and WDC outstanding/significant landscape maps should be overlaid on to the 'Use and Value maps' and 'Aquaculture Evaluation' maps. The overlays designating outstanding/significant landscapes should then be eliminated from AMA consideration or be designated as critical.	068.1, 069.1, 070.1, 088.2, 092.2, 182.1, 195.3, 196-206, 209.3, 211-238
	Areas available for AMAs should be restricted to those operating and existing at present.	Goodwin, Trevor Grant

		087.2
	Public notice should be required for all proposed changes to Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Use and Value Maps.	Garrett, Gerald 120.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The "DoC Parks and Reserves Buffer 500m" should be allocated a Significant level of constraint on the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps</li> <li>- The "Protected and Popular Anchorages" should be allocated a critical level of constraint on the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps.</li> <li>- The "Boat Ramps" should be allocated a critical level of constraint on the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps</li> <li>- "Recognised recreational sailing/racing areas" should be identified in consultation with local Yacht Clubs</li> <li>- "Chartered Navigation Channels" should be identified</li> <li>- Review all use and values on the Use and Value Maps and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps to ensure they are complete and accurate.</li> <li>- "DoC Parks and Reserves" on Use and Value maps be renamed "Parks and Reserves".</li> <li>- Boat ramp access lanes should be included in the current "Boat ramps" use and value</li> <li>- The two options to increase the level of constraint in areas where there are multiple overlapping constraints should be investigated and the most efficient and effective option be incorporated.</li> <li>- An assessment should be undertaken to test the appropriateness of the following buffer zones identified</li> </ul>	Waanders, Paul 126.3
	Constraint maps appear to have many inaccuracies at the "local" level. No specific relief sought.	Brierley, Peter 148.1
	<p>Include an additional method within the Plan Change 4 that states: "Council will in accordance with section 165W of the Resource Management Act 1991, by public notice, identify the following areas as AMA exclusion zones when calling for IPPC Applications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The area that includes the Bay of Islands Maritime Park and bound by a line that extends from the Cape Brett Lighthouse, to a point seaward of Percy Island and through to the Nine Pin Island;</li> <li>(ii) Any areas identified on a New Zealand Hydrographical Chart as being recognised anchorage, including bays that contain a "Dolphin Mooring" intended for large vessels or cruise ships;</li> <li>(iii) All Marine Reserves, Maritime Parks or other protected areas;</li> <li>(iv) Areas identified as "critical" on Aquaculture Evaluation Maps.</li> </ul>	Horne, Mike 161.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Move "DOC Parks and reserve Buffer 500m" from potential to significant</li> <li>- Include other reserves and covenanted areas</li> <li>- Move "Protected Beaches Buffer 500m" from significant to critical</li> <li>- Move "Popular Beaches Buffer 500m" from significant to critical</li> </ul>	Horne, Mike 161.5

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include access lanes to and from jetties and wharfs as critical constraints</li> <li>- Undertake meaningful consultation with the charter industry</li> <li>- Tourist charter routes to be moved to a "critical constraint"</li> <li>- Any alternative, further or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully give effect to the relief sought above.</li> </ul>	
<p>Amend to include the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Incorporate a Matrix system of assessing whether a particular spatial area should be upgraded to "critical" or "significant" where multiple constraints overlap.</li> <li>2. Alternatively, wherever two or more of the following constraints overlap, identify these areas as "critical": areas of important conservation value; landscape and natural character; landscape buffer 1000m; popular beach buffer 500m; tourist charter route buffer.</li> </ol> <p>Any alternative, further or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully give effect to the relief sought above.</p>	<p>Horne, Mike 161.3, Cochran, David 176.2</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Divide the "Significant Level of Constraints" into two separate levels with the higher order constraints being: areas of important conservation value; landscape and natural character; landscape buffer 1000m; popular beach buffer 500m; tourist charter route buffer.</li> <li>- Any alternative, further or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully give effect to the relief sought above.</li> </ul>	<p>Horne, Mike 161.4, Cochran, David 176.3</p>
<p>Recreation should be placed in the "critical" category</p>	<p>Donald, Denise 162.1</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amend the Use and Value Maps and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps so that the submitter's coastal Whangaroa property will not be affected.</li> <li>- Clarify the explanation and policy framework surrounding the maps and the their rating as "critical", "significant" and "potential"; the basis of some of the constraints, which are too limited in extent; and the limited reference to 'constraints' like access to shore facilities, exposure, water depth and recreation.</li> </ul>	<p>Josephson, Peter 164.1</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amend the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps so that the gazetted 'Wildlife Refuges' and 'Areas of Important Conservation Value' are transferred from the 'significant' level of constraint to 'critical'.</li> <li>- The council needs to undertake an evaluation of the remainder of the cma of the region (apart from Whangarei Harbour) in consultation with district councils, other relevant agencies and community groups in the region towards identifying 'Area of Important Seascape and Aesthetic Value', 'Important multi-use Recreational and Tourist Area' and 'Area Subject to Significant Emergency and Accidental Discharges' and then incorporating them into the Maps.</li> </ul>	<p>Kippenberger, Jane 173.5, 173.8</p>
<p>Include the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify all anchorages that are marked on the NZ Hydrographic Survey charts on the Use and Value Maps</li> </ol>	<p>Cochran, David 176.4</p>

	<p>as a critical constraint</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Move "Protected and Popular anchorages" from significant to critical</li> <li>3. Include access lanes to and from jetties and wharfs as critical constraints</li> </ol>	
	Delete the proposals for "Landscape Buffer 1000m" and as 'significant constraints' on the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps. The converse does not appear to apply to major intrusions to landscape from land development.	McCallum, Callum 177.7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Include larger scale maps or insets to the existing maps for areas with high multiple use and/or values.</li> <li>– Either incorporate the maps into Plan Change 4, or delete all references to them from the proposed Plan.</li> <li>– Undertake a natural character assessment to include descriptions and potential ranking of the natural character of the coastal environment and to identify outstanding landscapes, biodiversity values and areas of high recreational and other amenity values, and incorporate the results in the maps,</li> <li>– "DoC parks and reserves buffer" be renamed "Conservation areas, reserves and marine protected areas buffer",</li> <li>– Important reserves and protected areas which are administered by parties other than DoC should be included in the maps.</li> </ul>	Jenkins, Chris 183.3, 183.5
	Amend the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps to include; protected, sheltered and popular anchorages, boat ramps, boat grid points buffer 200m, areas of important conservation value, wildlife refuge, popular beaches buffer 500m, landscape character, landscape buffer 1000m, tourist charter route buffer 50m.	Brabant, Jeremy 185.3
	Include Maori culture and historic heritage as key themes for the Use and Value Maps.	Manley, Clive 186.1
	Clarify what information will be included on the use and value maps and evaluation maps and when NRC intends to do this.	Manley, Clive 186.2
	Amend the buffer zone shown around DoC reserves by extending it from 500m to 1000m.	Brown, Rodney 207.1
<b>Officer Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not possible to provide the level of assurance requested in submissions 003.1 and 003.2. Resource Management is about weighing up all the relevant factors and making an assessment accordingly. There are always going to be effects and the degree to which these can be avoided, remedied or mitigated is the significant aspect to consider.</li> <li>• The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. Many of the requests are not able to be considered in detail at this time, however in several cases some of the requests can be accepted. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps will be updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers many of the specific points of relief sought above including the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Use and Value Map buffer zones, Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA, and the Location of the Maps outside of the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee recognises and accepts that there are mapping limitations including the extent of currently verifiable information. The maps represent currently verifiable knowledge of uses and values within and adjacent to the coastal marine area.</li> <li>• The Committee has not provided any discussion on relief sought which is a RMA matter that needed to have been addressed through submissions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>• The Committee makes comment on the following specific points of relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- District Council owned land (parks and reserves) adjacent to the coastline should be shown on the Use and Value Maps as a means of recognising the scenic, aesthetic, recreational and tourist values associated with parts of the Northland coastline. The Committee would also like to point out that the District Council identified outstanding landscapes are shown on the Use and Value Maps. (submission 026.1)</li> <li>- Wildlife refuges (as identified by the Department of Conservation) are already shown on the Use and Value Maps. In addition, migratory bird habitats are covered to a large extent within Marine 1 Management Areas as identified through the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland. (submission 008.5)</li> <li>- DoC Parks and Reserves category will be changed to include District Council parks and reserves to more accurately represent public open space along the coastline and be renamed “Parks and Reserves”. (part submission 126.3)</li> <li>- All protected anchorages identified on the NZ Hydrographic Survey Charts are shown on the Use and Value Maps. The Charts also identify “Small Craft Mooring” and “Yacht Mooring” Areas, however the Regional Coastal Plan identifies mooring areas in accordance with the provisions of the RMA and these have been identified on the Use and Value Maps. (submission 176.4)</li> <li>- Known Maori cultural and historic heritage areas are identified on the Use and Value Maps including Taiapure Areas. It’s also considered appropriate to identify registered Wahi Tapu Areas and Maori Oyster Reserves as recognised Maori interest in specific areas of the coastal marine area. (submission 186.1)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Accept submissions in part: 026.1, 126.3, 161.5, 176.4 and 186.1.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Include District Council owned land adjacent to the coastal marine area to the DoC Parks and Reserves category and change the name to Parks and Reserves.</b></li> <li><b>2. Include all anchorages identified on the NZ Hydrographic Survey Charts.</b></li> <li><b>3. Include registered Wahi Tapu Areas and Maori Oyster Reserves.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Reject submissions 003, 004, 008, 015, 026, 068, 069, 070, 087, 088, 092, 120, 125, 126, 148, 161, 162, 164, 173, 176, 177, 182, 183, 185, 186, 188, 195-209, 211-238</b></p>

<b>Maps: Excluded areas</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 008, 015, 126, 136, 144, 149, 161, 165, 173, 185, 188, 194		
	The basic principle to be considered when creating an AMA is the protection of the natural character of Northland's coastline and that no marine areas should be permitted in coastal areas which are at present	Panckhurst, D.J 008.3

undeveloped and 'pristine'.	
Excluded areas should be identified where IPPCs cannot be made, to provide increased certainty to both the community and industry regarding areas with a large number of critical constraints. This includes ensuring consistency with the Auckland Regional Council by identifying areas that have already been identified as excluded by ARC.	Neal, Brendon 015.1, 015.4
Oppose all AMAs. New Zealand should be left for all.	Elliott, David Keith 020.2
Oppose all proposed AMAs in the Far North	Bleakley, Warrick Scott 043.2
Opposed to all aquaculture farming due to (a) pollutants, (b) wrong zoning, (c) removing food supply from existing shellfish and (d) visual pollution.	King, Marie 057.1
Opposes any more aquaculture.	Knight, Simon 059.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Identify areas of high recreational value as being excluded from developments as an Aquaculture Management Area</li> <li>– Identify areas that are of significant importance to existing tourism, charter and established diving sites as being excluded from development as an Aquaculture Management Area</li> <li>– Identify areas of high conservation value as being excluded from development as an Aquaculture Management Area</li> <li>– Identify any other area where the existing values are such that it is inappropriate to establish an AMA</li> <li>– The above areas to be incorporated into the Use and Value Maps and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps released as a Statement of Proposal under the LGA 2002 if this process is not abandoned.</li> </ul>	Waanders, Paul 126.2
Include excluded areas on the maps.	Drummond, Lucie 136.2
NRC should publicly identify all areas in coastal waters that are excluded from marine farming.	Grace, Sharon 144.1
All areas in the vicinity of coastal communities should be added to the exclusion maps.	Lieffering, Robin 149.1
Exclude any areas that are deemed inappropriate from consideration as an AMA under the Invited Private Plan Change process.	Horne, Mike 161.2
Opposed to aquaculture development or its expansion in areas that are entirely inappropriate or where public consultation has indicated a clear direction in terms of areas that should be specifically excluded from development as AMAs	Long, JM & LA 165.1
There should be reasonable certainty in the Coastal Plan as to where marine farming is not to be normally allowed, by way of appropriate 'zoning' or 'excluded areas'.	Kippenberger, Jane 173.1

	The proposed threshold test for IPPC requests should be abandoned (on the basis that PPC4 is rejected). If not, then NRC should first identify excluded areas for which no IPPC applications will be invited.	Brabant, Jeremy 185.1
	Establish clarity and certainty as to the future use of the CMA by undertaking comprehensive studies and work with community by effective consultation to establish excluded areas or potential AMAs. Identify highly valued areas and those with overlapping uses and values as being excluded from development of AMAs.	Hunt, Heather 188.3
	The council should notify their intention to seek public consultation to identify Excluded Areas from the IPPC process in the Northland CMA, subject to s.165W of the RMA.	Bellingham, Mark 194.1
<b>Officer Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps;</li> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA. It will then take all submissions made on this matter into account.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers in detail the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Exclusion Areas under section 165W of the RMA and the recommendation for Aquaculture Restriction Areas which will be identified through new Policy 9 and Method 2 (maps) of Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>The Committee wish to clarify that the Use and Value Maps are a representation of currently verifiable information about the coastal marine area and adjacent land. They are not a mechanism through which aquaculture may be excluded or limited as has been requested in a number of the above submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 008.3; 015.1 and, 015.4; 020.2; 043.2; 057.1; 059.1; 126.2; 136.2; 144.1; 149.1; 161.2; 165.1; 173.1; 185.1; 188.3; and, 194.1</b>	

<b>Maps: Houhora Harbour (3A/B)</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 93, 94, 95		
<b>Submissions generally in opposition:</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the location of the landfill buffer zone at Houhora Harbour</li> <li>Include the Wildlife Refuge at Kowhai Beach</li> <li>Designate Kowhai Beach and Houhora Bay as popular beaches</li> <li>Identify shellfish gathering areas in Houhora Harbour</li> <li>Identify Houhora Harbour as a popular recreational fishing area.</li> </ul>	Rae, Murray 093.1; Carey, Wayne 094.1

	Amendments to be made to relevant maps (provided in submission), and that the council actually visit the harbour before drawing them up.	Wagener, Norman George 095.1
<b>Officer Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. Many of the requests are not able to be considered in detail at this time, however in several cases some of the requests can be accepted. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps.</li> <li>The submitters may like to elaborate at the Hearing in relation to the first three points in submissions 093.1 and 094.1</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers many of the specific points of relief sought above including the removal of Use and Value Map buffer zones.</li> <li>While the landfill buffer has been removed, it has been verified by NRC staff that the location of the landfill site at Houhora Harbour as notified is inaccurate and that the submitter's relocation is an accurate representation of the landfills actual location.</li> <li>Wildlife refuges (as identified by the Department of Conservation) are already shown on the Use and Value Maps and includes Kowhai Beach. In addition migratory bird habitats are covered to a large extent within Marine 1 Management Areas as identified through the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>The Committee recognises and accepts that there are mapping limitations including the extent of currently verifiable information. The maps represent currently verifiable knowledge of uses and values within and adjacent to the coastal marine area.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Accept in part submissions: 093.1 and 094.1</b>  <b>Relocate the landfill site as identified in submission 093.1 and 094.1.</b>  <b>Reject submissions 093.1 and, 094.1; and, 095.1</b></p>	

<b>Maps: Whangaroa Harbour/Cavalli Islands (6A/B)</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 010, 012, 018, 036, 039, 040, 043, 080, 082, 086, 090, 099, 101, 105, 139, 141, 142, 146, 243, 244, 251-254, 256		
	Declare the area bounded by the proposed "Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park" an inappropriate area for any new AMAs and not available for consideration,	Keys, David 010.2; Hassall, Trevor 012.1; Hassall, Elizabeth 139.1; Thomas & Thomas, Schelle 141.1; Stone, Geoffrey 142.1; Kingston, Stuart and Andrea 146.2;
	Limit the size of all AMAs in which any form of commercial fishing or aquaculture can occur around	Churton, Troy 018.1

	Whangaroa/Stephenson's Island.	
	Whangaroa Harbour should be kept free of further commercial fish or shellfish farming.	Smith, Robert 036.1
	No AMAs should be established in or outside Whangaroa Harbour.	Fleming, Brian 039.2; Garton, Noeline 040.2; Hamilton, Ross 080.1; Hamilton, Wendy 082.1; O'Brien, Anton 251.1; Walker, Shannon 252.2, Smith, Bryce 253.2; Walker, Violet Eva 254.2; Douglas, Ray 256.2
	All proposed AMAs for the Whangaroa area should be rejected.	Bleakley, Warrick Scott 043.2
	The Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park concept should be established as planned with no future commercial development.	Hall, William 086.1
	Amend the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps to show the area of the proposed Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park and state that new AMAs will not be permitted in that area.	Keys, David and Alison 090.8
	The Whangaroa Harbour already has enough marine farming and that the rest should be kept for recreational fishing.	Jones, Janice Eileen 099.2
	No aquaculture should occur in Map 6 as this area is a significant natural area.	Corbin, Rodger David 101.2
	AMAs should not be established based on predetermined criteria, especially in Whangaroa Harbour.	Walker, Vivienne 105.1
	No Aquaculture Management Areas within the Hohepa Te Taha rohe, namely Taupo Bay.	Peterson, Elizabeth 243.1
	Oppose the proposal of and for Aquaculture Management Areas within the rohe of Ngati Aukiwa.	Peterson, Michael 244.1
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. Many of the requests are not able to be considered in detail at this time, however in several cases some of the requests can be accepted. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA;</li> <li>The size of an AMA will be determined on a case-by-case basis considering the adverse effects of the potential aquaculture activity when determining the size of an AMA.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee wish to clarify that the Use and Value Maps are a representation of currently verifiable information about the coastal marine area and adjacent land. They are not a mechanism through which aquaculture may be excluded or limited as has been requested in a number of the above submissions.</li> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers in detail the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Exclusion Areas under section 165W of the RMA and the recommendation for Aquaculture Restriction Areas which will be identified through new Policy 9 and Method 2 (maps) of Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>A number of the submissions requested the “Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park” be declared an inappropriate area for any new marine farming. The “Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park” has not been formally established or recognised through any legislation and is currently only at the community conceptual stage. For this reason it is considered inappropriate to identify it on the Use and Value Maps as the boundaries and purpose may change prior to it being formally recognised.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 010.2, 012.1, 139.1, 141.1, 142.1, and 146.2; 018.1; 036.1; 039.2, 040.2, 080.1, 082.1, 251.1, 252.2, 253.2, 254.2, and 256.2; 043.2; 086.1; 090.8; 099.2; 101.2; 105.1; 243.1; and, 244.1</b>

<b>Maps: Bay of Islands Area (7A/B, 8 A/B, 25 A/B)</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 005, 011, 013, 091, 098, 113, 125, 136, 161, 175, 176, 177, 207		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can the Council please accordingly advise and confirm: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether there are any current applications and/or proposals under the new IPPC procedure in relation to AquaMarine Farms in the Bay of Islands Area.</li> <li>Whether any of those proposals involve areas adjacent to or surrounding Moturoa Island.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Amend the current existing proposed maps and restrictive designations to provide some form of protection to Moturoa Island of at least, if not more, significant constraints than the constraints afforded to non-rate paying islands in the Bay of Islands itself.</li> <li>Amend the evaluation maps to include a greater recognition of the protective wildlife status of Moturoa Island and landscape buffer zone incorporating the area surrounding Days Point and Bayley's farm and the southern and western coastlines adjacent to Moturoa Island.</li> <li>Amend the evaluation map to more correctly designate the tourist route of the cream boat to protect all tidal and weather routes in the boating channel.</li> </ul>	Ward, Michael 005.1, 005.2, 005.5

<p>Amend the use and value map of the Bay of Island, Kerikeri Inlet, Waikare in respect of the Te Puna Inlet to show the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To show popular anchorages in Wrights Bay.</li> <li>2. Registered moorings in the same general area.</li> <li>3. Sheltered anchorages on the SW coast line from Wrights Bay to the southern most point of the Purerua Peninsula.</li> <li>4. Boat ramps on the bays adjacent to Wrights Bay.</li> <li>5. Shellfish gathering grounds on the same area of coastline.</li> <li>6. There is a structure which is situated in the centre of the Te Puna Inlet which is not shown on the Use and Value Map in the Bay of Islands, (submitter has indicated the structure's approximate position)</li> </ol>	Subritzky, W.A 011.1
<p>Amend the use and value maps of the Bay of Islands to show more of the recreational sites, e.g. sheltered anchorages, shellfish gathering beds.</p>	Stowell, Anne 013.2
<p>Amend the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That Day Point be shown as an area of Important Conservation Value OR be shown with a similar notation.</li> <li>2. That there be an area of 1000m entirely around Day Point top be shown as conservation buffer OR a similar notation.</li> <li>3. That Day Point and the 1000m buffer zone classified as a "critical" area on the Evaluation Maps.</li> <li>4. That Moturoa Island and the area around it and Onewhero Bay be treated in a similar manner whereby they are deemed to be areas unsuitable for AMAs.</li> </ol>	Dowell, J.H. 091.2
<p>The area identified within the Bay of Islands from Piercy Island, Cape Brett, extending across to the Nine Pin and Cape Wi Wiki should be declared an exclusion area for AMAs, as well as an extending 500 meter buffer zone.</p>	McCarty, Graeme 098.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The whole Bay of Islands area from the Nine Pin across to Cape Brett should be declared unavailable for new AMAs with the exceptions of the upper reaches of the inlets</li> <li>– The Use and Value Map for BOI: Kerikeri Inlet/Waikare Inlet needs to show a further "popular Anchorage" symbol immediately west of the Te Pahi Islets and adjacent area.</li> </ul>	Harrisson, Ernest 113.1
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The entire Bay of islands region from Cape Brett to the Cavallis should be marked as critical.</li> <li>– Landscape Buffers should be expanded from 1 kilometre to 10 kilometres.</li> <li>– Additional plan changes should be made with respect to beaches, anchorages, marine mammal habitat, kiwi habitat and pa sites within the area.</li> <li>– The importance of Rangihoua Pa should be recognized and marked as well as a buffer given.</li> </ul>	Chandler, Donald 125.1

	The maps should show the proposed Rangihoua Historic Heritage Area, and this should be an excluded area.	Drummond, Lucie 136.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Undertake meaningful consultation with the charter industry</li> <li>– Identify the entire Bay of Islands Maritime Park as encompassing existing tourist charter routes</li> <li>– Tourist charter routes to be moved to a "critical constraint"</li> <li>– Identify the bay containing access to and views of Marsden Cross as a critical constraint</li> <li>– Identify the area around Percy Island - Hole in the Rock, extending 200 metres off the island and through to Cape Brett as a critical constraint</li> <li>– Identify the area around the Black Rocks, extending 200 metres offshore as a critical constraint</li> <li>– Identify Deepwater Cove, including access to Deepwater Cove and the proposed site for HMNZS Canterbury as a critical constraint</li> <li>– Any alternative, further or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully give effect to the relief sought above.</li> </ul>	Horne, Mike 161.6, 161.7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Amend the Use and Value Maps and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps to rectify the stated matters of concern.</li> <li>– The existing marine farm in Paroa Bay should be reviewed and if necessary deleted from the maps.</li> </ul>	Hall, Peter 175.1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Identify the Bay of Islands Maritime Park as being a high level Critical Constraint to Aquaculture on the use and Value Maps;</li> <li>– Identify the Bay of Islands Maritime Park on the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps as an area that will not be considered for further aquaculture development;</li> <li>– Any alternative, further or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully give effect to the relief sought above.</li> </ul>	Cochran, David 176.5
	Oppose the recording of the Waikare Inlet as an area of "significant Constraint" on the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps due to "poor quality" as this is not its current position. This needs to be amended to update, or deleted.	McCallum, Callum 177.8
	Amend the Use and Value Maps to show navigational restraints in the area south of Moturoa Island, Bay of Islands currently showing no uses or restraints.	Brown, Rodney 207.2
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council can advise that an application has been received for an aquaculture activity near to Moturoa. This application is currently on hold due to the moratorium in place on new marine farms whilst the plan change is being progressed;</li> <li>• The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. Many of the requests are not able to be considered in detail at this time, however in several cases some of the requests can be accepted. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps;</li> <li>• The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do</li> </ul>	

	<p>so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In relation to submission 011.1 the submitter may like to identify whether the Boat Ramps in Wrights Bay are public and also an indication of what the structure mentioned in point 6 is.</li> <li>• In relation to submission 013.2 the submitter may like to provide more detail as to the specific recreational sites.</li> <li>• In relation to submission 125.1 (point 3) the submitter may like to provide more detail as to the specific locations.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers many of the specific points of relief sought above including the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Use and Value Map buffer zones, Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA, and the Location of the Maps outside of the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>• The Committee recognises and accepts that there are mapping limitations including the extent of currently verifiable information. The maps represent currently verifiable knowledge of uses and values within and adjacent to the coastal marine area.</li> <li>• The Committee has not provided any discussion on relief sought which is an RMA matter that needed to have been addressed through submissions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>• The Committee makes comment on the following specific points of relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where popular anchorages have been identified and are able to be verified by NRC maritime staff then these should be shown on the Use and Value Maps. (submission 011.1 and 113.1)</li> <li>- All registered moorings are not shown on the maps as there are too many and it would clutter up the maps to the extent that they were uninterruptible. All Marine 4 (Mooring including Marina) Management Areas from the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland have been shown. NRC maritime staff have indicated that the currently identified sheltered anchorages on the South West coast of Purerua Peninsula are an accurate reflection of the sheltered anchorages. The boat ramps adjacent to Wrights Bay are all privately owned with no public access and for that reason should not be shown on the maps. No recreational shellfish gathering areas are identified on the maps. No information was provided as to what the structure is, however its understood to be a navigational marker. (submission 011.1)</li> <li>- The Rangihoua Historic Heritage Area is a registered heritage site and as such should be recognised and shown on the Use and Value Maps. (submission 136.2)</li> <li>- The HMNZS Canterbury has been sunk since the notification of the Use and Value Maps and the final location has been confirmed. Therefore its location should be shown on the maps as is the case for other confirmed wrecks.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Accept in part submissions 011.1, 113.1, 136.2 and 161.6</b></p> <p><b>Include verifiable popular anchorages.</b></p> <p><b>Include Rangihoua Historic Heritage Area.</b></p> <p><b>Include HMNZS Canterbury.</b></p> <p><b>Reject submissions 005.1, 005.2, and 005.5; 013.2; 091.2; 098.1; 113.1; 125.1; 136.2; 161.6, and 161.7; 175.1; 176.5; 177.8; and, 207.2</b></p>

<b>Maps: Whangaruru Harbour-Whananaki (9A/B)</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 126, 134, 195-206, 209, 211-238		
	Exclude the following areas from AMA establishment; Whangaruru Harbour; Bland Bay	Waanders, Paul 126.2
	No Marine farming in the Whangaruru Harbour. The Whangarei District Council and its ratepayers may be liable to costs incurred by operators of marine farms from sewage overflow.	Scheibmair, Ursula and Werner 134.1
	No AMA establishment in the Whangaruru harbour.	195-206, 209, 211-238
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps;</li> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers many of the specific points of relief sought above including the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA.</li> <li>The Committee recognises and accepts that there are mapping limitations including the extent of currently verifiable information. The maps represent currently verifiable knowledge of uses and values within and adjacent to the coastal marine area.</li> <li>The Committee has not provided any discussion on relief sought which is an RMA matter that needed to have been addressed through submissions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 126.2; 134.1; 195-206, 209, and 211-238</b>	

<b>Maps: Tutukaka/Ngunguru/Horahora (10A/B, 11A/B)</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 126		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exclude the following from areas from AMA establishment; Tutukaka Coast generally and more specifically Ngunguru, Wellingtons Bay, Tutukaka Harbour, Matapouri Bay, Whale Bay and Wooleys Bay;</li> <li>Exclude the following from areas from AMA establishment; Teal Bay; Pataua Estuary; Pataua North.</li> </ul>	Waanders, Paul 126.2
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers many of the specific</li> </ul>	

<b>Discussion</b>	<p>points of relief sought above including the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee recognises and accepts that there are mapping limitations including the extent of currently verifiable information. The maps represent currently verifiable knowledge of uses and values within and adjacent to the coastal marine area.</li> <li>The Committee has not provided any discussion on relief sought which is an RMA matter that needed to have been addressed through submissions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submission 126.2</b>

<b>Maps: Whangarei Harbour (12A/B, 26 A/B, 27 A/B)</b>		
<b>Submissions:</b> 016, 017, 024, 025, 026, 033, 048, 053, 058, 061, 065, 066, 067, 071, 072, 073, 074, 106, 119, 126, 135, 144, 145, 173, 174, 176, 188, 193, 208, 210		
	Clearly exclude commercial marine farming from being established in the Whangarei Harbour.	Molloy, Donald 016.1; Thompson, Lynn 025.1; Fyfe, Alice 071.1; Fyfe, Noel 072.1; Hunt, Heather 188.2; Kokich, Dwane 193.1; Brown, Katherine 208.2; Monro, Patricia 210.1
	There should be no extension to the existing oyster farm in Parua Bay.	Robertson, Maureen 017.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No AMAs established in the Whangarei Harbour</li> <li>Existing shellfish gathering areas downstream of One Tree Point boat ramp need to be better identified and protected.</li> </ul>	Pyle, Barry 024.1, 024.2
	Concern raised about the effects that Aquaculture would have in Whangarei Harbour. No specific relief sought.	Blowers, David 026.2
	Tourism and clean harbours are more essential to the future growth of Northland than aquaculture. Concerned about the future of Whangarei Harbour. No specific relief sought.	Dempsey, Sandra 033.2
	Exclude any further form of commercial farming from being established in Whangarei Harbour or adjacent reserves.	Smith, Mary Julia 048.2; King, Jeanette 053.2; Messenger, Lisa 061.2;

		Smith, Mary 065.2; King, Philip 066.2; Woest, Cindy 067.2, Bell, Susan 106.2; Pearson, Diana 119.2
	NRC should ban any form of fish farming in the Whangarei Harbour.	Robinson, Leo 058.1
	Oppose marine farming in the Whangarei Harbour	Ware, Gayle 073.1; Ware, John 074.1
	The maps need to clearly show Parua Bay is a recreational area and its significance.	Lamerton, Michelle 117.1
	The following areas should be excluded from development as an Aquaculture Management Area on the Use and Value Maps and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps: Whangarei Harbour generally and more specifically Mcleod Bay, Reotahi, Little Munro Bay, Taurikura, Urquharts Bay.	Waanders, Paul 126.2
	There should be no changes regarding aquaculture farming in the Whangarei Harbour.	Millett, Theresa 135.1
	Need to take into account that the Whangarei Harbour is a natural wildlife area.	Grace, Shannon 144.1; Grace, Errol 145.1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amend the following on the Use and Value Maps of the Whangarei Harbour and entrance area; a) The area particularly delineated on the attached plan be included on the Maps as 'Area of Important Seascape and Aesthetic Value'; b) The area particularly delineated on the attached plan be included on the Maps as 'Important Multi-use Recreational and Tourist Area'; c) The area particularly delineated on the attached plan be included on the Maps as 'Area Subject to Significant Emergency and Accidental Discharges'.</li> <li>- Amend the following on the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps of the Whangarei Harbour and harbour entrance; a) The 'Area of Important Seascape and Aesthetic Value' detailed above be included on the Maps as a 'Significant' level constraint; b) The 'Important Multi-use Recreational and Tourist Area' detailed above be included on the Maps as a 'Significant' level constraint; c) The 'Area Subject to Significant Emergency and Accidental Discharges' detailed above be included on the Maps as a 'Critical' level constraint area.</li> </ul>	Kippenberger, Jane 173.6, 173.7
	The Uses and Values of the Whangarei harbour should be acknowledged as 'critical' constraints against commercial marine farming in the harbour.	George, David 174.1
	Identify all areas of the Whangarei Harbour that afford a navigable depth of 2 metres or more as a critical constraint resulting from recreational yacht navigation and yacht race courses	Cochran, David 176.4
<b>Officers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. . The Plan Change contains a</li> </ul>	

<b>Discussion</b>	<p>requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers many of the specific points of relief sought above including the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Use and Value Map buffer zones, Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA, and the Location of the Maps either within or outside of the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>The Committee recognises and accepts that there are mapping limitations including the extent of currently verifiable information. The maps represent currently verifiable knowledge of uses and values within and adjacent to the coastal marine area.</li> <li>The Committee has not provided any discussion on relief sought which is an RMA matter that needed to have been addressed through submissions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>The Committee makes comment on the following specific points of relief sought: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While it may be unclear, the Whangarei Harbour wildlife refuge is shown on the Use and Value Maps. (submission 144.1 and 145.1)</li> <li>The Outstanding Landscapes shown are those identified on District Council planning maps which have gone through a public consultation process under the RMA. It is considered inappropriate to identify additional outstanding landscapes or seascapes through this process that have not followed the same rigorous process (submission 173.6 and 173.7) .</li> <li>All consented discharges are identified on the Use and Value Maps (submission 173.6 and 173.7).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 016, 017, 024, 025, 026, 033, 048, 053, 058, 061, 065, 066, 067, 071, 072, 073, 074, 106, 119, 126, 135, 144, 145, 173, 174, 176, 188, 193, 208, 210</b>

<b>Maps: Bream Bay – Hen and Chicken Islands (13A/B)</b>					
<b>Submissions:</b> 024, 188					
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>No AMAs established in Bream Bay.</td> <td>Pyle, Barry 024.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Identify Bream Bay as an excluded area.</td> <td>Hunt, Heather 188.2</td> </tr> </table>	No AMAs established in Bream Bay.	Pyle, Barry 024.3	Identify Bream Bay as an excluded area.	Hunt, Heather 188.2
No AMAs established in Bream Bay.	Pyle, Barry 024.3				
Identify Bream Bay as an excluded area.	Hunt, Heather 188.2				
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA.</li> </ul>				
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers the specific points of relief sought above including the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Use and Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA.</li> <li>The Committee has not provided any discussion on relief sought which is an RMA matter that needed to have been addressed through</li> </ul>				

	submissions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Reject submissions 024.3; and, 188.2</b>	
<b>Maps:</b>	<b>Kaipara Harbour-Mangawhai (14 A/B, 15 A/B, 16 A/B)</b>	
<b>Submissions:</b>	038, 172	
<b>14</b>	– No aquaculture activities within the Mangawhai Harbour, its environment or the adjacent coastal waters.	Welson, Raymond 038.2
<b>15/16</b>	– "Protected" and "sheltered" anchorages should be provided in the Kaipara Harbour as there are many recreational users of the harbour and it is essential that there is sufficient area available for safe anchorage during adverse conditions.	Donald, Trevor 172.1
<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. It. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps.</li> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers the specific points of relief sought above including the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA.</li> <li>The Committee has not provided any discussion on relief sought which is an RMA matter that needed to have been addressed through submissions on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture) to the Regional Coastal Plan for Northland.</li> <li>The Committee has recommended that where popular anchorages have been identified and are able to be verified by NRC maritime staff then these should be shown on the Use and Value Maps. (submission 172.1)</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<b>Accept in part submission 172.1 Reject submissions 038.2</b>	

<b>General: Process</b>
<b>Submissions:</b> 007, 008, 009, 015, 016, 017, 018, 019, 020, 021, 022, 023, 025, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 033, 034, 035, 036, 037, 039-044, 045, 046, 047, 048, 049, 050, 051, 052, 053, 054, 055, 056, 059, 060, 061, 062, 063, 064, 065, 066, 067, 071, 072, 073, 074, 075-087, 089, 090, 096, 097, 099, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 118, 119, 121, 122, 123, 124, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 153, 154, 155, 156-160, 161, 162, 163, 168, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 176, 177, 183, 184, 185, 188, 189, 190, 193, 208, 239, 242, 240, 241, 242, 245, 246, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256

	<p>[The process is too complicated and/or confusing.] No specific relief sought.</p>	007.1, 193.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The process as outlined leaves open the possibility that companies with large financial resources and astute lawyers taking applications through to the Environment Court stage will obtain consents for farms in areas which adversely affect conservation values. No specific relief sought.</li> <li>- Every time an application is made, those interested in preserving conservation values will have to be involved in submissions and hearings applicable to the case, when some over arching principles that protect areas of ecological significance could have removed some areas from the application arena in the first place.</li> </ul>	Panckhurst, DJ 008.1, 008.6
	<p>NRC needs to create a simple and clear process. A clear statement should be included in the plan to the effect that duplication is not required and any evidence provided once by an applicant will suffice for the full process.</p>	Banfield, Gordon 009.2
	<p>Ensure that the proposed policy promotes sustainable and integrated management of both the land catchments as well as the coastal marine areas. This includes co-ordination with Auckland Regional Council, particularly relating to the Kaipara Harbour.</p>	Neal, Brendon 015.2
	<p>The Threshold Test and Maps should be made part of Plan Change 4 (and consulted under the RMA rather than the LGA).</p>	016.2, 017.1, 019.1, 023.1, 025.2, 026.1, 033.1, 045.1, 046.1, 048.1, 049.1, 050.1, 051.1, 052.1, 053.1, 054.1, 55.1, 056.1, 060.1, 061.1, 062.1, 063.1, 064.1, 065.1, 066.1, 067.1, 071.1, 072.1, 073.1, 074.1, 078.1, 096.1, 097.1, 106.1, 107.1, 108.1, 115.1, 116.1, 118.1, 119.1, 121.1, 122.1, 123.1, 124.1, 127.1, 129.1, 130.1, 133.1, 136.1, 137.1, 138.1, 140.1, 143.1, 144.1, 145.1, 147.1, 153.1, 154.1, 155.1, 156.1, 157.1, 158.1, 159.1, 160.1, 161.1, 162.1, 163.1, 171.1, 174.1, 177.3, 184.1, 188.1, 190.1, 208.1, 242.1, 249.1

<p>The Threshold document needs to be re-written to require NRC to take a balanced look at Aquaculture Issues, possible Adverse Effects and likely Community Views in making its Threshold Decision.</p>	<p>018, 020, 021, 022, 027, 028, 029, 030, 031, 032, 034, 035, 036, 037, 039-044, 047, 059, 075-087, 089, 090, 099, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 128, 131, 132, 139, 141, 142, 146, 168, 169, 170, 240, 241, 245, 246, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 256</p>
<p>The Threshold Test needs to be re-written to require council to make the test more balanced.</p>	<p>Gow, Robyn 114.1</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorporate the Use and Value Maps into the Regional Coastal Plan as "Planning Maps"</li> <li>- Incorporate the aquaculture Evaluation Maps into the Regional Coastal Plan as "Planning Maps"</li> <li>- Incorporate the Aquaculture Invited Private Plan Change Acceptance Threshold Test into the Regional Coastal Plan</li> <li>- Re-notify all those aspects associated with Regional Coastal Plan Change 4 (outlined in 1-3 above) in accordance with the first schedule of the RMA 1991</li> <li>- Any alternative, further or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully give effect to the relief sought above.</li> </ul>	<p>Waanders, Paul 126.1; Cochran, David 176.1</p>
<p>Either the Threshold Test and Maps should be made a part of Plan Change 4, or before making any decisions regarding its proposal for the Maps and its content, the Council should seek a declaration from the Environment Court under s.310 of the RMA to determine whether having the Maps outside of Plan Change 4 is legal.</p>	<p>Kippenberger, Jane 173.4</p>
<p>The Threshold Test should be incorporated as a policy in proposed Plan Change 4, or if they remain separate, any references to the Threshold Test and associated criteria within the Proposed Plan Change should be deleted.</p>	<p>Jenkins, Chris 183.1</p>
<p>Any maps used as assessment tools should be included as part of the whole PPC4 process.</p>	<p>Brabant, Jeremy 185.2</p>
<p>Amend the whole process so that it makes sense to the public.</p>	<p>Hunt, Heather 188.1</p>
<p>[Oppose the Plan change being under two separate legislative regimes. There is inconsistency in the terms and phrases used in both Plan Change 4 and the Proposed Threshold Test.] No specific relief sought.</p>	<p>Kapa, Remarie 189.1</p>

	Proposed an alternative two step process	Jessop, B and C 239.1
<b>Officer Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The process of establishing an AMA is considered to be best applied using the Invited Private Plan Change (IPPC) process and threshold test because under the normal private plan change and council initiated plan change processes the applicant for the AMA is not guaranteed to be the party granted application for an authorisation for any subsequent coastal permit. The IPPC process gives more certainty to the successful applicant for the AMA as they are then the only party with authorisation to apply for a coastal permit. Use of the evaluation criteria in the threshold test is considered the fairest way to assess the different applicants for the AMA.</li> <li>The maps are one method for informing the process and changes may be made from time to time. The Plan Change contains a requirement that the maps are updated every time an invited private plan change process is initiated. This will give stakeholders the opportunity to provide feedback and make suggestions for changes to the maps.</li> <li>The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If it decides to consider options for detailing excluded areas it will do so in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Committee concurs with the first bullet point of the Officers discussion above however there are implications for the maps and general process as a consequence of the Committee Recommendations on Plan Change 4 (Aquaculture). Specifically these are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any reference to the Use and Value Maps and Aquaculture Evaluation Maps be removed from Plan Change 4. In effect, this means that they no longer have any weighting in the decision making process surrounding where AMA's should or shouldn't go. The Use and Value Maps are purely a collation of information about the Northland coastline to inform applicants.</li> <li>An additional policy (new Policy 9) and Aquaculture Restriction Maps have been added to Plan Change 4 as an alternative method of restricting AMA locations. It is worth noting that this does not however preclude the Council from using section 165W of the RMA in the future.</li> </ul> </li> <li>The Committee discussion of the key matters raised by submissions (located at the front of this report) covers the removal of the Aquaculture Evaluation Maps and Excluded areas under section 165W of the RMA.</li> <li>The Committee does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>	
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Reject submissions 016.2, 017.1, 019.1, 023.1, 025.2, 026.1, 033.1, 045.1, 046.1, 048.1, 049.1, 050.1, 051.1, 052.1, 053.1, 054.1, 055.1, 056.1, 060.1, 061.1, 062.1, 063.1, 064.1, 065.1, 066.1, 067.1, 071.1, 072.1, 073.1, 074.1, 078.1, 096.1, 097.1, 106.1, 107.1, 108.1, 115.1, 116.1, 118.1, 119.1, 121.1, 122.1, 123.1, 124.1, 126.1, 127.1, 129.1, 130.1, 133.1, 136.1, 137.1, 138.1, 140.1, 143.1, 144.1, 145.1, 147.1, 153.1, 154.1, 155.1, 156.1, 157.1, 158.1, 159.1, 160.1, 161.1, 162.1, 163.1, 171.1, 174.1, 176.1, 177.3, 183.1, 184.1, 185.2, 188.1, 190.1, 208.1, 242.1, 249.1</b></p> <p><b>No specific relief is sought for submissions 007.1, and 193.2; and, 189.1</b></p>	

<b>General: Miscellaneous</b>
<b>Submissions:</b> 002, 005, 038, 052, 065, 068, 069, 070, 088, 092, 149, 165, 177, 178, 182, 187, 191, 192, 195-209, 211-238, 248

[Supports the proposal.] No specific relief sought.	McCoubrey, Dorothy-Jean 002.1
Clarify whether the 18 sites approved by the council under the old AMA legislation continue to have any relevance as being identified potential sites suitable for AMAs.	Ward, Michael 005.3
Support the Proposed Threshold Test, the comparative evaluation step and the adopted process for Invited Private Plan Change.	Welson, Raymond 038.1
Support all comments made by the Whangarei District Council submission (Waanders, Paul; 126)	Coates, P.J. 052.2; Smith, Mary 065.3; Lieferring, Robin 149.1; Long, JM & LA 165.1; Mickelson, Karen 178.1
[Opposes the Threshold Test and Evaluation Criteria for Invited Private Plan Change requests. The Test is not comprehensive and could allow AMAs to be located in a part of the coast that is clearly inappropriate.] No specific relief sought.	Thompson, Parata Heta 68.2; Anlauf, Jeffrey 69.2; King, Dwayne 70.2; Anlauf, Debbie 88.3; Hehape, Sid 92.3; Dobier, Nick 182.2; 195-209, 211-238.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the Plan Change Initiatives but state that further work needs to be done to recognise pending law changes.</li> <li>- The plan should wherever possible support all existing marine farms as AMAs.</li> <li>- Implement an effective process to select the most appropriate applicant.</li> </ul>	McCallum, Callum 177.1, 177.2, 177.4
Delete all provisions that seek information additional to that required by the RCP proposed provisions.	Britton, Robin 187.9
The document should be renamed to accurately reflect its content as it is on page 3.	Kapa, Remarie 189.2
Support the proposed threshold test and maps.	Kingi, Roger 191.1; Steele, Judy 192.1
Oppose the proposal in its current format as the criteria are effectively “the rules of the game”, but by being placed under different legislation to the Coastal Plan, the council may have the ability to change the ‘rules’ with little public involvement, and Treaty and Maori avenues for involvement are not as robustly inscribed or as prescriptive as in the RMA.	Pivac, A.M. 248.1

<b>Officers Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council is currently pursuing an approach of open application. If the recommendation to consider options for detailing excluded areas is accepted, Council will do this in accordance with Section 165W of the RMA. It may be that the '18 areas' could form a part of that consideration.</li> <li>• The threshold test provides an initial opportunity to assess the potential suitability of a location for an AMA. This is a very useful step in the process and is followed by another very detailed assessment through the coastal permit process.</li> <li>• It is not the role of the Plan to support activities but to evaluate them where that is consistent with the Act.</li> <li>• The IPPC process entitles the authorisation holder to an automatic 80% of the AMA, whereas the Private Plan Change and Council Initiated Plan Change processes do not give the same level of certainty. As the IPPC process is Council's the preferred method, it is likely that there will be competing interest for the same locations. To select the preferred applicant, the Council has chosen a comparative evaluation process. This approach requires a methodology for assessment and evaluation which can only be applied under the LGA, not the RMA.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Discussion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee concurs with the Officers discussion, with the exception that the Committee Recommendation in Plan Change 4 surrounding section 165W is that restriction via policy and maps is a more effective means of restricting the location of future potential AMAs. Notwithstanding this change, the Committee does not recommend any changes as a result of these submissions.</li> </ul>
<b>Committee Recommendation</b>	<p><b>Accept submission 038.1; 191.1, and 192.11</b></p> <p><b>Accept in part submissions 052.2, 065.3, 149.1, 165.1, and 178.</b></p> <p><b>Reject submissions 177.1, 177.2, and 177.4; 189.2; and, 248.1</b></p> <p><b>No specific relief sought in submissions 002.1; 068.2, 069.2, 070.2, 088.3, 092.3, 182.2, 195-209, and, 211-238</b></p>

## Oral Submissions and Evidence Presented at the Hearings

(In the order they presented)

1. DOC – Katherine Anton
2. DOC – Hillary Aikman
3. DOC – Kirsty Russell
4. DOC – Paul Buisson
5. DOC – Tony Beachamp
6. DOC – Lynnell Greer
7. DOC – Andrew Riddell
8. DOC – Paul Quinlan
9. WDC – Paul Waanders
10. WDC – Cr Shelley Deeming
11. WDC – Shaun Baker
12. Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board – Luana Pirihi
13. Roderick McLean
14. Barry Mosley
15. Environs Holdings Ltd - Juliane Chetham
16. Te Ohu Kai Moana Trustee Ltd - Kirsty Woods
17. BOI Coastal Watchdog Inc – Helen Pick
18. Fullers BOI – Shaun Baker
19. Bream Bay Action Group – Margaret Hicks
20. Michael Ward
21. Denise Donald
22. Joshua Austin
23. Alex de Vries
24. Maree Lammerton
25. Brian Currie
26. Ross Attwood
27. Dave Monro
28. Mick Buckley
29. Lynn Allan
30. Sandra Dempsey
31. Justin Murfitt
32. Elvis Reti
33. Sanford NZ Ltd - Ted Culley (read by P Mitchell)
34. Sanford NZ Ltd – Dr Philip Mitchell
35. James Dowell (reads letter from AR Watson)
36. Mountain Landing Properties – Helen Atkins
37. Mountain Landing Properties – Maps evidence
38. Barry Jessop
39. Franz Iseke
40. NRC – Ben Lee (tables legal opinion from John Burns)
41. Davis Holt
42. Daphne Holt
43. Michael Smythe
44. Cathering Somerville
45. Robina Investments/G Paykel/Paroa Bay Station - John Goodwin
46. Robina Investments/G Paykel/Paroa Bay Station – photos
47. Robina Investments/G Paykel/Paroa Bay Station - Natalie Hampson
48. Robina Investments/G Paykel/Paroa Bay Station - Catherine Clarke
49. Stuart & Karen Paterson
50. David Lourie
51. Yachting NZ/Northland Yachting Assn – Jeremy Brabant
52. Yachting NZ/Northland Yachting Assn – Court of Appeal Judgment
53. NRC – Ben Lee – (tables evidence from Federated Farmers NZ)
54. NRC – Ben Lee – (tables evidence on Oyster Reserves status)
55. Northland District Health Board - Mark Stroud
56. Blair Dempsey – (1 copy to chair)
57. Landcare Group – Mary Smith & Philip King
58. Mary Smith
59. Jeanette King
60. Philip King
61. Onerahi Yacht Club – David Cochrane
62. Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc – Tim Grove
63. Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc – Jane Kippenberger
64. Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc – Hal Pepper
65. Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc – Glenda Bostwick
66. Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc – photos
67. Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc – Tim Grove
68. Trevor Hassall
69. Far North Holdings Ltd – Ian Boddington
70. Houhora Marine Protection Group/Houhora Big Game and Sports Fishing Club Inc – Sandra King
71. Rikona Marae/Ngati Ruamahue Te Hapu – Joyce Walker
72. John Greenfield
73. Kaitaia Spat Ltd – Chris Hensley
74. Rodger Corbin
75. Rolf Weight (for Les Foster)
76. J More
77. Kerikeri Cruising Club - Graeme McCarty

78. Te Wakaminenga O Nga Hapu  
Ngapuhi – Nuki Aldridge
79. Myra Larcombe
80. Ngati Aukiwi Hapu – Michael Peterson
81. Mussels Far North Ltd/Ngati Rehia Ltd  
– Robin Britton
82. Geoff Stone
83. Chris Richmond
84. Te Rununga O Te Rarawa - Abraham  
Witana
85. Ngatiwai Trust Board/Ngatiwai Fishing  
Ltd – Kier Volkerling
86. Taitokerau Iwi Chief Executives  
Consortium – Kier Volkerling
87. TEC (Integrated Management) – Kier  
Volkerling
88. TEC (Coastal Occupation Charges) –  
Kier Volkerling
89. Michael Sheehan
90. Alan Moore (evidence tabled by NRC  
J Gibbard)

## Index of Submitters by Number

ID	Surname	Given Name	Organisation
1	Millichamp	Simon	Community Business and Environment Centre
2	McCoubrey	Dorothy-Jean	New Zealand Food Safety Authority
3	Shepherd	Paul	
4	Clarkson	David	Bay of Islands Coastal Watchdog Inc
5	Ward	Michael	Moturoa Island Limited
6	Haydon	G & S	
7	Iseke	Franz	
8	Panckhurst	D J	
9	Banfield	Gordon	
10	Keys	David	Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park Steering Group
11	Subritzky	W A	Dovedale Properties Ltd
12	Hassall	Trevor	
13	Stowell	Anne	
14	Gillard	Mark	New Zealand King Salmon
15	Neal	Brendon	Kaipara District Council
16	Molloy	Donald	
17	Robertson	Maureen	
18	Churton	Troy	
19	Rosieur	D C	
20	Elliott	David Keith	
21	Lowen	Gary John	
22	Lane	Douglas Ian	
23	Fraser	Roderick and Jane	
24	Pyle	Barry	
25	Thompson	Lynnis	
26	Blowers	David	
27	Russell	Anne	
28	Martin	Richard & Marjorie	
29	Wright	John	
30	Schischka	Colleen	
31	More	J	
32	Boyed	Barry William	
33	Dempsey	Sandra	
34	Goldsberry	Daniel	
35	Brown	Russell Mervyn	
36	Smith	Robert Walton	
37	Lane	Elsa Margaret	
38	Welson	Raymond	Mangawhai Harbour Restoration Society Inc
39	Fleming	Brian	
40	Garton	Noeline	
41	Seon	D M T	
42	Tomich	Ian and Daphne	
43	Bleakley	Warrick Scott	Bleakley Family Trust
44	Warner	Judy	
45	Thompson	Donald	
46	Steinmelz	Michael	
47	Goodman	Guy Coulthard	Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park
48	Smith	Mary Julia	
49	Sutcliffe	Lloyd Martin	
50	Mortimore	Jack	

<b>ID</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
51	Diamonte-Cooper	Patricia	
52	Coates	PJ	Whangarei Heads' Citizens Association
53	King	Jeanette	
54	Mortimore	Patricia	
55	Coates	Peter John	
56	Cooper	Lou	
57	King	Marie	
58	Robinson	Leo	
59	Knight	Simon	
60	Holt	David	
61	Messenger	Lisa	
62	Holt	Daphne	
63	Allan	Lynn Pilbrow	
64	Pike	Geoff	
65	Smith	Mary	Papakarahi Landcare Group Inc
66	King	Philip	
67	Woest	Cindy	Kent Consulting (NZ) Ltd
68	Thompson	Parata Heta	
69	Anlauf	Jeffrey	
70	King	Dwayne Lennard	
71	Fyfe	Alice	
72	Fyfe	Noel	
73	Ware	Gayle	
74	Ware	John	
75	Fugler	Helene	
76	Bosch	Adriaan	
77	Drake	Valerie Ann	
78	Dymond	Catherine	
79	Tauroa	Kevin Matarae	
80	Hamilton	Ross	
81	Linssen	Helen	
82	Hamilton	Wendy	
83	Robertson	Kevin	
84	Hatton	Christopher Tony	
85	Gammon	Matthew	
86	Hall	William	
87	Goodwin	Trevor Grant	
88	Anlauf	Debbie	
89	Fugler	John	
90	Keys	David and Alison	
91	Dowell	J H	C/- AR Watson Associates Ltd
92	Hehape	Sid	
93	Rae	Murray	Houhora Marine Protection Group
94	Carey	Wayne	Houhora Big Game and Sports Fishing Club
95	Wagener	Norman George	Mt Camel Farms Ltd
96	Boyes	Jan	
97	Curtis	Greg	
98	McCarty	Graeme	Kerikeri Cruising Club Inc and Member Organisation of Northern Yacht Assn Inc
99	Jones	Janice Eileen	
100	Wilson	William and Gladys	
101	Corbin	Rodger David	
102	Raynes	Derek Anthony	
103	Manley	Avril	

<b>ID</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
104	Flanagan	Francis Joesph	
105	Walker	Vivienne	
106	Bell	Susan Zana	
107	Curtis	Shirley	
108	Curtis	Jan	
109	Gow	Doug	
110	Smith	Alastair Barrett	Sea Fever Cruise and Holidays Ltd
111	Manley	Derek Michael	
112	Henderson	Moira	
113	Harrisson	Ernest	
114	Gow	Robyn	
115	Fordyce	Stuart John	
116	Fordyce	Sue	
117	Lamerton	Michelle	
118	Meredith	Michael	
119	Pearson	Diana	
120	Garrett	Gerald	Bay of Islands Swordfish Club (Inc)
121	Paterson	Stuart and Karen	
122	Brown	Richard Wayne	
123	Buckley	Mick	
124	Evason	Suzanne	
125	Chandler	Donald	Mataka Residents Association
126	Waanders	Paul	Whangarei District Council
127	Oxborrow	Jon William	
128	Van Pierce	JK and RW	
129	Owens	Patricia	
130	Bohme	Friedrich Karl	
131	Browne	JM and MD	
132	Johnstone	Lawrence Scott	
133	Carter	Peter	
134	Scheibmair	Ursula and Werner	
135	Millett	Theresa	
136			Mountain Landing Properties
137	Tattley	Paddy	
138	Coutts	Donald Norman	
139	Hassall	Adele Elizabeth	
140	Tattley	Kay	
141	Thomas & Thomas	Schelle	
142	Stone	Geoffrey Bernard	
143	Dempsey	Blair	
144	Grace	Sharon	
145	Grace	Errol	
146	Kingston	Stuart and Andrea	
147	Rose	Colleen	
148	Brierley	Peter	
149	Lieffering	Robin	
150	Smeal	Douglas	Northland Yachting Association Environmental Committee
151	Jarvis	H D	Auckland Regional Council
152	Chetham	Juliane	Environs Holdings Ltd
153	Brackenbury	Gerald Nigel	
154	Brackenbury	Carole Ann	
155	Hamlin	Kirsty Amanda	

<b>ID</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
156	Luton	Iain Harold	
157	Hall	Judith Mary	
158	Hall	Murray Henderson	
159	Thorne	Helen Caroline	
160	Thorne	Kevin John	
161	Horne	Mike	Fullers Bay of Islands Ltd
162	Donald	Denise	
163	Marsland	Gregg	
164	Josephson	Peter	Josephson Farms Ltd
165	Long	JM and LA	
166	Richmond	Chris	
167	Volkerling	Keir	Ngatiwai Trust Board
168	Fong	Edwin and Sheryl	WMRP
169	Bainbridge	Neill and Sheryl	
170	Giles	Harry and Heidi	
171	Lourie	David	
172	Donald	Trevor	Northern Wairoa Boating Club Inc
173	Kippenberger	Jane	Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc
174	George	David	
175	Hall	Attn: Peter	Paroa Bay Station Limited
176	Cochran	David	Onerahi Yacht Club Inc
177	McCallum	Callum	New Zealand Oyster Industry Association
178	Mickelson	Karen	
179	Hicks	Margaret	Bream Bay Action Group Inc
180	Milner	C M	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board
181	Milner	David	Patuharakeke Rohe Moana Sub-Committee
182	Dobier	Nick	
183	Jenkins	Chris	Minister of Conservation
184	Petty	Frederick and Iris	
185	Brabant	Jeremy	Northland Yachting Assn and Auckland Yacht and Boating Association Inc
186	Manley	Clive	Far North District Council
187	Britton	Robin	Ngati Rehia Fisheries
188	Hunt	Heather	Urquhart Bay Association
189	Kapa	Remarie	Te Runanga o Ngati Rehia
190	Woods	Kirsty	Takutai Trust
191	Kingi	Roger	Karangahape Marae Trust
192	Steele	Judy	Te Runanga O Whaingaroa
193	Kokich	Dwane	
194	Bellingham	Mark	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand
195	Reid	Ian and Marie	
196	Kiwi Kiwi	Richard	
197	Haynes	Jared	
198	Kiwi Kiwi	George	
199	Raharaha	Charles	
200	Kiwi Kiwi	Mane	
201	Aspinall	Pania	
202	Kiwi Kiwi	Donna	
203	Kiwi Kiwi	Hemi	
204	Wells	Kiri	

<b>ID</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
205	Kiwi Kiwi	Hepi	
206	Watene	Emma	
207	Brown	Rodney	
208	Brown	Katherine Lucy	
209	Watene (Jnr)	Robert Valentine	
210	Monro	Patricia Ann	
211	Learmonth	Craig	
212	Kiwi Kiwi	Dawn	
213	Kiwi Kiwi	Kowhiu	
214	Kiwi Kiwi	Mane Te Kauhoa	On behalf of Grandchildren
215	Kiwi Kiwi	Pene Heemi	
216	Wells	Arthur John	
217	Stockman	Trudy Joy	
218	Wells	William	
219	Kiwi Kiwi	Te Wiki	
220	Ngere	Carwyn John	
221	Liese	Helen	
222	Storey	Graham	
223	Wells	Arihi	
224	Beduhn	Lisa	
225	Wheto	Kelly	
226	Watene	Robert	
227	Ngere	Cecelia	
228	Kiwi Kiwi	Mane	
229	Griffin	Duncan	
230	Matiahe	Michelle	
231	Kiwi Kiwi	Paul	
232	Watene	Edward	
233	Kiwi Kiwi	Karroll	
234	Maynard	Steven	
235	Kiwi Kiwi	Nyree Christine	
236	Kiwi Kiwi	Forte-Avant	
237	Kiwi Kiwi	Hohepa Peni Hemi	
238	Wheto	Donna	
239	Jessop	Barry and Carol	Parua Bay Oysters
240	McAulay	Dennis	
241	Shepherd	Philip	
242	Kahn	Kristina	
243	Peterson	Elizabeth	Hohepa Te Taha
244	Peterson	Michael	Te Hapu Ngati Aukiwa
245	Hayes	Michael	J L Hayes and Sons Ltd
246	Brockway	Marion	
247	Godbert	Derry	Northland Yachting Association
248	Pivac	A M	Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua
249	Jeeves	Vicki	
250	Need	Gary	
251	O'Brien	Anton	
252	Walker	Shannon May	
253	Smith	Bryce Peda	Te Roopu Taku Taimoana o Te Whare Tangaroa
254	Walker	Violet Eva	
255	Brabant	Jeremy	Yachting New Zealand
256	Douglas	Ray	

## Index of Submitters by Name

### Local and Central Government

ID	Company	Surname	Given Name
151	Auckland Regional Council	Jarvis	H D
186	Far North District Council	Manley	Clive
15	Kaipara District Council	Neal	Brendon
183	Minister of Conservation	Jenkins	Chris
2	New Zealand Food Safety Authority	McCoubrey	Dorothy-Jean
126	Whangarei District Council	Waanders	Paul

### Non-Governmental Organisations and Community Groups

ID	Company	Surname	Given Name
4	Bay of Islands Coastal Watchdog Inc	Clarkson	David
120	Bay of Islands Swordfish Club (Inc)	Garrett	Gerald
179	Bream Bay Action Group Inc	Hicks	Margaret
1	Community Business and Environment Centre	Millichamp	Simon
94	Houhora Big Game and Sports Fishing Club	Carey	Wayne
93	Houhora Marine Protection Group	Rae	Murray
98	Kerikeri Cruising Club Inc and Member Organisation of Northern Yacht Assn Inc	McCarty	Graeme
38	Mangawhai Harbour Restoration Society Inc	Welson	Raymond
125	Mataka Residents Association	Chandler	Donald
172	Northern Wairoa Boating Club Inc	Donald	Trevor
255	Yachting New Zealand	Brabant	Jeremy
185	Northland Yachting Assn and Auckland Yacht and Boating Association Inc	Brabant	Jeremy
247	Northland Yachting Association	Godbert	Derry
150	Northland Yachting Association Environmental Committee	Smeal	Douglas
176	Onerahi Yacht Club Inc	Cochran	David
65	Papakarahi Landcare Group Inc	Smith	Mary
194	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand	Bellingham	Mark
188	Urquhart Bay Association	Hunt	Heather
173	Whangarei Harbour Watchdog Inc	Kippenberger	Jane
52	Whangarei Heads' Citizens Association	Coates	PJ
47	Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park	Goodman	Guy Coulthard
10	Whangaroa Maritime Recreational Park Steering Group	Keys	David
255	Yachting New Zealand	Brabant	Jeremy

### Tangata Whenua Organisations

ID	Company	Surname	Given Name
243	Hohepa Te Taha	Peterson	Elizabeth
191	Karangahape Marae Trust	Kingi	Roger
187	Ngati Rehia Fisheries	Britton	Robin
167	Ngatiwai Trust Board	Volkerling	Keir
181	Patuharakeke Rohe Moana Sub-Committee	Milner	David
180	Patuharakeke Te Iwi Trust Board	Milner	C M
190	Takutai Trust	Woods	Kirsty

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
244	Te Hapu Ngati Aukiwa	Peterson	Michael
253	Te Roopu Taku Taimoana o Te Whare Tangaroa	Smith	Bryce Peda
189	Te Runanga o Ngati Rehia	Kapa	Remarie
248	Te Runanga o Ngati Whatua	Pivac	A M
192	Te Runanga O Whaingaroa	Steele	Judy

### Aquaculture Industry

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
14	New Zealand King Salmon	Gillard	Mark
177	New Zealand Oyster Industry Association	McCallum	Callum
239	Parua Bay Oysters	Jessop	Barry and Carol

### Businesses and Professional Bodies

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
161	Fullers Bay of Islands Ltd	Horne	Mike
110	Sea Fever Cruise and Holidays Ltd	Smith	Alastair Barrett

### Individuals, Landowners and Families

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
136	Mountain Landing Properties		
63		Allan	Lynn Pilbrow
69		Anlauf	Jeffrey
88		Anlauf	Debbie
201		Aspinall	Pania
169		Bainbridge	Neill and Sheryl
9		Banfield	Gordon
224		Beduhn	Lisa
106		Bell	Susan Zana
43	Bleakley Family Trust	Bleakley	Warrick Scott
26		Blowers	David
130		Bohme	Friedrich Karl
76		Bosch	Adriaan
32		Boyed	Barry William
96		Boyes	Jan
153		Brackenbury	Gerald Nigel
154		Brackenbury	Carole Ann
148		Brierley	Peter
246		Brockway	Marion
35		Brown	Russell Mervyn
122		Brown	Richard Wayne
207		Brown	Rodney
208		Brown	Katherine Lucy
131		Browne	JM and MD
123		Buckley	Mick
133		Carter	Peter
152	Environs Holdings Ltd	Chetham	Juliane
18		Churton	Troy
55		Coates	Peter John
56		Cooper	Lou
101		Corbin	Rodger David
138		Coutts	Donald Norman

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
97		Curtis	Greg
107		Curtis	Shirley
108		Curtis	Jan
33		Dempsey	Sandra
143		Dempsey	Blair
51		Diamonte-Cooper	Patricia
182		Dobier	Nick
162		Donald	Denise
256		Douglas	Ray
91	C/- AR Watson Associates Ltd	Dowell	J H
77		Drake	Valerie Ann
78		Dymond	Catherine
20		Elliott	David Keith
124		Evason	Suzanne
104		Flanagan	Francis Joesph
39		Fleming	Brian
168	WMRP	Fong	Edwin and Sheryl
115		Fordyce	Stuart John
116		Fordyce	Sue
23		Fraser	Roderick and Jane
75		Fugler	Helene
89		Fugler	John
71		Fyfe	Alice
72		Fyfe	Noel
85		Gammon	Matthew
40		Garton	Noeline
174		George	David
170		Giles	Harry and Heidi
34		Goldsberry	Daniel
87		Goodwin	Trevor Grant
109		Gow	Doug
114		Gow	Robyn
144		Grace	Sharon
145		Grace	Errol
229		Griffin	Duncan
86		Hall	William
157		Hall	Judith Mary
158		Hall	Murray Henderson
175	Paroa Bay Station Limited	Hall	Attn: Peter
80		Hamilton	Ross
82		Hamilton	Wendy
155		Hamlin	Kirsty Amanda
113		Harrisson	Ernest
12		Hassall	Trevor
139		Hassall	Adele Elizabeth
84		Hatton	Christopher Tony
6		Haydon	G & S
245	J L Hayes and Sons Ltd	Hayes	Michael
197		Haynes	Jared
92		Hehape	Sid
112		Henderson	Moira
60		Holt	David

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
62		Holt	Daphne
7		Iseke	Franz
249		Jeeves	Vicki
132		Johnstone	Lawrence Scott
99		Jones	Janice Eileen
164	Josephson Farms Ltd	Josephson	Peter
242		Kahn	Kristina
90		Keys	David and Alison
53		King	Jeanette
57		King	Marie
66		King	Philip
70		King	Dwayne Lennard
146		Kingston	Stuart and Andrea
196		Kiwi Kiwi	Richard
198		Kiwi Kiwi	George
200		Kiwi Kiwi	Mane
202		Kiwi Kiwi	Donna
203		Kiwi Kiwi	Hemi
205		Kiwi Kiwi	Hepi
212		Kiwi Kiwi	Dawn
213		Kiwi Kiwi	Kowhiu
214	On behalf of Grandchildren	Kiwi Kiwi	Mane Te Kauhoa
215		Kiwi Kiwi	Pene Heemi
219		Kiwi Kiwi	Te Wiki
228		Kiwi Kiwi	Mane
231		Kiwi Kiwi	Paul
233		Kiwi Kiwi	Karroll
235		Kiwi Kiwi	Nyree Christine
236		Kiwi Kiwi	Forte-Avant
237		Kiwi Kiwi	Hohepa Peni Hemi
59		Knight	Simon
193		Kokich	Dwane
117		Lamerton	Michelle
22		Lane	Douglas Ian
37		Lane	Elsa Margaret
211		Learmonth	Craig
149		Lieffering	Robin
221		Liese	Helen
81		Linssen	Helen
165		Long	JM and LA
171		Lourie	David
21		Lowen	Gary John
156		Luton	Iain Harold
103		Manley	Avril
111		Manley	Derek Michael
163		Marsland	Gregg
28		Martin	Richard and Marjorie
230		Matiahe	Michelle
234		Maynard	Steven
240		McAulay	Dennis
118		Meredith	Michael
61		Messenger	Lisa

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
178		Mickelson	Karen
135		Millett	Theresa
16		Molloy	Donald
210		Monro	Patricia Ann
31		More	J
50		Mortimore	Jack
54		Mortimore	Patricia
250		Need	Gary
220		Ngere	Carwyn John
227		Ngere	Cecelia
251		O'Brien	Anton
129		Owens	Patricia
127		Oxborrow	Jon William
8		Panckhurst	D J
121		Paterson	Stuart and Karen
119		Pearson	Diana
184		Petty	Frederick and Iris
64		Pike	Geoff
24		Pyle	Barry
199		Raharaha	Charles
102		Raynes	Derek Anthony
195		Reid	Ian and Marie
166		Richmond	Chris
17		Robertson	Maureen
83		Robertson	Kevin
58		Robinson	Leo
147		Rose	Colleen
19		Rosieur	D C
27		Russell	Anne
134		Scheibmair	Ursula and Werner
30		Schischka	Colleen
41		Seon	D M T
3		Shepherd	Paul
241		Shepherd	Philip
36		Smith	Robert Walton
48		Smith	Mary Julia
46		Steinmelz	Michael
217		Stockman	Trudy Joy
142		Stone	Geoffrey Bernard
222		Storey	Graham
13		Stowell	Anne
11	Dovedale Properties Ltd	Subritzky	W A
49		Sutcliffe	Lloyd Martin
137		Tattley	Paddy
140		Tattley	Kay
79		Tauroa	Kevin Matarae
141		Thomas & Thomas	Schelle
45		Thompson	Donald
68		Thompson	Parata Heta
159		Thorne	Helen Caroline
160		Thorne	Kevin John

<b>ID</b>	<b>Company</b>	<b>Surname</b>	<b>Given Name</b>
42		Tomich	Ian and Daphne
128		Van Pierce	JK and RW
95	Mt Camel Farms Ltd	Wagener	Norman George
105		Walker	Vivienne
252		Walker	Shannon May
254		Walker	Violet Eva
5	Moturoa Island Limited	Ward	Michael
73		Ware	Gayle
74		Ware	John
44		Warner	Judy
206		Watene	Emma
226		Watene	Robert
232		Watene	Edward
209		Watene (Jnr)	Robert Valentine
204		Wells	Kiri
216		Wells	Arthur John
218		Wells	William
223		Wells	Arihi
225		Wheto	Kelly
238		Wheto	Donna
100		Wilson	William and Gladys
67	Kent Consulting (NZ) Ltd	Woest	Cindy
29		Wright	John