

Summary of submitter's comments on *Aquaculture in the Greater Wellington Region: A discussion document*

Name and Organisation	Comments
Ed Arron, PAU2 Industry Association Inc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any area could be considered an AMA. They could cover large areas if the technology proves to be effective. ▪ Aquaculture activities should be a discretionary activity that will ensure effects are minimised. ▪ Wellingtons high energy coast will dictate where and what aquaculture can be developed. ▪ The Wellington Region is unlikely to experience high demand for aquaculture and a first come first served allocation approach is fair. ▪ Option 2 is supported for the location of AMAs where development is planned. ▪ Research on the establishment of AMAs and aquaculture should be on a user pays basis.
Yvonne Legarth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Research required for the development of AMAs should be on a user pays basis. ▪ Legislation provides for coastal occupancy charges that should be applied to private use of the coastal marine area. ▪ The assessment of AMA locations should include natural or historic heritage, characteristics and capacity of ecosystems, and effects of the proposed aquaculture operation. ▪ Option 1 is supported until demand for aquaculture increases. ▪ Option 2 is not entirely appropriate but is a practical approach to assessment of environmental effects of specific aquaculture types with further AMAs being subject to a plan change process. ▪ AMA locations should meet section 32 RMA requirements and be smaller, discrete areas.
Yvonne Weeber	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Option 1 – do nothing – is most appropriate. ▪ Use the private plan change process to include aquaculture in the future if

	<p>required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AMA locations should be based on adequate research. ▪ Large AMAs should not be set aside for aquaculture.
<p>Dan Riddiford</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adverse and positive effects of marine farming should be considered in a balanced manner. ▪ Option 1 “do nothing” is legally impossible. Option 3 to “create AMAs over large areas where aquaculture is a possibility” is preferred. ▪ Aquaculture adjacent to Owhango Station and Te Awaiti Station should be a controlled use recognising existing rights, legitimate expectations, and knowledge. ▪ Allocation should be on a first in first served basis subject to riparian rights. ▪ AMAs greater than 2km from the shoreline should be a controlled activity. ▪ All other areas should be discretionary activity status. ▪ Regional council should provide for aquaculture as quickly as possible adjacent to Owhanga Station, Te Awaiti and Mahanga Bay with controlled use processing and low fees. ▪ Use of global consenting for marine farming operations and infrastructure.
<p>Geoff Doring, Forest & Bird Society – Wairarapa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for Option 1 to do nothing.
<p>Peter Redfern, Aquaculture Consultants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Types of aquaculture that are suitable to the region should be considered, such as paua farming on the east coast and finfish and mussels on the east and west coasts. ▪ Protect areas of conservation value, contact recreation, communications and power cables, and marine navigation areas. ▪ There needs to be control of the effects of marine farming. ▪ Support for Option 3, to create AMAs over large areas where aquaculture is a possibility in the future.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Types of aquaculture should be matched with the types of environment. ▪ Locate marine farming based on plankton supply, sea currents and compatible ecology. ▪ First come first served is a basis for allocation.
Peter Ackroyd, Sea Right Investments Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ AMAs should be located in areas identified by marine farmers and where there is the least conflict with navigation, harbour facilities and cable protection zones. ▪ Since AMAs are set up for aquaculture, these activities should be controlled. ▪ A first come first served AMA allocation method for Wellington is supported. ▪ Option 2 is supported as it allows existing operations to continue while leaving opportunities for future aquaculture development.
Jim Mikozi, Wellington Recreational Fishers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More detail is needed on how an applicants “fitness” is judged. ▪ Wellington south coast is a high energy coastline. ▪ The nature of undue adverse effects on recreational fishers will have to be assessed.
Dane Rimene, Rangitane o Wairarapa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Option 1 - to do nothing – is supported. Seabed and foreshore issues require resolution before aquaculture law reform progresses.
Stephen Rainbow, Wellington City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The plan change process for including future demand for AMAs is supported. ▪ Restrictions on recreational uses of Wellington Harbour should be minimised. ▪ There is a loss of visual amenity associated with marine farm structures. ▪ There is only one existing consent for aquaculture, at Mahanga Bay, which is adjacent to the City Council landward boundary. ▪ WCC supports the Taputeranga Marine Reserve proposal, which should not be considered an area for AMA.

<p>Jeff Flavell, Department of Conservation (Wellington Conservancy)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Option 1 does not allow for strategic planning.▪ Option 3 of creating large AMAs can exclude other future uses of the coastal marine area. Other possible uses for marine space should be considered before large AMAs are created.▪ Planning assessment and criteria for AMA sites should recognise the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and the issues of national importance which include preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (i.e. estuaries, coastal wetlands, mangroves).▪ Option 2 is supported, which is to create AMAs where aquaculture development is planned. Environmental assessment will need to be undertaken for AMA effects with a focus on ecological food web effects of marine farming.▪ Another approach is to define where AMAs should not go with the use of constraints mapping that can help aquaculture applicants site their activities where they have least effect on other coastal marine uses and values. However, areas without constraints should not immediately become AMAs.▪ Constraints could include representative marine environments, marine protected areas (current, proposed, future) harbours, estuaries, river mouths, marine areas adjacent to terrestrial coastal environment, buffers around marine reserves and offshore islands, taiapure, areas of important and significant conservation value, areas for recreation areas of significance to tangata whenua.▪ A strategic approach is crucial for protection of the coastal environment and to allow for sustainable management within the marine environment.▪ Controlled activity status provides applicants and the community some certainty as the environmental effects are fully assessed and the likelihood of a successful application is high.▪ If aquaculture is a controlled activity, criteria should specify that all environmental effects must be assessed.▪ There is low demand for aquaculture in Wellington. Large AMAs will not be necessary.
---	--