

# Draft Stewart Island / Rakiura Conservation Management Strategy and Draft Rakiura National Park Management Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

MAY 2009



Department of Conservation  
*Te Papa Atawhai*

New Zealand Government



# Draft Stewart Island / Rakiura Conservation Management Strategy and Draft Rakiura National Park Management Plan

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

MAY 2009

Hard copy ISBN: 978-0-478-14610-3

Web PDF ISBN: 978-0-478-14611-0



# Contents

1.0	Introduction .....	1
2.0	Submissions Received .....	2
3.0	Overview .....	3
4.0	Draft Stewart Island / Rakiura National Park Management Plan .....	4
4.1	CMS Part 1 - Introduction .....	4
4.2	CMS 1.1 - Treaty of Waitangi Responsibilities .....	4
4.3	CMS 1.2 - Public Participation in Conservation Management .....	4
4.4	CMS 1.3 - Conservation of natural resources .....	5
4.5	CMS 1.3.1 - Terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, habitats and species .....	5
4.6	CMS 1.3.2 - Biosecurity and management of threats to indigenous ecosystems habitats and species .....	5
4.7	CMS 1.3.3 - The Islands .....	6
4.8	CMS 1.3.4 - Fire Management .....	6
4.9	CMS 1.3.5 - Marine Ecosystems, Habitats and Species .....	7
4.10	CMS 1.3.6 - Geological Features, Landforms and Landscapes .....	7
4.11	CMS 1.3.7 - Ecosystem services .....	7
4.12	CMS 1.4 - Historic and Cultural Heritage .....	7
4.13	CMS 1.5.1 - Planning and Management for Public Benefit and Enjoyment .....	8
4.14	CMS 1.5.2 - Vehicles (Including Aircraft) .....	9
4.14	CMS 1.5.3 - DOGS .....	9
4.16	CMS 1.5.4 - Animals (including Pets) .....	9
4.17	CMS 1.5.5 - Marine Mammal Viewing .....	10
4.18	CMS 1.5.6 - Wildlife Viewing .....	10
4.19	CMS 1.6 - Accommodation and Related Facilities .....	10
4.20	CMS 1.7.1 - Authorisations .....	11
4.21	CMS 1.7.2 - Sand and Shingle Extraction .....	11
4.22	CMS 1.7.3 - Commercial Eeling .....	11
4.23	CMS 1.7.4 - Collection of Materials .....	12
4.24	CMS 1.8.1 - Other Matters .....	12
4.25	CMS 1.8.2 - Re-classifying Public Conservation Land .....	12
4.26	CMS 1.8.3 - Bylaws .....	12
4.27	CMS Part 2 - Places .....	12
4.28	CMS 2.1 - Stewart Island / Rakiura CMS Area .....	12
4.29	CMS 2.2 - Oban / Paterson Place .....	13
4.30	CMS 2.3 - Codfish Island / Whenua Hou Place .....	13
4.31	CMS 2.4 - Eastern / Tai Rawhiti Place .....	13
4.32	CMS 3.2 - Monitoring, Reporting and Review .....	14
4.33	CMS 3.3 - Milestones .....	14
4.34	CMS Part 4 - Land Inventory .....	14
4.35	Glossary .....	14
4.36	List of Maps .....	15
4.37	List of Tables .....	15

5.0	Draft Rakiura National Park Management Plan .....	17
5.1	NPMP 1.1 - The Beginning .....	17
5.2	NPMP 1.2 - Legislative Context .....	17
5.3	NPMP 1.2.6 - Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.....	17
5.4	NPMP 2.1 - Giving Effect to the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi.....	17
5.5	NPMP 3.1.1 - Ecosystems and Habitats .....	17
5.6	NPMP 3.1.2 - Indigenous Species .....	18
5.7	NPMP 3.2.1 - Introduced Plants.....	18
5.8	NPMP 3.2.2 - Introduced Animals.....	18
5.9	NPMP 3.3 - Freshwater Species, Habitats and Ecosystems .....	20
5.10	NPMP 3.4 - Islands .....	20
5.11	NPMP 3.5 - Geological, Landform and Soil Features.....	20
5.12	NPMP 3.6 - Fire.....	20
5.13	NPMP 3.7 - Facilities and Access for Management Purposes .....	21
5.14	NPMP 4.1.3 - Recent History .....	21
5.15	NPMP 4.2 - Management of Historic and Cultural Heritages.....	21
5.16	NPMP 5.1 - Introduction .....	21
5.17	NPMP 5.2 - Recreational Opportunity Setting.....	22
5.18	NPMP 5.3 - Public Access and Facilities.....	22
5.19	NPMP 5.4 - Information and Interpretation .....	22
5.20	NPMP 5.5- Hazards to People .....	23
5.21	NPMP 5.6 - Sports Fishing and Game Bird Hunting.....	23
5.22	NPMP 5.7 - Animals.....	23
5.23	NPMP 5.8 - Aircraft .....	23
5.24	NPMP 5.9 - Watercraft.....	23
5.25	NPMP 5.10 - Other Vehicles .....	24
5.26	NPMP 6.1 - Authorisations.....	24
5.27	NPMP 6.2 - Wild Animal Recovery Operations (WARO).....	24
5.28	NPMP 6.3 - Mining and Extraction.....	24
5.29	NPMP 6.4 - Indigenous Freshwater Fishing.....	24
5.30	NPMP 6.5 - Utilities.....	25
5.31	NPMP 6.6 - Customary Use.....	25
5.32	NPMP 6.7 Accommodation and Related Facilities.....	25
5.33	NPMP 7.1 - Additions to Rakiura National Park.....	26
5.34	NPMP 7.2 - Bylaws .....	26
5.35	NPMP Part Eight - Places .....	26
5.36	NPMP 8.1 - Ulva Island .....	26
5.37	NPMP 8.2 - Northern Place.....	27
5.38	NPMP 8.3 - Mason Bay.....	27
5.39	NPMP 8.4 - Southern Place.....	28
5.40	NPMP 8.5 - Port Pegasus / Pikihatiti .....	28
5.41	NPMP 9.2 - Monitoring, Reporting and Review.....	29
5.42	NPMP Part Six - Uses Requiring Authorisations Not Covered Elsewhere .....	29
6.0	Requests to be Heard.....	29
7.0	List of Submitters.....	30

# 1.0 Introduction

The Department of Conservation released the Draft Stewart Island / Rakiura Conservation Management Strategy (“DSIRCMS”) and Draft Rakiura National Park Management Plan (“DRNPMP”) in November 2008.

The process of consultation to develop these draft documents started with two public meetings held in Oban and Invercargill in September 2005. Following these public meetings, an initial discussion document was released in September 2006. This resulted in over 400 feedback responses. Several public workshops were held enabling the Department to work through key places and issues raised from feedback on the discussion document.

Consideration of the issues raised resulted in the draft planning documents, submissions to which closed at 5pm on the 11th of March 2009.

## 2.0 Submissions Received

A total of 316 submissions were received on the draft documents. The majority of submissions received were recorded as being from individuals (270 out of the 316). The table below shows the submission received from groups/sectors.

Submissions were received from the following groups/sectors	
Individuals	270
Tourism industry	11
Recreational hunting groups	17
Other recreational group	4
Environmental group	4
Local authority	3
Ngai Tahu	1
Scientific group	1
Residents group	1
Rakiura Maori Land Trust	1
Professional group	1
Historic/Archaeological group	1
Fishing industry	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>316</b>

Submissions were received from throughout New Zealand, the most common areas being Southland, Canterbury, Waikato and Otago. Areas from which submissions were received are displayed in the table below. Please note that the 'unknown' category in general reflects submissions received by e-mail where the submitters did not provide physical address details.

Submissions were received from the following areas	
Southland	71
Canterbury	37
Waikato	36
Otago	31
Wellington	27
Nelson/Marlborough	22
Bay of Plenty	16
Auckland	12
West Coast	7
Tongariro/Taupo	4
Wanganui	3
Hawkes Bay	2
East Coast/Hawkes Bay	1
Overseas Australasia	2
Overseas Other	0
Unknown	45
<b>Total</b>	<b>316</b>

## 3.0 Overview

Individuals and organisations represented their particular interests vigorously through the submission process, comments generally reflected positions expressed in feedback received on the initial discussion document.

Many comments were made in support of the consultation process that was undertaken before and during the development of these two documents. This is seen in the comments received for DSIRCMS section 1.2: Public Participation in Conservation Management. The comments expressed the importance of public consultations and the need to include all stakeholders.

There were concerns raised in the submissions with regard to the use of the words 'will', 'should' and 'may' in the two draft planning documents. Submitters requested clarification as to when each word is properly used. There were several comments throughout sections sharing the view that the words 'will', 'should' and 'may' were used inappropriately. For example, submitters commented that 'should' was used when 'will' should be.

The structure and content of the two draft planning documents was raised in a number of submissions. Concerns were raised regarding inconsistency, grammatical errors, clarity and formatting within the two planning documents. Submitters also questioned the need to repeat information between the two documents.

The Department of Conservation was pleased with the number and quality of submissions received. It is very pleasing to see that so many people are interested in this special place.

This report has been written to summarise the points made on all sections of the Draft Stewart Island / Rakiura Conservation Management Strategy and the Draft Rakiura National Park Management Plan. Every effort has been made to accurately reflect the views of the submitters by presenting a summary of the diverse and broad ranging submissions. Direct quotations from submitters are used where they reflect a widely held viewpoint or add clarity to this summary.

A count on the number of submitters has been made for all sections. However submitters often made more than one comment per section so 'number of comments made' on certain topics have been used to reflect the interest in certain issue.

If individual comments are not reflected in this summary it is not because those points are not important. The report captures the topics raised by the majority of comments on each particular section thus specific issues may not be included. However will be incorporated into the analysis and will be considered during the rest of the process.

This is intended as a working document to give an overall picture of comments made in submissions to aid staff and hearing panel members, in their understanding of submission topics and issues.

## 4.0 Draft Stewart Island / Rakiura National Park Management Plan

### 4.1 CMS PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

Four submitters commented on this section. These submitters supported the explanation of 'will', 'should', and 'may'. Submitters identified corrections to the text and made suggestions for the inclusion of a map showing the CMS area and National Park area.

### 4.2 CMS 1.1 - TREATY OF WAITANGI RESPONSIBILITIES

Five submitters commented on this section. Two submitters made comments on the wording of the objectives and policies in this section. A submitter requested that policy 6 "be altered to include the wordings: actively consult, support and enable mana whenua residents on Stewart Island to be included with Kaitiaki Roopu in future decision-making regarding Rakiura.." A submitter requested that the objectives and policies be amended to incorporate "a live claim to the Waitangi Tribunal that is still to be researched (sic) and heard / negotiated in respect of as yet unsurveyed and hence unallocated lands..."

A submitter opposed part of the wording of section 1.1, requesting a new subsection be included in section 1.1, to acknowledge and take into account the rights awarded by the Crown under the South Island Landless Natives Act 1906, the Stewart Island Grants Act 1873, and any subsequent relevant legislation, including Te Ture Whenua / Maori Land Act 1993. A submitter also requested that paragraph 2 be retained as it is currently worded.

A submitter opposed the section as a whole requesting that new text be added to the section to replace existing text, this text contained two new subsections; Ngai Tahu Deed of Settlement and Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act, and Customary use.

### 4.3 CMS 1.2 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT

A total of 100 submitters commented on this section. Of these, 90 submitters commented in support on the section overall. Of the 100 submitters, 52 submitters made specific comment in support of the objectives in this section, whilst 6 submitters expressed support for the policies in this section. Overall, submitters commented on the importance of public consultation in the

preparation of the draft planning documents. Of those submitters commenting on this section, there was considerable support for the inclusion of all stakeholders during the consultation process.

#### 4.4 CMS 1.3 - CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Three submitters commented on this section. Comments were received in opposition to the use of the words 'preservation' and 'resource' within this section. The long term sustainable needs of Stewart Island individuals, the forest and wildlife, was identified as being a priority.

#### 4.5 CMS 1.3.1 - TERRESTRIAL AND FRESHWATER ECOSYSTEMS, HABITATS AND SPECIES

A total of 27 submitters commented on this section. The majority of comments made on this section these comments were in relation to corrections to text and/or requests for additional text to be added.

Six comments were received on the Freshwater Fish sub-section. One submitter opposed the information provided in this section commenting that it was incorrect and out of date, in particular the reference to Longfin eels and adverse effects of harvesting eels. Two comments were also received on conflicting information with regard to declining eels in particular Longfin eel and Giant kokopu between the text and tables in this section. One submitter supported commercial eeling on Stewart Island/Rakiura. Two submitters commented that it was their view that commercial eeling should be prohibited on Stewart Island / Rakiura.

Five submitters commented on dune systems and the removal of marram grass. Two comments were made in opposition to the removal of marram grass, however three comments were received in support for marram grass removal. Comments in opposition related to the potential effects on the dune systems if marram grass was continually removed. The significance of the dune system and the habitat that it provides were also noted.

Two comments were received on forest and shrub land sub section. Both comments were in relation to adverse effects on forest and shrub land by deer and need for this to be recognised more suitably in this planning document.

A total of 21 comments were received on specific objectives and policies in this section. These comments were of a specific nature and ranged from the strength and wording of objectives and policies to integrated management.

#### 4.6 CMS 1.3.2 - BIOSECURITY AND MANAGEMENT OF THREATS TO INDIGENOUS ECOSYSTEMS HABITATS AND SPECIES

283 submitters commented on this section, the majority of these were from individuals. Generally these submissions were in opposition to the eradication

of white tail deer through comments relating to text references, objectives and policies. 109 comments received expressed they want white tail deer to be recognised as a recreational resource. Comments received supported the objectives in this section the exception of the eradication of white tail deer. A submitter said this “I would like whitetail deer to be recognised as a recreational hunting resource, and would like to see them protected for the purpose of recreational hunting on Stewart Island.”

67 comments were received in support of policy 4 in this ‘Will encourage recreational hunting on public conservation lands.’

56 comments were received expressing their total support for policy 8 ‘will continue to engage with the Stewart Island / Rakiura Pest Liaison Group and the Stewart Island / Rakiura Community and Environment Trust regarding community led pest control and eradication programmes.’ In addition 100 comments received supported part of this policy, however this support did not extend to the eradication of white tail deer. An example of this is with a submitter said “I support the Pest Liaison Group, but totally oppose the eradication of White tail deer.”

There was a mixture of comments regarding policy 5 ‘Will encourage commercial hunting as a control measure for wild animals’ in regard to white tail deer. 35% of comments received on this policy were partly in opposition to this policy. Generally comments expressed commercial hunting should only take place if recreational hunting is not effectively controlling deer numbers. 51% of comments. 52% of comments received were against any form of commercial hunting on the island.

A few submitters commented that the draft planning documents do not address pest control appropriately, in particular with regard to deer. A submitter said this “One of the weakest aspects of the plan is the treatment of wild animals, particularly white tail and red deer. I am concerned that the latter are barely mentioned in the plan yet they have the potential to inflict quite unacceptable impacts. Several research projects have demonstrated the serious and unacceptable impact of deer on a range of ecosystems on Stewart Island, particularly coastal forest (see Veblen & Stewart’s comparison on forest on Bench Is and the adjacent mainland: NZJ Ecology 3: 50-68. 1980).”

#### 4.7 CMS 1.3.3 - THE ISLANDS

Nine submitters commented on this section. The majority of comments on this section were for corrections to be made to the text and formatting. Two submitters asked for clarification of concession limits to the islands. A submitter requested the draft, “State what visitors and concessionaire limits apply for islands. Like to see concessionaire access for Bench Island to view wildlife species.”

#### 4.8 CMS 1.3.4 - FIRE MANAGEMENT

Three submitters commented on this section. These comments were of a general nature providing examples of how the Department of Conservation

could implement the objectives listed here and information regarding fire use on the island.

#### 4.9 CMS 1.3.5 - MARINE ECOSYSTEMS, HABITATS AND SPECIES

Seventeen submitters commented on this section. five of these comments where of a neutral nature providing information and requesting corrections to text.

Policy 5 states that the Department, “Will advocate that inlets within the Stewart Island / Rakiura CMS area including Paterson Inlet / Whaka a Te Wera (excluding Big Glory Bay) and Port Pegasus / Pikihatiti remain free of marine farming structures and marine farming activities.” six comments were received on this policy, 5 of these comments were in support of this policy. One submitter commented that Port William should be included in this policy.

Three comments received raised concerns regarding the invasive pest plant *Undaria*, asking for it to be given a higher priority. In general, support for marine protected areas was expressed by those submitting to this section of the draft.

#### 4.10 CMS 1.3.6 - GEOLOGICAL FEATURES, LANDFORMS AND LANDSCAPES

There were five submitters to this part of the draft. The comments received related to the incorporation of culture into objective 1, working with council and land clearance, together with correcting grammar within the draft.

#### 4.11 CMS 1.3.7 - ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

Six submitters commented on this section. Half of the submitters on this section opposed the name and / or the inclusion of this section in the CMS. Two comments received supported this section.

#### 4.12 CMS 1.4 - HISTORIC AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Fifteen submitters commented on this section of the draft CMS. The comments were generally in support of the content of this section. Three comments were made regarding the use of the words ‘Iwi’ and ‘Tangata Whenua’. Four comments were received regarding missing information or places, for example Kilbride Homestead. For example, a submitter pointed out that, “ In my opinion there should be some mention of The Whaling Base, and the Kilbride Homestead.”

Six comments received were on access to these sites and the management of them. A submitter said the “[Submitter] also supports the majority of the associated management policies of this section. However we believe the

policies as currently stated do not facilitate access to the sites. While we acknowledge that some sites may be sensitive to proven physical impacts, there are a number that are not. Visitor access to these sites should be maintained.”

#### 4.13 CMS 1.5.1 - PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT FOR PUBLIC BENEFIT AND ENJOYMENT

One hundred and thirty five submitters commented on this section. The majority of comments on this section related to specific objectives and policies.

28 comments were received on Table 9 Recreational Opportunity Settings for the Stewart Island / Rakiura Area, these comments were generally in relation to better clarification of the information presented. 16 of these comments were in opposition specific parts or the entire of Table 9, for example a submitter commented saying, “Typical Visitor Interactions - overly prescriptive and unworkable for the Stewart Island situation e.g. 30 or less people seen for Frontcountry. You need to be realistic if there are limited opportunities and/or limited easy opportunities and everyone is promoting Ulva Island or say Observation Rock, you will definitely see more than 30 people during peak times and especially if you meet the multigroups coming off the ferry daily or a cruise ship tour. Concern that this will be used to control concessionaires and limit number of walking track opportunities.”

86 comments were received on objective 3, “To work co-operatively with stakeholder and communities of interest to ensure appropriate management of recreational opportunities on public conservation lands and waters, 75 of these were in support. A submitter said this “I support this completely. Co-operation with the local community particularly.”.

80 comments were received on policy 2, “Will ensure the construction of new facilities is in accordance with the outcome sought for each place and the recreational opportunity spectrum as it applies to the Stewart Island / Rakiura CMS area..” 56% of these comments were of a general nature, relating to requests for a hunters hut to be placed in the Upper Lords area. A submitter said this “A hut in the Upper Lords would be very welcome. Also in those places where existing bivvies are to be removed.”

Policy 3 “Should use the recreational opportunity spectrum for the Stewart / Island CMS area as set out in table 9 to guide the management of recreational activities on public conservation land” received 61 comments. 80% of these were stating that the policy needs further clarification and suggesting a map may be one method of clarifying this.

83 comments were received on policy 7 “The taking of freezers, generators, and other similar large electrical devices onto public conservation land should be prohibited (see also section 1.8.3 - Bylaws).” 59% of these comments were in support, however 14% of these comments were in opposition to this policy.

A submitter said this “Part of the lure of hunting on Stewart Island is it’s remoteness and the need for self reliance, consequently I think that those that want to take freezers & generators onto the Island should go to a camping

ground instead in their mobile home and leave the Island to those who appreciate it. I do not support the taking of these items onto the island.”

A submitter said this ‘Policy No 7, the taking of freezers and generators or other similar electrical devices onto public conservation land be prohibited is a draconian measure to serve what purpose? Where recreational visitors are on the island for a period greater than three days there is little safe way of storing food that will readily spoil or animals shot for subsequent removal from the island. The use of generators would also serve as a means of providing alternative heat for huts, rather than using vegetation. The provision of Chillers/Freezers is considered of benefit to encouraging recreational visitors.’”

#### 4.14 CMS 1.5.2 - VEHICLES (INCLUDING AIRCRAFT)

23 submitters commented on this section. 9 comments were received on this section were in regard to aircraft, in particular helicopter landing sites. Three comments requested further helicopter landing sites on one hand. Three comments supported the restrictions placed on aircraft access on the other.

Nine comments were received relating to motorised vehicles with requests maintain the status quo with regard to any form of motorised traffic. Five comments were with regard to water craft and monitoring of freshwater ecosystems. Four comments were received on opening up the tracks commenting that they do not want the tracks to be opened up further. A submitter said this “I don’t want to see the tracks opened for any form of motorised transport.”

#### 4.14 CMS 1.5.3 - DOGS

Seven out of the 12 submitters on this section commented on policy 1 “May identify areas of public conservation lands and waters where dogs may be taken without compromising the values of those areas.” In general these comments were in opposition to this policy, requesting that no dogs be allowed on conservation land.

A submitter said this “I think it is unwise to establish ‘dog areas’ on public conservation lands and waters, because this will only serve to encourage people to bring dogs to Rakiura. It’s all very well to say the dogs must be leashed, but who would police this? There is also the amenity issue of dog dung in public areas. Lone dogs have decimated kiwi populations in other areas of New Zealand and every effort should be made to minimise the risk of dog attacks on Stewart Island tokoeka and penguins.”

#### 4.16 CMS 1.5.4 - ANIMALS (INCLUDING PETS)

Five submitters commented on this section. There was a mixture of comments received on this section. Two comments received were in opposition to the wording of the section with reference to domestic cats contributing to wild cat populations and inclusion on animals taken on to conservation land with

regard to objective 1. Two comments supported the objectives and policies outlined in this section.

#### 4.17 CMS 1.5.5 - MARINE MAMMAL VIEWING

Three submitters commented on this section. Two out of the three comments were in opposition to the described permission zones. A submitter said this “We oppose Marine Mammal Viewing Permits being limited to being issued based on the permissions zones shown in map 7. These zones were created to enable the data on permits to be stored in a computer system, they have very little correlation to where a trip would be likely to go. If, for example, part of one zone was to be discovered as critical habitat for a species, we would not want all permits within that entire zone to be unable to operate, because the plan states that permits should be managed according to the zones.”

#### 4.18 CMS 1.5.6 - WILDLIFE VIEWING

Fourteen submitters commented on this section. The majority of comments made on this section were in regard to kiwi viewing. Four comments were received in opposition to policy 1 “Should limit commercial kiwi viewing operations to three sites only with the aim of exposing a small percentage of the kiwi populations to viewing. These sites are (a) Ocean Beach / Glory Cove; (b) Old Sand Neck; (c) The area around the Island Hill homestead and public hut at Mason Bay.” Three comments were also received in support of the objectives and policies in this section. Comments were also received on specific objectives and policies in this section.

#### 4.19 CMS 1.6 - ACCOMMODATION AND RELATED FACILITIES

206 submitters commented on this section. The majority of comments received on this section were expressing support and the continuation of the Rakiura Hunter Camps Trust.

110 comments were received on objective 5 “To continue to monitor and manage existing concessioned accommodation facilities in a manner which avoids or mitigates any adverse effects of these facilities” 90 of these comments were in support of the Rakiura Hunter Camp trust.

Objective 1 is “To ensure that unauthorised accommodation facilities are not established on public conservation lands and waters and remove any existing unauthorised buildings from conservation land and waters.” There was a mixed response to this objective. 41% of the comments received for this objective requested that if facilities were removed then they should be replaced with authorised facilities. A submitter said this “I favour the retention of authorised and (even) unauthorised bivvies unless and until they are replaced either by approved hunters huts (built by the trust) or by other lawful agency. Other suitable locations deserve the erection of hunters huts and should be favourably entertained for such development.”

Policy 2 (Should consider applications for accommodation and related facilities in accordance with Conservation General Policy 10 and ensure the accommodation is available for members of the public to use on an open and equal basis), 23% of comments on this section were in support of this policy. 42% of comments received expressed that hunters should have priority. 23% of comments were in complete opposition to this policy. A submitter said this “I believe the Hunter Camp Trust’s huts should be available for preferential use by hunting parties ahead of trampers. If tracks are built close to these huts DOC should consider building additional facilities for trampers if there is likely to be excessive pressure on a limited accommodation resource.”

#### 4.20 CMS 1.7.1 - AUTHORISATIONS

A total of 14 submitters commented on this section. Six comments were received on the wording in parts of this section, in particular the wording of policies.

Policy 3 “May establish limits for authorised opportunities where there is a potential for adverse environmental or social impacts and / or where the cumulative effects of activities are becoming unacceptable.”, four comments were received in opposition to this policy, with submitters asking how adverse effects will be monitored, how adverse effects are deemed ‘adverse’ and whether there was any review of limits. Four comments were also received in opposition policy 2 “Should apply a precautionary approach where the impacts of increasing visitor numbers to a place are unknown.”, suggesting that temporary monitoring should take place to assess the impacts first.

Three comments were received in opposition to Objective 3 “To encourage authorisations which promote the recreational use, public access, appreciation and protection of public conservation lands and waters.”, regarding the use of ‘encourage’ and ‘protection of conservation lands and waters’.

There were also comments relating to specific issues or parts of this section.

#### 4.21 CMS 1.7.2 - SAND AND SHINGLE EXTRACTION

Four submitters commented on this section. A Submitter requested that it be noted that resource consents are required for gravel extraction not just a concession. A Submitter supported the objectives and policies. Two submitters opposed the potential screening of gravel.

#### 4.22 CMS 1.7.3 - COMMERCIAL EELING

Six submitters commented on this section. The majority of submitters supported this section. One submitter opposed this section, commenting that just because commercial eeling does not currently take place in Stewart Island / Rakiura CMS are it does not mean that it should not.

#### 4.23 CMS 1.7.4 - COLLECTION OF MATERIALS

Two submitters commented on this section. One submitter requested a cross reference to section 1.1 of the draft Conservation Management Strategy (Treaty of Waitangi). One submitter requested that it be noted that collection of materials may be subject to the Historic Places Act 1993 and the Protected Objects Act 1975.

#### 4.24 CMS 1.8.1 - OTHER MATTERS

One submitter commented on this section in support of the objective, however opposed part of the policy requesting that relevant conservation conventions and agreements are adhered to.

#### 4.25 CMS 1.8.2 - RE-CLASSIFYING PUBLIC CONSERVATION LAND

Five submitters commented on this section. Two comments were received requesting the land status of Upper Lords River area to enable a hunters hut to be built. One comment received requested that consultation be carried out before any re-classification was carried out and one commented that re-classification should not be to a lesser protection than current.

#### 4.26 CMS 1.8.3 - BYLAWS

Of the eight submitters commented on this section, future consultation regarding bylaws was seen as a concern. Submitters requested that consultation be carried out with all stakeholders before any implementation. Three comments supported bylaws a, b, c, e and f. There was a request for clarity and one comment received in opposition to proposed bylaw d, 'Access to Ulva Island during the hours of night.'

#### 4.27 CMS PART 2 - PLACES

Two submitters commented on this section. One submitter requested clarification and one comment was in support.

#### 4.28 CMS 2.1 - STEWART ISLAND / RAKIURA CMS AREA

There were six submitters to this section, with submitters giving general support for this part of the plan. A few specific comments were received on this section relating to additional wording. For example, a submitter said that "Objective 2 needs to refer to integrating terrestrial and marine management."

#### 4.29 CMS 2.2 - OBAN / PATERSON PLACE

A total of 22 submitters commented on this section, some submitters making general comments regarding phrasing, content and clarity.

With policy 10 (“May authorise ‘one off’ landings in the Oban / Paterson place but only if the purpose of landing, frequency of activity and effects on neighbouring landowners are such that adverse effects can be avoided or mitigated. Sites that have high visitor use and where biodiversity values are high should be avoided.”) four comments were received, one comment was in opposition, one comment was in support, the other two comments were requested further clarity on the nature of landings and the why one off landings are needed.

Three comments received in relation to policy 5 were in opposition to various parts of this policy, in particular the proposed limitations on day walking. Clarification of the impacts or likely impacts was requested. One submitter supported the periodic party size of 13 in policy 5a. One comment was made in relation to signage and that it should not deteriorate the values present. One comment requested this policy be moved to Southern Place.

Support was offered for policy 4 (Will work with local community - based organisations and landowners to undertake introduced animal control, weed control and ecological restoration initiatives.) by all those submitters commenting on this policy specifically.

Comments from submitters on Policy 6 “Concessionaires offering guided overnight walking on the Rakiura Track should be restricted to 50% of the available bed space in the Port William and North Arm hut” were in opposition, with submitters seeking if space was available concessionaries should be allowed to use it.

#### 4.30 CMS 2.3 - CODFISH ISLAND / WHENUA HOU PLACE

Eleven submitters commented on this section. Comments made varied in their nature and covered a range of topics. A submitter requested this “Add words which explain the effect of the nature reserve on the cultural values and why the Whenua Hou Committee was established.”

Seven comments received on this section were neutral, i.e. neither in support or opposition, instead requesting additional information be included in the draft plan. A few people supported the objectives and policies in this section. Two comments were received in opposition of this section with regard to wording and public / concessionaire access.

#### 4.31 CMS 2.4 - EASTERN / TAI RAWHITI PLACE

In total 116 submitters commented on this section. The majority of these comments were in support. There was considerable support for the objectives in this section with 70 comments made in support..

Comments were received on corrections to grammar and information.

Four comments were received on the remote setting of the area with the view that this designation may not be appropriate for the entire area.

A total of 72 comments received were with regard to policy 10 (May investigate a process to unify the status of public conservation land in the eastern / tai rawhiti place to a legal status appropriate for managing this area consistent with the outcomes sought for this place. Gazetting all public conservation area in this area as a scenic reserve may be an option) 54 of these comments were in supported of the change in status from Nature reserve to scenic reserve, a submitter said this "Management Policies #10 I vigorously support changing status of land in this place from Nature Reserve to Scenic Reserve. " Comments were also made ask for a hunters hut placed in the Upper Lords area.

#### 4.32 CMS 3.2 - MONITORING, REPORTING AND REVIEW

Four submitters commented on this section. Comments requested some form of annual reporting be done to the community, monitoring plans to be developed and formalised within one year and integrated approach to deer and dog monitoring. There was a request for a research and monitoring section to be included in the plan.

#### 4.33 CMS 3.3 - MILESTONES

Nine submitters commented on this section. Two were partly opposed to the five year milestone of a wilderness area in the southern part of Stewart Island / Rakiura, requesting further consultation. Two comments were received on the seven year milestone; All conservation land in the Oban / Paterson place unified and gazetted under the most appropriate status. Further comments were made with regard to missing milestones in particular relating to protection and restoration of biodiversity. A submitter said this "We feel that in the milestone for seven years, that the gazettal of Oban / Paterson only be done after full consultation to evaluate the 'most appropriate status'"

#### 4.34 CMS PART 4 - LAND INVENTORY

Five submitters commented on this section. Comments were made on information presented in the Land Inventory and corrections to this information.

#### 4.35 GLOSSARY

A total of three submitters commented on this section. These comments were requesting additional words be included in the glossary. There was also opposition expressed to some definitions given in the glossary. A submitter

said this “The current definition is too limited, as it does not include clay, minerals or stone. While it is acknowledged that this is the definition in the Settlement Protocols, it is considered that definition was specific for the purposes of those Protocols. Request the definition be slightly changed, to read “For the purposes of this CMS, cultural materials are defined as any plant, animal, clay mineral or stone to the extent to which the Department holds or is responsible for them, and which are important to [the submitter] in maintaining their culture”.”

#### 4.36 LIST OF MAPS

No submissions were received regarding the list of maps.

#### 4.37 LIST OF TABLES

No submissions were received regarding the list of tables.



## 5.0 Draft Rakiura National Park Management Plan

### 5.1 NPMP 1.1 - THE BEGINNING

Two submitters commented on this section. One comment was in support of the mihi. One submitter suggested that the mihi should be at the start of the combined draft planning documents.

### 5.2 NPMP 1.2 - LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT

Two submitters commented on this section. One submitter expressed concern over the Crown Minerals Act 1991 and the potential for it to allow mining in the national park.

A submitter suggested that the Director-General “Insert after section four text the following: This provides two principles of equal status, preservation for intrinsic worth and for the benefit use and enjoyment of the public.” (section four text relates to the National Parks Act 1980 and its context for this document.).

### 5.3 NPMP 1.2.6 - NGAI TAHU CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT 1998

One submitter commented on this section. The submitter opposed the name of the section and requested a new sub-section be included.

### 5.4 NPMP 2.1 - GIVING EFFECT TO THE PRINCIPLES OF THE TREATY OF WAITANGI

One submitter commented on this section. The submitter questioned the content of the section and the possible repetition of information between this section and CMS section 1.1 Treaty of Waitangi Responsibilities. The submitter also commented on the wording of objectives and policies in this section.

### 5.5 NPMP 3.1.1 - ECOSYSTEMS AND HABITATS

Seven submitters commented on this section. Comments were received in support and with suggestions that further information that could be included. Two comments were made regarding coastal ecosystems, in particular marram grass. These comments were in opposition to marram grass being described as a threat and expressing opposition to the marram grass removal programmes.

## 5.6 NPMP 3.1.2 - INDIGENOUS SPECIES

A total of 13 submissions were received on this section. There were a number of comments on specific parts of this section.

Support was given to objectives and policies in this section. Submitters commented on predator control and monitoring. Comments were made requesting for the species that are declining to be identified in the text.

## 5.7 NPMP 3.2.1 - INTRODUCED PLANTS

A total of 34 submitters commented on this section. The comments on this subject covered a range of topics for example identifying potential pest plants, seeking an up to date weed list.

Five comments were received supporting the objectives and / or policies in this section. A submitter said this "I generally support the objectives and policies for control of weeds on Rakiura. In particular, the efforts to control marram on coastal dunes are applaudable (sic) and should be continued as a long term project.."

Two comments were received on marram grass in opposition to its removal from sand dunes, there was also a comment made in opposition to marram grass being classed as a weed.

Three comments were received on Policy 7 "All machinery, boats and equipment should be properly cleaned before being taken into Rakiura National Park. Park users should be encouraged prior to entering the park..." One comment was received in support of this policy, one comment was received in opposition and one comment requested further clarification regarding wording.

Four comments received were in support of actions to eradicate pests when they are newly established. Three comments were received specifically regarding gorse and the abundance of it on the island.

## 5.8 NPMP 3.2.2 - INTRODUCED ANIMALS

A large number of submissions were received to this part of the draft, with 280 submitters making comment. General comments were received on this section.

In total 95 comments were received on objective 1 "To eradicate, control and manage introduced animals in Rakiura National Park in accordance with national plans, regional pest management strategies and Southland Conservancy priorities." Of these comments 83 were in opposition, in particular opposition to eradicating deer. A submitter said this "I would like to see Whitetail Deer protected and recognized, treated as a recreational asset to the public of New Zealand."

A total of 89 were received on objective 2 "To identify and monitor the impacts of introduced animals in Rakiura National Park and undertake the eradication of introduced animals according to establish priorities. Priority will

be given to areas where eradication is possible, practical and sustainable, without reinvasion or where reinvasion or where reinvasion is manageable.” 69 of comments received on this section were in opposition or in opposition to parts of this objective.

Objective 4 “To encourage integration and coordination between user groups, including the Stewart Island /Rakiura Pest Liaison Group; local authorities and the community to achieve an integrated approach to the eradication, control and management of introduced animals in Rakiura National Park.” This objective received 86 comments. 66 of these were in support for the pest liaison group but in opposition to the eradication of deer.

Objective 6 “To recognise the value that recreational hunters place on whitetail deer within Rakiura National Park”, received 163 comments. 113 of these comments were in support of this objective, a number of people also suggesting ways the department can implement this objective. A submitter said this “I support recognition of the values that recreational hunters place on Whitetail Deer in the Rakiura National Park.”

Policy 2 (Establish and regularly review introduced animal control priorities with the Stewart Island / Rakiura Pest Liaison Group. ...) received 87 comments. 78 of comments made on this were in support for the Pest Liaison Group, but in opposition to the eradication of deer. A submitter said that “I support the Pest Liaison Group and the removal of red deer from Stewart Island but oppose the Eradication of Whitetail.”

Policy 7 is for the “Proposed eradication programmes must be able to meet the following criteria: ...” 54 out of 68 comments received on this policy were in support of the criteria listed here.

Policy 9 is to “Undertake community consultation prior to undertaking introduced animal control operations where the operations involve the use of previously unused toxins or bio-control agents.” 76 out of 113 comments made on this policy were in support, however 12 comments made on this policy were in opposition to this. A submitter said that “Pest control operations using toxic poisons or bio-control methods should only ever be done with the support of the local community.”

Policy 10 is to “Monitor introduced animal densities and vegetation to ensure that trends in population and habitat condition are known.” 132 comments were made on this policy. 38 of these comments were in support. 85 comments were received of a general nature, for example comments requesting that information on deer numbers should be available to hunters. Suggestions were made that this information could be made available via a website, newsletter or hunting magazine.

A number of submitters commented on policies 12, 13 and 14 (rat, cat and possum control). 159 out of 198 comments made on these policies were in support of rat, cat and possum control in Rakiura National Park. A submitter said this “I strongly support the eradication of cats, rats and possums from the island. I strongly support the work being done by Southland branch NZDA members killing rats on the island.”

Policy 17 is for the “Commercial recovery operations (Wild Animal Recovery Operations or WARO) may be authorized through a concession. ...” 33 out of

86 of comments received on this policy were in complete opposition to this policy. 40 out of the 86 comments made expressed that commercial hunting should only be used if recreational hunters are not managing deer numbers.

Policy 18 is to “Continue to encourage recreational hunting within Rakiura National Park as a key method towards controlling the ...” 22 out of the 71 comments received on this section were in support of this policy. 31 out of the 71 comments suggested ways that the Department could further encourage recreational hunting. A submitter suggested that “Recreational hunting should be encouraged as the method of managing deer populations on the Island. DOC and hunter groups can work more closely to identify areas that require cull activities and advise hunter groups appropriately.”

Policy 19 is to “Encourage the hunting community to provide accurate hunting returns, as a means of increasing ...” 43 comments out of 82 comments received in this section were in support of this policy. In addition, a number of submitters suggested ways that the Department could achieve this. For example a submitter suggested that “Hunting returns should be mandatory. No return no permit next year. ...”

#### 5.9 NPMP 3.3 - FRESHWATER SPECIES, HABITATS AND ECOSYSTEMS

In total eight submitters commented on this section. Comments received varied in their nature from general comments on the section to specific policies. Four comments were received on pest fish species, with support offered for their eradication. One submitter suggested that the department could do more than consider eradication and one submitter suggested monitoring for the internal waterways.

#### 5.10 NPMP 3.4 - ISLANDS

Four submitters commented on this section. Overall the comments on this section were in support. There was a suggestion that this section should be in the CMS and not the NPMP.

#### 5.11 NPMP 3.5 - GEOLOGICAL, LANDFORM AND SOIL FEATURES

Three submitters commented on this section. Two submitters supported this section with one submitter suggesting landform protection could be expanded to incorporate methods.

#### 5.12 NPMP 3.6 - FIRE

Four submitters commented on this section. Comments were received requesting further information and consultation on bylaws in this section. One submitter supported the objectives and policies in this section. Another

submitter suggested that “The Department should look at the efforts of the Rakiura Hunter Camp Trust in providing facilities that encourage safer camp sites / huts with regard to cooking areas etc. All effort (sic) should be made to further expand the work of the trust.”

#### 5.13 NPMP 3.7 - FACILITIES AND ACCESS FOR MANAGEMENT PURPOSES

Five submitters commented on this section. The majority of comments received on this section were in support of the section however they requested some minor adjustments/additions to objectives and policies. A submitter made comment on policy 2 stating that “Efforts will be made to avoid or otherwise minimize disturbances (as per the GPNP) and they must be consistent with other relevant planning documents unless the Plan takes legal precedence.” One submitter expressed concern regarding these objectives and policies lay outside of the Department’s day to day operational activities.

#### 5.14 NPMP 4.1.3 - RECENT HISTORY

One submitter commented on this section. This submitter stated that the “Sewerage scheme was not begun in 2004, this is when the expanded scheme was finished.”

#### 5.15 NPMP 4.2 - MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC AND CULTURAL HERITAGES

Seven submitters commented on this section. These comments varied in their nature. Some submitters made suggestions for additions to the section. For example a submitter said this “The RNPMP should mention the Whitetail and Red deer herds since their introduction in 1901. These are a significant part of the historic and cultural heritage of Stewart Island, and an attractor of recreational hunters, as still evidenced by hunter campsites, and the legacy of the RHCT’s recent huts.”.

Other comments were in relation to consultation with other organisations, community groups and stakeholders.

One submitter highlighted the need for a stronger emphasis on public education.

#### 5.16 NPMP 5.1 - INTRODUCTION

Four out of the seven submitters to this section commented in opposition to the sentence “Rakiura National Park caters for visitors in all categories aside from thrillseekers and short stop travellers.” submitting that short stop travellers do visit the national park, for example visitors of cruise ships, or those staying in Oban only one night.

Four comments were received on the categories of users and how certain groups were categorised. For example a submitter said this “Self-reliant hunters and trampers are classed as Backcountry Adventures. The flaw here is that hunters are clearly not self-reliant. They rely on mechanical means to enter and leave the area with the vast array of gear they use within the hunting block. Also they stay in one place. These two groups should be classed separately.”

#### 5.17 NPMP 5.2 - RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITY SETTING

Two submitters commented on this section. A submitter said this “We support the remote designation but oppose any wilderness area designations”. A submitter said this “I have general concerns about the recreational opportunity setting and how it will be managed and how it restricts rather than fosters special conditions relating to some areas.”

#### 5.18 NPMP 5.3 - PUBLIC ACCESS AND FACILITIES

A total of 194 submitters commented on this section. There was general support for the objectives in this section.

Policy 8 states that “In addition to meeting the criteria of policies 6 and 7, applications for new hunter huts by the Rakiura Hunter Camp Trust should also meet the following criteria:...” 106 out of 114 comments received on this section were in support for the Rakiura Hunter Camp Trust.

Policy 4 is for “Recreational facilities within Rakiura National Park will continue to be available to the public. Where booking systems apply, these systems should operate on an open and equal opportunity basis.” 55 out of 71 comments received on this policy were partly in opposition, requesting that where hunter huts are concerned hunters should have priority. A submitter said this, “As previously stated, I have no problem with users other than hunters having access to Hunters huts, but as Whitetail deer management is the objective. I feel that hunters should be given priority, and for safety reasons should therefore be the only users in that areas at that time.”

A few submitters commented that there needs to be clear objectives and policies regarding commercial accommodation. A submitter said this “Provides for new commercial recreational facilities with limited criteria - p176 needs an objective to ensure any new commercial recreational facilities are focused on the outcomes sought for different areas.”

A few submitters requested that no more hunter huts be established in Rakiura National Park.

#### 5.19 NPMP 5.4 - INFORMATION AND INTERPRETATION

Eight submitters commented on this section. Of those, half supported this

section, in particular the objectives and policies.

Two submitters held the view that signage and interpretation should not detract from the values of areas. A submitter said this “Stewart Island / Ulva Island are places of high scenic beauty. Signage and interpretation panels should be limited, not be intrusive (e.g. Lee Bay) and not take way from the natural character of the landscape and views. Do not want to see unnecessary signage.”

#### 5.20 NPMP 5.5 - HAZARDS TO PEOPLE

Four submitters commented on this section. Two submitters requested that hazard areas are made available to the public and existing concessionaires. A comment was made in opposition to the use of avoid, remedy and mitigate in objective 1. One submitter expressed their support for the final paragraph regarding individuals responsibility for their own safety.

#### 5.21 NPMP 5.6 - SPORTS FISHING AND GAME BIRD HUNTING

Three submitters commented on this section. Two submitters expressed the view that the management objectives and policies in this section were weakly worded in relation to sports fishing and the potential introduction of fish. One submitter supported this section.

#### 5.22 NPMP 5.7 - ANIMALS

Five submitters commented on this section. Overall there was support for this section. One submitter expressed concern over the possibility of areas of conservation land being opened up for dog access.

#### 5.23 NPMP 5.8 - AIRCRAFT

Of the 112 submitters commenting on this section, the majority of these comments were in relation to policy 4 “Future consideration should be given to the provision of a helicopter landing site and limited landings at Homestead Hunters Hut site, Mason Bay”. Approximately 80% of comments received were in support of this policy. A number of them requested the word ‘should’ be changed to the word ‘will’.

#### 5.24 NPMP 5.9 - WATERCRAFT

Four submitters commented on this section. Comments were received requesting further consideration for future growth of water taxis. Comments were also received regarding the monitoring of existing water taxis. One submitter supported the management objectives and policies in this section.

## 5.25 NPMP 5.10 - OTHER VEHICLES

Nine submitters commented on this section. Policy 2 “The use of mountain-bikes and other similar vehicles within Rakiura National Park should not be permitted.” received a combination of views. Three of the comments received supported no mountain bike access to the national park, one comment requested further consideration be given to mountain bike access.

Two submitters supported the management objectives and policies in this section.

## 5.26 NPMP 6.1 - AUTHORISATIONS

Five submitters commented on this section. These comments covered a range of topics. One submitter suggested criteria for areas of limited opportunities to ensure they are being used. policy 6 “Concessionaires and their clients may share public facilities on an open and equal opportunity basis, but concessionaries usage may not exceed more than 50% of available sleeping capacity in huts on any day or night.” Two out of three comments received on this policy were in support.

## 5.27 NPMP 6.2 - WILD ANIMAL RECOVERY OPERATIONS (WARO)

A total of 92 submissions were received on this section. 53 out of 89 comments received on this topic were in opposition to Wild Animal Recovery Operations, in particular the recovery of whitetail deer.

Policy 1 “Authorisations for wild animal recovery operations maybe restricted in order to avoid conflict with other recreational users within Rakiura National Park.” 12 out of 75 comments were in support for policy 1. A total of 20 out of 75 comments expressed that if WAROs were to take place that they should only be carried out after consultation with hunters and only if recreational hunters are not controlling deer populations. A submitter said this “I think rec hunters should be given a go at animal control - and recovery work not carried out until it is shown the rec hunters are not controlling numbers effectively.”

## 5.28 NPMP 6.3 - MINING AND EXTRACTION

Three submitters commented on this section. All submitters supported the prohibition of mining within Rakiura National Park.

## 5.29 NPMP 6.4 - INDIGENOUS FRESHWATER FISHING

Four submitters commented on this section. In general these comments were in relation to eeling. One submitter objected to the prohibition on commercial

eeling within the park. One submitter commented that recreational eeling should be permitted in the park. One submitter questioned the difference between the 'should not be permitted' in regard to whitebait and 'will not be permitted' with regard to eeling and why they differ.

### 5.30 NPMP 6.5 - UTILITIES

Four submitters commented on this section. Two submitters commented on the objective in this section. These comments recommended additions to the objective, in particular adding biodiversity and utility requirements to better tie in with policies.

Two comments were neutral. One requested that the criteria listed in this section be applied to DOC signage. The other related to moorings and water hoses.

### 5.31 NPMP 6.6 - CUSTOMARY USE

Two submitters commented on this section. These comments were in relation to the terminology used and structure of objectives and policies.

### 5.32 NPMP 6.7 ACCOMMODATION AND RELATED FACILITIES

A total of 18 submitters commented on this section. These comments were mostly of a specific nature focusing on certain management objectives and policies.

Support was offered for the huts of and work done by the Rakiura Hunter Camp Trust.

Two comments were made in opposition to Policy 2 "Should only authorize new accommodation and related facilities where it; (a) is provided by recreation clubs with open membership or by educational services relating to the national park and is available for public use; and (b) is in accordance with GPNP 9(d) and (e); and (c) is provided for in the outcome for the place; and ..."

A submitter said this "Policy 2 provides for recreational clubs or educational services to establish new accommodation. It is not referenced to a similar policies 6 and 7 on p176 in section 5.3. as noted for section 5.3 above this is not necessary and should be deleted. The [submitter] supports no new accommodation facilities to be provided for in RNP." where as

Another submitter said this "Point 2 is aimed at stopping concessionaires develop facilities but favours recreational hunting. This doesn't lend itself to the aim of not discriminating against one user group in favour of another."

Three comments were received suggesting the two sections relating to accommodation be merged.

### 5.33 NPMP 7.1 - ADDITIONS TO RAKIURA NATIONAL PARK

Four submitters commented on this section. Suggestions were given on other areas that could potentially be incorporated into Rakiura National Park, for example Bishop and Clerk Islands and the foreshore below mean high water, and the fish factory site.

### 5.34 NPMP 7.2 - BYLAWS

Two submitters commented on this section. One submitter commented that they did not want to see bylaws implemented unless they are necessary and this should only be done after public consultation. One submitter opposed the proposed bylaw on Ulva Island (access restriction during night hours).

### 5.35 NPMP PART EIGHT - PLACES

The comments received on this section were generally in support of the concept of the places. However some opposition was directed at the proposed boundaries and constituency of the places. There was also opposition to guided hunting policies in the places.

### 5.36 NPMP 8.1 - ULVA ISLAND

Sixteen submitters commented on this section. Comments were received in support of the objectives and policies in this section. In addition, comments were received on specific parts of this section.

Policy 7 states that “The public will generally have free access to the national park on Ulva Island. A restriction on access during the hours of night should be investigated as well as a restriction on overnight stays and / or camping within the national park on Ulva Island. Bylaws may be an option for achieving these access restrictions.” Three comments were received in support of this policy, one comment was received in opposition to policy 7. A submitter stated that “We oppose the policies in the document which refer to investigation restrictions on access to Ulva Island, in particular by having a bylaw. Such bylaws may also limit opportunities such as the extremely popular kakapo viewing which has previously taken place on Ulva Island.”

Policy 8 is that “Concessionaire opportunities that are consistent with the outcomes sought for Ulva Island as a place include guided walking, bird watching and nature appreciation activities. Concessions need to be consistent with the outcomes sought for Ulva Island as a place, such as adding no artificial noise to the Ulva Island environment.” Two comments were received in support for this policy, two comments were in opposition. One comment was received requesting artificial noise be defined.

Policy 9 states that “An appropriate combination of visitor and group management measures may be investigated and implemented to ensure that visitor experiences are maintained and enhanced. Some options that may be

considered are: ...” Four out of nine comments received on this policy were in opposition. Certain aspects of the policy were opposed in particular, the majority of comments received related to group sizes and questioned how one guide would manage a larger group and the effects on the experience with a larger group. Clarity was also requested with regard to how the group interaction and the spacing out of groups will be managed.

Policy 10 is to “Encourage recreational users and water taxi operators to adopt similar measures as in policy 9 above, to maintain and enhance the visitor experience available on Ulva Island is being sustained.” Three comments were received on this policy in support.

### 5.37 NPMP 8.2 - NORTHERN PLACE

A total of 16 submitters commented on this section. These comments varied in their nature and covered a range of topics. Concerns were raised regarding terminology used in this section and its consistency with the National Park General Policy.

Policy 13 is to “Manage the number of concessionaires on the lower Freshwater River between Paterson Inlet / Whaka a Te Wera and Freshwater Landing according to effects based information and safety of river users. ...” Four out of six comments received on this section were in opposition to this policy. Submitters had concerns that the proposed restrictions on watercraft were too restrictive. Conversely, one submitter requested that only two powered watercraft concessions should be allowed. Policy 18 states that “Concessionaire opportunities for helicopter landings to facilitate access at sites at Long Harry, East Ruggedy and Hellfire Pass should be limited to 6 landings per site per month.” Three out of four comments received on this topic were in opposition, particularly to the limitations proposed to the site at East Ruggedy. A submitter said this “the [submitter] seeks the deletion of the East Ruggedy site.”

### 5.38 NPMP 8.3 - MASON BAY

Twenty four submitters commented on this section. These comments covered a range of topics. Overall there was support for the outcome in this section. Comments were made regarding further information and / or requesting corrections to this section.

Policy 9 states that “Concessionaires should be restricted to a maximum party size of 8 (inclusion of guides).” Three out of seven comments received were in opposition to this policy requesting larger party sizes. One submitter commented that maximum party size should be nine to keep consistent with water taxis.. Two comments were received in support for this policy.

Policy 10 states that “The construction of new commercial accommodation facilities in the Mason Bay area are not considered consistent with the outcome and applications should be declined. ...” Five out of nine comments received on this policy were in opposition. A submitter said this “Commercial accommodation facilities would reduce pressure on the hut and perceived

overcrowding at certain times of the year. No reason why commercial operators should be discriminated against versus hunters.” Three comments were received in support of this policy.

Policy 15 states that “Helicopter access may be permitted in the vicinity of the Homestead hunter hut. Landings at this site should be limited to 6 landings per month.” Seven out of nine comments on this policy opposed this policy in relation to the proposed helicopter landing site, a submitter said this “We seek the deletion of policy 15 regarding helicopter access to Homestead Hunters Huts.”

#### 5.39 NPMP 8.4 - SOUTHERN PLACE.

56 submitters commented on this section. The majority of submissions received related to the boundaries and proposed wilderness designation for Southern Place.

23 comments were received on the proposed wilderness designation for Southern Place were in opposition to this designation. Four comments were received in support of the wilderness area. 10 comments were received in opposition to the proposed wilderness area. A submitter said this “I’m not a great fan of ‘Wilderness Areas’ - I believe that all outdoors enthusiasts should be able to access and enjoy the whole of the public estate and not be excluded from any part of New Zealand.”

13 Comments were received on the boundaries on Southern Place 5 of these comments expressed opposition to the proposed boundaries. A submitter said this “The draft boundaries of the Southern Place need to be Altered to include Gog, Magog, Bald Cone and to the Pegasus Bay riparian zone edge, but not to include the hunters hut.”

Objectives 3 “To manage the recreational opportunities for Mason Bay place consistent with the outcome sought for the Mason Bay place.” And objective 4 “Manage the Mason Bay place as a backcountry recreational opportunity consistent with the outcome sought for the Mason Bay place.” Seven out of 13 comments received on these objectives were in opposition, in particular with regard to wilderness zoning and the potential impacts on pest control (possum, cats, rats).

#### 5.40 NPMP 8.5 - PORT PEGASUS / PIKIHATITI

21 submitters commented on this section. The comments received on this section were of a varied nature covering a range of topics, from specific policies to the boundaries of the Port Pegasus / Pikihatiti Place. In general, of those that commented on policies 7, 8, and 9, these comments were generally in support.

Policy 9 “Investigate the formalisation of the following recreational facilities in the Port Pegasus place:...” Nine comments were received on this policy. Of these approximately three were in support and three were in opposition. A submitter said this “We do not support Policy 9. This area should be managed as wilderness with no tracks.”

Policy 12 “Concessionaire party sizes within Port Pegasus place should be restricted to one party per week with a maximum party size of 8 (inclusive of guide) unless otherwise provided in policy 15.” Three out of the eight comments received on this policy were in opposition, one comment was received in support.

Policy 13 “Guided parties within the Port Pegasus place should be restricted to the following sites. ...” Three out of the seven comments were received in opposition to this policy. .

#### 5.41 NPMP 9.2 - MONITORING, REPORTING AND REVIEW

One submitter commented that they would like to see reporting to the community and stakeholder groups on an annual basis.

#### 5.42 NPMP PART SIX - USES REQUIRING AUTHORISATIONS NOT COVERED ELSEWHERE

Two submitters commented on this section. These comments were of a specific nature requesting further clarification on the intent of policies and the possibility for further concessions.

## 6.0 Requests to be Heard

Hearings will be held from late June to Late August the likely locations are Stewart Island / Rakiura, Invercargill, Dunedin and Hamilton, the dates are currently being finalized. A total of 63 submitters have requested to be heard on their submissions.

#### **Hearing dates are:**

22 June 2009 - Stewart Island / Rakiura

29 June 2009 - Invercargill

13 July 2009 - Invercargill

17 July 2009 - Invercargill

20 July 2009 - Dunedin

27 July 2009 - Invercargill

10 August 2009 - Hamilton

17 August 2009 - Invercargill

24 August 2009 - Stewart Island / Rakiura

## 7.0 List of Submitters

Submitter Number	Submitter
1	Rakiura Helicopters Ltd
2	Murray Schofield
3	Alex Kidd
4	Telecom New Zealand Limited
5	Beverley Osborn
6	David Hodder
7	Bill Chisholm
8	Warren Plum
9	Murray Rowe
10	Ann Pullen
11	John Hunter
12	Nelson Branch New Zealand Deerstalkers Association
13	Bill Roundhill
14	Geoff Rodgers
15	Kevin Godfrey
16	M J Dench
17	Blair Plum
18	William Clive McDonald
19	Brett Pocock
20	Steve Brown Douglas
21	Neil McDonald
22	Mike Clinch
23	Les Hurford
24	Chris Petersen
25	Paul Smith
26	Mark Watson
27	Tony Roberts
28	Brian Sheppard
29	Brendon Bell
30	The Coopers
31	Glenn Kipling
32	Dave McDonald
33	Grant Hogg
34	Douglas James Gordon
35	Kelvin O'Hara
36	Suzi Phillips
37	Tony Allnutt
38	Kevin Fitzgibbon
39	Kerry G. O'Rourke
40	Andrew Pickford
41	Scott Cameron
42	Lousie and Vern Pearson
43	Peter Simpson
44	Bevan McNaughton

45	Karl McCarthy
46	Glen Candy
47	Peter Henderson
48	Peter Livesey
49	S P Long
50	Dave Asher
51	Fred Singleton
52	Paul Peychers
53	Dave Barraclough
54	R W Neckelson
55	David Musgrave
56	Mike Davie
57	Gerard Phillips
58	Mike Hodder
59	Moira Parker
60	Brian S Harre
61	David Wood
62	Alan Thompson
63	Martinius Pepers
64	Kevin Crosby
65	Bruce Hargood
66	Graeme Nairn
67	Andrew Cuffield
68	Ken Leckie
69	Stephen Hunter
70	RJ and CA Hawkless
71	Murray Barkman
72	John R McNamara
73	A J Chittock
74	Hans Biemond
75	Jim Kroening
76	Elaine Hamilton
77	John Voorend
78	Hayden Dore
79	Brian McNeil
80	Shirley M Hudson
81	Andrew Gordon
82	Carl Huxford
83	Michael Holmes
84	John W Hart
85	Mike Hilton
86	Dr R. H. Mchale
87	Murray Sulzberger
88	Grant Dodson
89	Southland Branch New Zealand Deer Stalkers Association
90	Stephen Foote
91	Paul Bryant
92	David Henry
93	Peter Thompson
94	Jeff Smith

95	Jules Snoyink
96	W Benfield
97	W A Bell
98	Craig Benbow
99	G G Hamilton
100	Douglas M Morrison
101	Kevin Baxter
102	G O Johnston
103	Geoff Lindsay
104	Howard Egan
105	Gordon Jannink
106	Ron Hannah
107	David Hannah
108	Blue Horton
109	Nick Klaus
110	Aaron Couchman
111	Murray Dench
112	Alan Jackson
113	Chris Munro
114	Alastair Richard Mackintosh
115	Ian Parker
116	Rakiura Hunter Camp Trust
117	Coral Princess Cruises
118	Bruce J Ford
119	West Coast Branch NZDA
120	Graeme John Marshall
121	G M Hammond
122	Andrew Boot
123	Brendan White
124	John Grant
125	Terry Knight
126	John Molyneux
127	Ross Dymock
128	Scott Peters
129	T Bowen
130	Don Thorburn
131	Neil Stewart
132	Andrew Rowland
133	Ian Anderson
134	Paul Lisignoli
135	Ian Murphy
136	Karl Schasching
137	Robert Peeters
138	Ron Cordell
139	David Roache
140	Marcus Pinney
141	Brian Hildreth
142	Tim Holland
143	Terry Galuszka
144	Edward Colligan

145	Grant Lower
146	Paul Annear
147	North Taranaki Deerstalkers
148	Lyndon Nairn
149	Eric Manssen
150	Reece Perkins
151	Paul Lenz
152	G Sinclair
153	John Gledhill
154	Ray Phillips
155	Paul Sayer
156	Isabel Morgan
157	Ken McAnergney
158	John Gunn
159	Jon Astwood
160	Glyn Eades
161	Ulva Goodwillie
162	Ulva Island Charitable Trust
163	Michael Roberts
164	Peter Tait
165	Alexander Sims
166	Dave Thomson
167	Karl Belfield
168	Roy Sloan
169	Michael Smorti
170	Peter Wilkins
171	Barry Petrie
172	Shaun Moloney
173	Michael DeLury
174	Chaz Forsyth
175	Hutt Valley Branch NZDA
176	Nigel Grant
177	Alan Mackie
178	William Cuttance
179	Bay of Plenty Branch NZDA
180	Leif Pickwell
181	Neil Eagles
182	Bruce Wadham
183	Keith Finlayson
184	Trevor Hunt
185	Dave Halliday
186	Jim McLean
187	Andrew Lowe
188	Peter Morrison
189	Stewart Hydes
190	Andy McGaw
191	Fraser Cooper
192	Graeme Scott
193	Kyle Craig
194	Gary Hodgetts

195	John Bissell
196	Nigel Jeffries
197	Southern Lakes Helicopters
198	Venture Southland
199	John Drummond
200	Kathy Duncan
201	Alex Wingham
202	David Browne
203	Linda Flynn
204	Peter Flynn
205	Bevan Middlebrook
206	S R Hewitson
207	Marlborough Branch NZDA
208	Paul Young
209	Bill Young
210	Lance Shaw
211	Ken Geeson
212	Mark Eston
213	Ross Tobin
214	Roger McNaughton
215	Barry McLeod
216	John DeLury
217	Stewart Middlebrook
218	N P Nairn
219	Brett Dann
220	James Davies
221	Angela Middlebrook
222	Tom Hollings
223	Marion Donaldson
224	Craig Potton
225	J Maass-Barrett
226	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc – Southland Branch
227	Fiordland Ecology Holidays
228	Stewart Island/Rakiura Community and Environment
229	Brian Hutton
230	Peter Hutton
231	Ellie Hutton
232	Kevin Clark
233	Guy Brown
234	Alex Hutton
235	Gordon Thompson
236	Sandy King
237	Maureen Coleman
238	Peter Avery
239	Rakiura Maori Land Trust
240	Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu
241	Richard Hall
242	Mary Chittenden
243	NZ Historic Places Trust

244	Brad Osborn & Lee Kelly
245	Environment Southland
246	Tourism Industry
247	Southland District Council
248	Thames Valley Branch NZDA
249	Jos Holton
250	John Spinks
251	Mike Deane
252	Keven Caddy
253	Tony Coleman
254	Fraser Ross
255	Jenny Campbell
256	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ Inc - National Office
257	Robin Meaclem
258	Stewart Murray
259	John Noakes
260	Ray Webb
261	Spanton & Gilmour Families
262	Dave Howden
263	Wellington Botanical Society
264	Haines Battrick
265	Andrew Morrison
266	Dave McCarlie
267	Federated Mountain Clubs of NZ
268	Geoff Henderson
269	Graeme Williams
270	Jim Ridley
271	Rob Smith
272	Owen Hudson
273	Vaughan Skiffington
274	Rick Watson
275	Chris Windust
276	Tony Bankier
277	Gary Muirson
278	Lincoln Jackson
279	Dave Harley
280	Bud Jones
281	Ron Murdoch
282	Euan Butters
283	Glen Matheson
284	Tim Dawson
285	Russell Mckeen
286	Allan Dodson
287	Paul Holmes
288	Dave Saunders
289	Jamie Ward
290	Gordon Perkins
291	Alan Mark
292	Kevin Trainor
293	Stuart & Beth Bay

294	Kelvin Lloyd
295	Yellow-Eyed Penguin Trust
296	Chris Shaw
297	Game Forest Foundation
298	NZ Deerstalkers Assn
299	Richard Kwapisz
300	Kari Beaven
301	Robert Kerr
302	Southland Tramping Club
303	Sara Comer
304	N & A Dawson
305	Christine Henderson
306	Morgan Comer
307	Daniel Comer
308	Bill Hawkeswood
309	David McKay
310	Paul de Groot
311	Marco de Groot
312	Richard Banks
313	Joshua Galuszka
314	Peter Goomes
315	Furhana Ahmad
316	Real Journeys