

**Theme: Aquaculture**

---

**Total number of submission points on the theme**

220 individual submission points.

**Number of submission points supporting or agreeing with the provisions in the Proposed NZCPS**

53 submissions.

**Number of submission points opposing the provisions in the Proposed NZCPS**

8 submissions.

**Note:** some submissions comment on but do not support or oppose the provisions.

**Key messages within the submissions**

1. The provisions for aquaculture are inadequate. Stronger provision and encouragement for local authorities is required for the appropriate development of aquaculture.
2. Fish farming on land is preferable to Maori for maintaining the mauri of the receiving waters. Schedule 1 fails to take into account Treaty issues, and should make specific reference to Maori interests in aquaculture.
3. Current protection and monitoring tools need to be integrated into Policies (e.g. Policies 12 and 36).
4. A “whole of harbour” approach is needed for integrated management.
5. Need definitions of human sewage and treated effluent.
6. Schedule 1.9 will unnecessarily capture temporary construction work in the CMA.
7. No strong argument for the decrease in threshold in Schedule 1 from 300m to 100m.
8. As worded, provision S.1.1.3 and S.1.4(a)(ii) would include any solid structure in the CMA.
9. Support stronger commitment to zoning activities in the CMA.
10. Allocating resources according to activity categories is unnecessarily restrictive.
11. There should be no aquaculture in the Bay of Islands CMA.
12. Intertidal zones and estuaries should be protected from aquaculture.
13. Need to recognise important ecological relationships between land and sea, and adopt a precautionary approach.
14. There is no clause to ensure physical and environmental requirements of activities need to be considered.
15. No guidance for Council’s preparing Policy Statements and Plans as to what Crown’s interest in aquaculture is, and so Policy 18 cannot be given effect to. Ownership and

commercial interests of the crown in land should not influence decisions under the RMA. In addition, “Crowns interests” should not be contrary to the rights of the existing industry or biological requirements of farmed species. If Crown wishes for opportunities to be made available for aquaculture this should be done by a Plan Change and follow the process for creating an aquaculture management area.

16. Disagree with the s32 analysis, disputing claims of “appropriate”, “effective” and “efficient.”
17. Aquaculture should not be singled out and endorsed as an activity given its adverse effects. It is not the role of the NZCPS to promote a particular type of coastal development, it should be neutral.
18. There should be a focus on mitigating direct impacts on biotic patterns and movements and substrate composition under cage/farm sites and reducing near-field impacts.
19. Policy 31 uses the word “containing” which is not useful given boundaries taxa may cover, especially migratory species. It is not clear what the desired outcome of Policy 31 is.
20. Aquaculture goes through a large amount of regulatory processes before being permitted, and therefore should not be a restricted coastal activity.
21. The role of council in the establishment and movement of ‘stock’ may conflict with responsibilities of the Ministry of Fisheries.
22. The lack of a definition of “natural character” and “restoration” could mean that Objective 3 could be misinterpreted to mean a prohibition on any new developments within the coastal environment, and that existing aquaculture farmers are forced to cease.
23. The phrase “open space” is not appropriate in Objective 5, as farmers need open space to fish efficiently and effectively. Fishing industries rights as harvesters but not occupiers of public space must also be recognised and protected. Decisions should not erode property rights of fishers issued to them in perpetuity by the Government.
24. High water quality is paramount for the aquaculture industry.
25. It is essential that commercial and historical values of local iwi are integrated and previously settled treaty arrangements are not undermined through policy.
26. Questions why “public use and enjoyment” is singled out in Policy 6(c). Since fishers are accessing a public resource, are effects on their use also considered under this definition?
27. Policy 9 is unclear as to where the jurisdiction for council ends. Biosecurity measures should be dealt with through the Biosecurity Act.
28. Do not understand why certain activities of the seafood industry have been given priority in a national policy. The entire seafood industry, including wild stock harvests are extremely important to national and regional economies. Will lead to regional variability and Environment Court costs.
29. Policy 18 is weak and directionless. Words such as “where such use and development would meet the purpose of the Act” reduces the weight of this policy as read.

30. Infrastructure projects of national significance should be subject to the same regulatory requirements as other resource management activities. Crown interests should not automatically take precedence over the public interest.
31. Aquaculture is best managed by local authorities using local knowledge.
32. It is not clear what Policy 18 achieves that is not already provided for in the RMA.
33. Matters in Policy 18 do not need to be in a regional policy statement as it is not applicable to all regions. Implementation plans is a duplication of effort.
34. Local authorities should develop and share a nationally available information base to streamline processes for dealing with aquaculture applications and ensure future development is on a sound basis.
35. Given potential impacts of aquaculture on fisheries aquaculture management areas should remain a restricted coastal activity.
36. Schedule 1.9(b) should be extended to apply to port and navigation activities.
37. Managing commercial fishing on an activity basis is restrictive and constricts growth and innovation in the industry without achieving the desired consequence of limiting environmental effects.
38. The RMA does not deal with allocation of marine space appropriately. Policy will not override or patch-up bad legislation.
39. There is an apparent omission in the NZCPS of Crown making opportunities available for ports and port facilities, which are the most importance commercial activity occurring in the CMA.
40. Activities associated with fishing should remain controlled under the Fisheries Act 1983 or 1996 and ensure protection for existing rights holders remain in place.

### **Additional Provisions Sought**

41. Submissions 408.36, 409.36 and 404.03 request that Policy 18 be accepted and also requests that a new Policy 18A be inserted as follows:

Policy 18A Crown interest in port activities

Policy statements and regional coastal plans shall have regard to the Crown's interest in making opportunities available for port activities in the coastal marine area, where such use and development would meet the purpose of the Act.

42. Submission 234.11 states that the allocation of coastal space needs to be addressed adequately in the NZCPS. This submission requests the addition of a policy as follows:

In allocating coastal space regional councils shall have particular regard to the following factors:

- (a) the economic benefits of any proposed activities to the local, regional and national economies.
- (b) any social or cultural benefits or costs of any proposed activities to local, regional or national communities.

- (c) the degree to which any adverse effects on the environment can be avoided or mitigated.
- (d) the extent to which public access to the coastal space will be maintained.
- (e) any pre-existing investment in use of the space under consideration.

43. Submission 353.11 recommends that Crown's interest in aquaculture be footnoted (and/or included in the Glossary) as being defined in Government's "Our Blue Horizons" document. This will set out clearly for the regions where to find and interpret the Crown's interest in aquaculture activities.

44. Submissions 163.6 and 502.8 suggest there should be a new objective recognising obligations on regional councils to provide for aquaculture management areas inserted under the Resource Management Act (No 2) 2004, as follows:

Objective 11

Management of natural and physical resources in the coastal marine area recognises the obligation to make provisions for aquaculture activities.