

Before the Independent Hearings Panel
At Department of Conservation

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA** or **Act**)

In the matter of Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Regional Coastal Plan:
Kermadec and Subantarctic Islands

Summary Statement of Evidence of Darryn John Shaw on behalf of Sanford Limited

8 June 2026

Submitter's solicitor:

Ben Williams / Conor Meredith
Anderson Lloyd
Floor 2, The Regent Building, 33 Cathedral Square, Christchurch 8011
PO Box 13831, Christchurch 8141
DX Box WX10009 Christchurch
p + 64 335 1250
ben.williams@al.nz / conor.meredith@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Summary statement of evidence of Darryn John Shaw

- 1 My full name is Darryn John Shaw.
- 2 I am the Group Manager Wildcatch for Sanford Limited (**Sanford**) based in Timaru. I manage Sanford's Wildcatch fishing operations including thirteen vessels, seven of which target scampi.
- 3 I prepared a statement of evidence dated 2 June 2026 in relation to Proposed Plan Change 1 (**PC1**) to the Regional Coastal Plan: Kermadec and Subantarctic Islands (**RCP**).
- 4 My experience is set out in that statement of evidence.
- 5 This summary provides a brief overview of Sanford's Wildcatch business and its history in Subantarctic Ocean. It also confirms my key conclusions from my statement of evidence in relation to Sanford's concerns on PC1 as proposed.

Sanford's Wildcatch business and its history in the Subantarctic Ocean

- 6 Sanford is a wild harvest and aquaculture seafood business. based in Timaru. It operates thirteen vessels, engages over four hundred share fishers and has forty-seven support staff. Sanford requires certainty in operational rules, regulatory impact and the cost of compliance.
- 7 Sanford has fished around the Subantarctic targeting scampi since the mid-1990s. Sanford has seven scampi vessels, six of which fish part of the year in the Scampi 6A (Auckland Island) fishery.
- 8 Sanford has a long history of operations in the area and has a deep respect for its unique environment. It is very familiar with its changeable conditions, and what is required to operate in manner which ensures the safety of its crew, vessels and the marine mammals that reside within the Subantarctic Islands.

Key concerns in relation to PC1

- 9 Sanford considers it will be adversely affected by PC1's proposed amendments to the RCP.
- 10 First, Sanford is extremely concerned about the removal of the permitted access to dedicated and permitted anchorages for Sanford's vessels within Port Ross during the winter period (1 April to 31 October) for the following reasons in particular:

- (a) it raises significant health and safety concerns for Sanford. Port Ross is a critical sheltering location for the safety of fishing vessels and crew and is the main safe anchorage in the northern end of the Auckland Islands for vessels when transiting to and from the mainland. Every opportunity to reduce risk to vessel and lives must be considered as beneficial and a requirement of the RCP. There should be no need for Masters having to second guess their legal ability to access the designated anchorages in Port Ross, by having to reinterpret and switch rules for certain times of the year;
 - (b) the proposed amendments are not justified by evidence that validates the closure of Port Ross for all vessels apart from research and management vessels during the winter period, due to the perceived potential risk of vessel / tohorā interaction;
 - (c) specifically, the changes do not account for the absence of incidents in Port Ross while the RCP has been active, or while Sanford has been accessing the area generally, and uses wide generalizations about “risk” from extracts of interactions that occurred around the world in entirely different circumstances, with vessels of different size, nature and character; and
 - (d) in our view, the amendments appear to potentially increase the risk to tohorā as it promotes reliance on Rule 1 for all other vessels to allow safe sheltering in Port Ross during the winter months. Rule 1 does not incorporate the proposed precautionary mitigation measures as set out in Table 2 by the specific default of its design and nor should it, as Rule 1 has a specific intent and use outside that of a “gap measure” that is to be used when anchorages are in a temporal closed status.
- 11 Regarding these mitigation measures, the proposed RCP sets out several that are to apply to research and management vessels when entering Port Ross during the winter period. The measures are considered by DOC to adequately mitigate the risk arising from these vessels. We consider that the key core measures would also mitigate the risk from fishing vessels seeking safe shelter in Port Ross during this time, and would consider the application of these measures to fishing vessels seeking safe shelter reasonable.
- 12 Suggesting that an operator such as Sanford could apply for a resource consent in order to safely shelter in Port Ross during the proposed winter closure period is an unfair, unrealistic and significant cost burden to be imposed on the fishing industry. Particularly in the context of our view that

there is no actual justification from a risk mitigation perspective for the proposed amendments, nor a guarantee that a consent would be granted, or granted with practical and workable conditions.

- 13 Second, Sanford is concerned about the amendments in relation to the biofouling requirements. Sanford considers that an appropriate distinction should be made between domestic and international vessels. Further, the new proposal provides unnecessary additional work and cost for domestic vessels, such as Sanford, without being appropriately justified with evidence of the risk it is mitigating.
- 14 The time and cost required to conduct an inspection, and the associated report writing will significantly increase as a result of the amendments. We note that there is a significant quantity of inspections that are already required, particularly for a domestic based vessel such as those in the Sanford's scampi fleet, that regularly return to port.
- 15 Third, there are amendments made, such as removing the requirement that an inspection be undertaken by Approved Persons, that Sanford considers potentially increases the biosecurity risk, and does not meet the requirements of Policy 3 of the RCP for certification to occur.
- 16 Last, Sanford is concerned that the amendments as proposed decline to add the requested Tucker Point Anchorage, despite the clear need for a dedicated and identified year-round marked anchorage within this general location. This Anchorage would provide desired shelter in south-easterly/easterly wind conditions.

Proposed relief

- 17 For completeness, and as set out in full in its submission, Sanford is seeking:
 - (a) retention of the currently permitted access to Port Ross during the winter period for vessels seeking safe shelter;
 - (b) that the Tucker Point Anchorage be included as an additional permitted anchorage; and
 - (c) the proposed amendments to the biofouling requirements should not apply to domestic vessels that have successfully operated and complied with the RCP's existing measures.

Dated this 8th day of June 2026

Darryn John Shaw