

## Peter Johnson-5472

---

**From:** Peter Johnson-5472  
**Sent:** Friday, 23 August 2019 4:57 PM  
**To:** 'Amanda Hills | Gascoigne Wicks'  
**Cc:** Emma Deason | Gascoigne Wicks; Josh Marshall | Gascoigne Wicks; Mark Gillard  
**Subject:** U190438 - Further information request(1)

Hi Amanda,

I've now completed my initial assessment of the application and write to request the following further information about the proposal. As you'll appreciate, the application documents are lengthy and of a technical nature; it is possible that I may have overlooked some of the below-requested details in the submitted application. If this is the case please direct me to the location of that information in the application documents.

I have generally set out the items below in a sequence which follows the submitted application, referenced by page number on the associated application document.

### Assessment of Environmental Effects

1. Page 5 – Please provide a large scale plan drawing of the proposed Stage 1 structures (I'd suggest 1:4000 at A3 size). [See also item 20 below.]
2. Page 6 – Please provide a plan drawing (I'd suggest 1:25,000 at A3 size) of the proposed structure location/s with respect to the green-grey coloured area referred to at the top of page 6. [See also item 20 below.]
3. Page 6 – Please clarify the maximum extent of development that resource consent is sought for in the current application. The AEE states that the current projection is that discharge of up to 40,000 tonnes is possible, whereas the landscape report identifies up to 4 stages totalling 80,000 tonnes.
4. Page 8 – please clarify on a map the whereabouts of any proposed structure exclusion areas. I ask this because the benthic report recommends that anchors are not installed in any horse mussel or brachiopod habitat. [See also item 20 below.]
5. Page 8 – Please provide the maximum proposed dimensions (including height above water) of the likely and alternative farm structures and related anchoring systems that you seek consent for. While I acknowledge the intention to follow the Hudson Associates design guide, that guide appears to indicate preferences rather than provide a strict design envelope with dimensions.
6. Page 8 – Please specify the maximum surface area of net pen and related structures for which consent is sought at each stage of development up to and including the maximum extent of development.
7. Page 8 – Please specify the maximum number and maximum dimensions of the barges proposed at the site at each stage of development up to and including the maximum extent of development.
8. Page 8 – Please provide a description of the number and position(s) in the water column of the proposed underwater lights, and what amount of resulting light is likely to be visible at the water's surface above each net pen.
9. Page 8 – please describe what the proposed net cleaning devices comprise and what, if any, importance they have to an assessment of the effects of the proposal.
10. Page 9 – please clarify the area of exclusive occupation which is sought *“to the extent necessary to undertake the activity and ensure the safety and security of the marine farm, all its structures, and staff working on the farm.”* In this regard I note that a marine traffic exclusion area within the buoyed area has been recommended by OCEL in Appendix R. [See also item 20 below.]
11. Related to 10 above, please clarify whether or not a fishing exclusion area (temporary or permanent) is proposed to be implemented around the proposed farm structures, and if so please provide a map showing such areas. [See also item 20 below.] I ask this because a) it is unclear whether fishing would *“unreasonably interfere”* with the operation or safety (eg. anchoring systems) of the farm, and b) the pelagic fish report seems

to indicate a fishing exclusion area as a potential tool for studying and/or managing effects of the farm on wild fish stocks.

12. Please explain how the area and shape of the 1791 hectare farm site applied for is reasonably necessary for the operation of the proposed farm at its maximum extent of development, given that the RMA definition of occupy means *“the activity of occupying any part of the coastal marine area where the occupation is reasonably necessary for another activity...”*.
13. Page 19 – it is unclear what additional vessel traffic has been considered in the navigation report. Please describe the maximum number and size of support vessels and maximum number of vessel movements proposed to maintain and operate the farm at each stage of development up to and including the maximum extent of development.
14. Page 25 – related to 13 above, please identify which ports/landing areas that personnel, equipment, stock and feed associated with the farm will be transported from/to and in what proportions (eg. 60% Picton, 20% Havelock, 10% Nelson, 10% Elaine Bay), and identify the proposed vessel routes to and from the proposed salmon farm, with particular reference to the breeding seabird populations identified in the seabird report. [See also item 20 below.]
15. Page 27 – please provide the evidence referred to in Clinton Duffy's email to you of 14 March 2019, if that evidence is something you wish Council to consider.
16. Page 28 – please describe the proposed feeding methodology, how this will minimise the loss of feed from the net pens and how this will be monitored on an ongoing basis, with particular reference to the depth of the net pens and the current speeds experienced at the site.

### **Benthic Report**

17. Figures 3, 4, 7 and 14, and Appendix 10 – the figures used in the report to illustrate the various properties of the MBES study area and the depositional footprints of the various modelled scenarios are not clear at the scale provided. In particular, the modelled scenarios do not clearly show the extent of depositional overlap with the various habitats identified in Figure 7, or appear to show Stage 1 layout or subsequent stages. Please provide a folio of large scale maps (perhaps 1:30,000 on A3) of these figures with sufficient detail to illustrate the findings of the MBES survey and the results of the relevant deposition modelling which has been undertaken for the proposal. [See also item 20 below.]
18. Page 34 – the depositional modelling appears to have been carried out with the pens arranged perpendicular to the main flow axis, whereas page 5 of the AEE indicates the pens will be arranged parallel with the current. If available, please provide the results of depositional modelling based on the proposed Stage 1 layout as described in the AEE, along with modelling for subsequent stages and layouts up to and including the maximum extent of development.

### **Management Plans**

19. Much of the application indicates that various management plans are to be employed as a key method for managing the potential adverse effects of the proposal. In some instances you have set out in Appendix B (conditions) the critical performance standards to be achieved by the management plans. In other instances the management plan conditions provide far less certainty. In order for Council to make an informed decision on the application, can I ask that you as far as possible provide all management plans referred to in the proposed conditions.

### **Digital Spatial Information**

20. Where I have above requested large scale maps or spatial information can I suggest that where possible you also provide the spatial information in a digital format compatible with ArcGIS software, eg. shapefiles. In addition, in order to inform Council's evaluation of the proposal and related management and monitoring regimes, can I ask that you provide all of the MBES survey results for the entire survey area in a digital format which is compatible with ArcGIS software. With your agreement this data could be added to Council's existing MBES data for Queen Charlotte Sound/Tōtaranui and Tory Channel and thereby enhance knowledge and management of the coastal marine area of the district by all resource users.

### **Responding to this Request**

Under section 92A of the RMA, within 15 working days you must either:

- Provide the requested information; or

- Provide written confirmation that you intend to provide the requested information, but cannot provide the requested information within the timeframe (Council will provide a revised timeframe for the information to be provided); or
- Provide written confirmation that you do not agree to provide the requested information.

Please let me know if any of the above requests are unclear.

Regards,

**Peter Johnson**  
**Senior Resource Management Officer**  
**Marlborough District Council**

---

**From:** Amanda Hills | Gascoigne Wicks [mailto:ahills@gwlaw.co.nz]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 August 2019 11:47 AM  
**To:** Peter Johnson-5472  
**Cc:** Emma Deason | Gascoigne Wicks; Josh Marshall | Gascoigne Wicks; Mark Gillard  
**Subject:** RE: U190438 - Final landscape report

Hi Peter

Many thanks for keeping us informed of progress. NZ King Salmon is committed to working with you to ensure Council is comfortable with the proposal and has the necessary information to make its assessment.

By way of update, in the meantime we are liaising with key stakeholders to respond to any queries they may have. A copy of the application has been sent to a number of parties. NZ King Salmon is meeting with representatives of DoC this Friday. We are meeting with EDS in early September in Auckland.

Look forward to progressing to the next phase. Please let us know if we can assist in anyway.

Regards  
Amanda



Amanda Hills | Associate | **Gascoigne Wicks**  
**DDI:** 03 520 5040 | **Email:** [ahills@gwlaw.co.nz](mailto:ahills@gwlaw.co.nz)  
P O Box 2 | Blenheim | 7240

Website: <http://www.gascoignewicks.co.nz>

Caution. This e-mail message and accompanying data may contain information that is confidential and subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this message or data is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify me immediately and delete all material pertaining to this e-mail. Thank you

---

**From:** Peter Johnson-5472 [mailto:Peter.Johnson@marlborough.govt.nz]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 21 August 2019 10:48 a.m.  
**To:** Amanda Hills | Gascoigne Wicks <ahills@gwlaw.co.nz>  
**Cc:** Emma Deason | Gascoigne Wicks <edeason@gwlaw.co.nz>; Josh Marshall | Gascoigne Wicks <jmarshall@gwlaw.co.nz>; Mark Gillard <Mark.Gillard@kingsalmon.co.nz>  
**Subject:** RE: U190438 - Final landscape report

Hi Amanda,

Thank you for providing the final version of the navigation report and landscape and natural character report. I have updated Council's records accordingly.

Due to the scale and complexity of the technical information provided, Council has under section 37 of the RMA added 20 working days to the applicable time period for publicly notifying the application.

I acknowledge your suggestion concerning the sending of the s92 questions in two parts. However, given the scale and complexity of the technical information provided I anticipate that more than just two s92 requests will be needed. I will endeavour to send you the first such request this Friday 23 August, and any subsequent requests on a topic by topic basis as they arise.

Regards,

**Peter Johnson**  
**Senior Resource Management Officer**  
**Marlborough District Council**