



Information Package

Regional Planning & Development

17 April 2014

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Environmental Policy | 1 |
| Status of Plan Changes..... | 1 |
| Activity Report – 24 January 2014 to 3 April 2014 | 2 |
| Water Allocation Working Group Notes | 3 |
| Sounds Advisory Group Meeting Notes | 13 |

Environmental Policy

Status of Plan Changes

(Report prepared by Mark Caldwell)

Reference W045-15-00 & M135-15-00

The tables below list the plan changes currently being processed by Council in accordance with the Frist Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 and their current status

Since the last status report the following has occurred:

- The appeal by TrustPower to Item 6 on Plan Change 61 has been withdrawn. The item is now able to be approved and made operative (See agenda item 3).
- The Closing date for appeals on Plan Changes 27 & 62 has passed with no appeal received. The provisions are now able to be approved and made operative (See agenda Item 1)
- The Environment Court has now released its decision on Plan Change 59 approving the plan change.
- The requestor has withdrawn its appeal on Plan Change 60.
- A hearing has been held for Plan Changes 64 – 71.

| Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan | | |
|--|--|---|
| Plan Change No. | Description | Status |
| PC21 | Waikawa Bay Mooring Management Areas and Marina Zone Extension (Private Plan Change) | Currently under appeal by Applicant. Negotiations are proceeding between requestor (Port Marlborough), submitter and the Council |
| PC23 | Frost Fans | Currently under appeal by submitter. Interim Environment Court decision issued. |
| PC24 | New Zealand King Salmon – Plan change request lodged with the Environmental Protection Authority | Currently under appeal by two submitters. Appeals heard by Supreme Court and awaiting a decision from the Court. |
| PC26 | Minor Amendments | Item 5 (Amendments to marine farming rules) referred to the Minister of Conservation for approval. Operative date for the remainder of items was the 20 March 2014 |
| PC27 | New Dairy Farms | Provisions ready for approval. Once approved the operative date can be notified and the provisions incorporated into the Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan. |

| Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan | | |
|--|--|--|
| Plan Change No. | Description | Status |
| PC58 | Frost Fans | Currently under appeal by submitter. Interim Environment Court decision issued |
| PC59 | Colonial Vineyard Limited (Private Plan Change) | The decision of the Council to decline Plan Change 59 was appealed by the applicant to the Environment Court. The Environment Court released its decision on the 14 March 2014 to allow the appeal and approve Plan Change 59. |
| PC60 | Maxwell Hills Zone (Private Plan Change) | The applicant has withdrawn the appeal against the decision of Council to decline Plan Change 60. |
| PC61 | Minor Amendments | Decision on Item Six (Utility Provisions) appealed by TrustPower Limited but appeal now withdrawn. The operative date for the remainder of the Items in the Plan Change was the 20 March 2014. |
| PC62 | New Dairy Farms | Provisions ready for approval. Once approved the operative date can be notified and the provisions incorporated into the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan. |
| PC64 | Urban Growth Area One | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |
| PC65 | Urban Growth Area Two | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |
| PC66 | Urban Growth Area Three | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |
| PC67 | Urban Growth Area Four | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |
| PC68 | Urban Growth Area Five | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |
| PC69 | Urban Growth Area Six | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |
| PC70 | Urban Growth Area Seven | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |
| PC71 | Urban Growth Area – Plan Provisions | Hearing held 24/02/2014 |

Activity Report – 24 January 2014 to 3 April 2014

(Report prepared by Pere Hawes)

R425-02-00, M090-02-00

- Water Allocation Working Group process ongoing. A consultation strategy for engaging with all water users has been developed as has a draft discussion document. A water forum to be held in late May/early June followed by catchment/aquifer based meetings to provide resource specific information. The next step in the process is to confirm the discussion document and to also confirm the draft RPS and RMP that will form the basis of consultation.
- A topic of particular focus for the Water Allocation Working Group has been groundwater and surface water interaction. In particular the Group has been exploring options for managing

groundwater abstraction that has significant adverse effects on surface water flows and for establishing a threshold for significance.

- Ongoing review of existing Plan provisions managing land disturbance activities associated with commercial forestry. This is nearing completion and a package of rules to discuss with forestry interests has been compiled. Note that there are further attempts at a national level to reconsider a NES for commercial forestry and this may influence the consultation strategy.
- Current focus of RPS drafting is provisions for rural environments. This will draw on the body of work undertaken by the Plan Review Sub-committee in 2013. These provisions will be tested like all other provisions through relevant focus groups.
- Draft report "Natural character of the Marlborough coast" received. This identifies areas of high, very high and outstanding natural character as required by Policy 13 of the NZCPS and will form a useful resource for the review process. The document has been prepared in conjunction with the Department of Conservation and could be used as guidance to local authorities on giving effect to Policy 13.
- Current focus of RMP drafting is provisions planning for residential amenity for urban zones. This draws on earlier work completed as part of the SMUGS process.
- Approach with respect to hazardous substances and GMOs confirmed. No specific planning for these issues to be included in the RPS/RMP, except for groundwater protection zones.
- Response received from MPI regarding proposals to regulate dredging and bottom trawling in areas of significant marine biodiversity value (as identified in joint MDC/DOC publication).
- Floodway mapping for a new Floodway Zone completed and now being peer reviewed.
- Mapping of all rivers and lakes for inclusion on zoning maps completed.

Water Allocation Working Group Notes

(Report prepared by Rachel Anderson)

R425-02-18-08

The notes of the Water Allocation Working Group meetings held on 20 February 2014 and 14 March 2014 are **attached** for the members' information. Due to the size of the appendices attached to the meeting notes they have not been included in the Information Pack, however they are available on request.

Notes of a Meeting of the WATER ALLOCATION WORKING GROUP held in the Committee Room, District Administration Building, Seymour Street, Blenheim at 9.00am on Thursday, 20 February 2014

Present

Clr G Evans, Guy Lissaman, Steve Wilkes, John Bright, John Hickman, Francis Maher and Dr R Balasubramaniam (Bala), Mike Insley, Dr John Small and Dominic Pecchenino

In Attendance

Pere Hawes, Val Wadsworth, Peter Davidson, John Patterson and Sue Bulfield-Johnston

Late

Guy Lissaman arrived at 9.25am

Mike Insley arrived at 9.55am

Dominic Pecchenino arrived at 10.00am and left at 12.30pm

Apologies

Rachel Anderson, Neil Deans, John Hickman

The following documents were circulated prior to the meeting:

- Notes of WAWG Meeting 11 December 2013. Trim ref 1347192 – copy attached – Appendix 1.
- Draft enhanced transfer provisions (showing tracked changes). Trim ref 1444560 - copy attached – Appendix 2
- Expressions of allocations on water permits. Trim ref 1443222 – copy attached – Appendix 3.
- Water Allocation and Use – Consultation Document – draft. Trim ref 1445885 – copy attached - Appendix 4.
- Southern Valleys Storage – discussion document. Trim ref 1443535 – copy attached – Appendix 5.

1. Matters Arising

- Minutes of last meeting

Item 4, page 5 - Following the discussion on damming/storage at the previous meeting, Pere confirmed the only change to the draft provisions was replacing the words 'blocking sediment flows' to 'retention of sediment flows'.

Item 6, page 5 – Hui with the Iwi Working Group. Pere reported this group is about to present the completed Iwi Chapter for the RPS to the Regional Planning & Development Committee at the meeting set down for 13 March 2014. Following this the IWG will engage in dialogue with the WAWG. It was agreed that Pere and John Patterson discuss how to address the differences between the WAWG approach to the issue of full and over allocation and the IWG approach to strategic allocation. It was also agreed that some of the group members should attend the hui, John Patterson, Clr Evans, Steve, Francis, Pere and Mike were nominated .

- Permitted Activities Rules – legal opinion

Pere reported back on a question raised by Bala at the previous meeting regarding the status of replenishing dams after water has been taken for firefighting purposes.

- Council's solicitor was initially of a view that this could be done as a permitted activity if it occurred at the time the water was being taken for such purpose. She was not of the same view if the dam was replenished at a later period. The matter is still under consideration and a final opinion will be issued in due course.
- It may be that this activity should be explicitly provided for in the resource consent in the first instance.
- Val will contact Marlborough Helicopters to ascertain the volume of water likely to be taken in a typical firefighting event in order to gauge the potential scale of the issue.
- It is also possible that water is taken for firefighting purposes during a dry period in the year. To provide for this activity through a Plan rule could enable some persons to take water when other permit holder are facing restrictions.
- Emergency provisions enable a Local Authority to take water but not for the purpose of refilling dams.
- MAF funding

Pere reported that he has met with MAF officials who have confirmed the funding will stay in place until the end of this financial year. MAF also requested that the funding be used entirely in this financial

year. Pere was on the view that, based on the group's rate of progress, there was unlikely to be any need for external funding other than for the implementation of the enhanced water transfer system.

2. Enhanced Transfer Provisions – Pere Hawes

Pere provided an overview of the Enhanced Transfer Provisions – Appendix 2. The group discussed aspects of the provisions and suggested changes. Pere will incorporate the changes into the document and re-present it at the next meeting.

Pere tabled a map in respect of Policy 4.5(a), copy attached – Appendix 2A. The map defined the water catchments.

Staff introduced the group to the smart map system on the Council website. It is possible the system could be used to manage enhanced water transfers, etc.

3. Balloting Methodology – Pere Hawes

In a discussion on the possible ballot system the attendees made the following points:

- There are a variety of ways that water can become available and it may be difficult to identify water that could specifically be made available through the ballot system.
- The enhanced transfer system is more effective means to gain access to additional water and may remove the need to implement a ballot system.
- In order to participate in the enhanced transfer system the consent holder's water use requirements must first have been assessed through Irricalc which may result in water being clawed back. The clawed back water would then be made available to other water users through the ballot system.
- A ballot system would include:-
 - Council retaining the clawed back water to be made available through the ballot on an annual basis with the potential for a second ballot within the twelve month period.
 - Water users wanting access to the clawed back water would have to register for the ballot.
 - The ballot would be run on an annual basis in a manner similar to a raffle (in terms of supervision).
 - Winning the ballot does not constitute resource consent. It is only a means of providing all water users an equal opportunity to win the right to apply for the water.
 - Successful balloters would then have 12 months to gain the necessary resource consents. Participants in the ballot may choose to shorten the process by applying for the relevant consents in anticipation of winning the ballot.
 - Rolling the ballot back to 1 June would provide the winner more time to gain the necessary consent(s) prior to the irrigation season.
 - Any residual water would be returned to the ballot for the following draw.
- A discussion is required on the notification process for consent applications lodged by the winner of the ballot. On the basis that the water resource is not over-allocated, it may be possible to follow a non-notified process provided there is an additional process to deal with interference effects.
- Strong policy direction will be required to prevent lodgement of applications for water permits in order to circumvent the ballot system, e.g. until the consents are granted to a ballot winner the resource is deemed to be fully allocated.

- It was agreed that the policy providing a two year lapse period on water permits should provide an exception for water use consents granted to water users who are waiting for the opportunity to gain access to water, i.e. through enhanced transfer or the ballot system. A lapse period of ten years was considered appropriate.

4. Allocation Expression (Take and Use Permits) – John Bright and Pere Hawes

Refer table – Appendix 3. Pere explained that the Expressions of Allocations Table was drafted following the whiteboard discussion conducted at the previous meeting. He provided an overview of the table and invited feedback from the attendees to ensure he had correctly interpreted the group's conclusions from that discussion.

The group reconsidered how to address the issue of water permit users who apply their daily allocation or surface water over a shorter period, e.g. over 12 hours or 20 hours. It was recognised that the extraction may at times, for varying property management reasons, exceed the instantaneous rate set out in the resource consent despite the consent holder remaining within the daily allocated rate. Such instances result in contact from Council Compliance staff regarding breaches of consent conditions.

The group discussed various approaches and settled on two possible options. Refer copy of the white board printout, copy attached – Appendix 6. The two options provided (a) a buffer of 20% on instantaneous rate of take or (b) a buffer of 20% of daily period in which the daily rate may be exceeded.

It was agreed that any resolution needed to be simple, pragmatic, provide certainty to water users and clarity to Council staff.

Guy questioned the specific reference to the Irricalc system in the method section on the expressions of allocation table. Pere conceded there is a risk in specifying a system in the Plan given the life of the document and the likelihood of changes to technology. In this instance however he considered advantage existed in that it served as the default water use calculator, provided certainty to water users and Aqualinc will be contracted to maintain the currency of the system for the life of the Plan. Any water user would still have the option of providing property specific records with their application if it was considered the Irricalc model did not reflect the needs of their property.

Pere explained that by 2024 Council will be required to set cumulative contaminant limits on individual catchments. This means that each operation will have to provide a nutrient budget. Currently there is one model used as an accepted regulatory tool. Other Councils are beginning to address this issue and this Council will then review the systems in place before developing its own.

Pere advised there were two matters the group still needed to discuss:-

- The relationship between surface and ground water.
- The provisions only dealt with five aquifers, consideration needed to be given to abstractions that are from aquifers other than the five.

He noted that there is a connection between the two. The above items will likely be on the next agenda.

Tasks from the discussion:

Val was tasked with assessing what impact the two options (Appendix 6) may have on rivers and streams.

Val also scrutinise water use records to determine what level buffer would in fact address the issue of spurious non-compliance.

Steve to review the 'non-compliant' situations he is aware of to determine if the proposed options would resolve this matter.

John Bright to translate the table updated from this meetings discussion and apply it to existing resource consents. Then report his findings back to the group at the next meeting.

5. Metering on Southern Valleys Water Permits Steve Wilkes and Dominic Pecchenino

Steve spoke of a consent application lodged for a backup water supply to be used only when SVIS water was unavailable. The consent was in processing, but if granted will likely require the installation of a water meter with data logger and telemetry. Steve asked the group to consider whether it was reasonable to require high level metering on such a consent that may only be utilised occasionally. Dominic advocated for a simple and all-encompassing system that wasn't cost prohibitive for people using wells as a backup supply to the SVIS scheme.

The group engaged in a robust discussion on the pros and cons of metering in these conditions. It was recognised that some means of gauging levels of compliance was necessary for times when the aquifer was under pressure.

The group concluded that meters with data loggers were required with readings to be supplied annually. Readings also to be supplied to Council on a monthly basis when SVIS was shut off and the backup wells were in operation. The readings to be supplied monthly because that is how the backup allocation will be expressed on the consents.

Francis pointed out the SVIS Committee needed to convene to consider this matter and work out an operational response to the WAWG conclusion. Clr Evans invited Francis to attend the next meeting.

Pete and Val showed the attendees a series of graphs to demonstrate the effects on the aquifers resulting from increased usage and or dry periods.

6. Draft paper discussion – Pere Hawes

Copy of discussion paper attached – Appendix 4. Pere spoke to his first draft of a discussion paper that will eventually go out to water users. He explained that the paper is targeted to water users who have not had the benefit of developing the detailed level of understanding on how the allocation framework will operate, as the WAWG members have. The paper highlights four key issues:-

- The difference between paper allocation and actual use.
- Trying to operate under full allocation.
- The requirement by Central Government to deal with over allocation
- The setting of limits where they are no already set.

The group endorsed the document and discussed options for consultation. It was agreed that water users should be invited to a daylong forum at which an explanation of the allocation framework will be provided. The discussion document will be provided with the invitation to the forum to allow attendees to be better prepared on the day. The draft provisions document would be released on request to those at the forum who wanted a greater level of detail. Pere agreed to speak to key stakeholders prior to the forum, e.g. Federated Farmers and Marlborough Wine Growers. Following the forum, catchment/aquifer based meetings will be scheduled to provide the relevant water users more detail on how the principles will be applied for each resource.

Any outstanding matters that need to be addressed by the group prior to the forum will be on the agenda for the next meeting. Additionally the rules supporting the objectives and policies need to be drafted.

It was anticipated the forum could be scheduled for May/June. Pere identified Alastair Bisley as a possible Chairman for the forum. Alistair was previously the Chairman of the Land and Water Forum.

Clr Evans and Francis will brief full Council prior to the forum. Similarly the WAWG members will speak to their respective water user groups.

Tasks:

Pere agreed to approach Alistair Bisley to chair the forum.

Pere and Steve agreed to work on draft rules to bring back to the group.

Group members to provide feedback on the discussion document prior to the next meeting.

Steve and John discussed issues with the short term water in the Rai catchment, specifically its transition to a long term water classification. The group thought it appropriate for Steve, John and Val to have further discussion in order to progress the option further.

The group will be asked to confirm the discussion document (including amendments resulting from any feedback) at the next meeting. Following that the briefing on the paper will be presented to Full Council and to the Iwi Working Group.

The group decided that John Patterson, Clr Evans, Steve Wilkes, Francis Maher, Pere Hawes and Mike Insley will be its representatives at the meeting with Iwi Working Group. The meeting will be scheduled after 14 March and no later than May.

7. Update on Wairau River SFR Project – Val Wadsworth

Val provided an update in the Wairau SFR investigation. John Hayes and Jo Hay from Cawthron have commenced the investigation and are funded by an Envirolink grant. The anticipated timeframe for the project conclusion is six weeks. The completed report will be brought back to the group.

8. Storage of groundwater – Peter Davidson

Pete provided a presentation on the difficulties of defining surplus ground water (C Class for storage) in response to a query raised by Bala at the previous meeting. Refer to copy of presentation attached – Appendix 7.

Peter spoke of the research undertaken on the mechanics of the Wairau Aquifer and its relationship with the Wairau River. More information is required in order to define the influences on the aquifer before a Class C extraction framework can be developed. In conclusion there may be opportunities for additional allocations in the future but it was not anticipated that such a framework would be ready for the pending notification of the Resource Management Plan.

Val commented that taking surface water from the Wairau River to storage (Class B) would be more reliable than taking groundwater to storage would likely be. He also suggested that there may be an opportunity to take water for storage from the Opawa/Gibson Creek/SVIS system.

It was clarified that any water not utilised from a consent holder's allocation could be taken by that consent holder to storage provided the consent has been varied to allow for that activity.

9. Storage of Southern Valleys Surface Water – Val Wadsworth

Val spoke to his discussion paper drafted in response to a question raised previously by the group. Specifically, should there be a storage allocation in the Southern Valleys, given they are in the greatest state of over allocation. Copy of paper attached - refer Appendix 5. Using an aerial diagram, Val demonstrated how the flow pattern of the Southern Valleys works. Copy of aerial diagram attached - refer Appendix 5A.

Val made the point that the flows coming out of the upper hills and disappearing into the ground are essential to keeping the Southern Valleys Aquifers topped up and so need to be protected. He was also of the view that no further allocations for storage should be made from the Ben Morven, Fairhall and Mill Stream aquifers because the length of drying was such that the water is required for maintaining the aquifers. The Ben Morven aquifer is the most at risk.

In terms of the Taylor catchment, although there is some capacity to take water for storage, Val recommended a continuous flow of 500 litres per second in order to maintain fish habitat. Similarly he recommended a minimum flow of 2000 litres per second in the Omaka River in order to provide for aquifer recharge and maintain fish habitat. In both cases there is flow over and above the recommended minimum flows to provide some storage opportunity albeit for limited period of time.

In addition to an environmental flow Val recommended setting allocation limits on any abstractions to storage.

The group discussed the options set out in the paper. It was agreed that the amount of additional flow over and above the minimum environmental flow was not sufficiently or consistently available for it to endorse the use of this water for storage purposes. The group preferred to use the additional flow for environmental purpose. Therefore they elected to discourage the abstraction of Southern Valleys water to storage.

10. National Objectives Framework update – Pere Hawes

<http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/water/proposed-amendments-nps-freshwater-management/index.html>

Pere reported that the submissions closed recently on the National Objectives Framework. For the first time the regions and unitary councils provide one collective submission. The submission recorded the councils' agreement on the principle that the objectives should be set at national level and some debate on the detail, i.e. what was being monitored and what were the limits. MfE will likely publish the submissions on its website in due course.

11. Other Matters

The next meeting is scheduled for Friday 14 March 2014. (A meeting notice has been sent to attendees.)

Notes of a Meeting of the WATER ALLOCATION WORKING GROUP held in the Meeting Room, Chateau Marlborough, High Street, Blenheim at 9.00am on Friday 14 March 2014

Present

Clr G Evans, Guy Lissaman, Steve Wilkes, John Bright, John Hickman, Francis Maher and Dr R Balasubramaniam (Bala), Mike Insley, Dr John Small, Neil Deans, John Hickman and Dominic Pecchenino

In Attendance

Pere Hawes, Rachel Anderson, Val Wadsworth, Peter Davidson, John Patterson and Sue Bulfield-Johnston

The following documents were circulated prior to the meeting:

- Notes of WAWG Meeting 20 February 2014. Trim ref 1463603 – copy attached – Appendix 1.

12. Matters Arising

- Minutes of last meeting

There were no matters arising from the minutes of the previous meeting.

- Refilling storage dams

Rachel reported back from a discussion with Kaye McIlveney regarding the issue of refilling of storage dams after water has been taken for firefighting purposes. It was Kaye's view that any such incidences should be considered on a case by case basis, rather than providing for such an activity in a resource consent or as a permitted activity in the Plan.

Val reported that he had spoken to Marlborough Helicopters about the volume of water taken for an average sized fire. It was estimated that using three helicopters it is possible to take up to 300 cubic metres in a day. This volume was not considered to be a significant quantity.

- Expression of allocation for surface water

Pere circulated to the attendees an updated version of the table of expressions of allocations on water permits. Copy attached – Appendix 2.

Pere spoke to the changes made to the table following discussions at the previous meeting.

In terms of the proposed 20 percent exceedance of instantaneous rate of take (item 1 - page 2 of document), Neil asked if any consideration had been given should all water users exercise this exceedance simultaneously. Val suggested there was sufficient distance between water takes on larger water sources to mitigate any effects. It was acknowledged there is a potential for adverse effects on a smaller water source with a concentration of water takes, however, it was considered such scenarios were not present in Marlborough.

The group discussed the concept of the 24 hour period and defined it on the table as a calendar day, i.e. midnight to midnight.

Pere then circulated examples prepared by John Bright of how surface and ground water takes and water use would be expressed on resource consents under the new regime. Copies attached – refer Appendix 3.

John provided an explanation of the design concepts. While the examples triggered a robust discussion amongst the attendees, it also became clear the examples contained errors and so needed to be re-worked. John agreed to bring amended examples to the next meeting.

In the discussion the group covered the following matters:

- The discussion in terms of pro-rata rationing is on-going.
- Rationing is necessary for the Waihopai and Awatere Rivers in order to comply with the current SFRs for those rivers.
- While the language in the water take examples is not in a final form, the examples illustrated the concept of the state of availability being dependant on the state of the river flow.
- In principle the e-planning system would provide an electronic management tool for Council and consent holders' use that would track water abstraction under each consent and calculate total volume extracted for each month, and total allocation remaining within any given month, and for the year remaining.
- Francis commented that the group had previously discussed the potential for water on the shoulders of the Irricalc bell curve model to be available for transfer under the enhanced transfer system. John Bright referred back to a previous meeting in which he had demonstrated there would be water available each month within the bell curve that could be transferred under the system.
- Val suggested the water use table reflect the July to June water year rather than the standard calendar year. This would better reflect the bell curve shape.
- The group has previously agreed that meter requirements for monitoring water use will be on a per use basis. The use types still need to be defined and will be in the nature of a category rather than by individual crop types, i.e. irrigation, storage, winery, industrial, etc.
- There was further discussion and clarification among the attendees in terms of where excess water will come from that can then be utilised for storage. Some group queried whether the allocation would be a flat line daily rate and only the use would be defined by the bell curve. Any water in excess of the usage defined by the bell curve but within the flat line daily rate would then be available to put to storage.

Pere reminded the group that it had previously agreed on the principle of allocation for use matching the crop demand. Further the group had previously agreed that on days that the full irrigation requirement was not required (i.e. when it is raining) the unutilised allocation could then be used for storage. The retention of a flat line allocation model would in effect be the retention of the status quo.

The group discussed the two concepts and the option that any additional allocation for storage on the shoulder of the irrigation season would be subject to a separate consent.

All consents will be subject also to any rationing based on river flow.

- The group has to find a practical balance between meeting water users' needs and the requirement for Council to meet its more stringent obligations relating to water management. Water management in the future is going to be more complex due to the Central Government requirement of Council to account for every litre of water taken and used. Management will be more intensive in Council's reporting to Central Government and on users.
- John agreed to run Guy Lissaman's consent through the Irricalc system to show what this consent would look like under the new regime. The consent allows the taking and use of A and B Class water for the irrigation of vineyard, crops and pasture.
- Val suggested John also run another complex consent through Irricalc because it allows the taking of water for multiple uses over multiple properties under separate ownerships. The consent uses cover domestic, viticultural, horticultural and commercial (winery).
- John will also compile the presentations he has made to the group thus far to show at the next meeting how it all fits together with the above consent examples.
- Neil noted that two goals identified at the outset of the group's considerations were to incentivise storage and enable more water to become available for allocation. He asked the group whether the system developed will meet these objectives.
- The unbundling of the take consent from the use consents will create a lot of flexibility.
- The group agreed that the members must have a complete and common understanding of the regime if it is to be able to promote it to other water users. They also saw benefit in having examples prepared to illustrate to water users the key points of the regime.

2. Managing the interaction between groundwater and surface water – Val Wadsworth

Pere explained that of the list of issues identified at the outset of the group, the last substantive issue is the relationship between surface water and groundwater. Specifically, how the abstraction of groundwater can have an effect on surface water resources, and how this can be managed.

Val and Pete provided an explanation of stream depletion effects and management options; and provided case studies of the different types of relationships that exist in Marlborough. See copy of their presentation – Appendix 4.

Pete also spoke of the inconsistency between resource consents in terms of the conditions imposed and duration, i.e. different consents that enable abstractions from the same surface water resource but have different durations and restriction/cut-off trigger levels. He sought the same terms to be applied to all consents drawing from the same resource.

The attendees discussed the management regime on the Tukituki River in Hawkes Bay and how this might be applied to the Wairau Valley. After further discussion, Steve proposed the following policy:

The % of the abstraction that after 30 days continuous pumping from or contributing to the river or tributaries is the % of the consented allocation that shall be subject to river flow restrictions.

In addition, Steve also recorded the ECan threshold for no effect, as follows:

<40% @150 days = 0.

There was then a brief discussion on appropriate pumping duration but no decision was made.

The group recognised that before it can make any determination on whether, or how, to manage effects on surface water bodies and before community consultation can begin, it must first have a clear understanding in terms of the level of connection and effects between ground water and surface water bodies.

3. Consolidated Draft Provisions – Pere Hawes

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

4. Draft RMP Rules – Rachel Anderson

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

5. Managing take, use dam and divert from water bodies with high natural character – Pere Hawes, Rachel Anderson

This item was deferred to the next meeting.

6. Consultation Strategy – Pere Hawes

Pere reported that he and John Patterson recently met with Richard Bradley to discuss the hui planned in order to present the proposed water allocation regime. John reported that the Iwi recognise the importance of the proposed regime. From the discussion with Richard the following approach was formulated.

The Mayor to invite the chairs and any other relevant persons of the eight iwi across the top of the South Island to a hui to present to them the proposed regime. Council would manage the hui which will be held on Council grounds. Rangitane to assist in the planning of the hui and facilitate the meeting in terms of protocols.

Pere in the meantime will inform the Iwi Working Group of the approach.

7. Other Matters

Due to the limited amount of time remaining, and to there being items on the agenda from this meeting that had not been discussed, and points of clarification required following the discussion at this meeting, an extra meeting was added to the schedule.

The next meeting is scheduled for 14 April 2014 to be held at Chateau Marlborough commencing at 8.30am and running through until 4.00pm.

Sounds Advisory Group Meeting Notes

(Report prepared by Alan Johnson)

C230-001-M02

The notes of the meeting of the Sounds Advisory Group and public meeting held on 24 February 2014 are **attached** for members' information.

Meeting Notes of the Sounds Advisory Group, held at Port Underwood on Monday 24 February 2014 commencing at 9.10 am

Present: Councillor Trevor Hook (Chairperson), Victor Koller, Joe Heberley, Monyeen Wedge, Ken Roush, Graeme Coates, Rob Schuckard, Tim Greenhough, Eric Jorgensen, Judy Hellstrom, Poneke Rene, Robin Cox (9.40 am) and Councillor Graeme Barsanti.

MDC Staff: Alan Johnson, Steve Urlich and Kay Leach (Secretary)

Apologies: Kristen Gerard, David Hayes, Ron Sutherland, Ian Mitchell, Rachel Drake, Linda Booth, Raymond Smith, Councillors David Oddie, Jenny Andrews, Laressa Shenfield and Peter Jerram

Actions from Last Meeting

Alan had forwarded information to Animal Control regarding ticks.

A message of appreciation had been forwarded to Council for appointing Steve Urlich.

Inwards Correspondence

The application to cart logs on Port Underwood and Tumbledown Bay Roads was received from the Assets and Services Department of Council, dated 11 December 2013.

This application was before the Assets and Services Committee last week. The recommendation is to decline this application. This was passed by the Assets and Services Committee, but it still requires to go to Full Council.

Eric questioned what action is being put in place to resolve the issue, for the long term, of heavy vehicles on Sounds roads. Trevor agreed this needs to be addressed. One avenue could be through the Marlborough Regional Policy Statement review. Victor noted some logging does not have the option of using barges. It is impossible to have a general rule for the whole Sounds. Judy felt there is social and community cost to the road use. Maybe the price for that is not to replant. Joe felt it made more sense to make more barge sites. Trevor advised barging is not always economic, particularly for the domestic market. Rob questioned if there had been proper analysis of the economics, or is it just what the industry is telling us. Alan advised maybe the best approach would be for an industry forum to consider in terms of an analysis reviewing how best to integrate the economic, social, environmental and infrastructural imperatives that exist. Maybe the Primary Industry or Forestry Forum could be tasked through the Smart and Connected initiative. Rob noted one of the Environment Award winners highlighted environmentally friendly logging. Monyeen suggested another option to be addressed could be commercial forestry of kauri trees, or other natives. Tim suggested making toll roads for harvesting with revenue utilised for road maintenance. Graeme Barsanti advised this could not be achieved without a law change.

Robin Cox joined the meeting at 9.40 am

Membership

Trevor read Lynley Perkin's memo advising of her resignation. Trevor had spoken with Lynley and advised her she did not need to be a member of the Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents' Association to remain a member of the Sounds Advisory Group (with the Association's agreement). Lynley's resignation is to be held over until dialogue is completed regarding a Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents' Association representative.

Port Marlborough Facilities

Joe had been approached by Tony Crapper, who voluntarily cleans the facilities on the wharf in Picton. There is no water source on the visitors wharf. Tony had requested Port Marlborough provide this water and a hose on the wharf. This would be useful for fire fighting purposes also. Alan will make contact with Port Marlborough regarding this.

Speed of Ferries

Joe had been asked by several residents in Tory Channel to bring up this issue. Joe had been working closely with the Harbour Master. There is concern visitors would not be aware of the ferry wash. The Harbour Master had advised Joe the data collection system is not working at present. Gina Ferguson would present analysis of the data at the next Sounds Advisory Group meeting. Graeme Barsanti advised the Harbour Master had reported twice to the Environment Committee. Alan advised the issue had been escalated to the Compliance Unit at Council. Alan thanked Joe for bringing this issue up.

D'Urville Island Pest Control

Alan spoke of an email received from Dean Heiford of Council, which covered a request he had received from a resident of D'Urville Island regarding trying to mitigate issues in terms of spread risk on D'Urville Island when machinery is taken from French Pass on to D'Urville Island. It was requested that cleaning equipment be provided, but this is considered to be problematic, including D'Urville being one of many island in the Sounds. It is though the best option is education of communities and contractors regarding cleaning of equipment. Alan provided a draft fact sheet 'Biosecurity Hygiene in the Marlborough Sounds'. This still required review by the Department of Conservation. Alan would like members of the group to distribute the fact sheet, once finalised, to their respective resident associations. Judy noted that machinery is not the only issue. Gravel brought in for road works can import pest weeds. She also suggested examples of the worst plants would be useful on the fact sheet. Moneen suggested the fact sheet could be included with building consents, although Alan felt this could be an overload of information. Trevor noted that residents need to ask the questions whether machinery had been cleaned. There are not a huge number of contractors so education of contractors is the key.

Poneke advised the pest issue came up regularly with the D'Urville Island Residents' Association, particularly when there is a review of the pest management strategy. Pest plants are not the only issue, deer, pigs, ants. D'Urville does not have possums at present. Alan advised it is the responsibility of everyone, including property owners and contractors, for managing biosecurity pathways. Regulation is not the answer in its entirety. Poneke noted a lot of pests come in on barges. He felt a large sign advising of the risk would be helpful. Cleaning at point of departure is the best option. Poneke spoke of contractors going to D'Urville Island being encouraged to deal with pest clear sites first so pests are not distributed from one part of the island to another. Trevor felt Council contractors should set an example.

Joe noted the falcon population increasing in the Sounds and questioned how the Department of Conservation felt about this with regard to native birds. Eric noted the increase is a good sign. They are there because the feed is there. Joe noted there is no indication if the falcons are attacking native birds.

Steve Ulrich provided the following link following the meeting:

NZ Journal of Ecology article on falcon diet in Marlborough. The study authors looked at what falcons hunted in hill country and vineyards. They found that falcons favoured introduced birds more than what was expected. They also hunted rats, mice, rabbits and even stoats.

http://newzealandecology.org/nzje/new_issues/NZJEcol37_1_51.pdf

New Zealand Journal of Ecology, 37(1): 51–59 (2013)

Diet composition and prey choice of New Zealand falcons nesting in anthropogenic and natural habitats

Sara M. Kross, Jason M. Tylianakis and Ximena J. Nelson

Styela Clava Update

A governance group has been formed which is represented by industry, Marlborough District Council, Ministry for Primary Industries, Port Marlborough and iwi. A management plan has been agreed, with a funding mechanism for ongoing management. Every response is followed by a review, i.e. what it is costing and are the objectives achieved. The Ministry for Primary Industry fund 50%, with industry, Marlborough District Council and Port Marlborough funding the balance 50%. Eradication will be impossible, but reduction of density and risk in Picton Marina will reduce the risk of spread. Numbers are now down considerably. Graeme Coates felt this is a good example of getting on to something quickly. This is a national issue because of risk pathways. Graeme Coates noted industry minimise the transfer by antifouling each year. Alan advised the biggest issue for Council and the stakeholders is another organism could arrive and new decisions will need to be made. Moneyeen suggested recreational divers could be educated to identify Styela Clava. Graeme Coates spoke of difficulties with this. Alan suggested education is the key. The TOS Marine Biosecurity Partnership had been set up which is working well.

Regional Policy Update

Alan provided a report 'Progress with the Review of the Marlborough Regional Policy Statement, Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan and Marlborough Sounds Resource Management Plan' from Pere Hawes. He advised Pere would attend the next Sounds Advisory Group meeting. Alan updated the Group on the new committee structure, Environment Committee and Regional Planning and Development Committee, and where responsibilities sit.

Moneyeen queried if the completion date to notification of December 2014 would be affected by significant events. Alan advised this is a political decision by the committee as to when the plan would be notified. The staff are on track to getting most of the chapters worked up. Largely 16 of the 19 chapters are complete, with Water Allocation, Urban Environment and Rural Environment outstanding. Alan noted good processes are in place to deal with those three elements. Trevor noted it is better to have in depth discussion on the issues during the draft phase rather than the notification phase. Once notified it is in a more formal process.

A water allocation working group has been formed working on technical information, including developing new policy framework to stimulate new mechanisms.

Graeme Coates questioned if Council is happy with the response to the draft. Trevor noted that did not take into account working group comments. That is a more substantive process. Trevor noted the rules are the most important, which are guiding us for the next 20 years and will have environmental, social and economic effects.

Landscape

Alan provided a report 'Landscape Review' from Emma Richardson. Alan spoke on the landowner meetings and then the subsequent survey and feedback received. There are some emerging signals coming out of the survey. Council is now considering where to go next. This is still a conceptual phase. Feedback from members of the Sounds Advisory Group is encouraged. Trevor noted Councillors will be workshopping this.

There was considerable discussion regarding management of commercial forestry and management of built form (colour pallet, reflectivity, light pollution). In general terms members considered that the prohibition of new commercial forestry in the Sounds is too broad in definition (exotic and native species), not the best way to mitigate the environmental concerns and viewed that consideration of other consent controls would be more pragmatic. The issue is a straight out prohibition would limit, in the long term, innovation and any technical advances.

Coastal Monitoring

Salmon Farming

Steve provided a report 'Best Practice Guidelines for Salmon Farming Management'. A process is to be undertaken, informed by overseas experts as well as NIWA, Cawthron, members of the Sounds Advisory Group and Council. The report informs on the process to date. The visit by Professor Black encouraged people to start talking to one another again. Two sub-committees have been formed, one looking at best practice farm management and operational guidelines, the other developing monitoring and standards. Each sub group has had one meeting. Further meetings are proposed. It is hoped to have a draft of the guidelines ready by mid year.

Eric spoke on the group looking at farm management and operational guidelines. Eric advised they are focusing on the lifecycle of the farm. There are several headings under the lifecycle which King Salmon are going to make a first draft on. At the same time industry is looking at a code of practice for salmon farming, so there is discussion about how these fit together. Eric is to write the foreword for the guidelines. The next meeting will be in two weeks. Eric felt the December workshops are an important first step to get everyone talking.

Graeme Coates advised the codes of practice are moving at a faster pace and how would these link with the guidelines. Eric advised Mark Gillard is looking at that. These best practice guidelines are for salmon farming, hopefully all, not just King Salmon. Other finfish species are not included at this point.

Rob spoke on the group looking at monitoring and standards. The baseline hydrodynamic data is still in draft, which should be the precursor for the guidelines. They are still working with the Board of Enquiry and Supreme Court outcome, which is pending. What is the ability of the Sounds to deal with what is there and for what is to come? Where do the existing consent conditions sit with the guidelines being produced? Issues have been identified but meaningful dialogue has not been achieved as yet. Relationships in the group are positive.

Rob advised the guidelines are to be received as a draft and to be taken to the community as a draft.

Hydrodynamic Modelling

Steve provided a report 'Development of Hydrodynamic Models for the Marlborough Sounds'. He advised the modelling enables Council to understand why and where things are in the Sounds. NIWA are behind with timelines but are now putting urgency into this. Animated models are planned to be available on the Council website. The models will enable Council to better understand the flow of nutrients and how phytoplankton respond to that, as well as understanding the patterns of movements. Impacts in the future will be able to be modelled. Monthly monitoring is continuing which is providing powerful information now. Hopefully models will be delivered for the Queen Charlotte Sound by the end of May and for the Pelorus Sound by the end of June. These will come in the form of reports and some animations, to be provided to the Environment Committee meeting on 1 May.

Alan advised there is not a lot of good science and information in the Marlborough Sounds. Working up these best practice and monitoring guidelines, there is a need to put timeframes around it so you get outputs. When this good information comes in those things can be reviewed and adapted. Science is always behind operational. There is a need for patience. Rob questioned if Marlborough was unique in coming up with the baseline models. Alan advised Waikato region are doing some work. Graeme Coates advised Marlborough has gotten behind, but Marlborough is complex. Steve will give an update at the next meeting on the coastal monitoring strategy and where we are up to with collecting information in relation to the objectives, and the staged implementation of the strategy.

DOC Update

Robin provided a Department of Conservation update:

Staff

The full complement of staff for the Sounds is now in place. Leanne Flynn, who has received promotion as a result of the restructure, has been replaced by Joe Healey, who was employed on a short term contract. The morale of the staff based in the Sounds is at a high level compared to some other locations, it is reported.

Maud Island

Planning for the eradication of mice during the winter of 2014 continues. As the brodifacoum is being applied from the air a resource consent will be required. Derek Brown has been employed to coordinate the process. This operation probably means that the takahe will have to be removed from the island for a period.

The six public trips to Maud went ahead as per normal during January. All the groups saw the newly hatched takahe chicks and one group was very privileged to see orca. The numbers of visitors were down from the previous year to 122 adults and 8 children. Since then two other public groups have visited, Tennyson residents and Renwick Lions.

The annual visits to Maud Island by the schools in the Pelorus cluster are now being organized. These groups are very lucky to stay overnight and experience the prolific nocturnal wildlife on the island.

Spartina

The five person spartina team has started work and this will continue until mid March. This is a joint DOC/MDC project, with the numbers of plants found declining each year.

Blumine Island

In early December a selected group of students from Canterbury and Marlborough spent five days on Blumine Island sponsored by the Untouched World Foundation. They undertook monitoring and assisted staff with weed control. The following week an Outward Bound watch undertook track work for two days. The Outward Bound group also tidied up after a local school visited the island and, after persuasion, the school paid the cost of transporting two Outward Bound watches to the island, which is a great result.

A possum was reported on Blumine Island and this has now been caught. How it got there is unknown, with the closest land, Arapawa Island, supposedly possum free.

A public trip organized by the Marlborough Historic Society is planned on 23 February and as of 20 February over 40 people had booked on it.

Motuara Island

A rodent was reported on Motuara Island. After a rodent detection dog visit, the use of tracking tunnels and chew sticks, it was confirmed that no rodents were present. During the same period Pickersgill Island was checked, with no pests found.

Arapawa Island

The hunters, now based from Renwick, spent four weeks on Arapawa Island and for their efforts shot 120 goats and 5 pigs. This is well down on last year when 160 goats were shot. The 5 pigs were shot in the fenced reserve area.

Campgrounds

The first stage of the Momorangi Campground has now been completed. The planning and tendering for the second stage is well underway. A public event was held at Momorangi on 9 January involving the Minister of Conservation, Mr Nick Smith. He highlighted the desire to involve others in conservation, such as Kathmandu at Mistletoe Bay, and stressed the extra effort required to protect our native species. This event was supported by Te Atiawa and Eco World.

Cow Shed Bay and Kenepuru Heads campgrounds were well used over the summer, no doubt helped by the new toilets and shelters being open for their first summer. Some individual/s thought they should also benefit from the increased usage and fished out envelopes containing camping fees from the iron ranger. This was in spite of voluntary camp ground hosts being on site most of the time.

Marine

Around Christmas there were two marine mammal incidents which involved staff. In both cases the results are dead animals. One was in Tory Channel and the other in Double Cove. The fast ferry monitoring and the Long Island Marine Reserve has started and this will continue until March.

Queen Charlotte Track

The work on the Queen Charlotte Track has changed from mowing and vegetation clearance to spraying. Outward Bound has helped with maintaining the track by providing a watch in February.

During much of the summer there has been a volunteer camp ground host at Camp Bay and this has ensured the camp ground is maintained to a higher standard and a higher fee compliance achieved. During this summer there have been few incidents reported.

A start has been made on the annual \$50,000 upgrade, this year from Tawa Saddle towards the Pines in Endeavour Inlet. Two staff will be involved in this project for approximately eight weeks.

King Salmon has provided \$10,000 toward the cost of a viewing platform for the Regal Rimu close to Furneaux Lodge. Once a plan is accepted it will be costed, materials purchased and the carpentry course at Nelson Marlborough Institute of Technology will pre cut it and assemble it on site. It has been indicated that Outward Bound will help carry the pre cut material from the barge to the construction site.

Summer Program

Numerous activities were undertaken in the Sounds for the DOC coordinated Marlborough Summer Program. Those that took place in the Sounds were:

1. Six trips to Maud Island - DOC and Pelorus Tours
2. Trip to Pelorus Bridge to learn about the bats - DOC and Forest & Bird
3. Tramp to Emerald Pool - Marlborough Tramping Club
4. Trip to Kaipupu - Kaipupu Point Mainland Island Society and DOC
5. Guided trip to Blumine Island - Marlborough Historic Society and DOC

Save the Birds

All the indicators are that 2014 will be a mast year, when beech trees produce heaps of seed. This results in an increased number of rats and mice, followed by an increased number of stoats. Later in the year, the rats and mice will suffer from food shortages, as will the stoats at a later time, and increased predation of birds will occur.

It has been announced that the government will spend \$21 million to protect the native species. The only area where this money will be spent in the Sounds is the area between Nydia and Tennyson Inlet, and then only if monitoring indicates an increased level of pests. This is basically the same area that was treated prior to Christmas and, although the results appear to be successful, the final monitoring report is still being worked on. Early indications are that immediately following the operation rat numbers were very low and the possum numbers below the equivalent of 4% of the residual trap catch.

General Discussion

Whale Survey

Joe thanked the Department of Conservation for their support regarding the whale survey. Last year the weather was against them. The programme has been operating for 10 years. There have been 15

match ups in that 10 year period with surveys in Australia and the Cook Islands. There is hope that the numbers are building. An oil company which is funding the project has committed funding for another two years.

Notes of the Sounds Advisory Group Public Meeting, held at Port Underwood, on Monday 24 February 2014 commencing at 1.15 pm

Present: Bruce Hearn, Jill Hearn, Irene Ross, Tamati Smith, Maureen Joyce, Roy Joyce, Kevin Sharp, Naida Sharp, Ruth Simonsen, Ross Simonsen, Diane Cranfield, John Cranfield, Bryon Gleeson, Wendy Simonsen, Sara Roush, Councillor Trevor Hook (Chairperson), Ken Roush, Victor Koller, Joe Heberley, Monyeen Wedge, Rob Schuckard, Tim Greenhough, Eric Jorgensen, Judy Hellstrom, Poneke Rene, Robin Cox and Councillor Graeme Barsanti.

MDC Staff: Alan Johnson, Steve Ulrich and Kay Leach (Secretary)

Apologies: David Whyte, Brian Denny, Sue Denny, John Davison, Mara Davison, Pam Saunders, Lawrie Saunders, Graeme Coates, Kristen Gerard, David Hayes, Ron Sutherland, Ian Mitchell, Rachel Drake, Linda Booth, Raymond Smith, Councillors David Oddie, Jenny Andrews, Laressa Shenfield and Peter Jerram

Trevor introduced himself as Chairman of the Sounds Advisory Group and spoke on the role of the Group. Members of the Group introduced themselves and spoke on their representation on the Group. He then opened the floor to the public in attendance.

Neighbourhood Watch

Sara advised she is head of Neighbourhood Watch in Port Underwood. Previously there had been a good support system through Picton Police. There are no longer meetings during the year. She understood the role had been taken over by Council, but Picton and the Sounds has been overlooked. As a group they do not know where to go from here. Graeme thought the Police (Russell Smith) is picking up Neighbourhood Support again. Graeme will investigate this.

Graeme, following the meeting, advised Neighbourhood Watch is under Council's Emergency Management Team based at the Emergency Operations Centre. Graeme is communicating with Mary at Picton Police Station to keep the Sounds communications open through her.

Forestry/Roading

Ken had received an email from a Port Underwood Association member regarding forestry and roading. His main concern is the use of the public roads for forest extraction. If the use of public roads is granted, he had concerns about whether the usage would be adequately monitored and enforced, or if indeed it is enforceable at all. The email talked of the use of private roads as opposed to public roads. He would like to see the improvement of the private road to alleviate the use of public road through the Port Underwood area itself. He would invite Council to facilitate the internal road network through a collaborative effort by key stakeholders, Council, industry and the community. Tamiti advised the private road in question is not suitable for logging trucks.

Irene congratulated Council on the Smart Maps on the website. Fantastic.

Irene noted there is a lot of noise from the road due to forest harvesting. Her understanding is the forest will fall if it is not harvested. Who would be responsible if the trees fall into the sea. The forest needs to be harvested. She felt if the truck is licensed it could not be stopped from driving on the road. Irene spoke of an old County Council consent for planting which had a condition precluding the logs being trucked out, but they are being taken out by road. She questioned if Council looked at the

original consent before allowing harvesting. Trevor spoke on the history of the consent Ken was discussing, where six months following consent approval an attachment was made advising 'if Council approved' the logs could be taken out by road. That application was before the Assets & Services Committee last week and the application was declined. The logs must be barged. Irene felt discussion should continue for the sake of subsequent forestry harvesting. Trevor spoke of an informal agreement regarding a maximum of 10 trucks per day, certain hours, etc. Council needs to deal with each case as it comes up as consents have many differing conditions. Council is living with a legacy of issues. This is why there is a need to get the district plan as right as possible. Joe felt this is a safety issue. He would not have liked to have come across a logging truck on the road. Tourists also use this road.

Tamati advised he managed Underwood Farm, Rayonaire Forest and Whataroa. He advised the log quality at Whataroa is pretty good. The best timber is kept for the domestic market. There is the potential for 40-50% of the Whataroa wood to the domestic market. The reality is the logistics to make it happen. It is proposed to utilise the existing agreement with Council, i.e. 10 trucks a day.

Graeme queried Department of Conservation rules regarding the foreshore if a barge site is proposed. Robin advised they would need a licence from the Department of Conservation and resource consent from Council. The Department of Conservation would look at archaeological sites as part of their assessment. The log handling area would be the flat area behind Sounds Foreshore Reserve.

Alan queried what is the cheaper option, barge or road. Tamati advised road extraction is the most cost effective option.

Marine Significant Areas

Bruce questioned if there are any areas in Port Underwood proposed to be designated marine significant areas. Steve thought there may be but could not remember the detail. Alan advised the RMA requires Council to put a level of protection on all things that are significant in terms of natural features. No decision has been made on those areas as yet. The community would be consulted over those areas. The 'Ecologically Significant Marine Sites in Marlborough' publication is available on the Council website. Eric thought Council is looking at dredging and bottom trawling. It was felt trawling and dredging, whether amateur or professional, could be excluded from any Sounds areas because of the damage to the environment. Alan advised Council needs to balance environmental concerns with economics and rights of existing fisheries through the legislation.

It was requested that East Bay Brachiopods be included as a priority. Extending mussel farming could endanger this specie.

Landscape

Trevor asked for the public opinion regarding the colour pallet and reflectivity for new houses in the Sounds proposed by Council. Bruce advised when he had built, Carter Holt Harvey would not warranty timber painted a dark colour. Trevor wanted to know if this is really an issue in the Sounds. The general consensus was that it is not an issue. Eric considered there is a need to protect aesthetics/amenity values, including recreational opportunities, of the Sounds for the future. Trevor advised there will be more thought and discussion.

Management of Commercial Forestry

Trevor asked if all new commercial forestry in the Sounds should be prohibited. Is this only exotic species? There is no clarification as yet. If you look at exotic that would include all exotic, including hardwoods. If prohibited is to be put in the Plan it is there for the length and life of the Plan (20-30 years), unless there is a private plan change, which is difficult to do. This would prohibit indigenous forestry and there is a good indigenous forestry plan, low yield, but works well. Tamati felt the wording of the survey could have been better. Prohibition of new commercial forestry is too narrow. There are not large areas left for new forestry in the Sounds. It was questioned if there should be a guideline regarding percentage of native to exotic forests in the Sounds. If this is the case, if someone planted native species it would free up other areas to become exotic forest.

There is an issue of sedimentation in water around harvesting of forests. Trevor felt there is required to be consideration of mitigating effects. One view was that mussel farms create more sedimentation than forestry. There is a need for investigation into sedimentation. It was felt a major effect of sedimentation to Port Underwood comes from the Wairau River.

It was felt the Council has a social responsibility to the community. Commercial forestry creates a lot of employment. Trevor noted economic data is on the Council website under Smart and Connected. Alan noted forestry was strong through the recession and took Marlborough through the recessionary period.

Judy spoke on a Council workshop on wilding pines. A paper was presented by Paul Millen on alternatives to conifers. Totara came up trumps in the workshop. Rob noted totara are complex to get going, but then they are okay. Do you need consent to plant natives? Would you be able to harvest? Robin noted if you farm native trees you can harvest whenever you want.

It was suggested to plant a totara at the same time as poisoning wilding pines. Judy felt the funding would probably be prohibitive.

Cemeteries

Ruth spoke of her family history in Port Underwood. There are family burial plots around the area. She would like the Council to retain information of these sites on the website. These are private cemeteries. Alan advised Ruth to look at the Smart Maps to see what is available. Ruth is concerned that once this generation is gone the knowledge will be gone as well. If this information could go on to the website it would be protected. Graeme advised Ruth to advise Council of sites. Nic Crous at the Council will be requested to make contact with Ruth. These burial sites need protection, particularly damage from falling trees. Trevor noted if a cemetery is on private land there is not a lot Council can do. Robin noted that sites prior to 1900 could be registered as an archaeological site. Alan noted if Council know of these sites they can be considered when dealing with resource consent issues.

Dog Exercise Area

Robin advised of a complication in Hakahaka Bay where the community sought the Department of Conservation to put up no dog signs and then immediately adjacent to that Sounds Foreshore Reserve is a Council dog exercise area. There is a conflict here. Council land is esplanade reserve, the no dog area is Sounds Foreshore Reserve, with these being a continuation of the same piece of coast. The only way people can get to the dog exercise area is across Sounds Foreshore Reserve. There is no public access to the dog exercise area. There is a need for consultation between the community, the Department of Conservation and Council to rectify this situation.

There is a historical problem of dogs allowed to run loose in the Bay. Dogs are allowed to exercise on the beach and are allowed off their leash under control, because it is designated as road. Dogs must not disturb the wildlife. Alan thought decisions such as this should be made via the residents association. Graeme will investigate this.

Graeme, following the meeting, advised he had spoken with Council staff and Maata Waka and will deal directly with Irene Ross and the Chairman of the Port Underwood Association.

Wilding Pines on Road Reserve

Wendy advised that above Hakahaka Bay there is forestry land which has now gone back into regenerating bush, with some wilding pines. Who is responsible for the trees currently not harvested and wilding pines? Is there not something in their consent that they must spray or get rid of these wilding pines? If they are on road reserve, Graeme will get Marlborough Roads to look into this. Robin advised this is a classic example of forestry planting over the boundaries or too close.

Road Marking

Ken noted there is a lot of tourist traffic on the road. Often they are used to driving on the other side of the road. He would like to see directional arrows on the paved roading, possibly around Rarangi/Whites Bay. Also between Waikawa and Hakahaka Bay. It was suggested the 50 kilometre signs could be changed to 'keep left' signs, as it is impossible to drive faster than 50 kilometres on this road. Graeme will take this issue to the Road Safety Committee.

Open Drain

Wendy had an issue with a drain on Hakahaka Road which comes down from Tumbledown Bay Road. Recently it was requested for this drain to be filled in because it was a danger. It had been packed with hardcore, but when it rains it comes away again. This area had been tarsealed before. There had been erosion, which had been fixed, but new tarseal had not been provided. Wendy would like to see this area tarsealed, as previously. Graeme will investigate this.

Rubbish Bags

Wendy questioned why Sounds properties do not get rubbish bags. Trevor advised Sounds residents do not pay rates for this. They could, as a community, apply to receive rubbish bags through the Annual Plan process, but there would be a rate charged for this. The most cost effective option would be to buy rubbish bags at the supermarket, squash them down as small as possible and take them to the transfer station, where charge is made on size. Council bags are designed for kerbside collection only.

Dog Fencing

Wendy spoke of information received from Council which advised if a dog resided on a property that the property had to be fenced. Graeme advised if a dog is unmanageable or dangerous then the property must be fenced. Graeme will investigate this.

Freedom Camping

It was questioned who to contact to advise of freedom camping. Trevor advised to ring Council with details re location, description and possibly vehicle registration. This would be anonymous. A ranger would move them on. It was requested a sign be placed at the bottom of Hakahaka Hill where the turnoff is to Tumbledown Bay Road advising no freedom camping past this point. Trevor advised it would be illegal to state past this point. Alan advised there would then be a requirement for further signs in other areas. Trevor advised Council needs to know the extent of issues around freedom camping in order to make decisions. The more information Council had the better the picture for what is happening around the region. Please do not hesitate to ring Council. Robin felt the wording 'freedom camping' is wrong. To some this means you can do whatever you like wherever you like. He thought there is two components, one being contained campers who could stay more or less anywhere for two nights, and then are the vans and cars who just stop without containment. There has not been a differentiation between the two. Those in the vans and cars should only stay at sites that have toilets, including Department of Conservation campsites, which charge a nominal fee. Robin noted an article in the paper which advised only 20 infringement notices had been issued. He suggested notification of illegal campers would greatly increase these figures.