

Tasman Environment Plan Review

Tasman Coastal Group

Meetings: Monday 12 April 2021 and Tuesday 22 June 2021

Notes:

The inception meeting in April for the Tasman Coastal Group started with a welcome and round of introductions, setting the scene for the wide range of views and experience within the room. It was noted that not all stakeholder groups were able to attend this session and follow up meetings would be held.

Follow up meetings were held in June to capture inputs from the recreational and commercial user groups.

All group meetings discussed the key issues, from their perspectives, that need to be addressed within the coastal space. The following is a collation of what we heard:

- Aquaculture and fishing:
 - Aquaculture and diversification of aquaculture activities.
 - Overharvesting / overfishing – availability of kai moana.
 - Spat facilities onshore in Golden Bay.
 - Security of tenure for aquaculture, ability to allow development and improvement, certainty for funding.
 - Observation of increase in fish stocks in Tasman Bay and role that marine farms play in providing habitat, but a need for more to be done to support fish stocks e.g. structures and artificial reefs. Careful consideration is required before establishing artificial reefs.
 - Fish releases by Cawthron have helped with recreational fish catches. More fish varieties are being caught.
- Water quality:
 - Sedimentation from land based activities, affecting coastal water quality and biodiversity. Getting worse each year. This is a matter for integration between the coastal portfolio and other portfolios that are part of the Environment Plan review process. See also work done in Marlborough and with Sea Change (Hauraki Gulf).
 - Contamination from urban and rural land uses. Pollution and impacts on marine mammals.
 - Spartina removal has increased sediment release.
- Structures and infrastructure:
 - Development allowed on the coastal margin, including coastal protection structures.
 - Management of coastal infrastructure on the coastal margin.
 - Infrastructure of significance to coastal area e.g. ports. Purpose of marine facilities especially Port Motueka and Taroahe.
 - Need for more facilities in Port Motueka including dry storage, boat maintenance areas, pump out facilities, wash down and parking. Options for reclamation to enlarge area and potential for spatial planning to guide future development. Port area is too small for current use, future as a viable port at risk.
 - Appropriate development at Port Motueka favoured over alternative neighbouring sites.
 - Loss of functional Port area's due to other developments and uses.

- Need for more port facilities generally within the region and linked to more boat ramp access. Lack of parking, long waits to use current ramps.
- Need more moorings especially at Motueka, dry boat stacks.
- Infrastructure for all types of activity including boat ramps for access and hard stands for cleaning. Also carparking at boat ramps and port areas. See also the Regional Boat Ramp Study.
- Need to consider future of older jetties/wharves e.g. Collingwood and the need to ensure safety. Old wharves are well used during summer, particularly Waitapu and Westhaven. Derelict wharves can be a navigational hazard.
- Need for (long term) strategic planning at Ports Tarakohe and Motueka
- Population growth and general increase in recreational boating has led to pressure on current facilities.
- Need to provide for engineering, salvage, barging, delivery, bus charters, pump out, fuel and storage in association with commercial marine activities.
- Coastal hazards and climate change:
 - Management of coastal hazards and climate change effects, including sea level rise. Relationship to terrestrial land uses at risk.
 - Climate change, adaption and cumulative effects – how to better manage effects that build up over time.
 - Need to manage many different responses to climate change – sea level rise, acidification, storminess.
- Biodiversity and biosecurity:
 - Environmental protection and restoration of significant marine habitats. Need to identify a range of areas to be restored e.g. sand dunes, seabed, eroded areas, wetlands, salt marshes etc.
 - Biodiversity protection and climate change effects, including loss of estuaries and wetlands.
 - Estuaries – vital issue for district, not well understood or managed currently, degraded, recipients of sediment, development on edges. Important areas for coastal hazard protection.
 - Need to know more about significant marine sites – similar to the work done for the Marlborough Environment Plan, knowledge about species, habitats etc, protection of remnant sites.
 - Protection and enhancement of biodiversity, environmental compensation and protection of values for development.
 - Bio-remediation and contribution to aquaculture.
 - Lack of knowledge – what is there and in what state, ecosystem management.
 - Climate change adaption – coastal and watercourses.
 - Science needed to back up local knowledge and clearly show what areas are irreparably damaged, which areas could be restored and which merit protection.
 - Tourism is based on natural values and supports limitations on activities affecting natural character and wildlife (environment).
- Integration:
 - Need for integration, Mountains to Sea approach, including the need to deal with issues holistically. Ecosystems management and fisheries management.
 - Coastal access integrated with active transport routes and other recreational activities. Boardwalks & bike tracks linked to coastal access points e.g. Kaiteriteri & Mapua.
 - Integrate use of areas through strategic planning – consistent messages from Council.

- Effects on cultural values and kai moana.
- Other issues:
 - Policy drafting and industry positivity.
 - Sewage treatment with sea level rise and cultural issues.
 - Integration across statutes, “incoherency” between RMA and Fisheries Act. Hard to be strategic when the legislation is not. Overlaps of responsibility especially with DOC in relation to the Able Tasman and its coastal edge. Ability to manage different uses on land and water with multiple management approaches.
 - Areas of particular interest – Separation Point, no anchor zone to protect sea floor, corals no longer in evidence. Options for artificial reefs.
 - Specific projects including conservation and restoration management. Contribution of marine farmers to improvements.
 - Tasman Bio Strategy looking at sediment and seabed disturbance. Not all sediment is bad, fine sediment is the issue with smothering and resuspension.
 - Top of the South Marine Biosecurity project – biosecurity threats, lack of infrastructure to clean boats especially recreational vessels.
 - Safety – ability to get people off the water quickly.
 - Vehicles on beaches (or not) and dogs.
 - Noise and light effects.
 - Need for education.
 - Rubbish tips in estuaries, all mapped now, ability to remediate.
 - Resilience – of industries to change, of the environment to deal with change.
 - Concern that there is not enough space for new moorings. Conflicts between mooring users.
 - New marinas would be good but very expensive.
 - Need to ensure zones and rules enable key facilities.
 - Opportunities for coastal transport / ferry links and supporting on-shore facilities for shelter and parking. Mapua, Motueka and Kaiteriteri are potential sites which would require all tide access. Ferry terminals should link to active transport routes.
 - Provide for temporary marine recreational activities and supporting onshore facilities e.g. toilets and eating places.
 - Limitations on using Port Tarakohe as an alternative base due to controls on commercial tourism.
 - Need to ensure coastal structures like artificial reefs do not affect surf breaks.

The April meeting included a larger group and a longer meeting time and thus was able to extend the discussion beyond issues. The additional discussion included:

Information gathering underway:

- Tasman Landscapes Study – areas and their values, threats to values
- Coastal Environment and Natural Character Study – areas and their values, threats to values
- Aquaculture Planning Fund project to review industry needs, and then a second stage to look at the effects of these needs.
- NZCPS requirement for strategic plan for the coastal environment relating to ‘appropriate’ activities
- Significant Biodiversity Sites – TDC is looking to do a study similar to that done in Marlborough.
- Restoration site potential – looking to work with restoration groups to identify restoration sites.

- Biodiversity – this workstream crosses across the Environment Plan work and will include looking at values on land, river margins, wetlands, estuarine and coastal
- Public Access – another topic that crosses over workstreams and will include locations where vehicles may or may not be appropriate.
- Marine Facility needs investigation.

Information required and gaps in knowledge to be explored:

- Significant Biodiversity Sites – group keen on this. Funding to come in next financial year. Group keen on ensuring ground truthing. Want to identify both what is still remaining for protection and areas that have the potential for recovery or restoration. Need to ensure the scale of information is sufficient to enable mapping for protection and restoration.
- Want to be able to target restoration areas – need to know more about the profile of sediment types and biodiversity values. Basis of Marlborough work at present and some work in Tasman and Golden Bays.
- MBIE is interested if habitat recovery is viable.
- Sea surface – marine birds and mammals, insufficient knowledge of habitat use patterns, feeding areas.
- Need to review and update the TRMP schedule of areas of significant conservation value.
- Sea level rise – need more knowledge on impacts on estuaries, loss of salt marsh, impacts on margins, options for retreat, stopbanks, etc. Also more on adaption and retreat options and funding issues. Links to spatial planning, policy frameworks and funding. Private land ownership issues and impacts on property value.
- Ecosystem services work – previous project not completed and need to establish values.
- Tsunami study – historical data, risks e.g. industry on Waimea edge.
- Lidar – resolution levels.
- DOC work on coastal infrastructure retreat.
- Iwi Management Plans – more work needed in this area to advance direction and link to cultural mapping. Some iwi more advanced than others and limits on resourcing. Interested in support and funding options. Also links to claims and resolution through hearings is taking a long time with the national process currently stalled.
- Vehicles on beaches and dogs – not enough information on where the issues. Currently only monitored due to complaints. Need to explore options for education and physical restriction (always or seasonally). Need to offer alternatives where access is restricted.
- Community / Recreation desire and use – need to know more about the variety of uses, spatial areas, conflicts e.g. jet skis, boat launching areas, resource limitations, biophysical limitations.
- Sewage discharges from boats – shortage of facilities to manage, discharges at distance and depth, requirements for holding tanks.
- Mussel Farm information – need realistic data on benefits of the industry (not just focussing on negative views) and monitoring data. AMA management plans and advisory group inputs.
- Structures – need reassessment of existing structures including boat sheds. Approach to public moorings to replace anchoring areas.
- Water quality – more information on pollution and nutrients. Closely linked to settlements e.g. metals, also dairy and horticulture impacts. Sewage quality not currently identified as a major issue.
- National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry – can restrict forestry to protect the coastal environment.

- Bioremediation options – this is off putting where consents are needed to do positive projects. Plan needs to provide for restoration efforts.
- Detailed hydrology information – Marlborough has done this. Need knowledge for restoration feasibility.
- Motueka integrated catchment management study – freshwater catchments (waahi), effect of freshwater plumes.
- National Science Challenge – Tasman and Golden Bays Synthesis Study.
- Esplanade reserves and strips – usually thought of as used for access but can provide other roles. Information gap on where esplanades have been taken and where waivers granted. Opportunity for sea level rise to be countered by taking esplanades based on datum.
- Need to consider effects of filling low areas e.g. Lower Queen Street – restrict this to enable coastal edge migration.
- Flood gates impeding fish passage.

The current Tasman Resource Management Plan - what works well and what needs to change:

- The Environment Court decision on Tasman Aquaculture is viewed as providing well resolved provisions and AMA's.
- Point source discharges are well managed.
- Aquaculture provisions are working now but are not forward looking – need to better consider projected timeframes, spaces and species, and tenure of farms for certainty.
- Regional Policy Statement is a good document but has not been well implemented. Provides a good basis for this work and integration with Nelson at a high level.
- Mountains to Sea integrated approach needs to work well, and consider cumulative effect of permitted activities as well as those seeking consent. Need to build in outcomes focus.
- Need to be clear about where development can go and where protection is expected – strategic approach.
- Need to deal with education, enforcement and compliance issues.
- Need to develop and integrate coastal occupancy charges.
- Need an integrated spatial plan.
- Need to comprehensively deal with coastal structures and shore hardening.
- Need to look at how Nelson can assist with funding works in Tasman area.