

Attachment A: Comparison between proposed NES Marine Aquaculture and Auckland Unitary Plan

Preferred Option Component of NES	Relevant Section of Unitary Plan	Does the Unitary Plan follow this approach?	Degree of Change and Implications for Unitary Plan	Agree/Disagree
<p>Re-Consenting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - replacement consents for existing farms = non-notified restricted discretionary activity - limited set of matters of discretion - non-notification clause - specific criteria to be considered and 'existing farm' 	<p>F2 General Coastal Marine Zone (GCM)</p> <p>Table F2.19.9 – A116</p>	<p>Yes – for activity status. Re-consenting for aquaculture activities is a restricted discretionary across the General Coastal Marine Zone and all overlays.</p> <p>The matters of discretion that apply in the Unitary Plan differ from the NES. The Unitary Plan matters are broad and include mana whenua values, ecological values, water quality. The NES matters are more specific in terms of ecology, e.g. regarding marine mammals and seabirds, and do not include effects on water quality.</p> <p>The additional matter of discretion in the NES applying to 'outstanding areas' does not include 'high natural character areas' or areas of significant ecological value as per s6 of RMA.</p> <p>No for notification - Non-notification is proposed, whereas UP has standard RMA tests for notification.</p> <p>The Unitary Plan has no specific criteria for 'existing' farms (other than those established prior to Sept 2013).</p>	<p>Medium Impact</p> <p>As the Unitary Plan follows this same approach as the proposed NES regarding re-consenting in terms of activity status, therefore no change is required here.</p> <p>The limited matters of discretion and assessment criteria would need to be consistent with the NES, however. Currently these address slightly different subject matters (discussed).</p> <p>Potentially different matters of discretion applying to outstanding natural character areas than high natural character areas (currently these are treated the same in Unitary Plan).</p> <p>Would need to add a new provision regarding non-notification.</p> <p>The criteria for 'existing farms' would also need to be aligned with the NES. Perhaps this could be in the form of a standard.</p>	<p>The matters of discretion are insufficient in terms of ecological values and water quality.</p> <p>The NES definition of 'outstanding' areas does not include Unitary Plan's high natural character areas and areas of significant ecological value.</p> <p>Do not agree with non-notification clause and prefer that standard RMA tests apply (as in Unitary Plan), particularly for larger marine farms.</p>

Attachment A: Comparison between proposed NES Marine Aquaculture and Auckland Unitary Plan

Preferred Option Component of NES	Relevant Section of Unitary Plan	Does the Unitary Plan follow this approach?	Degree of Change and Implications for Unitary Plan	Agree/Disagree
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - small scale realignments that do not exceed 1/3 of a 10ha marine farm - RD activities <i>(except within outstanding areas and areas with significant ecological value).</i> - limited set of matters of discretion - farm must not have been realigned in past 10 years - particularly where realignment would reduce adverse effects on the environment 	<p>F2 General Coastal Marine Zone</p> <p>Table F2.19.9 – A117</p>	<p>The Unitary Plan has the same restricted discretionary activity status within GCM Zone, but has a discretionary activity status for minor realignment within overlays.</p> <p>The Unitary Plan has a threshold of 1/3 of the farm for 'minor realignment', which is consistent with the NES. However the UP does not have a size threshold.</p> <p>The matters of discretion differ. As above, the NES matters of discretion are more specific and the Unitary Plan matters are broader in nature, such as ecological values and coastal processes generally.</p> <p>Unitary Plan - outstanding vs high natural character – Unitary Plan treats both the same but only 'outstanding' areas are excluded from NES. AUP includes SEA-M2 etc., which are not mentioned in the NES.</p>	<p>Medium impact.</p> <p>The threshold for realignments would need to be changed to less than 10ha.</p> <p>The overlay activity statuses (other than for overlays excluded by the NES) would need to be changed from D to RD.</p> <p>The matters of discretion and assessment criteria would need to be changed to be consistent with the NES.</p> <p>Potentially different activity statuses applying to outstanding natural character areas than high natural character areas (currently these are treated the same in Unitary Plan).</p>	<p>Agree it is appropriate for small scale realignments within General Coastal Management Zone to be restricted discretionary.</p> <p>Agree that outstanding areas and areas of significant ecological value be excluded from the NES realignment provisions, and consider that our high natural character areas also be excluded.</p> <p>Disagree that NES matters of discretion do not address water quality</p>

Attachment A: Comparison between proposed NES Marine Aquaculture and Auckland Unitary Plan

Preferred Option Component of NES	Relevant Section of Unitary Plan	Does the Unitary Plan follow this approach?	Degree of Change and Implications for Unitary Plan	Agree/Disagree
<p>Change of species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - non-notified RD where location and area of farm remain the same - Four categories apply: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No physical change to farming structure 2. Change in sub-surface structure 3. Addition of non-fed species 4. Addition of species to finfish farm - Categories 1 and 2 are considered lower impact and have a limited set of matters of discretion, whereas categories 3 and 4 include more comprehensive matters. 	<p>F2 General Coastal Marine Zone</p> <p>Table F2.19.9</p>	<p>No. Table F2.19.9 does not specify an activity status for change of species.</p> <p>This would likely fall under A119 Experimental Aquaculture (if less than 1ha) or A120 Aquaculture activities not otherwise provided for, which is D or NC in overlays.</p>	<p>Medium impact</p> <p>This would need to be specifically provided for in Table F2.19.9</p> <p>Standards and matters of discretion would also need to be imposed for the species and categories that apply.</p>	<p>Agree in general, as this is a more detailed approach than the Unitary Plan currently provides.</p>

Attachment A: Comparison between proposed NES Marine Aquaculture and Auckland Unitary Plan

Preferred Option Component of NES	Relevant Section of Unitary Plan	Does the Unitary Plan follow this approach?	Degree of Change and Implications for Unitary Plan	Agree/Disagree
<p>On farm biosecurity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Require all marine farms (existing and new) to prepare, implement and keep up to date biosecurity management plans by 2025. 	<p>F2 General Coastal Marine Zone</p> <p>Table F2.19.9</p> <p>Biosecurity Act 1993</p>	<p>No</p> <p>Table F2.19.9 does not specifically provide for on farm biosecurity. Biosecurity plans could be required under existing matters of discretion for the effects on ecology.</p> <p>Aquaculture policies refer to biosecurity risks related to gear and stock movements.</p>	<p>Medium / high impact</p> <p>This would need to be specifically provided for in Table F2.19.9 along with relevant standards.</p>	<p>This is a more prescriptive approach than the Unitary Plan currently provides.</p> <p>Significant monitoring and resourcing implications</p> <p>Should this be a regional council matter alone, given central government responsibilities under the Biosecurity Act</p>