

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Submitter Number/ Point</b>	<b>Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>
Euan Macduff	1/1		Value of mangroves; protect eco values Seeks that mangroves be left alone in the environment.
Noel Warren Doherty	2/1		Value of mangroves; questions eco value Questions the ecological value of mangroves as Captain James Cook's charts of the Firth of Thames made no mention of mangroves; if there were none back then it may be that ecologically speaking they don't matter.
Thomas Francis	3/1		Mangrove removal: supports Seeks that mangroves not be protected, and that they be removed before they have time to become established. Opposes the manpower and cost associated with successfully policing protection.
R Maxwell	4/1		Supports the plan change Generally supports all the proposed changes; channels, wharves and swimming areas should be kept clear of mangroves.
Pamela Denise Fisher	5/1	16.4.5-6	Mangrove removal: supports Supports 16.4.5-6; opposed to the random distribution of mangroves, the environment is adversely affected when growth is uncontrolled.
Jenny & Mike Franklin	6/1		Mangrove removal: supports Supports the proposed change and supports stronger provision for the removal of mangroves; do not want the mangroves to intrude further into their secluded beach area. (Bayswater address).
Murray Callister	7/1		Resource consent for removal Seeks a tighter set of rules that relate to resource consents.
Murray Callister	7/2		Resource consent for removal Opposes. Seeks that there is a requirement for a consent; there must be consent on a permit subject to conditions.
Murray Callister	7/3		Seedling Removal Seeks that there must be a consent for the removal of seedlings; that there are tighter rules.
Murray Callister	7/4		Value of mangroves; protect eco values Seeks that mangroves be preserved as parts of land and seascapes representing the original character of New Zealand; preserve our natural heritage.
David Steward	8/1		Mangrove removal: supports Seeks that mangrove removal be allowed; mangroves should be declared an exotic and noxious weed, their effect on erosion is minimal and they are a health hazard.
Mrs Irene Brodie	9/1		Mangrove removal: supports Supports mangrove management if developmental issues have created the problem.
Mrs Irene Brodie	9/2		Mangrove removal: supports Supports a co-ordinated effort to keep over production at bay and manage areas of disturbance. Mangroves have an important role to play but can take over and spoil areas.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Graeme Alicen Van Duyn	10/1	Mangrove removal: Tamaki River	Supports. Seeks that mangroves be cleared annually and the area restored to waterway. Councils have not taken ownership of the problems arising from development and the prolific growth of mangroves. The mangroves should not be allowed to choke and impede waterways without consideration for the overall life of the water.
Doug Paterson	11/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports allowing limited mangrove removal and hand removal of seedlings. Mangrove encroachment is affecting access to structures and public safety.
Philip Robert Parry	12/1	Supports mangrove protection	Supports the retention of mangroves and the ARC continuing support for the preservation of mangroves.
Angela Plimmer	13/1	Supports the plan change	Supports the proposed changes to the Coastal Plan.
Angela Plimmer	13/2	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports controlling and limiting mangroves to existing areas, preferably by hand removal, in recognition that mangroves are beneficial ecologically but in modern times are expanding at an alarming rate owing to anthropogenic processes.
Angela Plimmer	13/3	Mangrove removal: mechanical methods	Opposes mechanical removal.
Angela Plimmer	13/4	Sediment issues	Opposes trying to return mangrove areas to what may once have been sandy beaches, unless the coastal dynamics are altered first, i.e. storm water runoff is diverted, extra nutrient loading diverted, causeways replaced with bridges and flow regimes altered, so mangroves no longer viable in an area.
Ross Herry Cook	14/1	Supports the plan change	Supports the plan change; there is a need to address the affects of mangrove spread over the last decades.
Ross Herry Cook	14/2	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks an automatic right of removal back to the 1957 level subject to confirming information such as photographs existing, provided that coastal erosion protection afforded by mangroves is not compromised.
Ross Herry Cook	14/3	Sediment issues	Supports moves to better control runoff and other activities that result in silting, and the resulting colonisation and re-colonisation by mangroves.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Ross Herry Cook	14/4	Value of mangroves; questions eco value	Seeks that the ARC accept that the mangrove that has invaded our estuaries is largely a monoculture that is only to a limited degree ecologically beneficial as a nursery for marine life, and to therefore minimise the 'red tape' and costs attached to applications for mangrove removal, unless there is clear evidence that the application is not in the best interests of both applicant and environment. There is a risk that the mangrove will become to the estuaries what the possum has to the forest; an invading difficult to eradicate pest.
Robert Rees Richards	15/1	16.4.6 Mangrove removal: supports	Supports 16.4.6 ; ratepayers and residents associations as well as other community groups should be fully involved in any given areas of mangrove removal.
Robert Rees Richards	15/2	16.4.11 Vehicle use	Opposes in part 16.4.11. Seeks that vehicles used for the removal of mangroves be allowed access to coastal marine areas.
Robert Rees Richards	15/3	16.5.12.1 Non-notification and non-notification of affected parties	Opposes in part 16.5.12.1. Seeks that ratepayers and residents associations or other community groups provide input and be consulted; that the ARC not have sole control over these matters.
Robert Rees Richards	15/4	16.5.19 Restricted Coastal Activities	Opposes 16.5.19. The limit of the mangrove removal may well depend on mangrove colonisation where it can be identified from historical records, including aerial or other photos that mangroves are growing in areas where they were previously absent (in the last 50 years).
Robert Rees Richards	15/5	16.5.20 Restricted Coastal Activities	Areas of this size on the foreshore or seabed could be given Coastal Protection Area 1 status where it is deemed necessary by marine biologists with boardwalk access supplied by ARC rates money.
Robert Rees Richards	15/6	16.6.6/7/8 Other Methods: Sediment issues	Supports 16.6.6/7/8; all three methods will increase public awareness of the reasons for the proliferation of unnatural mangrove growth.
Sheryl Pulman	16/1	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Opposes the essentially passive approach of the Council to the control of mangroves (noxious weeds); this is inappropriate. Seeks an active plan to progressively remove the mangroves that are now threading to clog out inner harbours.
Sheryl Pulman	16/2	Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs	Seeks an active plan to progressively remove mangroves along the Wattle Downs reserve area (similar to that undertaken by the Papakura District Council) before the beaches are destroyed beyond redemption by mangroves.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested	
Sheryl Pulman	16/3		Opposes the plan change	Does not support the specific measures proposed by the ARC because they are totally inadequate to solve the current infestation problem. It is not sufficient to rely upon foreshore users and local residents to take responsibility for the problem by permitting them to remove very small sized mangroves from specific areas.
Sheryl Pulman	16/4		Mangrove removal: supports	Supports controlling the spread of mangroves. Does not support the specific measures proposed by the ARC as they are considered inadequate.
Ian John Grant	17/1	16.1	Resource consent for removal	Opposes in part 16.1. Supports the proposed plan change but seeks the addition of the following paragraph: <i><u>"Application for controlled activities, restricted discretionary activities or discretionary activities made by a local body approved volunteer organisation shall be free for the initial application. Additional applications for areas covered by the initial application, restricted coastal activities or non-complying activities shall occur normal fees as set out by the ARC at the said time."</u></i>
Ian John Grant	17/2	16.3	Objective	Supports 16.3; agrees with the objective of the plan.
Ian John Grant	17/3	16.4	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports 16.4; mangrove removal is required to maintain access to public areas.
Ian John Grant	17/4	16.5	Seedling Removal	Opposes in part 16.5. Supports the proposed changes with the exception of 16.5.3.c; seeks the following proposed wording: <i><u>"That seedlings are removed by hand pulling and the removal does not involve the use of powered hand held tools or machinery; and"</u></i>
Ian John Grant	17/5	16.6 to 16.8	Other Methods Principal Reasons for Adopting Anticipated Environmental Results	Supports all the proposed changes 16.6 - 16.8.
Shepards Park Management Committee	18/1	16.1	Resource consent for removal	Opposes in part 16.1. Supports the proposed plan change but seeks the addition of the following paragraph: <i><u>"Application for controlled activities, restricted discretionary activities or discretionary activities made by a local body approved volunteer organisation shall be free for the initial application. Additional applications for areas covered by the initial application, restricted coastal activities or non-complying activities shall occur normal fees as set out by the ARC at the said time."</u></i>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Shepards Park Management Committee	18/2	16.3 Objective	Supports 16.3; agrees with the objective of the plan.
Shepards Park Management Committee	18/3	16.4 Mangrove removal: supports	Supports 16.4; mangrove removal is required maintain access to public areas.
Shepards Park Management Committee	18/4	16.5 Seedling Removal	Opposes in part 16.5. Supports the proposed changes with the exception of 16.5.3.c; seeks the following proposed wording: <i>"That seedlings are removed by hand pulling and the removal does not involve the use of <u>powered</u> hand held tools or machinery; and"</i>
Shepards Park Management Committee	18/5	16.6 to 16.8 Other Methods Principal Reasons for Adopting Anticipated Environmental Results	Supports all the proposed changes 16.6 - 16.8.
Ron King	19/1	16.1 Resource consent for removal	Opposes in part. Supports the proposed plan change but seeks the addition of the following paragraph: <i>"<u>Application for controlled activities, restricted discretionary activities or discretionary activities made by a local body approved volunteer organisation shall be free for the initial application. Additional applications for areas covered by the initial application, restricted coastal activities or non-complying activities shall occur normal fees as set out by the ARC at the said time.</u>"</i>
Ron King	19/2	16.3 Objective	Supports; agrees with the objective of the plan.
Ron King	19/3	16.4 Mangrove removal: supports	Supports; mangrove removal is required to maintain access to public areas.
Ron King	19/4	16.5 Seedling Removal	Opposes in part. Supports the proposed changes with the exception of 16.5.3.c; seeks the following proposed wording: <i>"That seedlings are removed by hand pulling and the removal does not involve the use of <u>powered</u> hand held tools or machinery; and"</i>
Ron King	19/5	16.6 to 16.8 Other Methods Principal Reasons for Adopting Anticipated Environmental Results	Supports all the proposed changes.
Environment & Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc	20/1	16.2.3 Integrated Management Sediment issues	Supports 16.2.3; mangrove expansion should be dealt with by addressing causes rather than effects.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Environment & Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc	20/2	Value of mangroves: protect eco values	Supports the recognition of the value of mangroves to the marine and coastal ecosystem and the need for an integrated management approach.
Environment & Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc	20/3	Monitoring and enforcement of removal activities	Increased opportunities for mangrove removal will increase the level of resources required for monitoring and enforcement. These resources are better employed in achieving the Council's responsibilities for land and integrated catchment management.
Environment & Conservation Organisations of NZ Inc	20/4	Value of mangroves; protect eco and erosion protection values	The demand for coastal land and development is not in itself reason to change the protected status of mangroves under the plan. The protection status relates as much to the ecosystem and erosion protection function as to the mangroves themselves.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/1	16.1 Supports another submission	Supports 16.1 Introduction in so far as it reflects the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society submission(138). Also supports the submission of the Friends of Mahurangi Incorporated (134).
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/2	16.2.2 Issue	Opposes in part 16.2.2. Seeks the following changes: Rapid mangrove colonisation is only occurring in a few parts of estuaries and harbours, in response to catchment degradation. Amend the 1st sentence to reflect this: <i>"Some parts of estuaries and harbours in the region..."</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/3	16.4.4 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas (precautionary approach for removal)	At 16.4.4 amend to include Coastal Protection Area 2: <i>"Mangrove removal in any Coastal Protection Area 1 or 2..."</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/4	16.4.5 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas (precautionary approach for removal)	At 16.4.5 amend to include Coastal Protection Area 2: <i>"Mangrove removal in any Coastal Protection Area 1 or 2..."</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/5	16.4.6 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas (precautionary approach for removal)	At 16.4.6 amend to include Coastal Protection Area 2 in the chapter: <i>Mangrove removal in any Coastal Protection Area 1 or 2...</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/6	16.4.7 Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Sediment issues	Oppose in part 16.4.7. Amend this policy to require the preparation and implementation of integrated catchment management plans to address sedimentation issues in coastal compartments, prior to the approval of any mangrove removal.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/7	16.5.2 a Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas (precautionary approach for removal)	Opposes in part 16.5.2(a). Amend to include Coastal Protection Area 2.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/8	16.5.10 a Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas (precautionary approach for removal)	Opposes in part 16.5.10(a). Amend to include Coastal Protection Area 2.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/9	16.5.12.2 Non-notification and non-notification of affected parties	At 16.5.12.2 delete the phrase : " <del>or the need to serve notice of the application on affected persons.</del> "
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/10	16.5.18 (19?) Restricted Coastal Activities	At 16.5.18 add a new subsection: <i>(d) mangrove removal, trimming or modification greater than 1ha in area.</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/11	16.5.24 Cattle/stock grazing	Change 16.5.24 to: " <u><i>The grazing of cattle and stock in any part of the CMA.</i></u> "
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/12	16.1 Introduction	Supports 16.1. Mangrove habitats form an important component of estuarine ecosystems... needs to be addressed through greater integrated management of both catchment and marine receiving environments. The submitter strongly agrees with the need for Plan Change 4 and generally supports the detail of the of the proposed Plan Change.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/13	Generally supports plan change	Supports the plan change generally but considers that without the amendments sought the plan change would have an unintended result of the cumulative loss of mangrove cover that was more than minor, and in some places, wholly inappropriate.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/14	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas (precautionary approach for removal)	Seeks that the protection of mangroves proposed for Coastal Protection Area 1 should mostly be extended to Coastal Protection Area 2.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/15	16.2.2 Issue	Opposes in part. Seeks a change to recognise that "parts of" estuaries and harbours are experiencing rapid colonisation; mangrove colonisation is occurring in the Mahurangi, but this does not appear to be widespread or rapid. The following addition is sought: <i>"Parts of some estuaries and harbours in the region are experiencing accelerated colonisation by mangroves..."</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/16	16.5.3 b Seedling removal	Opposes in part. The cumulative effect of the proposed 30m <sup>2</sup> exemption is likely to result in large scale clearance, over time, of areas that would otherwise not receive ARC consent to be cleared. Suggests that the 30m <sup>2</sup> exemption could be revisited after the plan change had been in effect for a number of years. Seeks the following changes: <i>"The ARC is notified of the proposed time and extent of removal where more than 30m<sup>2</sup> of clearance is proposed; and..."</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/17	16.5.12 Controlled Activities	Opposes in part 16.5.12. Expresses concern at the cumulative effect of the proposed 30m <sup>2</sup> exemption for mangrove clearance. Seeks the following change: <i>"The removal of vegetation, including mangrove removal, that is necessary to enable the operation, maintenance and use of lawful structures, allow for the functioning of drainage systems, or to ensure public health and safety in the use or operation of existing infrastructure, which complies with all the conditions of Rule 16.5.2 other than the 30m<sup>2</sup> of clearance (Rule 16.5.2b), subject to the following standards and terms..."</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/18	16.5.24 Cattle/stock grazing	Opposes in part. Significant long-established mangrove areas within the Mahurangi Harbour lie outside those designated Coastal Protection Area 1. Seeks that the prohibition be amended to include Coastal Protection Area 2 areas: <i>"The grazing of cattle and stock in any Coastal Protection Area 1 or Coastal Protection Area 2."</i>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested	Decision Requested
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (Mid North Branch)	21/19	16.7.12	Principal Reasons for Adopting Cattle/stock grazing	Opposes in part 16.7.12. Significant long-established mangrove areas within the Mahurangi harbour lie outside those designated Coastal Protection Area 1. Seeks that Coastal Protection Area 2 areas be included in the prohibition for cattle/stock grazing: <i>"The grazing of stock in any Coastal Protection Area 1 &amp; 2 will have significant adverse effect on either the ecological or geological values, or potentially both, from trampling and the grazing of vegetation. The high probability of these effects justifies the prohibition of cattle and stock in Coastal protection Area 1 &amp; 2 areas."</i>
Miss Joshua Salter	22/1	16.5.3b	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Opposes the wording of 16.5.3.b as it is not clear whether this means removal up to 30m <sup>2</sup> per person, or allows 30m <sup>2</sup> to be removed daily, weekly, monthly or annually. Seeks that if removal of 30 m <sup>2</sup> of mangrove seedlings is a permitted activity <u>that it be restricted to a total of 30 m<sup>2</sup> per locality per year.</u>
Miss Joshua Salter	22/2	16.5.3 h and 16.5.3 i	Value of mangroves: erosion protection	Opposes the wording in clauses 16.5.3(h) and 16.5.3(i). Seeks that as the coastal/marine environment is so complex and difficult to understand, the ARC should precisely define maps on those areas where coastal erosion and/or environmental disturbance are particularly problematic and at the very least, require notification of intention to remove seedlings from these areas.
Miss Joshua Salter	22/3		Seedling Removal	Suggests that the approach for seedling removal should be: 1. The ARC, with councils and DOC, prepare maps that establish the extent of mangrove vegetation at a given time (e.g. 2005). 2. Mangrove seedling removal as a permitted activity could be restricted to the maintaining of vegetation to the (2005) line, as delineated on the maps. 3. The (2005) line in each locality could be marked by posts and/or sight lines to obviate the difficulties of interpretation of maps.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Section	Topic / Issue	Decision Requested
Glenn W Archibald	23/1		Opposes the plan change	<p>Seeks to be able to take care of our 'coastal yards' and that the plan change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Be more permissive</li> <li>- Be more explicit as to how controlled cases may be brought forward, received and decided upon</li> <li>- Place discretion discretely</li> <li>- Ensure other Central Agencies are encouraged to understand and assist communities to retrieve their desired outcomes more easily</li> <li>- Use further appendages to illustrate how application can apply for, and achieve consents that are practical in their construction and meaning , with implementation abilities that will encourage communities to be able to help themselves in a manner that does not impact on other aspects of the coastal environment.</li> </ul>
Glenn W Archibald	23/2		Comprehensive Coastal Management Plans & Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	<p>Seeks that ARC remove confusion over references to Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan on one hand, and then Integrated Management Plans, per Appendix H.</p>
Glenn W Archibald	23/3		Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	<p>Section 32 Report - Page 19 - 'Key Changes' - Point 4 appears to have not been fully acted upon. Clarify for the benefit of all. Provide assurance that Pahurehure Inlet Plan and other comprehensive community plans that have been adopted do not need to be revisited.</p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Glenn W Archibald	23/4	Mangrove removal: mechanical methods	<p>Seeks provisions that enable mangrove removal to be more easily carried out. Less environmental harm and damage occurs in areas that allow for mechanical means on floating pontoons or barges that could remove both the mangroves and mud, than removal by people trampling and bogging in the mud. Allow for the separation of the vegetation from the mud in a manner that mulched the vegetation and allowed for its land based use and recycling.</p> <p>The mud should be relocated in strategically identified fingers and arms of the harbour and harbours edge. There are good examples of stormwater filtration ponds for water treatment before it reaches the harbour. Silt from these sources returns to the land, so why not the same for silt that was deposited for so long before the Resource Management Act was introduced and modern treatment devices installed? Find practical permitted and controlled ways to restore these poorly managed historic problems of the past half century; use knowledge from Pahurehure Inlet removal activities.</p>
Glenn W Archibald	23/5	Pacific Oysters	<p>Pacific Oysters should be permitted to be totally removed from the harbours in which they reside.</p> <p>Collection and holding points should be established above the Manukau Harbour for disposal of shells.</p> <p>Mass harvesting is needed to prevent destruction of useable tidal channels and beaches.</p>
Robert & Lynette Jean Simms	24/1	Mangrove removal: supports	<p>Supports being able to remove a small amount of mangroves without a resource consent.</p>
Ian Ross Cartmer	25/1	Mangrove removal: supports	<p>Supports the plan change; mangroves are unsightly, blocking waterways and creating mud.</p>
Ian Ross Cartmer	25/2	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	<p>Opposes the essentially passive approach of the Council to the control of mangroves (noxious weeds); this is inappropriate. Seeks an active plan to progressively remove the mangroves that are now threatening to clog out inner harbours.</p>
Ian Ross Cartmer	25/3	Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs	<p>Seeks an active plan to progressively remove mangroves along the Wattle Downs reserve area (similar to that undertaken by the Papakura District Council) before the beaches are destroyed beyond redemption by mangroves.</p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested	
Ian Ross Cartmer	25/4		Opposes the plan change	Does not support the specific measures proposed by the ARC because they are totally inadequate to solve the current infestation problem. It is not sufficient to rely upon foreshore users and local residents to take responsibility for the problem by permitting them to remove very small sized mangroves from specific areas.
Ian Ross Cartmer	25/5		Mangrove removal: supports	Supports controlling the spread of mangroves, but does not support the specific measures proposed by the ARC as they are inadequate.
Tony lanigan & Krys Lanigan	26/1		Rewrite for clarity Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Supports the plan change in principle but considers that the plan change is complex and not easily related to mangrove removal. Seeks that a separate section dealing with mangrove removal be provided for: - criteria for what is permitted versus discretionary need to be clearly enunciated - the 30m <sup>2</sup> criterion is unrealistic to address the encroachment that has occurred - criteria need to reflect the need to restore, where possible, the amenity values pertaining 30 - 40 years ago.
Tony lanigan & Krys Lanigan	26/2	16.4.6	Rewrite for clarity	Opposes 16.4.6 in part. Need to make policies clearer and delete "may be". Amend to read: <i>Mangrove removal, other than in Coastal Protection Area 1, <del>may be</del> shall be considered...</i>
Tony lanigan & Krys Lanigan	26/3	16.4.6 b	Policy - Public amenity or use	Opposes 16.4.6 b in part . Change "high public amenity" to " <u>normal levels of public amenity</u> "; enjoyment by significant numbers of people for a specific locale is what should be covered.
Tony lanigan & Krys Lanigan	26/4	16.5.2	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Opposes 16.5.2 in part. Insert after the underline: <u>"...to remove sections of a mangrove colony, to restore colony boundaries, beach amenity values or estuarine access to levels pertaining 30 years ago.</u>
Tony lanigan & Krys Lanigan	26/5	16.5.2 b	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Opposes 16.5.2 b in part. Amend to read: <u>The total cleared area shall not exceed an area which restores mangrove colony boundaries to those pertaining 30 years ago and shall be immediately adjacent...</u>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Tony Ianigan & Krys Lanigan	26/6	16.5.12 Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Opposes 16.5.12 in part. This needs to be made consistent with the proposed change to clause 16.5.2 b. Need to remove the words "other than the 30m <sup>2</sup> of clearance".
Neil Duincan	27/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports the abolition of the mangroves and to allow clearing of them in a sensible manner.
Malcolm John Roberts	28/1	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Opposes the essentially passive approach of the Council to the control of mangroves (noxious weeds); this is inappropriate. Seeks an active plan to progressively remove the mangroves that are now threading to clog out inner harbours.
Malcolm John Roberts	28/2	Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs	Seeks an active plan to progressively remove mangroves along the Wattle Downs reserve area (similar to that undertaken by the Papakura District Council) before the beaches are destroyed beyond redemption by mangroves.
Malcolm John Roberts	28/3	Opposes the plan change	Supports to notion of controlling mangroves but does not support the specific measures proposed by the ARC because they are totally inadequate to solve the current infestation problem. It is not sufficient to rely upon foreshore users and local residents to take responsibility for the problem by permitting them to remove very small sized mangroves from specific areas.
Mangere Boating Club	29/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports the removal of mangroves in our waterways and foreshores (signed by 55 members of the Mangere Boatclub).
Carrol Margaret Elliott	30/1	Sediment issues	Long term management (of mangroves) would ideally involve construction of storm water ponds to collect the run-off, as has been done on the Onehunga shoreline by the motorway beneath Onehunga High School.
Carrol Margaret Elliott	30/2	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Seeks that mangroves be culled to prevent the silting up of the entire foreshore of the inner harbour (Onehunga/Mangere Bridge area), until the solution of construction of storm water ponds to collect the run-off is reached.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Henry van der Heijden	31/1	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	The proposed changes are only tinkering with the invasion of the mangroves and a much more radical approach is needed, for example; - a bounty on plants (school groups and community groups could earn money) - vigorous commercial removal may be the only way; a slow managed approach will make removing them more difficult and costly - requiring a resource consent for removal is "bureaucracy gone way over the top"
Ms Y S V Budge	32/1	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	The mangroves at Kiwi Esplanade (Mangere Bridge) detract from the view and must go.
Patricia A van der Heijden-Erlam	33/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Questions the value of mangroves for fish breeding and for stopping erosion. Mangrove seeds drift on the water and grow readily in mud; they need to be uprooted. Plants (mangroves) that grow where they are not wanted are "weeds" and need to be eradicated.
Mr Kevin Smith	34/1	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Expresses concern about the disregard by the ARC in the way mangroves are infesting our harbour and estuaries. Submitter has seen mangroves become established from Otahuhu to Kiwi Esplanade. Seeks that "common sense prevail" and the council ask for volunteers to remove mangroves.
Peter E Hansen	35/1	Rewrite for clarity	It is important that any changes made to the regulations relating to mangroves are transparently clear and not easily "misunderstood" and open to "open slather".
Peter E Hansen	35/2	Monitoring and enforcement of removal activities	It is vital to ensure that there are sufficiently heavy penalties in place to adequately punish anyone breaching regulations relating to removal.
Peter E Hansen	35/3	Sediment issues	As the increase in mangrove growth seems almost certainly down to human activities, then stricter controls on those human activities are long overdue.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Peter E Hansen	35/4	16.3.1 Objective	Supports Objective 16.3.1 but seeks that the wording be amended to read; (to offer more environmental protection) <i>"To provide for appropriate activities to take place which may involve a disturbance of the foreshore and seabed, <u>but at the same time will also endeavour to avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on the coastal environment, and will thoroughly remedy any damage that may come about as a result of the exercise.</u>"</i>
Peter E Hansen	35/5	16.4.1 Policy - Public amenity or use	Supports section 16.4.1, with the exception of sub section a (ii). This is open to conjecture on "use and enjoyment" in any particular situation. Amend to read: <u>enhance public access to</u> and delete <del>use and enjoyment of the coastal marine area.</del>
Peter E Hansen	35/6	16.4.2 Policies	Supports the whole of section 16.4.2.
Peter E Hansen	35/7	16.4.3 Policies	Supports the whole of section 16.4.3.
Peter E Hansen	35/8	16.4.4 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	Supports the whole of section 16.4.4.
Peter E Hansen	35/9	16.4.5 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	Supports section 16.4.5.
Peter E Hansen	35/10	16.4.6 Policy - Public amenity or use	Supports the objectives stated in this section, with the exception of paragraph b. Seeks that this be amended to read; <i>"...may be considered appropriate where... mangrove colonisation can be shown to be obstructing or interfering with existing areas of high public amenity or use, for example areas used for access and navigation, <u>and/or approved passive recreational activities.</u>"</i>
Peter E Hansen	35/11	16.4.7 Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Supports section 16.4.7 because it is necessary to the document as a whole.
Peter E Hansen	35/12	16.4.8 Assessment of ecological values	Supports section 16.4.8. It is imperative that such considerations are carefully applied throughout the whole programme.
Peter E Hansen	35/13	16.4.9 Value of mangroves	Supports section 16.4.9; such considerations are imperative to sensible decision making.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Peter E Hansen	35/14	16.4.10	Removal of exotic plants Supports section 16.4.10 in part, but seeks the amendment of sub section "a" to read: <i>"...an assessment of the effects and alternatives has been <u>stringently undertaken by fully qualified professionals</u> to determine whether or not such a course of action will have a lesser adverse effect than taking no action at all..."</i>
Peter E Hansen	35/15	16.4.11	Vehicle use Seeks the amendment of section 16.4.11 to read: <i>"Motor vehicles <u>are banned from using</u> the coastal marine area, except where <u>they are engaged</u> for emergency or conservation management purposes, <u>and there are no practicable alternative means of access. Any adverse effects caused to the environment by their presence should be either avoided, or kept to a minimum and carefully remedied should they occur.</u>"</i> This change is necessary to rid coastal marine areas of careless joy riders.
Peter E Hansen	35/16	16.4.12	Vehicle use Seeks that the wording in section 16.4.12 be amended to read: <i>"<u>Where approved (as under section 16.4.11) vehicle use of the coastal marine area is necessary ...</u>"</i>
Peter E Hansen	35/17	16.4.13	Cattle/stock grazing Seeks that the wording in Section 16.4.13 be amended to replace "avoided" with the word "forbidden": <i>"<u>The grazing of cattle and stock on the foreshore and in sensitive parts of the coastal marine area, especially coastal protection areas, should <del>generally be avoided</del>- be forbidden.</u>"</i> Cattle and stock cause enormous damage to delicate coastal marine areas.
Peter E Hansen	35/18	16.5.2	Mangrove removal: Permitted Activities Supports section 16.5.2.
Peter E Hansen	35/19	16.5.3	Seedling Removal Supports section 16.5.3, but seeks an addition to read: <i>"<u>That any removal must firstly be approved by the ARC in writing, and must either be done by ARC workers or monitored by them.</u>"</i> Unsupervised removal of mangrove plants by members of the public must not be permitted.
Peter E Hansen	35/20	16.5.4	Removal of vegetation/organisms from lawful structures Supports the retention of section 16.5.4 as it is currently written.
Peter E Hansen	35/21	16.5.5 c	Pest Management Strategy Seeks that section 16.5.5(c) require the mandatory monitoring of such an activity.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Peter E Hansen	35/22	16.5.6 Pacific Oysters	Supports section 16.5.6.
Peter E Hansen	35/23	16.5.7 Burial of marine mammals	Supports section 16.5.7.
Peter E Hansen	35/24	16.5.8, 16.5.9, 16.5.10, 16.5.11 Permitted Activities: Conditions	Supports provisions 16.5.8, 16.5.9, 16.5.10, 16.5.11 subject to their being consistently enforced.
Peter E Hansen	35/25	16.5.12, 16.5.12 a, 16.5.12.1 Controlled Activities	Supports provisions 16.5.12, 16.5.12(a) and 16.5.12.1.
Peter E Hansen	35/26	16.5.12.2 Non-notification and non-notification of affected parties	Opposes the provision (16.5.12.2) to allow for a controlled activity without the need for public notification or the need to serve notice of the application on affected persons in accordance with Sections 94D(2) and 94D(3) of the RMA. The provision allowing the ARC the discretion to provide a notification under Section 94c(2) of the RMA if it considers such a notification justified is not sufficient; it allows for discretionary decisions to be made and similar things being dealt with in different ways without explanation.
Peter E Hansen	35/27	16.5.13, 16.5.14, 16.5.14.1 Rewrite for clarity	Seeks that sections 16.5.13, 16.5.14 and 16.5.14.1 in their entirety be rewritten in a clearer, simpler and more concise manner in order to be fully understood by anyone.
Peter E Hansen	35/28	16.5.14.2 Non-notification and non-notification of affected parties	Opposes section 16.5.14.2 . All disturbance of reasonably sized areas of vegetation, or removal activities, should be <u>not be</u> considered without public notification.
Peter E Hansen	35/29	16.5.15 Rewrite for clarity	Opposes 16.5.15; the wording of this section is too open to individual interpretation. Seeks that it be rewritten more concisely.
Peter E Hansen	35/30	16.5.16 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas	Opposes 16.5.16; the removal of mangroves from a Coastal Protection Area should not be a "discretionary" activity.
Peter E Hansen	35/31	16.5.17 & 16.5.18 Discretionary Activities	Generally agrees with the points listed in this section (16.5.17 and 16.5.18), but would prefer them to be Controlled Activities as providing for them as Discretionary Activities leaves too much up to individual interpretation.
Peter E Hansen	35/32	16.5.19 & 16.5.20 Restricted Coastal Activities	The volumes for removal and the size of areas affected need to be revised as they are adding to coastal problems and will worsen with time.
Peter E Hansen	35/33	16.5.21 & 16.5.22 Restricted Coastal Activities	Provisions 16.5.21 and 16.5.22 are considered adequate.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Peter E Hansen	35/34	16.5.23	Prohibited Activities Supports rule 16.5.23.
Peter E Hansen	35/35	16.5.24	Cattle/stock grazing Supports the prohibition of cattle and livestock from CPA1 areas.
Peter E Hansen	35/36	16.6.1 - 16.6.9	Other Methods Sediment issues Considers the Other Methods to be generally acceptable. Supports Other Method 16.6.7 and 16.6.8; it is essential that there are reductions in sediment and nutrient inputs and stricter controls on the increasing volume of coastal housing developments and over development of the coastal environment.
Peter E Hansen	35/37	16.7.2	Principal Reasons for Adopting: rules Supports section 16.7.2; far too many people take the law into their own hands.
Peter E Hansen	35/38	16.7.3	Principal Reasons for Adopting: policies Supports section 16.7.3; this is the way the whole document should be written.
Peter E Hansen	35/39	16.7.7	Principal Reasons for Adopting: Pacific Oysters Supports 16.7.7; agrees with the safeguards mentioned.
Peter E Hansen	35/40	16.7.8	Principal Reasons for Adopting: Controlled Activities Supports 16.7.8; the ARC should maintain strict control over removal.
Peter E Hansen	35/41	16.7.9	Principal Reasons for Adopting: Controlled Activities Seeks that the words "all other"(Section 16.7.9) be retained: "Because the effects of many types of disturbance are difficult to predict unless a specific proposal is put forward, <del>all other</del> <del>most</del> <del>all other</del> -activities which disturb, damage or destroy the foreshore or seabed are treated as restricted discretionary or discretionary activities...." Otherwise supports this section.
Peter E Hansen	35/42	16.7.13	Principal Reasons for Adopting: Other Methods Supports section 16.7.13.
Peter E Hansen	35/43	16.7.14	Principal Reasons for Adopting: Other Methods Supports section 16.7.14.
Peter E Hansen	35/44	16.7.15	Principal Reasons for Adopting: Other Methods Sediment issues Supports section 16.7.15; controlling the level of sediment and nutrients that are entering the marine environment is crucial.
Peter E Hansen	35/45	16.7.16	Principal Reasons for Adopting: Policies vehicle use Expresses concern and opposition to the use of motor vehicles in the coastal marine environment unless they are for essential services and seeks that local bodies be pressured into applying restrictions to ensure vehicles to do damage the marine environment.
Peter E Hansen	35/46	16.8	Anticipated Environmental Results Seeks that the rules (at 16.8) be amended as sought to ensure that these outcomes are achieved.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	36/1		Opposes the plan change
Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	36/2		Active plan sought for mangrove removal
Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	36/3		Value of mangroves; questions eco value
Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	36/4		Sediment issues
Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	36/5		Remove CPA1 designation and allow mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge
Mangere Bridge Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	36/6		Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal
Tania M Bradshaw	37/1	16.5.3	Seedling Removal

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Maurice Athol Sinclair	38/1	Sediment issues: Manukau Harbour	Removing mangroves from Tararata Creek (Manukau Harbour) would be a waste of time, the creek is bounded by sediments and roots and the seabed would go with it.
Enerst B Kirk	39/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves are impinging on the public's ability to enjoy our harbours and foreshore.
Enerst B Kirk	39/2	Sediment issues	Mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities but it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Enerst B Kirk	39/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	The desirability of mangroves as a fish breeding habitat is negated by the fact that there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to the mangroves establishing.
Enerst B Kirk	39/4	Coastal Protection Area 1 designation: Mangere Bridge	Seeks to have the CPA1 designation changed from the west of the causeway to the old Mangere bridge; there is no lava flow in this area and it is hoped to develop a maritime park in the future.
Isabel Thomson	40/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Allow mangroves to be cleared from areas colonised in the last 10 years.
Mangere Community Board (Peter Skelton)	41/1	16.4.6 Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Supports 16.4.6.
Mangere Community Board (Peter Skelton)	41/2	16.4.7 Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Supports 16.4.7.
Mangere Community Board (Peter Skelton)	41/3	16.5 Rules	Supports 16.5- where the community sees the need or Council officers determine that in the future a need may arise.
Mangere Community Board (Peter Skelton)	41/4	16.5.2 b Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Supports the total cleared area being 40m <sup>2</sup> .
Mangere Community Board (Peter Skelton)	41/5	16.5.3 Seedling Removal	Supports 16.5.3; there are areas of the coastline that are inundated with mangroves - can a more rigorous and ongoing programme of removal be applied?
Mangere Community Board (Peter Skelton)	41/6	16.5.17 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	Supports 16.5.17; there are a number of areas where bird/fish habitat need to be protected.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Mangere Community Board (Peter Skelton)	41/7	Rewrite for clarity	Suggests that clear and simple guidelines need to be communicated to the public to ensure that there is a full understanding of the changes. Some community meetings/education of school aged students would be beneficial.
Mate Vlaslm	42/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports the right to remove mangroves, especially where they have infiltrated beaches in the last few years.
Mangere Bridge Walking Club	43/1	Value of mangroves; questions eco value	Concern that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- mangroves are impinging on the public's ability to enjoy the harbours and foreshore</li> <li>- along Kiwi Esplanade (Mangere Bridge) migratory birds are reluctant to feed in areas where mangroves are present</li> <li>- mangroves result in sediment being washed on incoming and outgoing tides to form banks of mud which is detrimental to sea and bird life.</li> </ul>
Roland John Allen	44/1	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Supports the right to remove the mangroves that have quickly taken over the waterfront of Kiwi Esplanade, Mangere Bridge.
Maureen T Allen	45/1	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Seeks the right to remove mangroves growing along the foreshore of Kiwi Esplanade; mangroves are affecting bird feeding areas and hinder public access and use of the area.
Kate Duffy	46/1	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Supports the right to remove mangroves that were not growing a few years ago and where they are growing now, e.g. along the foreshore at Kiwi Esplanade.
Valerie Kernot	47/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports the removing of mangroves; they limit public access and keep spreading.
Gladys May Goulstone	48/1	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Supports right to remove mangroves that were not growing a few years ago where they are now, e.g. along the foreshore at Kiwi Esplanade. Wading birds do not like mangroves, sandy beaches are being smothered and rubbish collects in them and brings rats.
Donald Lincoln Shaw	49/1	Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Seeks the right to remove mangroves from Kiwi Esplanade waterfront as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- without control mangroves will invade the habitat of migrating and local birds</li> <li>- they are a haven for mosquitoes</li> <li>- they will cover the lava flows which are quite unique.</li> </ul>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Vanessa Vlasich	50/1		Supports the right to remove mangroves. Supports the right to remove mangroves that have infiltrated the beaches in the last few years as: - they create mud and limit public access - migratory and other birds will eventually have nowhere to roost and feed - rats live in the mangroves because of the rubbish - the lava flows from Mangere Mountain are being destroyed.
John Charles Bourne	51/1	16.4.6 a	Supports policy on mangrove removal Supports 16.4.6(a); as mangroves spread birds will have to find new feeding grounds.
John Charles Bourne	51/2	16.4.6 b	Supports policy on mangrove removal Supports 16.4.6(b); the use of inner harbour (Manukau) beaches is being restricted by mangroves.
John Charles Bourne	51/3	16.4.6 d	Supports policy on mangrove removal Supports 16.4.6(d).
John Charles Bourne	51/4		Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga Supports mangrove removal; Mangere Bridge is one of the few in the inner harbour used by many south Auckland families and needs to be kept free of mangroves and protected from mangrove spread (photos attached).
Kerry Francis McCurdy	52/1		Value of mangroves; protect eco values To stop the action of the mangrove plantations by removing or managing them would be a cruel blow to the environment; leave them to do their work. They filter endless floating rubbish of every description that would otherwise be swept out to sea.
Ken Taylor	53/1		Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves are impinging on the public's ability to enjoy our harbours and foreshore.
Ken Taylor	53/2		Sediment issues Mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities but it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Ken Taylor	53/3		Value of mangroves; questions value to fish The desirability of mangroves as a fish breeding habitat is negated by the fact that there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to the mangroves establishing.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Ken Taylor	53/4	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Seeks that there be a Manukau Harbour Management Plan to identify areas where the mangrove is a new phenomenon (new pest) and that approval be given to remove mangroves with a simple application and approval process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at Mangere Bridge along Kiwi Esplanade migratory birds are reluctant to use areas where there are mangroves;</li> <li>- mangroves form mud banks that a detrimental to sea and bird life;</li> <li>- mangroves do not add to ecology and block views to the harbour;</li> <li>- that mangroves in our area are not natives to New Zealand (introduced from Australia).</li> </ul>
Enterprise Franklin Development Trust	54/1	Mangrove removal: Waiuku Estuary	Seeks that mangrove removal be permitted for the whole of the Waiuku Estuary; the Waiuku community has expressed its desire to return the Waiuku Estuary back to its former state especially within the Waiuku River/Tamakara Reserve area close to the town centre to enhance Waiuku's historic attraction and enable recreational activities within the estuary.
Enterprise Franklin Development Trust	54/2	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Seeks that Integrated Management Plan(s) allow for regular removal of mangroves as a permitted activity without having to apply for a consent each time work is required.
Enterprise Franklin Development Trust	54/3	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Opposes 30m <sup>2</sup> rule limit; it appears too small and does not allow enough flexibility to manage mangrove appropriately. Areas need to be site appropriate and not related to a 30m <sup>2</sup> rule.
Enterprise Franklin Development Trust	54/4	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Seeks that work be undertaken to identify where mangroves should be encouraged and areas where they need to be controlled or removed, with a different set of rules that apply. It is recommended that the whole of the Waiuku estuary be identified for permitted mangrove removal.
Enterprise Franklin Development Trust	54/5	Mangrove removal: mechanical methods	Seeks that allowance be made for initial mechanical removal and access to sites to undertake removal work; mangroves in places are dense and large.
Enterprise Franklin Development Trust	54/6	Mangrove removal: supports: important wading bird sites	Seeks that important wading bird sites be allowed to regularly remove mangroves without having to regularly apply for a resource consent.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Murray Ross McNaughten	55/1		Opposes the plan change Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date The plan change goes nowhere near satisfying the publics wish for removal of mangroves wherever they now exist, but were absent 40-50 years ago. The process of completing the Waiuku Coastal Compartment Plan and the tinkering with the Coastal Plan provisions confuses and frustrates practical people.
Murray Ross McNaughten	55/2		Sediment issues Without the removal of the siltation that has occurred since European settlement, any piecemeal removal of mangroves will require ongoing maintenance and repetition. This will be wasteful of time and other resources. Dredging of both mud and mangroves at the same time is the most efficient method.
Murray Ross McNaughten	55/3		Mangrove removal: Waiuku Estuary Seeks changes to reflect input previously provided into the Waiuku Coastal Compartment Plan and the press coverage related to the Waiuku Estuary. (attached to submission)
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/1		Supports the plan change Supports the efforts by the ARC to recognise and provide for the management of mangroves.
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/2	16.1	Introduction Supports 16.1.
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/3	16.2.2	Supports Issue Sediment issues Supports the wording of proposed issue 16.2.2.
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/4	16.2.3	Supports Issue Sediment issues Supports the wording of proposed issue 16.2.3.
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/5	16.4.1	Supports Policy Supports the proposed changes to the wording of policy 16.4.1.
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/6	16.4.6	Policy - Public amenity or use The proposed wording of policy 16.4.6 is supported in part, subject to the following suggested wording changes: (b) mangrove colonisation can be shown to be obstruction or interfering with areas of high <i>public</i> amenity or use.... (d) the proposed removal <u>will be beneficial to the area and will be beneficially viewed by the surrounding community; is in the overall public benefit, as opposed to individual or private benefit;</u> ...
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/7	16.4.7	Supports Policy Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Supports the wording of proposed policy 16.4.7.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/8	16.4.8	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date
<p>The wording of proposed policy 16.4.8 is supported in part, subject to the adoption of an additional policy recognising the positive effects of mangrove removal in areas where mangroves were previously absent . A suggested wording of this policy is: <u>16.4.8a Any application for mangrove removal shall identify whether the mangrove removal is proposed in an area where mangroves were previously absent, and provide an assessment of the effects associated with this removal including information on how long mangroves have been present and the positive effects associated with their removal. Effects associated with the removal of mangroves shall be considered in the context of the positive effects of their removal in these areas.</u></p>			
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/9	16.5.12	Controlled Activities
Supports the wording of proposed rule 16.5.12.			
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/10	16.5.14	Restricted Discretionary Activities
Supports the proposed changes to the wording of rule 16.5.14.			
Karaka Harbourside Estate	56/11	16.5.14.2	Non-notification and non-notification of affected parties
Supports the proposed changes to the wording of this rule and in particular the specific provision that vegetation removal activities that are in accordance with an Integrated Management Plan shall be considered without public notification or the need to serve notice.			
Malcolm Hardie	57/1		Supports the plan change Mangrove removal: supports
Supports Proposed Plan Change 4; mangroves have invaded much of our coastline. Supports mangrove removal.			

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
James McCleary, Ian Scobie & Betty Hamilton (residents adjacent to Rangiwhea Creek)	58/1	Mangrove removal: supports: Waiuku/Rangiwhea Creek	<p>A survey-petition of residents in our area (residents adjacent to Rangiwhea Creek, Waiuku) concerning the expansion of mangroves in the Rangiwhea estuary resulted in 457 in favour of total removal, 10 in favour of containment to the present level and no one in favour of allowing them to spread unimpeded. An ecological study conclude that mangroves in the Waiuku estuaries has occurred within the last 30 years and removal is likely to have few adverse ecological effects. Suggests/seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- residents are willing to take part in mangrove removal programmes/trials to clear areas and assess results;</li> <li>- the only costs to Council would be if mulching was specified (and transport for this);</li> <li>- once mangroves have been cleared residents would nurture salt marsh fringes and plant coastal planting on banks and edges of the estuary.</li> </ul>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/1	Definition: Mangrove Seedling	<p>(b) is not necessary as anything under 0.6m should be allowed to be removed regardless of its condition. Change as follows:</p> <p>(a) ....tall;<del>and</del>  <del>(b) shows no reproductive capability (i.e. has no propagates 9seed pods) or flowers)</del></p>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/2	16.1 Para 4	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Opposes in part 16.1 paragraph 4. Seeks the following changes to reflect the reality that the presence of mangroves is not necessarily beneficial:  <i>"Mangrove habitats <u>can</u> form an important component of estuarine ecosystems and <u>sometimes</u> play an important role in erosion control and shoreline protection. <u>There will be situations where</u> these values need to be recognised and protected..."</i></p>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/3	16.1 Para 2	<p>Introduction</p> <p>Opposes in part 16.1 paragraph 2. Seeks the following changes to align with the proposed changes to clause 16.1 para 4, and to explicitly recognise the case for removing mangroves for the additional reasons listed:  <i>"In some cases mangroves need to be removed in order to allow for the maintenance and use of structures: <del>and</del> the functioning of drains and outlets: <u>access, navigation, recreation and amenity benefits.</u> public infrastructure, such as roads may need to be..."</i></p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/4	16.4.1 a (i) Policies	Opposes in part. Seeks to add the word "restore" to recognise that most applications will be to restore an area to its original form. "Enhance" suggests that an area has never been any better than its current state. The following change is sought: <i>"Restore or enhance..."</i>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/5	16.4.2 d (ii) Pacific Oysters	Opposes in part 16.4.2 (d) (ii). Compliance with the fisheries catch limit would make it difficult to eradicate the shellfish from where that is deemed to be required. Therefore the facility to authorise waiving the limits is vital. The following changes are sought: <i>"In the case of removing Pacific Oyster shell, the provisions of the Fisheries Act regarding the taking of live shellfish need to be complied with, except where it is an authorised eradication programme."</i>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/6	16.4.6 a & b Policy mangrove removal public amenity	Opposes in part 16.4.6 a & b. Seeks the following changes: <i>"(a) mangrove colonisation can be demonstrated to <del>be</del> having <u>have had</u> an adverse impact on the values..... (b) mangrove colonisation can be shown be obstruction or interfering with areas of high public amenity or use, for example areas <u>formerly or currently</u> used for recreation, access and navigation;"</i>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/7	16.5.3 c Seedling Removal	Opposes in part 16.5.3 c. A trial showed that the hand pulling of seedlings inflicts greater damage to the ecology of an area than, for example, removal by a weed eater. Seeks the following changes: <i>"(c) that seedlings are removed by hand-pulling <u>or approved mechanical means (e.g. 'weed eater')</u>. <del>And the removal does not involve the use of hand held tools or machinery; and ..."</del></i>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/8	16.5.3 i Rules: Seabed disturbance remedied by natural processes in 7 days	Opposes in part 16.5.3 i. Experience shows that a full cycle of tides (spring tide to spring tide) over at least two weeks is needed to remediate the damage to an area caused by removal. Seeks the following changes: <i>"(i) any consequential disturbance to the foreshore and seabed shall be able to be remedied by the operation of natural processes within <del>7</del> <u>14</u> days."</i>
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/9	16.5.6 Pacific Oysters	Opposes in part 16.5.6. Clarify that it is both live oyster eradication and the removal of dead shell. Seeks the following changes: The removal of Pacific Oysters <u>and oyster</u> shells (other than cultivated Pacific Oysters) from the coastal marine area...

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/10	16.5.6 c	Pacific Oysters
	<p>Opposes in part 16.5.6 c. The intent is that one part of eradication will be to permit removal of live oysters from the tide without contravening the fisheries regulations. Seeks the following changes:  <i>"c the shell shall not be disposed of in the coastal marine area unless a resource consent has been granted for disposal. <u>However, any material growing live oysters may be moved to above mean high water springs.</u>"</i></p>		
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/11	16.5.8 a	Rules: Seabed disturbance remedied by natural processes in 7 days
	<p>Opposes in part 16.5.8 a. Experience shows that a full cycle of tides (spring tide to spring tide) over at least two weeks is needed to remediate the damage to an area caused by removal. Seeks the following changes:  <i>"(a) any disturbance.....within 7 <u>14</u> days in other parts of the coastal marine area."</i></p>		
Pahurehure Inlet Protection Society	59/12	16.5.19	Restricted Coastal Activities
	<p>Opposes in part 16.5.19. The new limitation imposed on the extent of the permitted removal by making any one of these limitations sufficient is an unreasonable reduction in scope. These criteria should either i) return to being collective or ii) the allowable area in item b) should be increased to 30 hectares.                      Seeks the following changes:  <i>"(a) is greater in volume than 300,000 cubic metres; <del>and/or</del> (b) is over an area equal to or greater than 10 hectares; <del>and/or</del> (c) extends....."</i></p>		
Miranda Naturalists' Trust	60/1		Mangrove removal: supports affecting bird habitat
	<p>Seeks to be able to selectively remove mangroves where they are encroaching on bird habitat, particularly for bird roosting areas which are restricted in size and where even a relatively minor encroachment by mangroves will render the roost unusable.</p>		
Miranda Naturalists' Trust	60/2		Sediment issues
	<p>The exponential expansion of mangroves over the development of shell banks has resulted in mangroves threatening to dominate the shore line to the detriment of other estuarine habitats such as salt marsh and shorebird roosting habitat. Seeks recognition of the need to manage the balance artificially and that tighter controls on agricultural land use over the next few decades may restore the natural balance.</p>		

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Miranda Naturalists' Trust	60/3	Seedling Removal	Strongly supports the provision in the plan change allowing for mangrove seedling removal and the controlled removal of larger plants where there is a direct threat to a coastal ecosystem or where the viability of shorebird roosting habitat areas is compromised.
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/1	Generally supports plan change	Generally supports the plan change, subject to a number of matters raised by the Association being addressed.
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/2	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas	<p>Seeks changes to recognise the important ecosystem values in CP2 areas and their need for ongoing protection; the Coastal Protection Area 2 areas have the more significant mangrove areas, but lack adequate protection from mangrove clearance and stock grazing. The following amendments to include Coastal Protection Area 2 areas are sought:</p> <p><u>16.4.4 "Mangrove removal within any Coastal Protection Area 1 or 2...."</u>  <u>16.4.5 "Mangrove removal within any Coastal Protection Area 1 or 2...."</u>  <u>16.4.6 "Mangrove removal in any Coastal Protection Area 1 or 2..."</u>                      16.5.2 (a) Amend to include Coastal Protection Area 2                      16.5.10 (a) Amend to include CPA2 (in addition to CPA1)</p>
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/3	16.4.7	<p>Sediment issues</p> <p>Amend policy 16.4.7 to require the preparation and implementation of integrated catchment management plans to address sedimentation issues in coastal compartments, prior to the approval of any mangrove removal.</p>
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/4	16.5.24	<p>Cattle/stock grazing</p> <p>Seeks changes to address inadequate controls on farm stock degrading and destroying mangroves in public CMA. Seeks the following change:  <u>16.5.24 "The grazing of cattle and stock in any <del>Coastal Protection Area 1</del> part of the CMA."</u></p>
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/5	Pacific Oysters	<p>Seeks recognition that the natural spread of the Pacific Oyster is:</p> <p>a. displacing existing oyster populations in muddy estuaries and                      b. accelerating the rate of estuary stabilisation.</p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/6	16.5.12.2	Non-notification of affected parties The non-notification of affected parties under Sec. 94D of the Act potentially leaves the way open for abuses of processes. Seeks the following change: <i>"Application for controlled activities shall be considered without public notification <del>or the need to serve notice of the application on affected persons</del> in accordance with Section 94D(2)...."</i>
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/7	16.2.2	Issue 16.2.2 - Rapid mangrove colonisation is only occurring in a few parts of estuaries and harbours, in response to catchment degradation. Seeks that the 1st sentence be amended to reflect this: <i>"Some parts of estuaries and harbours in the region are experiencing a rapid colonisation by mangroves...."</i>
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/8	16.5.18 (19?)	Restricted Coastal Activities Seeks the addition of a new subsection: <i>"(d) mangrove removal, trimming or modification greater than 1 ha in area."</i>
Pohutukawa Coast Community Ass	61/9		Include any consequential changes necessary Any other changes required to ensure consistency in the plan subsequent to the submitters changes being affected.
Ian Leslie Duder	62/1	16.5.2 b	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal Seeks that a far greater area than 30m <sup>2</sup> be permitted for removal, as this limit will not remedy the problems in Te Kuiti Stream (Duders Beach) or many other areas of mangrove invasion. Many blocked streams will require mechanical removal.
Ian Leslie Duder	62/2	16.5.2 d	Chemical spraying Suggests that the ARC along with chemical companies experiment with trials to ascertain whether a suitable spray could be found which may be more environmentally suitable to clearing drains and streams, than by mechanical means.
Ian Leslie Duder	62/3		Mangrove removal: supports: stream bed/drainage clearance Seeks that stream bed clearance be either a Permitted or Discretionary Activity so that drainage waterways can be kept clear to accommodate natural flood occurrence.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Clevedon Community Board	63/1	Mangrove removal: supports on effects basis rather than on coastal management areas	Opposes the restrictions that are being imposed on the removal of mangroves in different coastal management areas. Seeks that the encroachment by mangroves in inhibiting/suppressing natural species needs to be considered as effects based rather than by protection area, and on this basis that the removal of mangroves in the CPA1 should not be treated any different than the removal in any other area. Historic activities such as drainage, access etc should be able to continue in CPA1 areas, unless the activity is degrading the area.
Clevedon Community Board	63/2	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Seeks that the maximum 30m <sup>2</sup> clearance by way of Permitted Activity be removed or significantly increased; this limit is unrealistic and is not based on any science.
Clevedon Community Board	63/3	Seedling Removal	Opposes the requirement that any removal does not allow the use of hand tools as removal without the use of hand tools is impractical and an inefficient use of time.
Clevedon Community Board	63/4	Mangrove Mangrove removal in public benefit	Seeks that the plan change considers what is the effect of removing or not removing rather than who benefits.
Clevedon Community Board	63/5	Rules: Seabed disturbance remedied by natural processes in 7 days	Questions/opposes the 7 day remedy time by way of natural process; this is very questionable as foot prints in the mud often take months to disappear.
Clevedon Community Board	63/6	Cattle/stock grazing	The approach to minimise grazing stock on what is deemed a sensitive area of the foreshore needs further consideration. Should this be the agreed approach then the ARC should be looking at some incentives for the farmer to fence off these areas and a process of compensation for loss of grazing.
Clevedon Community Board	63/7	Pest Management Strategy	Any pest management strategy should be pro-active in promoting the removal of exotic or introduced plants which are pests in the CMA.
Clevedon Community Board	63/8	Vehicles on beaches	Any restrictions of vehicles within the CMA need to be based on the effect of the activity rather than being controlled by a generic ban.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Clevedon Community Board	63/9	Pacific Oysters	Pacific Oyster removal: - Should be encouraged in many areas, fisheries Regs maximise that pp per day. Maybe this needs reviewing looking at the problem some areas have. - There is no reason to "have to" remove the shells, there might be mechanical methods used to crush oysters which would do a good job. - The most effective way to destroy the oysters is to physically remove them or crush them, this is preferable to using chemicals.
The Onehunga Enhancement Society	64/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
The Onehunga Enhancement Society	64/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.
The Onehunga Enhancement Society	64/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
The Onehunga Enhancement Society	64/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 (plan attached). Submission is supported by O.A & K.W Willoughby.
Libby Inch	65/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Libby Inch	65/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Libby Inch	65/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Libby Inch	65/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Kathleen Garrett	66/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Kathleen Garrett	66/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.
Kathleen Garrett	66/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Kathleen Garrett	66/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Gregory Philip Jordan	67/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Gregory Philip Jordan	67/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Gregory Philip Jordan	67/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Gregory Philip Jordan	67/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Andy Gibson	68/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves should only be permitted in areas with a long history of their existence.
Andy Gibson	68/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Andy Gibson	68/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Andy Gibson	68/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Peter & Eleanor Williams	69/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Peter & Eleanor Williams	69/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Peter & Eleanor Williams	69/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Peter & Eleanor Williams	69/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Brent Hubbard	70/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Brent Hubbard	70/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Brent Hubbard	70/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	The desirability of mangroves as a fish breeding habitat does not mean that selected areas where human recreation would take place were it not for the mangroves shouldn't be cleared.
Brent Hubbard	70/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
The Manukau Cruising Club Inc	71/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves, silt and mud are building up around the few boat ramps in the upper harbour restricting the use of the harbour.
The Manukau Cruising Club Inc	71/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.
The Manukau Cruising Club Inc	71/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
The Manukau Cruising Club Inc	71/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Garth Houltham	72/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Garth Houltham	72/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Garth Houltham	72/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Garth Houltham	72/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Allan Oglivie Carbines	73/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves, silt and mud are building up around the few boat ramps in the upper harbour restricting the use of the harbour.
Allan Oglivie Carbines	73/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.
Allan Oglivie Carbines	73/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Allan Oglivie Carbines	73/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Maria Carbines	74/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves, silt and mud are building up around the few boat ramps in the upper harbour restricting the use of the harbour.
Maria Carbines	74/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Maria Carbines	74/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Maria Carbines	74/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Craig Pulman	75/1	Supports another submission	Supports the submission written by Malcolm John Roberts.
Craig Pulman	75/2	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Seeks an active plan to progressively remove the mangroves that are now threatening to clog our inner harbours. Supports controlling the spread of mangroves but opposes the measures proposed by the ARC as they are totally inadequate to solve the current problem.
Craig Pulman	75/3	Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs	The Wattle Downs reserve area requires a similar action plan to that which Papakura District Council has adopted; a pro-active approach to the clearance and disposal of mangroves in some areas before these beaches are destroyed. It is not sufficient to rely on foreshore users and local residents to take responsibility for the problem by permitting removal of mangroves of a very small size from some areas.
Peter Michael Garrett	76/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves, silt and mud are building up around the few boat ramps in the upper harbour restricting the use of the harbour.
Peter Michael Garrett	76/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.
Peter Michael Garrett	76/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Peter Michael Garrett	76/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Rosina Lucich	77/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago. Mangroves, silt and mud are building up around the few boat ramps in the upper harbour restricting the use of the harbour.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Rosina Lucich	77/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.
Rosina Lucich	77/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Rosina Lucich	77/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Delwyn Arthur	78/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Delwyn Arthur	78/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Delwyn Arthur	78/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Delwyn Arthur	78/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Steven Paul Inch	79/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Steven Paul Inch	79/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Steven Paul Inch	79/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Steven Paul Inch	79/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Jenjira Kaewkanlaya	80/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Jenjira Kaewkanlaya	80/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Jenjira Kaewkanlaya	80/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Jenjira Kaewkanlaya	80/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
John Yelverton	81/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
John Yelverton	81/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
John Yelverton	81/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
John Yelverton	81/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Manukau Harbour Protection Society	82/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Manukau Harbour Protection Society	82/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Manukau Harbour Protection Society	82/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Manukau Harbour Protection Society	82/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Katy Wright	83/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Katy Wright	83/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
Katy Wright	83/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Katy Wright	83/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
JB & J Clark & Family	84/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
JB & J Clark & Family	84/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.
JB & J Clark & Family	84/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
JB & J Clark & Family	84/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Steven McKeating	85/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Steven McKeating	85/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes natures way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from mans activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention and treatment prior to discharge.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Steven McKeating	85/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Steven McKeating	85/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Erskine Family Trust	86/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that the removal of mangroves be a permitted activity in all CPA areas where mangroves did not exist 50 years ago.
Erskine Family Trust	86/2	Sediment issues	Acknowledges that mangroves are sometimes nature's way of attempting to control sediment and pollution from man's activities; it is more appropriate that this should now be controlled through storm water detention prior to discharge.
Erskine Family Trust	86/3	Value of mangroves; questions value to fish	Questions the value placed on mangroves as a fish breeding habitat; there was probably a greater proliferation of fish prior to mangroves establishing.
Erskine Family Trust	86/4	Restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20	Seeks that the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal be changed to permit the restoration of the Onehunga foreshore west of SH20 .
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/1	Integrated management: protection v removal	The submitter would look at programmes that look at 'managed' protection taking all things into account before any programme that solely looks at the removal or full clearance of Manawa. Where relevant the submitter would also consider methodology to counter-act the issues of flooding and deteriorating water quality.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/2	Comprehensive Coastal Management Plans & Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Seeks that Ngati Whatua be involved with the development and consultation associated with any Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan or Integrated Management Plan.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/3	16.1 - Introduction Reference to "Manawa"	Seeks the use of the traditional name, "Manawa" as this will stimulate public interest in seeking to understand the depth of meaning in the plant being the 'heart' of the food source.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/4	16.1 - Introduction Opposes general mangrove removal	There is no 'appropriate' time nor excuse for removal of the heart (mangrove food source), unless there is an artery blockage or heart attack potential.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested	
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/5	16.1 - Introduction	Consultation: tangata whenua values	Adverse effects of Manawa removal need careful assessment and consideration. The deliberate modification of the foreshore and seabed by Manawa removal will cause spiritual disturbance and cultural offence of Ngati Whaatua Mana Whenua in the event that a process of consultation and assessment has not been enacted.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/6	16.2 2	Sediment issues	16.2.2 attests for the need in the development of culverts, causeways and amenities, to ensure that the impacts of construction does not aggravate sediment accumulation and coastal erosion.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/7	16.4.1 c	Value of mangroves	Supports 16.4.1 but seeks the addition to c: <i>"...the activity will not result in the permanent loss of any habitat or a rare or endangered species; [given that the Manawa is a rare endangered species in itself, from approximately latitude 38 degrees south] and</i>
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/8	16.5.13	Consultation and notification of affected parties	The submitter wants to be involved with assessing applications for restricted discretionary activities.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/9	16.5.16 (17) b	Mangrove removal: public access	Opposes the inclusion of boardwalks (in pre-notification version of plan change); boardwalks can be constructed around mature trees, saving the plant from destruction.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/10		Mangrove values: historical & cultural values	Seeks that the plan change recognise the following values of mangroves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- historical value (19 million years in Aotearoa)</li> <li>- cultural value, the plant highlights the role of Kohanga (as marine species form nurseries around the central plants)</li> <li>- ecological value, the plant highlights the role of Manaaki (as the plants form a buffer against tidal movement to shelter species, further protecting against shoreline erosion)</li> <li>- geological value, the plant highlights the whakamahi (as the plants actively filter the sediments and siltation land run-off)</li> <li>- recognising that terrestrial activities will increase siltation and water run-off, causing Manawa to increase; consideration must be included into new development plans and for continuing use of existing amenities.</li> </ul>
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/11	Definitions	Definitions	Seeks to ensure that these definitions do not lose significance of the terminology, over time and through new staff structures and the definitions becoming the generic term that is manipulated to fit the 'non-compliance' status.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/12	16.4.4 Policies	Opposes 16.4.4.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/13	16.4.5 Policies	Opposes 16.4.5.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/14	16.4.6 Policies	Supports 16.4.6.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/15	16.5.2 Permitted Activities	Supports 16.5.2.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/16	16.5.12 & 13 (now numbered 16.5.14) Non-notification of affected parties	Supports 16.5.12 and 16.5.13 but seeks to be involved with assessing applications for restricted discretionary activities.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/17	16.5.15 & 16.5.16 Discretionary Activities	Supports 16.5.15 and 16.5.16; subject to amendment to 16.5.17 b recognising that boardwalks can be constructed around mature Manawa trees, saving them from destruction.
Ngati Whatua Nga Rima O Kaipara Trust	87/18	16.5.20 & 21 (now numbered 16.5.21 & 22) Non Complying Activities	Supports 16.5.20 and 16.5.21.
Jim Sinclair	88/1	Mangrove removal: Otara Lake	Opposes the plan change in part. Seeks that the Otara lake be recognised as a man-made construct and be given special status to enable the removal of mangroves as a permitted activity (this does not change the status of the CPA2 area on the northern shore). In the alternative, introduce rules to allow greater provision for mangrove removal in Otara lake, for example as a controlled activity.
Jim Sinclair	88/2	16.4.8 Ecological Assessment Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Opposes 16.4.8 . Seeks that the ARC carry out further work on the regional context of mangrove removal rather than putting the onus on applicants to provide this information. This may include identifying areas where it may be appropriate to remove mangroves and allowing for this removal.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Mrs P R McDonald	89/1	Mangrove removal: supports: Tamaki River	Seeks consideration of ways to restore the estuary of Wakaaranga Stream to how it was 10 years ago; - maybe removing all the mangroves down the whole Wakaaranga Stream; - ensuring there is free flowing water from the small hills above it by growing small areas of bush and trees.
Gavin Fortune	90/1	Mangrove removal: supports: Tamaki River	Suggests that mangroves should be removed, particularly at Farm Cove Bay, and that some small beaches be created.
Bruce Graburn Barrack	91/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports the proposed changes and seeks to dispel some myths about the benefits of mangroves and to realise their detrimental invasiveness in many locations. (Discusses observation of past 43 years living on the banks of the Tamaki Estuary)
Bruce Graburn Barrack	91/2	Mangrove removal: supports: Tamaki Estuary, (example of changes when mangroves killed by oil spill)	Seeks to use the example of the positive environmental changes that occurred after a fire at an edible oil storage warehouse resulted in oil smothering, and killing mangroves - which were subsequently removed. (Tamaki Estuary - happy for site visits).
Jim Donald	92/1	Mangrove values	Opposes the propagation of mangroves and believes that they are not a 'native' plant and are a fairly recent arrival in New Zealand. Considers that they are taking over the Waiwera Estuary.
Jim Donald	92/2	Mangrove removal: supports	Seeks that mangroves are able to be controlled and not allowed to grow at will all over the coastline and estuaries.
H C Aiken	93/1	Mangrove removal: supports: Tamaki Estuary (Wakaaranga Creek)	Seeks that mangroves role in coastal ecology be recognised by allowing them to border the creek but that the central area be cleared to allow the water to flow freely again. Concerned over the rapid and invasive spread of mangroves (near entrance to Wakaaranga Creek), particularly : - the effect on water flows, views and the variety of birds; - that if unchecked we may lose oystercatchers and godwits.
Botany Community Board	94/1	Supports another submission	The submitter supports the submissions of the Manukau City Council, the Mangere Community Board, the Manurewa Community Board and the Otara Community Board.
Botany Community Board	94/2	16.4.6 Mangrove removal: Mangere Bridge/Onehunga	Supports 16.4.6.
Botany Community Board	94/3	16.4.7 Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Supports 16.4.7.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested	
Botany Community Board	94/4	16.5	Rules	Supports 16.5; where the community sees the need or Council officers determine that in the future a need may arise.
Botany Community Board	94/5	16.5.2 b	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Supports the total cleared area being 40m <sup>2</sup> .
Botany Community Board	94/6	16.5.3	Seedling Removal	Supports 16.5.3; there are areas of the coastline that are inundated with mangroves - can a more rigorous and ongoing programme of removal be applied?
Botany Community Board	94/7	16.5.17	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	Supports 16.5.17; there are a number of areas where bird/fish habitat need to be protected.
Botany Community Board	94/8		Rewrite for clarity	Suggests that clear and simple guidelines need to be communicated to the public to ensure that is a full understanding of the changes. Some community meetings/education of school aged students would be beneficial.
Botany Community Board	94/9	16.1 - Introduction	Visual Amenity	Opposes the Introduction in part. Seeks that it include the matter of aesthetics and the conservation of visual amenity, including free flowing water and expanses of water be addressed.
Botany Community Board	94/10	16.2.3	Issue	Supports 16.2.3. Explanatory investigations should be undertaken into sustaining adequate water flows that allow for a natural flushing of these waterways.
Botany Community Board	94/11		Whole plan change Mangrove removal: Otara Lake	Seeks that the current general management area of Otara Lake be accorded special status to enable the removal of mangroves as a permitted activity (note, this does not change status of CPA2 area on northern shore).
Botany Community Board	94/12		Mangrove removal: Otara Lake	Seeks that if mangrove removal in the general management area in Otara Lake is not provided for as a permitted activity then greater provision for removal is made, for example as a controlled activity. A number of reasons are given in support of the proposed provisions.
Botany Community Board	94/13	16.5 Rules	Mangrove removal: supports	Opposes the current rules (16.5) as they fail to consider special cases where rapid mangrove colonisation is occurring and if not accorded more latitude to remove mangroves will reduce future options to enhance environmental quality and provide for other uses of the coastal area.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Botany Community Board	94/14	16.4.5 Public access: Allow for boardwalks and jetties (CPA1 areas)	Opposes 16.4.5. Seeks a clear statement that allows for the construction of board walks and jetties.
Botany Community Board	94/15	16.5.17 Public access: Allow for boardwalks and jetties (CPA1 areas)	Opposes 16.5.17. Seeks an amendment to allow for the construction of board walks and jetties.
Botany Community Board	94/16	Whole plan change Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Opposes in part. Seeks that the ARC identify specific areas where mangrove removal may be appropriate and allow for this removal through appropriate rules. Preserving the visual aspect of waterways needs to be an objective of the mangrove management plan.
Botany Community Board	94/17	16.5.17 Mangrove removal: supports: recreational use and cultural activities visual amenity	Opposes 16.5.17. Seeks that this rule be worded to recognise the appropriateness of mangrove removal where necessary to allow for: - recreational use and the participation of cultural activities such as waka training and races - maintaining and/or enhancing the visual amenity of areas for increased enjoyment and appreciation of the environment
Botany Community Board	94/18	16.4.8 Ecological Assessment Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Opposes 16.4.8. Seeks that the ARC accept responsibility for carrying out the feasibility of removing mangroves when it is a community initiative, rather than putting the onus on applicants to provide this information. This may include identifying areas where it may be appropriate to remove mangroves and allowing for this removal.
Botany Community Board	94/19	16.4.1 1 (iv) Maintenance of navigation: Tamaki Estuary	Seeks that Policy 16.4.1 iv be amended to read "improve <i>or maintain</i> navigation and safety; or..." as maintenance of navigation is also an issue; particularly in some areas such as the Tamaki Estuary.
Botany Community Board	94/20	16.5.2 Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Opposes the 30m <sup>2</sup> limitation and seeks that this be increased to permit clearance up to 50 m <sup>2</sup> around structures, infrastructure, and drainage structures and up to 3 metres each side of these.
Botany Community Board	94/21	Whole plan change Mangrove removal: Otaru Lake	Seeks that the current general management area of Otara Lake be accorded special status to enable the removal of mangroves as a permitted activity (note, this does not change status of CPA2 area on northern shore).

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Botany Community Board	94/22		Mangrove removal: Otara Lake
Botany Community Board	94/23	16.4.8	Active plan sought for mangrove removal
Botany Community Board	94/24	16.5.17	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas
Botany Community Board	94/25	16.4.5	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas
Botany Community Board	94/26	16.5.17	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Botany Community Board	94/27		Active plan sought for mangrove removal: visual amenity, access and recreation
Botany Community Board	94/28	16.5.17 & 16.4.5	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas
Botany Community Board	94/29	16.1	Introduction
Botany Community Board	94/30	16.6	Other Methods
Botany Community Board	94/31	16.5.23	Rewrite for clarity
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/1	16.1 - Introduction	Visual Amenity

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested	
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/2	16.2.3	Issue	Supports 16.2.3. Explanatory investigations should be undertaken into sustaining adequate water flows that allow for a natural flushing of these waterways.
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/3		Mangrove removal: Otara Lake	Seeks that the current general management area of Otara Lake be accorded special status to enable the removal of mangroves as a permitted activity (note, this does not change status of CPA2 area on northern shore).
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/4		Mangrove removal: Otara Lake	Seeks that if mangrove removal in the general management area in Otara Lake is not provided for as a permitted activity then greater provision for removal is made, for example as a controlled activity. It is considered highly unlikely that the removal of mangroves around the Otara Lake margin (general management area) would have more than a minor effect upon the lake environs or the Tamaki Estuary.
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/5	16.5 Rules	Mangrove removal: supports	Opposes the current rules (16.5) as they fail to consider special cases where rapid mangrove colonisation is occurring and if not accorded more latitude to remove mangroves will reduce future options to enhance environmental quality and provide for other uses of the coastal area.
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/6	16.4.5	Public access: Allow for boardwalks and jetties (CPA1 areas)	Opposes 16.4.5. Seeks a clear statement that allows for the construction of board walks and jetties.
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/7	16.5.17	Public access: Allow for boardwalks and jetties (CPA1 areas)	Opposes 16.5.17. Seeks an amendment to allow for the construction of board walks and jetties.
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/8	Whole Plan change	Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Opposes in part. Seeks that the ARC identify specific areas where mangrove removal may be appropriate and allow for this removal through appropriate rules. Preserving the visual aspect of waterways needs to be an objective of the mangrove management plan.
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/9	16.5.17	Mangrove removal: supports: recreational use and cultural activities visual amenity	Opposes. Seeks that this rule be worded to recognise the appropriateness of mangrove removal where necessary to allow for: - recreational use and the participation of cultural activities such as waka training and races - maintaining and/or enhancing the visual amenity of areas for increased enjoyment and appreciation of the environment

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested	
Otara Community Board - Efu Koka	95/10	16.4.8	Ecological Assessment Active plan sought for mangrove removal	Opposes. Seeks that the ARC accept responsibility for carrying out the feasibility of removing mangroves when it is a community initiative, rather than putting the onus on applicants to provide this information. This may include identifying areas where it may be appropriate to remove mangroves and allowing for this removal.
Jonette Haig	96/1		Mangrove removal: supports: Tamaki Estuary	Seeks that the Tamaki Estuary be kept clear of mangroves and that the mangroves growing at the mouth of the Wakaaranga Creek be removed, as well as those growing at main water exit and entry areas; others should be thinned out.
Alan R Gautier	97/1		Mangrove removal: supports Supports seedling removal	Supports the management of mangroves, a reduction of colonisation and the removal of seedlings.
Alice Elaine Hill	98/1		Mangrove removal: supports: Tamaki Estuary	Supports mangrove removal (photo of extent of colonisation at Tamaki Bay over 11 years); we must not allow mangroves to take over.
Alice Elaine Hill	98/2	16.5.3 c	Seedling Removal	Supports 16.5.3 c.
Alice Elaine Hill	98/3	16.5 Rules	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports. Supports the clearing of 30m <sup>2</sup> or more; It would be good if entrances to bays could be kept open,
Martin Hutchinson	99/1		Supports plan change	Supports all the changes suggested as the increase in the growth of mangroves in places like the Tamaki Estuary particularly between Farm Cove and Manurewa Bridge is leading to the development of areas of black mud and the serious build up of silt in the Tamaki Estuary.
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/1	16.1	Whole plan change	Opposes in part; the Introduction does identify the issues very well but the remedial sections do not sufficiently actively address the significant problem of forestation of mature and seedling mangroves and offer a practical solution.
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/2	Rules	Permitted Activities	Supports removal being a permitted activity but opposes this being limited to the removal of seedlings by hand alone as this is a very restrictive way of implementing removal and does not impact on more established plants.
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/3	16.4.1 a	Policies	Supports 16.4.1 a, subject to including the following 2 new reasons in (a): - <i>"maintain or enhance coastal wildlife habitat"</i> and - <i>"maintain and enhance historical and archaeological values"</i> .

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/4	16.4.5	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Supports 16.4.5, subject to including the following 2 new reasons: - <u>"maintain or enhance coastal wildlife habitat"</u> and - <u>"maintain and enhance historical and archaeological values"</u> .
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/5	16.4.6	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Opposes in part 16.4.6. Seeks that the reference to this policy not applying to Coastal Protection Area 1 areas being deleted from the first sentence: <u>"Mangrove removal, other than in a Coastal Protection Area 1, may be considered appropriate where..."</u>
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/6	16.5.2	Permitted Activities Opposes in part 16.5.2. Seeks the following changes: Include in opening sentence; - <u>"maintain or enhance coastal wildlife habitat"</u> and - <u>"maintain and enhance historical and archaeological values"</u> Delete section (a) so that it will apply to CPA1 areas; - <u>"the activity does not take place in a Coastal Protection Area 1; and</u>
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/7	16.5.3	Seedling Removal Opposes in part 16.5.3. Seeks that the reference to this rule not applying to seedling removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas be deleted.
Honorary Rangers' Committee Auckland City Council Tahuna Torea Nature	100/8	16.5.7	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas areas Opposes in part 16.5.7. Seeks that mangrove removal in CPA1 areas should be a permitted rather than discretionary activity simply on the basis of cost/procedural implications of the latter. If this remains a discretionary rather than a permitted activity then additional criteria be added: - <u>"maintaining or enhancing historical and archaeological values; or</u> - <u>"maintaining or enhancing coastal wildlife habitat"</u> .
Friends of Lucas Creek Inc	101/1		Sediment issues Supports addressing sedimentation issues to minimise the rampant expansion of mangroves. Lucas Creek has suffered significantly from the adverse effects of sedimentation and mangrove expansion.
Friends of Lucas Creek Inc	101/2		Seedling Removal Seeks that seedling removal to allow communities to hold the line be applicable to Lucas Creek (believes that this rule does not apply as this area is of special wildlife interest and a conservation zone).
Friends of Lucas Creek Inc	101/3		Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal Opposes the clearing of up to 30 m <sup>2</sup> as a permitted activity in areas of significant wildlife interest without a resource consent.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Friends of Lucas Creek Inc	101/4	Whole plan change	Supports a long term solution to excessive mangrove colonisation being thoroughly and scientifically investigated now.
Len Cooper	102/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Supports retaining traditional areas of mangroves but seeks that there be a demarcation line. Suggests that the mangrove boundaries of 1970 or 1950 could be used, and mangroves removed back to these limits.
Len Cooper	102/2	Sediment issues	Seeks that councils be proactive in ensuring that development work does not result in the harbour, bays and coves being silted up - and for remedy.
Heather Brown	103/1	Mangrove removal: Hellyers Creek	Opposes the mangroves in Hellyers Creek and wishes to be heard at the hearing where the submitter will make a full report on their views.
Hobsonville Land Company	104/1	Supports whole plan change	Supports the proposed changes as a practical mechanism for allowing appropriate management of coastal areas affected by mangrove colonisation.
Hobsonville Land Company	104/2	Seedling removal	Supports the inclusion of manual seedling removal as a permitted/controlled activity and see this as a valuable management tool in areas where mangrove colonisation is impacting on recreational access, navigational, ecological and/or amenity value.
Bernard Lewis	105/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports the plan changes, i.e. remove mangroves from areas of public use/access and where obvious mangrove invasion has taken place. Cannot see any reason to protect the mangrove and need to acknowledge that it is the "blackberry of the sea" and take appropriate measures to ensure its incessant spread is controlled.
Vivienne Keohane	106/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Seeks more lenient rules for mangrove removal; waterways should be classed as recreation areas and mangroves are preventing use of many of these.
Vivienne Keohane	106/2	Rules	Seeks a policy to allow free applications for removal, (such as the tree policy of North Shore City Council) with automatic approval of 30m <sup>2</sup> with discretion of local council to ensure not too many applications are approved. All removals to be done by community groups who must demonstrate that the local community supports the removal; the groups to provide their own funding if needed.
Vivienne Keohane	106/3	16.5.2 Rules	Seeks that the requirement that mangrove removal be for a structure be removed.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Vivienne Keohane	106/4	16.5.2	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal Seeks that applications for the removal of mangroves for areas larger than 30m <sup>2</sup> be approved by the Council in the area, who must take into account cumulative effects.
Vivienne Keohane	106/5		Mangrove values: questions eco values Questions ecological values. Overseas research has shown that in some cases, the mangroves can hold so much run off from the land, including various chemicals, to such an extent that the water can become incapable of supporting marine life. Therefore the idea and theory that mangroves are feeding grounds for various marine life is flawed.
Mary O'Sullivan	107/1		Opposes whole plan change Opposes mangrove removal Opposes the whole plan change; let the mangroves proceed without interference because: - they are the nursery/breeding places of our sea life - natural selection/ecology will keep mangroves in bounds - mangroves needed to deal with run-off of sewage after rain - mangroves will help absorb the "vileness" of city dwellers
Graham Wilfred Ashton	108/1		Supports whole plan change Mangrove removal: supports Supports the whole change. Has observed mangrove spread at Lucas Creek; if something is not done water flow after heavy rain will be restricted by the narrowing clear waterway.
Graham Wilfred Ashton	108/2		Visual Amenity Seeks provisions to be included to allow a reduction in the height of mangroves, some of which are now 12/15 feet high (Lucas Creek).
Whangateau Traditional Boatyard Society Inc	109/1		Supports balanced approach to mangrove management Supports the recognition that mangroves are interfering with natural waterways and causing reclamation of coastal streams, but hopes that the spirit of this mangrove management plan does not foster a slash and burn mentality on the NZ coast as this may lead to more uglification; the coastline still needs careful management and respect from residents.
Whangateau Traditional Boatyard Society Inc	109/2	16.1	Introduction Supports 16.1.
Whangateau Traditional Boatyard Society Inc	109/3	16.4.1 v	Mangrove removal: supports: viability of infrastructure structures & outfalls Supports 16.4.1 v; mangrove removal may be appropriate to ensure the viability of public infrastructure such as storm water outlets, boat ramps etc.
Whangateau Traditional Boatyard Society Inc	109/4	16.4.4 - 16.4.7	Policies Supports; this recognises that urban bays such as those adjacent to the Bayswater peninsula have recreational and amenity values which need to be protected from unwelcome mangrove encroachment.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Whangateau Traditional Boatyard Society Inc	109/5	16.5	Rules Supports 16.5.
Whangateau Traditional Boatyard Society Inc	109/6	Appendix H	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Supports the use of Integrated Management Plans (as set out in Appendix H) as a means of establishing the interacting factors at any one site subject to the following condition: - that it should be stipulated that public experience and historical descriptions be sought and considered within the development of a draft plan before a final plan is put out to those who reside in the area and to the local authorities involved. There is a natural ebb and flow in the growth of mangrove areas and while this is hard to separate from the surrounding changes in the man made environment this needs careful consideration. (ref to Bayswater Community Committee submission).
Marie & Russell Ward	110/1		Supports balanced approach to mangrove management Supports the recognition that mangroves are interfering with natural waterways and causing reclamation of coastal streams, but hopes that the spirit of this mangrove management plan does not foster a slash and burn mentality on the NZ coast as this may lead to more uglification; the coastline still needs careful management and respect from residents.
Marie & Russell Ward	110/2	16.1	Introduction Supports.
Marie & Russell Ward	110/3	16.4.1 v	Mangrove removal: supports: viability of infrastructure structures & outfalls Supports; mangrove removal may be appropriate to ensure the viability of public infrastructure such as storm water outlets, boat ramps etc.
Marie & Russell Ward	110/4	16.4.4 - 16.4.7	Policies Supports; this recognises that urban bays such as those adjacent to the Bayswater peninsula have recreational and amenity values which need to be protected from unwelcome mangrove encroachment.
Marie & Russell Ward	110/5	16.5	Rules Supports.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Marie & Russell Ward	110/6	Appendix H Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Supports the use of Integrated Management Plans (as set out in Appendix H) as a means of establishing the interacting factors at any one site subject to the following condition: - that it should be stipulated that public experience and historical descriptions be sought and considered within the development of a draft plan before a final plan is put out to those who reside in the area and to the local authorities involved. There is a natural ebb and flow in the growth of mangrove areas and while this is hard to separate from the surrounding changes in the man made environment this needs careful consideration. (ref to Bayswater Community Committee submission).
Marjorie W Mumme	111/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports the changes proposed in this latest review, but seeks that it goes further and allows for handheld means of eradicating the existing mangroves for a period of time so that the spread and growth can be stopped or at least controlled.
Marjorie W Mumme	111/2	Mangrove removal and dredging: Hellyers Creek	Suggests that the waterways in the upper reaches of Hellyers Creek could be saved from extinction if the dredging and removal of the mud could be mixed with cement and walls made to stop the silt entering the waterways. This is a "historic site" and needs to be preserved.
Malcolm Ross Black	112/1	16.5.2 Permitted Activities	Opposes in part 16.5.2. Seeks an addition that will allow for opening up beach areas which have become overgrown with mangroves over the last 50 years : <i>"or provide unrestricted access to a beach area"</i> .
Malcolm Ross Black	112/2	16.5.2 b Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Opposes in part 16.5.2 b. Seeks that the total area that can be cleared by increased from 30m <sup>2</sup> to 100m <sup>2</sup>
Malcolm Ross Black	112/3	16.5.3 b Seedling removal	Opposes in part 16.5.3 b. Seeks that the area that can be removed without notifying the ARC be increased from 30m <sup>2</sup> to 100m <sup>2</sup> .
Malcolm Ross Black	112/4	16.5.12 Controlled Activities	Opposes in part 16.5.12. Seeks that the criteria relating to exceeding 30m <sup>2</sup> of clearance be increased to 100m <sup>2</sup> .

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Herald Island & Whenuapai Estuary Group	113/1	Definition: Estuary Care Groups	Seeks the addition of a definition for Estuary Care Groups to formalise recognised Estuary groups. Seeks the inclusion of a definition as included in the Tauranga Harbour Integrated Management Strategy Report; Care, Hapu and/or Ratepayer and Environmental Groups. Seeks the formalisation of ARC's approach to Estuary Care by signing of Memorandum of understanding between partner groups and the investigation of ways to better support interest care groups through financial support where appropriate and access to resources (including staff).
Herald Island & Whenuapai Estuary Group	113/2	16.1 Introduction	Seeks an addition at 16.1: <u>"However, over the last 20 years..." add <i>recognition that mangroves and the increased levels of sedimentation can retain toxins from natural seepage, wastewater systems and septic tanks outfalls. In turn in some circumstances this can affect water quality and recreational areas.</i>"</u>
Herald Island & Whenuapai Estuary Group	113/3	16.1 Introduction	Seeks an addition at 16.1: <u>"add recognition mangroves cause a build-up of the coastal floor level and as such reduce tidal flows. This build-up process is a form of reclamation and alters original and future coastal (the?) environment."</u> The preamble refers to the mangrove eco values but needs to also recognise the changes to the eco values also create through reclamation and build-up of the coastal floor.
Bayswater Community Committee	114/1	Sediment issues	Recognises that sedimentation is an important factor associated with mangroves and that this is very complex. Supports more research as a basis for future mangrove management planning.
Bayswater Community Committee	114/2	16.1 Introduction	Supports 16.1.
Bayswater Community Committee	114/3	16.4.1 (v) Mangrove removal: supports: viability of infrastructure structures & outfalls	Supports 16.4.1 v; mangrove removal may be appropriate to ensure the viability of public infrastructure such as storm water outlets, boat ramps etc.
Bayswater Community Committee	114/4	16.4.4 - 16.4.7 Policies	Supports; this recognises that urban bays such as those adjacent to the Bayswater peninsula have recreational and amenity values which need to be protected from unwelcome mangrove encroachment.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Bayswater Community Committee	114/5	16.5 Rules	Supports 16.5.
Bayswater Community Committee	114/6	Appendix H Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Supports the use of Integrated Management Plans (as set out in Appendix H) as a means of establishing the interacting factors at any one site subject to the following condition: - that it should be stipulated that public experience and historical descriptions be sought and considered within the development of a draft plan before a final plan is put out to those who reside in the area and to the local authorities involved. There is a natural ebb and flow in the growth of mangrove areas and while this is hard to separate from the surrounding changes in the man made environment this needs careful consideration.
Beach Haven, Birkdale Ratepayers Ass	115/1	16.1 Introduction	Opposes in part 16.1. Supports the proposed change with the addition of the following paragraph: <i>"Application for controlled activities, restricted discretionary activities or discretionary activities made by local body approved volunteer organisation shall be free for the initial application. Additional applications for areas covered by the initial application, restricted coastal activities or non complying activities shall occur normal fees as set out by the ARC at the said time."</i>
Beach Haven, Birkdale Ratepayers Ass	115/2	16.3 Objective	Supports 16.3; agrees with the objective of the plan.
Beach Haven, Birkdale Ratepayers Ass	115/3	16.4 Policies Mangrove removal: supports	Supports 16.4; mangrove removal is required to maintain access to public areas.
Beach Haven, Birkdale Ratepayers Ass	115/4	16.5 Seedling removal	Opposes in part 16.5. Supports the proposed changes with the exception of 16.5.3c and seeks that it be amended to include the use of powered hand held tools: <i>"That seedlings are removed by hand pulling and the removal does not involve the use of <u>powered</u> hand held tools or machinery; and"</i> This allows assisted hand pulling using weed removal tools, but does not allow cutting of mangrove seedlings.
Beach Haven, Birkdale Ratepayers Ass	115/5	16.6 - 16.8 Other Methods Principal Reasons for Adopting Anticipated Environmental Results	Supports all the proposed changes 16.6 -16.8.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Birkenhead/Northcote Community Board	116/1	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Supports in part the preparation of integrated management plans which recognise the interconnectedness of land and sea. As the waterways are important and recreational areas and the mangroves are compromising the recreational use of our coastlines.
Birkenhead/Northcote Community Board	116/2	16.5 Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Supports the removal of areas on a small scale but seeks that the scale of removal be 100m <sup>2</sup> instead of 30m <sup>2</sup> with the relevant Local Authority affected dealing with the issue.
Birkenhead/Northcote Community Board	116/3	16.5.4 Controlled Activities	Seeks that the scale of removal for controlled activities requiring a resource consent should be for clearance over 100m <sup>2</sup> rather than over 30 m <sup>2</sup> .
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/1	Supports whole plan change Mangrove removal: supports: Shoal Bay	Supports all of the proposed plan change; we have to act now to save the inner bays around the Waitemata Harbour, particularly northern side of Shoal Bay, from being taken over by mangroves.
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/2	Supports another submission	Supports the Bayswater Committee submission.
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/3	Sediment issues	Recognises that sedimentation is an important factor associated with mangroves and that this is very complex. Supports more research as a basis for future mangrove management planning.
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/4	16.1 Introduction	Supports 16.1.
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/5	16.4.1 (v) Mangrove removal: supports: viability of infrastructure structures & outfalls	Supports 16.4.1 v; mangrove removal may be appropriate to ensure the viability of public infrastructure such as storm water outlets, boat ramps etc.
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/6	16.4.4 - 16.4.7 Policies	Supports; this recognises that urban bays such as those adjacent to the Bayswater peninsula have recreational and amenity values which need to be protected from unwelcome mangrove encroachment.
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/7	16.5 Rules	Supports 16.5.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Lesley Opie/ Myles Opie	117/8	Appendix H	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)
	Supports the use of Integrated Management Plans (as set out in Appendix H) as a means of establishing the interacting factors at any one site subject to the following condition: - that it should be stipulated that public experience and historical descriptions be sought and considered within the development of a draft plan before a final plan is put out to those who reside in the area and to the local authorities involved. There is a natural ebb and flow in the growth of mangrove areas and while this is hard to separate from the surrounding changes in the man made environment this needs careful consideration.		
L Humphreys	118/1		Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs
	Expresses concern that at Wattle Downs there has been a deterioration from little sandy beaches to a sea of mangroves; loss of fish; ability for rescue of aircraft who fly over the area in the event of an accident.		
Shirley Foster	119/1		Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs
	Seeks restoration of the small beach areas (present 20 years ago) at Wattle Downs next to parks and grassy areas; does not advocate removing mangroves wholesale, but seeks to prevent small areas of sandy beach slowly being overgrown and made muddy by encroaching mangroves.		
Elizabeth Christensen	120/1		Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs
	Supports mangrove removal to re-establish the little sandy beaches and marine life; seeks to "give us back our water views and playground."		
Catherine King & Kevin King	121/1		Mangrove removal: supports: Weymouth
	Supports mangrove removal in the public access ways and recreation areas; Weymouth wharf is no longer used for the water activities it used to be because of the mangroves and the estuary will soon be so full of mangroves the yacht club and boat club will be hard pressed to get through. (photos attached)		
Peter Czaykowski	122/1		Supports plan change Mangrove removal: supports: Weymouth
	Supports mangrove removal; our area was used for swimming with easy access to the tidal water, now access is very limited, with mangroves covering almost the whole shore. The mud and roots prevent large portions of the coast around Weymouth from being used for recreation.		
Arthur George Randlers	123/1		Supports plan change Mangrove removal: supports: Weymouth
	Supports mangrove removal, especially in places that affect wildlife around the foreshore (no longer see white heron). Land development has resulted in an explosion of mangroves in all of the estuaries around the area; areas are becoming inaccessible by boat.		

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Chris Johns	124/1	Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs	Notes the rapid invasion of new mangroves at Wattle Downs over the last two years. Strongly supports maintaining the established mangroves and keeping the rest of the waterway free, this will provide a solution to maintaining the habitat for the wild life and ecology of the area, but it is essential to rid the rest of the estuary of any new mangroves.
Neil Frank Malins	125/1	Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs	Supports the removal of mangroves from estuaries where they border land and beaches where they once existed. Mangroves are silting up beach and other areas with mud and decaying debris and blocking coastal views.
Cyril Reginald Rosser	126/1	Mangrove removal: supports	Supports mangrove removal; the spread of mangroves is spoiling many otherwise beautiful spots.
Manurewa Marae & Community	127/1	16.4.6 Mangrove removal: Manurewa Marae (Puhinui Stream)	Supports 16.4.6. Seeks the removal of mangroves behind Manurewa Marae (Puhinui Stream) to develop a jetty and boat ramp for recreational sports behind the marae. (Submission includes 131 signatures in support).
Manurewa Marae & Community	127/2	16.4.7 Policies	Supports 16.4.7; to make sure that changes take into account both land and sea and to maintain the environment after the changes have been made. (Submission includes 131 signatures in support) .
Manurewa Marae & Community	127/3	16.5.3 Seedling Removal	Supports 16.5.3 the removal by hand of mangroves so they do not colonise the area any further and to ensure access to our facilities are maintained for the jetty we envisage. (Submission includes 131 signatures in support).
Jessie Anne Te Atatu Harris	128/1	16.4.6 Mangrove removal: Manurewa Marae (Puhinui Stream)	Supports 16.4.6. Seeks the removal of mangroves behind Manurewa Marae (Puhinui Stream) to develop a jetty and boat ramp for recreational sports behind the marae.
Jessie Anne Te Atatu Harris	128/2	16.4.7 Policies	Supports 16.4.7; to make sure that changes take into account both land and sea and to maintain the environment after the changes have been made.
Jessie Anne Te Atatu Harris	128/3	16.5.3 Seedling Removal	Supports the removal by hand of mangroves so they do not colonise the area any further and to ensure access to our facilities are maintained for the jetty we envisage.
Rangi McLean	129/1	Mangrove removal: Manurewa Marae (Puhinui Stream)	Supports. Seeks to clear a pathway of mangroves behind Manurewa Marae to install a jetty and launching pad for waka ama, waka taua, and small sea boats.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
K A King & C King	130/1	16.4.6 b Mangrove removal: supports: Weymouth	Supports 16.4.6 b; the expansion of mangroves has steadily increased to the present date obstructing recreational access and navigation in the area. (photos included).
K A King & C King	130/2	16.5.2 b Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Supports 16.5.2 b. At Waimahia inlet at Weymouth more than 30m <sup>2</sup> clearance is required to resurrect this area for public use.
K A King & C King	130/3	16.5.12 Controlled Activities	Supports 16.5.12. More than 30m <sup>2</sup> clearance is required to resurrect Waimahia inlet at Weymouth for public use and to eliminate a health and safety hazard. (Photos included).
Susan Jordan	131/1	Opposes whole plan change Value of mangroves: qsts value and status	Oppose Plan Change 4; not all mangroves swamps should be protected, mangroves are not native to New Zealand.
Susan Jordan	131/2	Mangrove removal: Wattle Downs	Seeks that the mangroves in the Wattle Downs area be removed, as they do not aid in coastal erosion in this instance; they have grown prolifically over the last 5 years; many people use the area for recreational pursuits.
Eric C Strickett	132/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Seeks that a datum be established at the pre forest felling, farming and subdividing time, for mangroves to be removed to this point. The major problem with mangrove forests is that they trap so much silt which causes all these tidal areas to become completely mud bound.
Eric C Strickett	132/2	Supports consultation	Supports consultation with the various parties (pressure groups) being carried out; there has to be agreement between various groups and their points of view.
Betty E Terzaghi	133/1	Sediment issues	Suggests that the way to control mangroves is by controlling that human behaviour which washes soil into our waterways. There is inadequate observance of the boat speed limits on the Matakana and at Sandspit; boats create waves which undermine our cliffs, adding to the damage caused by climate change and natural attrition.
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/1	16.1 Introduction	Supports 16.1. Mangrove habitats form an important component of estuarine ecosystems... needs to be addressed through greater integrated management of both catchment and marine receiving environments. The submitter strongly agrees with the need for Plan Change 4 and generally supports the detail of the of the proposed Plan Change.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/2		Generally supports plan change
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/3		Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas (precautionary approach for removal)
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/4	16.2.2	Issue
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/5	16.5.3 b	Seedling removal
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/6	16.5.12	Controlled Activities

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/7	16.5.24 Cattle/stock grazing	Opposes in part. Significant long-established mangrove areas within the Mahurangi Harbour lie outside those designated Coastal Protection Area 1. Seeks that the prohibition be amended to include Coastal Protection Area 2 areas: <i>"The grazing of cattle and stock in any Coastal Protection Area 1 <u>or Coastal Protection Area 2.</u></i>
Friends of the Mahurangi Incorporated	134/8	16.7.12 Principal Reasons for Adopting Cattle/stock grazing	Opposes in part 16.7.12. Significant long-established mangrove areas within the Mahurangi harbour lie outside those designated Coastal Protection Area 1. Seeks that Coastal Protection Area 2 areas be included in the prohibition for cattle/stock grazing: <i>"The grazing of stock in any Coastal Protection Area 1 &amp; 2 will have significant adverse effect on either the ecological or geological values, or potentially both, from trampling and the grazing of vegetation. The high probability of these effects justifies the prohibition of cattle and stock in Coastal protection Area 1 &amp; 2 areas.</i>
Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	135/1	Mangrove removal: supports: Sediment issues aesthetic & rec values other habitat values	Supports in principle the management and controlling of mangroves from further encroachment for the following reasons: - mangroves result in the loss of harbour energy and the resulting increased siltation; - mangroves by retaining and adding to the silting progressively reduce the volume of tidal movement and its ability to flush silt and maintain water quality; - need to preserve the aesthetic, commercial and recreational values of our harbours; - need to preserve the ecological habitats of our harbours threatened by mangroves, the loss of shell fish beds and mudflats are certainly detrimental to many high value native species such as snapper and our wading birds.
Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	135/2	16.5.1 Permitted Activities	Supports 16.5.1 with reservation; as accumulating sediment is the reason for the Mahurangi Action plan the Mahurangi Harbour could be exempt from this restriction as long as the exemption applies only to defined mud with a low sand content.
Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	135/3	16.5.2 Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Supports with reservation; the 30m <sup>2</sup> restriction is very limiting in achieving useful outcomes.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	135/4	16.5.3 a	Seedling removal Supports 16.5.3 a.
Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	135/5	16.5.3 b	Seedling removal Opposes 16.5.3 b; the area allowed is overly limiting and would create additional costs to manage and supervise.
Mahurangi East Residents & Ratepayers Ass Inc	135/6	16.5.3 c	Seedling removal Strongly opposes 16.5.3 c; - to cut off with a tool such as a grubber should be allowed as some mangroves even when seedlings root in to the rocky strata; - many coastal residents are elderly and would require the use of hand tools to maintain mangrove control (otherwise risk back injury); - to limit management to hand pulling when simple hand held tools would greatly reduce the time required is wasteful of time and energy
Eilene Lamb	136/1	16.4.5 a	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas areas Supports 16.4.5 a. Bird feeding areas are being lost all over the world, we need to support bird feeding areas.
Eilene Lamb	136/2	16.4.6	Mangrove removal: supports Supports 16.4.6. Need to retain bird feeding areas.
Eilene Lamb	136/3	16.5.2	Permitted Activities Supports 16.5.2, but seeks an addition to allow removal to maintain ecological areas: <i>"The removal of vegetation, including mangrove removal, that is necessary... <u>to maintain ecological areas (e.g. bird feeding places), ...."</u></i>
Franklin District Council	137/1	16.1	Introduction Supports the Introduction and seeks to retain the proposed wording in 16.1.
Franklin District Council	137/2	16.2.2	Issue Supports Issue 16.2.2 and seeks to retain the proposed wording in 16.2.2.
Franklin District Council	137/3	16.4.1 a (v)	Policies Supports Policy 16.4.1 a (v) and seeks to retain the proposed wording.
Franklin District Council	137/4	16.4.4 and 16.4.5	Policies Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas areas Supports these policies (16.4.4 and 16.4.5) and seeks to retain the proposed wording.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Franklin District Council	137/5	16.4.6 & 16.4.1	Policies
	<p>Seeks that Policy 16.4.6 be rewritten to be addressed within Policy 16.4.1, for example rewrite:                      16.4.1 i to read: <i>"rehabilitate or restore a coastal ecosystem, <u>cultural heritage site, or areas identified as having significant geological, ecological or habitat values.</u>"</i>                      16.4.6.b is adequately covered by 16.4.1 ii (enhance public access to, use and enjoyment of the coastal marine area) and                      16.4.1 iv (improve navigation and safety).                      Add a 16.4.1 viii: <i>"<u>enable the operation, maintenance, and use of lawful structures, and/or the efficient functioning of drainage systems</u>"</i>                      Similarly, 16.4.6 d and e to be incorporated into 16.4.1.</p>		
Franklin District Council	137/6	16.4.7	Policies Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)
	<p>Supports Policy 16.4.7 and seeks to retain the proposed wording.                      Seeks a minor amendment: The definition on Page 2 refers to a "Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan", however the policies and rules refer to an "Integrated Management Plan." The definition of a Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan may be redundant, as Appendix H: Integrated Management Plans seems to cover the same matters that a Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan would cover.</p>		
Franklin District Council	137/7	16.4.8	Policies Ecological assessment
	<p>Opposes Policy 16.4.8 and seeks that it be deleted. Believes that this policy could be interpreted in a manner than places an unnecessary burden on applicants. The criteria requires an assessment of effects on ecological values; it is considered that this is sufficient and a separate ecological assessment should not be required.</p>		
Franklin District Council	137/8	16.5.2	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal
	<p>Supports in part 16.5.2, but seeks reconsideration of the 30m<sup>2</sup> restriction where work is being carried out to ensure public health and safety.                      Consider adding a point "f" under 16.5.2 to the list which appears after the words "subject to the following conditions":  <i>f) removal does not take place between 1 September and 31 December in any year"</i></p>		

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Franklin District Council	137/9	16.5.3	Seedling removal
<p>Supports the permitted activity status of the removal of mangrove seedlings but considers that the removal of seedlings by hand pulling to be difficult and that the use of hand-held machinery and hand held tools will enable effective removal of seedling without causing significant disturbance to the foreshore and seabed.</p> <p>Seeks to amend the wording in 16.5.3 to enable the use of hand-held tools and hand-held machinery to remove mangrove seedlings, and remove the conditions that cleared vegetation be disposed of outside the Coastal Marine Area:</p> <p><i>"The removal of mangrove seedlings, subject to the following conditions:</i></p> <p><i>c) that seedlings are removed by hand -pulling and the removal does not involve the use of -or hand held tools or machinery; and...</i></p> <p><i>f) all cleared vegetation shall be disposed of outside of the coastal marine area</i></p>			
Franklin District Council	137/10	16.5.12, 16.5.12.1, 16.5.21.2	Controlled Activities Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal
<p>Supports 16.5.12, 6.5.12.1 and 16.5.21.2 in part but seeks reconsideration of the 30 m<sup>2</sup> threshold; this is overly restrictive, for example to retain sightlines around roads, near bridges, 200m<sup>2</sup> may need to be removed.</p>			
Franklin District Council	137/11	16.5.14.1	Restricted Discretionary Activities Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)
<p>Supports and seeks to retain the wording in 16.5.14.1. Strongly supports the consideration given to integrated management plans (16.5.14.1 h)</p>			
Franklin District Council	137/12	16.5.21	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas areas
<p>Supports and seeks to retain the wording in 16.5.21. Supports the non-complying activity status for mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas.</p>			
Franklin District Council	137/13	16.5.22	Vehicles on beaches
<p>Supports and seeks to retain the wording in 16.5.22. Supports the non-complying status and opposed to the previous prohibited status.</p>			
Franklin District Council	137/14	16.6	Other Methods
<p>Supports in part 16.6 and seeks to retain the existing Other Methods. Seeks to add a new method:</p> <p><i>"The ARC will work with local authorities and the community to develop Integrated Management Plans as set out in Appendix H."</i></p>			

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/1	16.2.2 Issue	Seeks to amend the first sentence to reflect that rapid mangrove colonisation is only occurring in a few parts of estuaries and harbours, in response to catchment degradation: <i>"Some <u>parts of</u> estuaries and harbours in the region..."</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/2	16.4.1 c Policies	Seeks amendment of policy 16.4.1 c to take account of the recognised classification of threatened species as used by the Department of Conservation, not just rare or endangered species.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/3	16.4.4 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas	Seeks that policy 16.4.4 be amended to recognise the important ecosystem values in CPA2 areas and their need for on-going protection. Include Coastal Protection Area 2: <i>"Mangrove removal within any Coastal Protection Area 1 <u>or 2...."</u></i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/4	16.4.5 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas	Seeks that policy 16.4.5 be amended to recognise the important ecosystem values in CPA2 areas and their need for on-going protection. Include Coastal Protection Area 2: <i>"Mangrove removal within any Coastal Protection Area 1 <u>or 2...."</u></i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/5	16.4.6 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 2 areas	Seeks that policy 16.4.6 be amended to recognise the important ecosystem values in CPA2 areas and their need for on-going protection. Include Coastal Protection Area 2: include Coastal Protection Area 2: <i>"Mangrove removal, other than in any Coastal Protection Area 1 <u>or 2...."</u></i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/6	16.4.7 Sediment issues	Seeks that policy 16.4.7 be amended to require the preparation and implementation of integrated catchment management plans to address sedimentation issues in coastal compartments, prior to the approval of any mangrove removal.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/7	16.5.2 a Permitted Activities Add Coastal Protection Area 2 to restriction for removal	Seeks that rule 16.5.2 a be amended to include Coastal Protection Area 2.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/8	16.5.10 a Permitted Activities Add Coastal Protection Area 2 to restriction for disturbance	Seeks that rule 16.5.10 a be amended to include Coastal Protection Area 2:

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/9	16.5.12.2	Controlled Activities Non-notification of affected parties Seeks the deletion of the phrase (at 16.5.12 2) " <i>or the need to serve notice of the application on affected persons</i> ".
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/10	16.5.18 (19?)	Restricted Coastal Activities Seeks that a new subsection be added: <i>"(d) mangrove removal, trimming or modification greater than 1ha in area"</i>
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/11	16.5.24	Cattle/stock grazing Seeks that rule 16.5.24 be changed to: <i>"The grazing of cattle and stock in any Coastal Protection Area 1 part of the CMA."</i> Inadequate controls on farm stock are degrading and destroying mangroves on public CMA.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society (North Island Regional Office)	138/12		Whole Plan Change Seeks that any other changes required be made to the Plan to ensure consistency subsequent to the changes sought in the Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society submission being made.
Auckland City Council	139/1		Whole Plan Change Supports the intent of the plan change as a whole and seeks that it be approved subject to the amendments sought in the Auckland City Council submission.
Auckland City Council	139/2		Vehicles on roads, bridges or structures in coastal marine area Seeks wording changes to clarify that motor vehicles are permitted on existing public roads located in the coastal marine area, including existing public roads within Coastal Protection Area 1 and the status and process for vehicles using, or seeking to use structures in Coastal Protection 1 areas. Considers that the discussion in the Section 32 report does not come through clearly in Policy 16.4.11 and Rule 16.5.22.
Auckland City Council	139/3	16.1	Introduction Amend the 7th paragraph of 16.1 Introduction as follows: <i>"In some cases mangroves need to be removed in order to allow for the provision, maintenance and use of structures, and the functioning of drainage systems including drains and outlets. Public infrastructure, such as roads, walkways and drainage systems, may need to locate in or adjacent to the coastal marine area, and mangrove removal may be appropriate."</i>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Auckland City Council	139/4	16.2.1 Issue	Seeks that Issue 16.2.1 be amended to ensure that vegetation removal and public infrastructure is referred to: <i>"Some disturbance of the foreshore and seabed, <u>including vegetation removal</u>, may be necessary to undertake activities which enhance amenity values, and use and enjoyment of the coastal environment <u>and relate to the provision, maintenance and use of public infrastructure</u>. However these activities may result in adverse environmental effects."</i>
Auckland City Council	139/5	16.3.1 Objective	Seeks that Objective 16.3.1 be amended to provide greater clarity that vegetation removal is included: <i>"To provide for appropriate activities, <u>including vegetation removal</u>, which involve the disturbance of the foreshore and seabed, while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating the adverse effects on the coastal environment."</i>
Auckland City Council	139/6	16.4.1 a (v) Policies	Amend Policy 16.4.1(a)(v) as follows: <i>"enable the provision, <u>maintenance and use of public infrastructure such as roads, walkways and drainage systems</u> where there is no practicable alternative location outside of the coastal marine area <del>that would achieve a better environmental outcome;</del> or"</i>
Auckland City Council	139/7	16.4.1 f Policies	Seeks that Policy 16.4.1 (f) be amended to delete the reference to the presence of natural features, as these are contained in the definition of natural character in the Auckland Regional Plan: Coastal: <i>"f the activity will not be likely to result in significant adverse effects on <del>natural features or ecosystems, or natural character;</del> and"</i>
Auckland City Council	139/8	16.4.5 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	Seeks that the first sentence of Policy 16.4.5 be amended as it is confusing and lacks clarity: <i>"Mangrove removal that is within any Coastal Protection Area 1 that is <del>in accordance with</del> <u>not identified as an area to be avoided under</u> policy 16.4.4 shall be considered inappropriate unless it is for the purpose of"</i>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Auckland City Council	139/9	16.4.5 d	Policies Public infrastructure
	<p>Seeks that Policy 16.4.5 (d) be amended to include "maintenance and use" of "roads, walkways and drainage systems" to clarify that these activities are envisaged and that public infrastructure includes roads, walkways and drainage systems. Also seeks the deletion of the reference to "a better environmental outcome as this is consistent with the wording in Rule 16.5.17 d):</p> <p><i>"v enabling the provision, <u>maintenance and use</u> of public infrastructure <u>such as roads, walkways and drainage systems</u> and any associated public health and safety requirements where there is no practicable alternative location outside of the coastal protection area <del>that would achieve a better environmental outcome;</del> or"</i></p>		
Auckland City Council	139/10	16.4.6 d	Mangrove Mangrove removal in public benefit
	<p>Seeks to retain Policy 16.4.6 (d) as it is appropriate to provide greater recognition of public benefit as compared with individual or private benefit.</p>		
Auckland City Council	139/11	16.4.7	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)
	<p>Seeks clarification of the role of integrated management plans, including who is required or encouraged to prepare them (presumably the applicant) and for what types of proposals.</p>		
Auckland City Council	139/12	16.5.2	Permitted Activities 30m <sup>2</sup> removal
	<p>Redraft Rule 16.5.2 to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide an exemption to allow minor trimming of mangroves to occur without being considered as 'mangrove removal'. This should be limited to trimming carried out by hand operated secateurs or pruning shears, in accordance with accepted arboricultural practice.</li> <li>- Provide for 200m<sup>2</sup> of mangrove removal to occur as a Permitted Activities, particularly where it is to enable the provision, maintenance and use of public infrastructure; or allow for the functioning of drainage systems.</li> </ul>		
Auckland City Council	139/13	16.5.2	Permitted Activities Public infrastructure
	<p>Seeks that the second part of the first sentence be amended to clarify that this rule (16.5.2) provides for mangrove removal that is necessary to enable the provision, maintenance and use of public infrastructure:</p> <p><i>"...to enable the operation, maintenance and use of lawful structures; <u>enable the provision, maintenance and use of public infrastructure;</u> allow for the functioning of drainage systems, or ensure public health and safety in the use or operation of infrastructure, subject to the following conditions..."</i></p>		

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Auckland City Council	139/14	16.5.3 Seedling removal	Retain Rule 16.5.3 which provides for the removal of mangrove seedlings by hand pulling as a permitted activity outside of Coastal Protection Area 1.
Auckland City Council	139/15	16.5.12 Controlled Activities	Redraft Rule 16.5.12 to provide for mangrove removal in excess of 200m <sup>2</sup> (rather than 30m <sup>2</sup> ) to be treated as a controlled activity.
Auckland City Council	139/16	16.5.12 Controlled Activities Public Infrastructure	Amend the first part of the first sentence (16.5.12) as follows: <i>"The removal of vegetation, including mangrove removal, that is necessary to enable the operation, maintenance and use of lawful structures; <u>enable the provision, maintenance and use of public infrastructure</u>; allow for the functioning of drainage systems, or ensure public health and safety in the use or operation of existing infrastructure...."</i>
Auckland City Council	139/17	16.5.12.2 Controlled Activities Public Notification Notification of affected parties	Retain the provision that notice of such controlled activity applications do not need to be served: <i>"Applications for controlled activities shall be considered without <del>public notification or</del> the need to serve notice of the application on affected persons in accordance with Section <del>94D(2) and</del> 94D(3) of the RMA, unless in the opinion of the ARC there are special circumstances justifying public notification in accordance with Section 94C(2) of the RMA."</i>
Auckland City Council	139/18	16.5.14 Restricted Discretionary Activities	Amend the final clause of the first sentence of Rule 16.5.14 as follows: <i>"... that is not provided for as a permitted, <u>controlled</u>, discretionary or non-complying activity in any other rule contained in this chapter."</i>
Auckland City Council	139/19	16.5.17 c Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Public infrastructure	Amend 16.5.17 c as follows: <i>"c <u>enabling the operation, maintenance and use of lawful structures; enabling the provision, maintenance and use of public infrastructure</u>; and/or allowing for the functioning of drainage systems; or to ensure public health and safety in the use or operation of infrastructure; or"</i>
Auckland City Council	139/20	16.5.21 Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	Retain Rule 16.5.21 as a non-complying activity.
Auckland City Council	139/21	16.5.22 Vehicles on beaches	Retain Rule 16.5.22 as a non-complying activity.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Auckland City Council	139/22	16.7.6	Principal Reasons for Adopting <i>Amend the last sentence as follows: "If any of the conditions are not satisfied, the activity will default to <u>Rule 16.5.12 or Rule 16.5.14</u>, and will be assessed through a resource consent process."</i>
Auckland City Council	139/23	16.7.8	Principal Reasons for Adopting <i>Amend the first of 16.7.8 as follows: "The permitted activity limitation of <del>30m</del><sup>2</sup> 200m<sup>2</sup> clearance to enable the <u>provision, operation, use or functioning of lawful structures, public infrastructure, drainage systems and health and safety for infrastructure will not always allow for sufficient clearance to achieve the intention of the rule.</u>"</i>
Auckland City Council	139/24		Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Amend the title of this "Appendix H - Integrated Management Plans" to "Appendix J - Integrated Management Plans".
Auckland City Council	139/25		Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Amend the second paragraph of Appendix H - Integrated Management Plans as follows: <i>"The emphasis and level of detail that will need to be provided in an IMP will depend on the particular matters that are addressed <u>and on the scale and location of the proposal.</u>"</i>
Auckland City Council	139/26		Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Include a statement acknowledging that in some circumstances the assessment required in an Integrated Management Plan may already be incorporated in other documents such as an open space action plan or strategy prepared by a territorial local authority which includes walkway construction proposals in the coastal marine area.
Auckland Regional Council	140/1		Rule 16.5.19 Addition to Restricted Coastal Activities Supports the addition of restricted discretionary disturbance activities being included in Rule 16.5.19 and seeks to identify that this is a new addition to the Plan that was not correctly identified by <i>italics and underlining</i> : <i>"Any discretionary or <u>restricted discretionary</u> disturbance of the foreshore or seabed...."</i>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Auckland Regional Council	140/2	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	<p>Supports the addition of Appendix H and seeks to identify that this is a new addition to the Plan that was not correctly identified by <i><u>italics and underlining</u></i>:  <i><u>"Appendix H Integrated Management Plans Introduction: "Integrated Management Plans (IMPS) provide a comprehensive long term management framework for part of the coastal environment..."</u></i></p>
Auckland Regional Council	140/3	16.4.4 & 16.4.5	<p>Seeks that these two policies (16.4.4 and 16.4.5) be amalgamated and reworded to provide greater clarity:  16.4.4 "Mangrove removal within any Coastal Protection Area 1 shall be;  a) <u>avoided where it will threaten the viability or significance of the ecological and geological values identified in Schedule 3 for the Coastal Protection Area, and</u>  <del>16.4.5 Mangrove removal within any Coastal Protection Area 1 that is in accordance with policy 16.4.4</del>  b) <u>shall be considered inappropriate unless it is for the purpose of:</u></p> <p>a i) <i>maintaining or enhancing the geological or ecological values of the Coastal Protection Area where it can be demonstrated that these values are being adversely affected by mangrove colonisation; or</i></p> <p><del>b ii) maintaining or enhancing public access, consistent with protecting the geological or ecological values of the Coastal Protection Area; or...</del> (and changing c) and d) to iii) and iv).</p>
Papakura District Council	141/1		<p>Supports the proposed plan change in addressing provisions relating to mangroves and mangrove removal.</p>
Papakura District Council	141/2	16.4.6 b	<p>Supports in part but seeks that the criteria be expanded to more fully address changes to visual amenity and the landscape and character of the coastal margin from mangrove colonisation and encroachment.</p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Papakura District Council	141/3	Comprehensive Coastal Management Plans Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	<p>Supports changes proposed to the definition of Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan (CCMP). Considers that the policies and rules of the plan could more specifically reference to the CCMP as the vehicle for addressing issues around ecological values and community aspirations.</p> <p>Supports the role of CCMPs through the Coastal Plan, the introduction and issue identification could be amended to ensure the mechanism is carried through a well defined policy structure.</p> <p>Supports changes proposed that introduce 16.4.7 and more fully recognise the role of a CCMP through the policy.</p> <p>Amendments are needed to ensure consistency and clarity; some confusion exists as to terminology and definitions between Integrated Management Plans prepared in accordance with Appendix H and Comprehensive Coastal Management Plans (in definition).</p>
Papakura District Council	141/4	Comprehensive Coastal Management Plans Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Rules for mangrove removal	<p>Seeks changes to ensure that mangrove removal where a CCMP has been approved is a controlled activity for which resource consent will be granted subject to appropriate conditions. Believes that the discretionary activity status applied to mangrove removal for maintaining or enhancing geological or ecological values, public access, infrastructure or ecological values, public access, infrastructure operation etc sets the resource consent bar too high where a CCMP has been prepared.</p>
Papakura District Council	141/5	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	<p>Supports changes to delete the prohibited activity status of indigenous vegetation clearance in any Coastal Protection Area 1 (Rule 16.5.20 - new rule 16.5.21).</p>
Papakura District Council	141/6	Seedling removal	<p>Supports proposed changes that provide for mangrove seedling removal (outside of CPA1 areas) as a permitted activity.</p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Papakura District Council	141/7		Definition: Mangrove Seedling
			Suggests that changes are made to the definition of "Mangrove Seedling", in line with the ARC Permit which defined "young mangrove" as follows: Mangroves that meet all the following criteria: - that are less than 1 metre in height, and - have up to 6 branches no more than 10 centimetres long, and - show no reproductive capacity (i.e. the plant does not have seed pods or flowers displayed), and - have a supple stem from the base of the plant, and very supple branches. This is considered a more robust definition of a young mangrove and could apply to a seedling.
Papakura District Council	141/8	16.5.19	Restricted Coastal Activities Comprehensive Coastal Management Plans
			Seeks that an appropriate linkage is included to ensure the relevance of an approved Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan and requested controlled activity status is identified. Seeks that 16.5.19 be amended to reflect that the removal of mangroves where a Comprehensive Coastal Management Plan has been approved is not a Restricted Coastal Activity irrespective of area of disturbance.
Papakura District Council	141/9		Other Methods Sediment issues
			Submitter wishes to express support for other methods that encourage TA's and landowners to manage land use activities and undertake riparian management to reduce the level of sediment and nutrients entering the coastal environment in the long term.
Manukau City Council	142/1	16.4.1 a (iv)	Maintenance of navigation: Tamaki Estuary
			Seeks that Policy 16.4.1 iv be amended to read "improve <i>or maintain</i> navigation and safety; or..." as maintenance of navigation is also an issue; particularly in some areas such as the Tamaki Estuary.
Manukau City Council	142/2	16.5.2	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal
			Opposes the 30m <sup>2</sup> limitation and seeks that this be increased to permit clearance up to 50 m <sup>2</sup> around structures, infrastructure, and drainage structures and up to 3 metres each side of these.
Manukau City Council	142/3		Whole plan change Mangrove removal: Otara Lake
			Seeks that the current general management area of Otara Lake be accorded special status to enable the removal of mangroves as a permitted activity (note, this does not change status of CPA2 area on northern shore).

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Manukau City Council	142/4	Mangrove removal: Otara Lake	Seeks that if mangrove removal in the general management area in Otara Lake is not provided for as a permitted activity then greater provision for removal is made, for example as a controlled activity. A number of reasons are given in support of the proposed provisions.
Manukau City Council	142/5	16.4.8	Active plan sought for mangrove removal  Opposes policy 16.4.8 and seeks that ARC carry out further work on the regional context of mangrove removal rather than putting the onus on applicants to provide this information (an assessment of ecological value of mangroves). This may include identifying areas where it may be appropriate to remove mangroves and allowing for this removal. If the above submission point is not accepted, it is sought that policy 16.4.8 be reworded so that it provides direction rather than imposes a requirement.
Manukau City Council	142/6	16.5.17	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas  Opposes 16.5.17. Seeks that the removal of mangroves in a Coastal Protection Area 1 for the purpose of enabling the operation, maintenance and use of lawful structures, allowing for the functioning of drainage systems, or ensuring public health and safety in the use or operation of infrastructure be allowed for by a less onerous activity status than discretionary.
Manukau City Council	142/7	16.4.5	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas  Opposes 16.4.5. Seeks that Policy 16.4.5 clearly allow for the establishment of new drainage systems and lawful structures (including jetties, boardwalks or similar structures) as well as infrastructure such as roads and bridges. The present wording does not make it clear that it includes the establishment or erection of new drainage systems and lawful structures.
Manukau City Council	142/8	16.5.17	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas  Opposes Rule 16.5.17 and seeks that the Rule clearly allow for the establishment of new drainage systems and lawful structures (including jetties, boardwalks or similar structures) as well as infrastructure such as roads and bridges. The present wording does not make it clear that it includes the establishment or erection of new drainage systems and lawful structures.
Manukau City Council	142/9	Active plan sought for mangrove removal: visual amenity, access and recreation	Seeks that the ARC identify specific areas, including beaches, where mangrove removal may be appropriate and allow for this removal through appropriate rules.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Topic / Issue	Decision Requested
Manukau City Council	142/10	16.5.17 & 16.4.5	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	<p>In the alternative to the ARC identifying specific areas, including beaches, where mangrove removal may be appropriate and allowing for this removal through appropriate rules it is sought that Rule 16.5.17 be modified to allow for mangrove removal for the purpose of maintaining or enhancing public amenity, including visual amenity and recreational use. For example amend Rule 16.5.17(b) to read as follows (or similar):</p> <p><i>"The removal of vegetation, including mangrove removal, in a Coastal Protection Area 1 for the purpose of:...</i></p> <p><i>b maintaining or enhancing public access <u>and amenity, including visual amenity, and recreational use,</u> consistent with protecting the geological or ecological values of the Coastal Protection Area; or...."</i></p> <p>Policy 16.4.5 should also be amended to be consistent with the above.</p>
Manukau City Council	142/11	16.1	Introduction	<p>Opposes. Seeks that paragraph 7 be amended so the second sentence reads:</p> <p><i>"<del>Public</del> Infrastructure, such as roads, <u>jetties or similar structures</u>, may need to locate in or adjacent to the coastal marine area, and mangrove removal may be necessary to allow for their development and maintenance."</i></p>
Manukau City Council	142/12	16.6	Other Methods	<p>Opposes 16.6. Seeks that "Other Methods" or an alternative appropriate place, include recognition that community groups will require access to funding to undertake any studies required as part of resource consent applications.</p>
Manukau City Council	142/13	16.5.23	Rewrite for clarity	<p>Opposes 16.5.23. Seeks it be reworded to clarify the intention of the provision.</p>
Department of Conservation	143/1	16.5.2	Other vegetation removal	<p>Seeks that Rule 16.5.2 be amended to include an additional criterion (f) as follows:</p> <p><i><u>"(f) the removal will not disturb or damage areas of salt marsh and/or sea grass"</u></i></p>
Department of Conservation	143/2	16.5.12	Rewrite for clarity	<p>Seeks that Rule 16.5.12 be amended as it is not clear what the words "the area proposed" mean. Amend to read as follows:</p> <p><i>"(a) that the <u>extent of the area proposed for removal is demonstrated to be the minimum necessary to enable the proposed activity"</u></i></p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Waitakere City Council	144/1	Whole Plan Change	<p>Retention of the following aspects of the plan change relating to the points listed below, subject to the amendments sought by the submitter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The linking of mangrove removal to mangrove colonisation, and the impact of that colonisation on identified heritage values; public amenity and public works; and</li> <li>2. The identification of the appropriateness of considering mangrove removal in the context of integrated management plans, and the wider geographic and ecological setting; and</li> <li>3. The intention of making the processes around any removal that is identified as appropriate as streamlined as possible to reduce the cost and resources to the community; and</li> <li>4. The discussion of the causes of mangrove colonisation and the need to manage land use activities to effectively control unwanted colonisation in the long term; and</li> <li>5. The direction that mangroves should not be removed where they are mitigating coastal erosion.</li> </ol>
Waitakere City Council	144/2	Whole plan change	<p>Seeks that the plan change be amended to address the following issues (as well as other changes discussed):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed approach to mangrove seedling management is fundamentally flawed and, if implemented as proposed, will lead to inappropriate mangrove removal, including within areas of mature mangrove forest; and</li> <li>2. The ARC has done insufficient analysis of the potential impact of the proposed provisions, and could be expected to track changes in mangrove distribution since the 1940s (where aerial photography became more widely taken), to get a crude quantification of the extent of colonisation. In the absence of this information there is not regional or even sub-regional basis to determine the effect of the plan change; and</li> <li>3. There is insufficient emphasis in the plan change on good information being the basis for decisions on where mangroves should and shouldn't be removed. There is also no mention of any ongoing monitoring of the effects of the plan change.</li> </ol>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section		Decision Requested
Waitakere City Council	144/3	16.1 16.2	Introduction Issue	<p>Include further discussion in the Introduction or Issues section about the following matters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extent of colonisation in the region</li> <li>- Effect of Colonisation</li> <li>- Habitat Values</li> <li>- Use of CPA1</li> <li>- Information as a basis for decisions</li> </ul>
Waitakere City Council	144/4	16.4	Policies	<p>Seeks retention of the following aspects of the policies, subject to amendments proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The clear linking of mangrove removal, particularly in CPA1 areas, with a specific set of criteria around public use and works, and in particular the emphasis on public versus private good (as set out in various policies including 16.4.1, 16.4.4, 16.4.5 and 16.4.6); and</li> <li>- The identification that in CPA1 areas mangrove removal will generally only be considered appropriate where (additions to above) this is for the purpose of protecting or enhancing the values of the CPA1 (Policy 16.4.5)</li> <li>- The emphasis in Policy 16.4.6 on mangrove colonisation; and</li> <li>- The emphasis in Policy 16.4.7 on integrated management plans; and</li> <li>- The requirement in 16.4.8 to include an assessment of the potential impact on the wider area of any proposed mangrove removal.</li> </ul>
Waitakere City Council	144/5	16.4	Mangrove removal: where not appropriate	<p>Seeks the introduction of policy/is which explicitly identify circumstances where mangrove removal will not be considered appropriate, including in areas other than CPA1.</p>
Waitakere City Council	144/6		Seedling removal	<p>Provide for removal of mangrove seedlings as a permitted activity only where this is in accordance with an Integrated Management Plan. Provide for removal of mangrove seedlings as a controlled activity in circumstances where it can be demonstrated that mangroves are colonising new areas, and this is a problem in terms of the criteria in Policy 16.4.6(a)-(e), subject to the matters set out in 16.5.3 and with the ARC retaining the discretions set out in rule 16.5.12.1.</p> <p>Provide for any other mangrove seedling removal with the same activity status (restricted discretionary, discretionary etc) as is provided for removal of mature mangroves in that area.</p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Waitakere City Council	144/7	16.5.2 Rules	Provide for the activities in rule 16.5.2 as a controlled activity.
Waitakere City Council	144/8	Rules	Retain the other rules, subject to the amendments proposed by Waitakere City Council.
Waitakere City Council	144/9	16.5.8, 15.5.19 & 16.5.20 Rewrite for clarity	Seeks that Rules 16.5.8, 16.5.19 and 16.5.20 (and any other aspect of the chapter as required) be amended to ensure it is clear which rules apply to the removal of mangroves.
Waitakere City Council	144/10	16.5.14 Restricted Discretionary Activities	Seeks that Rule 16.5.14 is explicit about what activities (in terms of mangrove removal) are covered by the rule.
Waitakere City Council	144/11	16.6.6 - 16.6.8 Other Methods	Retain methods 16.6.6 - 16.6.8.
Waitakere City Council	144/12	16.6 Other Methods Monitoring	Introduce a new method or methods which require the ARC to establish a monitoring programme to ascertain the effect and effectiveness of the proposed provisions, and to conduct a review of the provisions within no longer than five years.
Waitakere City Council	144/13	Whole Plan Change	In addition to the relief sought, seeks such decisions as may be necessary to give effect to the Waitakere City Council submission, including those incidental to the relief sought.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/1	Whole Plan Change	Supports the general thrust of the Proposed Plan Change and seeks that it be retained subject to the changes sought in the FFNZ submission.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/2	Whole Plan Change	Exempt mangroves on private property from the protection provisions of the Plan.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/3	16.1 Introduction	16.1 - Supports the insertion of the paragraph " <i>Mangrove habitats form an important component of estuarine ecosystems...</i> " and seeks its retention.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/4	16.1 Introduction	Include a paragraph describing the positive effects that would arise from the removal of mangroves.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/5	16.2.1 Issue	Include in the Issue a sentence noting that positive effects would arise from the removal of mangroves.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/6	16.4.1 a (v) Policies Include private infrastructure	Seeks that provision is made for activities including vegetation removal where the removal enables the provision and use of private infrastructure.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/7	16.4.4 & 16.4.5 Policies Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas	Seeks that provisions are included in Policies 16.4.4 and 16.4.5 for the removal of mangroves from drains and drainage structures in Coastal Protection Area 1 as an activity that would normally be considered appropriate.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/8	16.4.6	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Seeks that Policy 16.4.6 be amended to provide for the removal of mangroves from drains and drainage structures other than in Coastal Protection Area 1 as an activity that will be considered appropriate.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/9	16.5.2 a & 16.5.3 a	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Seeks that provisions be included in Rules 16.5.2 and 16.5.3 for the removal of mangroves from drains and drainage structures in Coastal Protection Area 1 in rural areas as a permitted activity.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/10	16.5.2 b & 16.5.3 b	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal Seeks that Rules 16.5.2 and 16.5.3 provide for the removal of at least 200 square metres of mangroves.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/11	16.5.3 f	Seedling removal Include the words "where practical" at the beginning of Rule 16.5.3 (f).
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/12	16.5.3 h	Seedling removal Seeks the retention of rule 16.5.3 h; FFNZ considers that it is important to allow mangroves to grow in areas where they are serving to mitigate coastal erosion.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/13	16.5.17	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Seeks that Rule 16.5.17 be amended to provide for the removal of mangroves from drains and drainage structures in Coastal Protection Area 1 in rural areas as a permitted activity, defaulting to a controlled activity in cases where the permitted activity standards are not able to be met.
Federated Farmers of NZ	145/14		Whole plan change That any consequential amendments required to give effect to the submission by Federated Farmers of New Zealand.
Transit New Zealand	146/1	16.4.1, 16.4.4, 16.4.5 & 16.4.6	Policies Mangrove removal Supports policies 16.4.1, 16.4.4, 16.4.5 and 16.4.6 as they allow for the disturbance and/or removal of mangroves as appropriate to enable the provision and use of public infrastructure where there is no practicable alternative location: roads being a public infrastructure.
Transit New Zealand	146/2	16.5.12	Controlled Activities Supports Rule 16.5.12 as it allows for the disturbance and/or removal of mangroves for areas greater than 30 m <sup>2</sup> , other than in CPA1 zones, as Controlled Activities.
Transit New Zealand	146/3	16.5.17 & 16.5.21	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Supports Rules 16.5.17 and 16.5.21 as they allow for the disturbance and/or removal of mangroves within CPA1 zones as Discretionary or Non-complying activities.
Transit New Zealand	146/4	16.5.22	Vehicles in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas Opposes. Seeks that Rule 16.5.22 provide for vehicles on structures and bridges in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas as a permitted activity.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Transit New Zealand	146/5		<p>Rewrite for clarity Public infrastructure</p>
Metrowater	147/1	16.5.2 b	<p>Permitted Activities: 30 m<sup>2</sup> removal</p>
			<p>Opposes the use of the words "provisions" and "providing" in respect of public infrastructure as it is not clear that they represent the building of new state highways. Seeks that the words "provision" and "providing" as they relate to infrastructure be replaced with "establishment" and "establishing" within policies and any subsequent consequential amendments to rules.</p>
			<p>Seeks that 16.5.2 (b) be redrafted to provide for:                      a) The clearance of mangroves where such clearance is necessary to keep stream mouths free of obstructions to prevent flooding upstream; and                      b) A suitable area of clearance, 200 m<sup>2</sup>, that provides for the efficient and effective operation of the drainage systems (including streams);                      c) Consistency with the provisions of the ALW Plan.                      Reword Rule 16.5.2 as follows, or words of like effect:  <i>"The removal of vegetation, including mangrove removal... in the use or operation of infrastructure, subject to the following conditions:</i>                      a) the activity does not take place in a Coastal Protection Area 1; and                      b) the total cleared area shall not at any time exceed <u>200 square metres</u> and shall be immediately adjacent to the structure <i>or infrastrucure or in, or immediately adjacent to any drainage system including streams and stream mouths; and</i>                      c) all cleared vegetation, <i>removed from the site</i> shall be disposed of <i>via an approved land based disposal system outside of the coastal marine area; and ...</i></p>

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Water Care Services Ltd	148/1	16.5.2	Mangrove removal for the installation of structures
	Seeks provision to be made for mangrove removal relating to the <i>installation</i> of structures under rule 16.5.2. Seeks the following wording for Rule 16.5.2: The removal of vegetation, including <i>mangrove removal that is necessary to enable the installation, operation, maintenance... subject to the following conditions:</i> a) <i>the activity does not take place in a Coastal Protection Area 1; and</i> b) <i>the total cleared area shall not at any time exceed 30 square metres and shall be immediately adjacent to the existing or proposed structure or infrastructure or in, or immediately adjacent to any existing or proposed drainage system; and</i>		
Water Care Services Ltd	148/2	16.5.12	Mangrove removal for the installation of structures
	Seeks that <i>installation</i> or structures be included in Rule 16.5.12 and the provision of mangrove removal in a Coastal Protection Area 1 as a Controlled Activity for water and wastewater infrastructure. The following changes to Rule 16.5.12 sought: <i>The removal of vegetation, including mangrove removal, that is necessary to enable the installation, operation, maintenance and use of lawful structures.... which complies with all the conditions of Rule 16.5.2 other than the 30 m<sup>2</sup> of clearance (Rule 16.5.2 b) for all infrastructure stated in Rule 16.5.2; and other than the Coastal Protection Area 1 (16.5.2 a) with regards to water and wastewater infrastructure ....</i>		
Water Care Services Ltd	148/3	16.5.12	Mangrove removal in Coastal Protection Area 1 areas
	Seeks that removal of greater than 30 square metres in the Coastal Protection Area 1 as a Controlled Activity relating to water and wastewater infrastructure under Rule 16.5.12.		
North Shore City Council	149/1		Whole plan change Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal
	Supports the plan change with amendments sought in NSCC submission. In particular supports clearance of 30m <sup>2</sup> as a permitted activity to allow maintenance associated with structures and drainage systems, and would not oppose increasing the limit to 50m <sup>2</sup> .		

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
North Shore City Council	149/2	16.5.3	Seedling removal Opposes in part and seeks consideration of the application of an area limit for permitted seedling removal to enable greater consideration of the environmental effects of large scale removal of seedlings. Seeks that the proposed rule be clearly linked to the issue of mangrove colonisation, so that seedling removal activity is only carried out in areas of new colonisation rather than established mangrove forest.
North Shore City Council	149/3	16.4.7	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Opposes in part. Seeks that Policy 16.4.7 be amended to clarify who has responsibility for preparing an Integrated Management Plan.
North Shore City Council	149/4	16.5.14.1 h	Restricted Discretionary Activities Opposes in part. Seeks that Rule 16.5.14.1 h should also refer to Policy 16.4.8.
North Shore City Council	149/5	16.5.14.2	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Amend Rule 16.5.14.2 to clarify who has responsibility for preparing an Integrated Management Plan.
Rodney District Council	150/1		Whole Plan Change Supports the flexibility in management approach.
Rodney District Council	150/2		Whole Plan Change Seedling removal Supports recognition that the expansion of mangroves into utilised recreational areas has created issues around access and use. Supports the hand removal of mangrove seedlings as a permitted activity in areas outside of CPA1.
Rodney District Council	150/3		Mangrove removal for drainage and infrastructure Opposes in part the whole plan change. The interference of mangroves in the operation and maintenance of infrastructure in particular drainage are important issues for Council. Permitting removal of mangroves in these situations is supported.
Rodney District Council	150/4	16.5.2 b	Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal Opposes 16.5.2 b. Increase the permitted mangrove removal limit of 30 m <sup>2</sup> and any subsequent amendments. An increased threshold is sought of at least 100 m <sup>2</sup> .
Rodney District Council	150/5	16.4.7	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H) Opposes in part 16.4.7. The term "significant" needs to be clearly defined and any subsequent amendments. Significance needs to be clarified or a threshold established to ensure mangrove protection; it could be interpreted differently by various community plans.

Submitter	Submitter Number/ Point	Plan Chapter / Topic / Issue Section	Decision Requested
Rodney District Council	150/6	16.4.7 Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Opposes. The approach needs to be reframed to be specific and unambiguous as to which plans are being referred to and any subsequent amendments e.g. definitions. Issues that need to be addressed include the relationship between IMPs and other planning instruments (e.g. comprehensive coastal management plans, coastal compartment plans) needs to be clarified. The use of terms "should" and "may" create uncertainty around responsibility and are open to interpretation.
Rodney District Council	150/7	Integrated Management Plans (Appendix H)	Opposes. The terminology used in Appendix H needs to be focused and unambiguous and any subsequent amendments. Clarification is needed around IMPs.
Jennifer Mary Cassey, Jean Anne Byrnes & Paul Anthony Byrnes	151/1	Mangrove removal: supports to the areas colonised at a past date	Supports the plan change in principle in its intent to address problems created by mangrove encroachment but seeks that the permitted activities be less restrictive and allow for the removal of mangroves to pre-existing levels to restore amenity values.
Jennifer Mary Cassey, Jean Anne Byrnes & Paul Anthony Byrnes	151/2	16.5.2 b Permitted Activities: 30 m <sup>2</sup> removal	Seeks that permitted activities allow for the removal of mangroves whether or not they are immediately adjacent to a structure, infrastructure or drainage system, and be allowed to exceed 30 square metres, to achieve pre-existing levels of vegetation.
Jennifer Mary Cassey, Jean Anne Byrnes & Paul Anthony Byrnes	151/3	16.5.3 b Seedling removal	Opposes in part 16.5.3 b. Seeks an increase in the limit of 30 square metres to allow for pre-existing levels of vegetation to be achieved (to maintain consistency with 16.5.2 b) above).
Jennifer Mary Cassey, Jean Anne Byrnes & Paul Anthony Byrnes	151/4	16.5.3 c Seedling removal	Opposes in part 16.5.3 c. To ensure the complete removal of seedlings, the use of hand-held tools should be allowed. This is normal practice when weeding out unwanted vegetation.