

Mangrove Management

THE AUCKLAND UNITARY PLAN

For more information, go to www.shapeauckland.co.nz

Summary of issues

- Mangrove expansion can lead to:
 - Perceived reduction in amenity values
 - Loss of access to and along the CMA
- Mangrove removal can create a risks of:
 - Coastal erosion
 - Biodiversity impacts
 - Contaminant release from sediment
 - Potential natural character effects
- Mangrove removal can be:
 - Costly (consents 3-30%, monitoring and physical works)
 - Require ongoing maintenance

Draft UP approach

Stage 1 (Notified UP)

Enable the removal of mangroves in areas that were free of mangroves in 1996 from:

- the General Coastal Marine zone; and
- Significant Ecological Areas that are wading bird habitats; and
- Significant Ecological Areas where the values are not from mangroves.

Stage 2 (Future plan change)

Undertake a prioritised investigation through Marine Spatial Planning and mapping exercise to identify further areas where mangrove removal has a low environmental risk and can be permitted.

Draft approach

Rationale

- Response to a community view of a need for a level of permitted removal beyond seedlings
- 1996 is widest available aerial photography
- 1996 is relatively recent, so environmental risk of removal likely to be low if standards are met
- If permitted mangrove removal is appropriate, it should apply to wading bird habitats but not be constrained by date in this area

Draft approach

Standards for permitted removal

- Disposal outside the CMA.
- No herbicides
- Removal by hand or by hand-held tools.
- Removal is not in areas where mangroves are serving to mitigate coastal erosion from wave action.
- Removal will not damage or disturb areas of salt marsh or sea grass.
- Written notice to council 10 working days prior to removal, advising location, extent, timing, method, evidence the area was clear in 1996.
- In a wading bird habitat removal timed to avoid bird roosting and nesting seasons.

General feedback

- ~140 received on mangrove management
- ~30% generally supportive or asking that it goes further (an earlier date)
- ~35% generally of the view that approach is too enabling of removal
- ~15% views unclear
- ~10% seeking a proactive approach by council

The cost of consents, experts and monitoring is too high

Allowing removal without adjacent land owner or Mana Whenua approval is inappropriate

The approach does not give effect to NZCPS

The date is too conservative and should be pushed back

General feedback

The approach strikes a good balance

Identifying areas where mangroves are mitigating coastal erosion will be difficult without expertise

Identifying areas with salt marsh or sea grass will be difficult without expertise

Disputes may arise where 1996 aerial photography isn't held by Council

Mana Whenua Feedback

Disagree with permitted activity status

Mana Whenua need to be involved because of the risk of environmental damage or disturbing taonga

Support removal to enable access to marae or areas of traditional use

Mangroves are a result of sedimentation, and need to be addressed holistically

Forum attendees

Auckland Conservation forum	Info about SEA	Pukekohe Vegetable Growers Association
Auckland University School of Biological Sciences	Kawau Island Advisory Committee	Rayonier
Combined Waitakere Ranges R&R Group	Landowners & Contractors Protection Association	Sandspit R&R group
Department of Conservation	Mahurangi East Residents and Ratepayers Assoc. Inc.	South Kaipara Ratepayers Association
Ecomatters	Manukau Harbour Restoration Society	South Kaipara Ratepayers Association
Environment Defence Society	Ngati Whatua Orakei	SPAN - Waitakere Ranges, Structure Plan Advocates Network
Federated Farmers	North Shore Forest and Bird	St. Lukes Environmental Protection Society
Friends of Mangemangeroa	Omaha Beach Community	Tamaki Estuary Protection Society
Friends of Oakley Creek	Piha Coastcare Trust	The Onehunga Enhancement Society
Grey Power	Piha Ratepayers and Residents Association Incorporated	Upper north island mangrove lobby
Howick Resident and Ratepayers Association	Protecting Urban Bush	

Views from the forum

- Recognition that mangrove management a complex issue in a dynamic environment**
- Considerable support for 'stage 2' of the proposed approach but limited support from 'stage 1'**
- 1996 date seen to be arbitrary and depending on local conditions too enabling, or too constraining**
- case-by-case approach generally appropriate as an interim measure**
- community mangrove management initiatives should receive active supported by Council and Local Boards**
- Local Boards are an appropriate vehicle for progressing/coordinating community mangrove management initiatives**

Suggested approach

- Discard date-based permitted activity
- Retain permitted activities for:
 - maintenance of assets (e.g. boat ramps) and infrastructure
 - seedlings removal
- Enable removal of mangroves from wading bird habitats as a controlled activity
- Promote omnibus consents coordinated at a local board level for other removal
- Clarify and strengthen policies supporting clearing with amenity, cultural, coastal access and other community benefits
- Consent applications for local board supported proposals processed free of charge

Enabling policy

Supportive of mangrove removal to enable, maintain, restore or enhance:

- public access to, or along, the CMA
- connections with reserves or publicly owned land and the sea
- public use and amenity values
- water access and navigation including waka portage routes
- public health and safety including sightlines and traffic safety
- access to the coast from marae or to areas of traditional use
- ecological values including significant wading bird feeding or roosting areas
- cultural or historic heritage or natural features