

Port Underwood Association



October 2019 Newsletter

Tuia 250 Celebration boats in Port Underwood

We were pleased to see several of the boats from the Tuia 250 celebrations coming into Port Underwood and spending the night. The picture is of a waka that visited and spent the night here.

Annual General Meeting 2020

The 2020 AGM will be held at 11 Hakahaka Bay Road at 3:00 P.M. on Saturday the 4th of January.

We hope to see as many of you there as possible. There will be drinks and nibbles immediately following.

Contents

2020 Port Underwood Association AGM	2
Wilding Pine Workshop	2
Wilding Pines and the Regional Pest Management Plan	2
Recreational Paua Catch Limit	2
Neighbourhood Support	2
2020 Subs	2
2019 Port Underwood Association Members Survey	2
Members Survey Summary	3

Committee Details

Ken Roush (Chairman)	sarakenroush@gmail.com	03 579 9474
Sara Roush (Sec/Treasurer)	sarakenroush@gmail.com	03 579 9474
Wayne Boustridge	wayne.boustridge@hotmail.com	03 579 5489
John Davison	jad793@gmail.com	03 579 9940
Bruce Hearn	apexhearn@xtra.co.nz	027 4402049
Martin Loach	martin.loach@mckendrymotors.co.nz	021 667 673
Anne Thompson	seascape1654@gmail.com	027 4560225
David Whyte	clintondale@xtra.co.nz	03 572 8193

Wilding Pine Workshop

Unfortunately, not enough people signed up for the workshop on poisoning wilding pines to justify having a tutor come out to the Port to give hands-on instructions.

Wilding Pines and the Regional Pest Management Plan

A proposal has been put forward by the Marlborough District Council to include wilding pines in the Regional Pest Management Plan under a progressive containment regime. If this is adopted there may be some obligations on land owners to take action against certain wilding pine species.

Recreational Paua Catch Limit

A reduced catch limit of 5 paua per day for Recreational fishers has been set in an effort to rebuild the paua stocks that were affected by the 2016 earthquake.

Neighbourhood Support

Enclosed with this newsletter you will find the NS list for your area plus an emergency numbers list both of which should be kept close at hand. If you find anything incorrect or that needs to be added please let me know.

2020 Subs

The 2020 subs of \$20.00 are now due and the notices are included with this newsletter. Subs can be paid either by cheque to the PUA Association, P.O. Box 59, Blenheim 7240, or by direct deposit to: Westpac Blenheim 030599 0216931 00. Please quote surname and Bay as references.

2019 Port Underwood Association Members Survey

A tremendous thanks to the members who filled out the survey. Your replies and comments are very useful in guiding how the Association will act in the future.

A short synopsis is included with this newsletter and a more complete report will be emailed to the members. The survey results will also be on the AGM agenda for discussion.

2019 PUA Survey Results

It is highly recommended that you refer to the more complete survey report for the full range of comments.

Question 1 Do marine farms affect your enjoyment of Port Underwood?

Negative Impact	No Impact	Positive Impact
58%	35%	6%

Sample Comments: They're an eyesore that detract from the natural beauty of the Port. They block access to the bays. Gives us interesting structures to fish around. Don't want to see more in Bay

Question 2 Should the Association object to applications for **new** marine farming space within the wider Port Underwood area?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
69%	22%	6%	3%	

Sample Comments: Association should not submit in relation to resource consents. The place is bulging with them. I estimate nearly 70% of the bays are littered with farms. We have enough marine farms in PU.

Question 3 Should the Association object to applications for **expansions to existing** marine farming space within the wider Port Underwood area?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
61%	32%	6%		

Sample Comments: A limited yes as the recreational enjoyment of the area is curtailed sufficiently at the moment and the current owners must satisfy the committee that expansion will not be unnecessarily intrusive and will only occur within the currently permitted areas, and there must be provision for the minimisation of marine and coastal waste. The cumulative impact remains unstudied. There is enough farms in the port now

Question 4 Should the Association object to applications for **renewals of existing** marine farming space within the wider Port Underwood area?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
9%	13%	28%	28%	22%

Sample Comments: The existing farms are a now established part of activity in Port Underwood. They provide a good base for employment and general economic benefit. In congested areas it is appropriate to question the overall effects of the combined farmed space that has been brought into use since the farms were established. Renewal time is when this should take place.

Question 5 I would like to see an extension to the area in Port Underwood where marine farming is prohibited or allowed.

Increase Prohibited Area	No Change	Increase Allowable Area
47%	53%	

Sample Comments: Pipi Bay and surrounding close by bays have always been popular with boaties and picnickers due to the sheltered waters there. It would be nice to see these areas protected. All areas not currently occupied by marine farms should be prohibited. If effects in congested areas are shown to be detrimental then more of that area should become prohibited.

Question 6 Is there anything else you would like to say regarding marine farming?

Sample Comments: Recognise that they are a significant contributor to the economy and accept their benefits but not expansion. Let's keep the remaining bays that are free from marine farms for non-commercial use. Also, we are happy with the current mussel farms but would not like to see other marine farms (salmon, oyster, etc) in PU at all. I think we will need to use the sea for greater food production in the future. I do not object to this, on condition there is respect paid to the quality of the food produced and the ways this food is produced is sustainable. There must be a way this can be done for the good of everyone, the environment and the people.

Question 7 I believe that the activity of commercial trawling negatively impacts the environment in general.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
62%	19%	19%		

Sample Comments: This is a sophisticated issue. Certain trawling methods can have less impacts than others, but it appears that most trawler that enter the harbour are traditional seine nets which have a negative impact on the sea floor and are prone to non-target species capture. Studies have shown that trawling destroys the ecosystem on the sea floor. Port Underwood is not a highly productive fishery. Trawling negatively affects the sea bed and fish habitat. No proof they impact on the fishing. Trawling should be prohibited within inlets such as PU. Fisheries records of Port Underwood catches show that commercial trawlers do catch fish targeted by recreational fishers. Commercial trawlers can quite easily fish the more open waters and leave the sheltered waters to smaller recreational boats.

Question 8 Do you support the current regulations on set netting?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
9%	19%	6%	22%	44%

Sample Comments: The fishery in the Port is sufficiently poor that line fishing only should be the rule to allow stocks to breed up. Open it again for set netting. Maximim 2 hours. Recreational fishers should have same rights as commercial and customary. Any ban or restriction on netting must apply to all fishers equally. **If it is proven** that Hectors dolphins deaths are attributed to set nets and a ban should be applied then it should be applied to all fishers. Recreational set netting should be allowed all year round. Not just January to April. Recreational fishers have to stay close to their nets so that should prevent entrapment of Hector 's dolphins. In general agree. Allowable set net length could be shortened. Would argue for similar restrictions on commercial set netting too. I think the limited season and the fact the fisher has to stay with the net is a good thing! Commercial set netting should have the same regulations as recreational set netting. Otherwise we support the current regulations,

Question 9 Should the Association advocate for consistency between recreational and commercial and customary set netting?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
70%	13%	4%	9%	4%

Sample Comments: Needs to be fair for everybody and any restrictions should be based on sustainability of the fishery not on commercial or solely cultural grounds. I understand fish quota is shared between recreational, commercial and customary. So we should all have the right to catch it. Absolutely. One rule for all.

Question 10 I support the Association's current position of advocating for recreational set netting with appropriate steps to mitigate risk to Hectors dolphins and marine mammals.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
71%	19%	6%		3%

Sample Comments: If you are with your net such that you are able to pull it out when you see dolphins are near, you are not mitigating effects, you are avoiding them. Avoiding effects is of higher priority than mitigating them under sensible approaches to sustainable management of biodiversity and fisheries. We agree totally with this. We have been fishing in this area for 50 years and never caught a dolphin. I think set netting should be banned in the port

Question 11 Is there anything else you would like to say regarding set netting or fishery matters?

Sample Comments: I have over 50 years experience set netting in Port Underwood. I have only seen 6-10 shag drownings. No Hector's dolphin entanglements. I never leave net over 2 hours. Leaving net "overnight" is the major culprit causing harm. A soak time of maybe 2 hours. I would like to set a small flounder net in close and not have to watch it. Shame we cannot do this

Question 12 What do you believe are the effects of forestry, both positive and negative, to you and the Port Underwood area.

Sample Comments: Forestry, like aquaculture is a significant contributor to the local / national economy and I have no problem with it provided it is undertaken responsibly. The pre-amble states it all really but the jobs created are insignificant against the negative consequences. Positive employment negative: visual impact (no native forests) impact on seabed. Toxicity in sea etc. etc. Should be planting natives. All the negative affects listed above that affect a lot of people. Positive effects apply to very few. Allow utilization of land that would otherwise be unfarmable. Forestry should be able to manage their activities in a way that works positively for their commercial needs as well as for the local residents and bach owners. Negative effects from harvesting include direct road and coastal damage, and also sediment damage. I believe a barrier (setbacks) should be sought to protect the coasts and the road edges from forestry activity. These barriers should be in native bush. Positive – an important industry for the country and region. We need all the trees we can get in the ground, if they are in the right places. Negative. They have often been planted on unsuitable sites, mainly too steep and too close to the sea leading to massive erosion and siltation into the sea. Effects of erosion (gullies etc) on local roads. Road safety issues from logging traffic

Question 13 I believe that the Association should be involved with Council to ensure appropriate conditions are placed (and monitored) on applications, such as conditions relating to harvesting, water pollution and truck loads.

Agree Strongly 93%	Agree Somewhat 3%	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat 3%	Disagree Strongly
--------------------------	-------------------------	---------	----------------------------	----------------------

Sample Comments: The association has the ability to pool the common views of residents together to present a cohesive community voice on issues that affect all of us. Yes – harvesting contractors should be monitored to ensure adherence to resource consents. And to prevent unwanted other effects to local area. I agree that conditions relating to harvesting, water pollution, truck loads and number, should have PUA involvement. Extra levies fees on all commercial logging companies to maintain the actual sections of roading they use. Timing of trucks should be limited to certain hours so that locals can know when to expect them on the roads. So important to have local input when the forestry's are not owned locally.

Question 14 I believe that generally the Port Underwood Road is maintained to an adequate standard for the area.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
9%	25%	13%	31%	22%

Question 15 I would be willing to pay more rates to see road maintenance carried out to a higher level than is currently done.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
3%	29%	23%	19%	26%

Question 16 I would like to see more of Port Underwood Road sealed.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
19%	16%	31%	19%	16%

Question 17 I would be prepared to pay more rates for a period of time to cover the costs of having more of Port Underwood Road sealed.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
9%	15%	24%	21%	30%

Question 18 I believe that generally the Tumbledown Bay Road maintained to an adequate standard for the area.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
6%	19%	28%	31%	16%

Question 19 I would be willing to pay more rates to see road maintenance carried out to a higher level than is currently done.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
3%	28%	25%	13%	31%

Question 20 I would like to see more of Tumbledown Bay Road sealed.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
9%	25%	34%	9%	22%

Question 21 I would be prepared to pay more rates for a period of time to cover the costs of having more of Tumbledown Bay Road sealed.

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
3%	25%	25%	13%	34%

Question 22 If you agree that you would like to see better road maintenance please indicate what section(s) you would like better maintained.

Sample Comments: Please see complete survey results.

Question 23 If you agree that you would like to see more road sealing completed please indicate what section(s) of road you would like to see sealed?

Sample Comments: Please see complete survey results.

Question 24 If you agree that you would be prepared to pay more rates to see better road maintenance please indicate what you would be prepared to pay annually for this?

Sample Comments: Please see complete results.

Question 25 If you agree that you would be prepared to pay more rates to see more road sealing completed please indicate what you would be prepared to pay annually for this and for how many years?

Sample Comments: Please see complete results.

Question 26 Any additional comment you would like to make about roading?

Sample Comments: More needs to be done by way of signage to make drivers aware of the need for much more caution than they currently display, especially commercial frequent users and those towing. Not having a super duper road keeps my residence remote from city/town hassle. If the road is too good too many people would want to be here. The people that have houses in the Port are not the only users of the road. In fact I would think that they are the minority users of the road when compared to workers, businesses, tourists, freedom campers and general visitors/ day trippers. Therefore the rate payers should not be the ones to have the burden of improving the road just because the local council or government is not paying enough to keep it in good condition. Just more maintenance, more often...instead of waiting for the problem. Overall pretty satisfied with roading but think HEB were taking short cuts to their contract which I believe will be addressed with the new evidence based proposal

Question 27 Should Freedom Camping be prohibited on any part of the Port Underwood Road other than the established DOC camping sites?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
74%	13%	13%		

Sample Comments: There is no provision for the disposal of human waste so it should only be allowed in limited areas to self contained vehicles. I'm not against fully self contained vehicles, but because the regulations around these includes SC vehicles with just a porta potti, there is a need to ban all freedom camping. There is very little space along Port Underwood Road that is safe to camp at without using private land. Only at DOC sites

Question 28 Should Freedom Camping be prohibited on all parts of the Tumbledown Bay Road?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
61%	19%	13%	6%	

Sample Comments: Same as above.

Question 29 Should the Association oppose any resource consent applications for subdivisions that are not permitted by current regulations?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
32%	35%	26%		6%

Sample Comments: The association should submit on any plan changes to change zonings and any applications to change plan zonings. An issue to be dealt with on case by case. In general, yes, the rules are there as a result of a long process and should be adhered to, otherwise we will lose the character of the Port that attracts us there in the first place. Anything that does not fall within the zoning plans or does not have consent of all affected parties.

Question 30 How adequate are the parking spaces at current boat launch sites?

Sample Comments: some are ok, others not and congestion depends on time of year. OK at present but with greater usage this will become an issue.

Question 31 Which bays suffer from car parking/trailer parking problems? Please describe the problems and solutions.

Sample Comments: Probably Oyster Bay, as the area is not big enough for Commercial as well as Recreational...many boaties drive over from Picton.

Question 32 Should there be more parking and/or launch sites in Port Underwood? If so, where?

No	Neutral	Yes
26%	57%	17%

Sample Comments: Please see complete survey results.

Question 33 Any further suggestions, solutions or comments on the parking spaces at boat launch sites?

Sample Comments: Please see complete results.

Question 34 Do you consider that there is sufficient room for additional moorings at Oyster Bay? Give comments on problems and suggested solutions.

No	Neutral	Yes
14%	75%	11%

Sample Comments: Oyster Bay should be the main focus for any investment in public launching sites, jetties, carparking and facilities for public and commercial access. Additional mooring sites could be provided if further investment is made in this jetty area.

Question 35 Do you consider that there is sufficient room for moorings at other bays?
State which bay you are referring to? Give comments on problems and suggested solutions.

No	Neutral	Yes
4%	87%	8%

Sample Comments: Please see complete survey results.

Question 36 Should the Association oppose any resource consent applications for jetties?

Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
12%	12%	52%	15%	9%

Comments: Again, foreshore structures and jetties are fairly rigorously examined by MDC in RC process so think should leave to them as can see potential for disputes with Assn members. Depends. Common sense really needs to be applied. Oppose applications that would create adverse effects for the community.

Question 37 Should any resource consent applications for a jetty consider parking for cars and trailers (presumably on the western or northern side of the Port) and other supporting infrastructure, and if not included in the application, should the Association object to the application?

Agree Strongly 35%	Agree Somewhat 29%	Neutral 29%	Disagree Somewhat 3%	Disagree Strongly 3%
--------------------------	--------------------------	----------------	----------------------------	----------------------------

Sample Comments: Logical and sensible. More car/trailer parking has to be necessary. Parking is essential for these areas. This must be allowed for in the application. Common sense, can't have cars/trailers parked half on half off road- bad enough road as it is, untidy, brings opportunity for thieves if vehicles are parked for long periods of time etc

Question 38 I believe the Association meets my expectation of its roles in representing the membership.

Agree Strongly 66%	Agree Somewhat 44%	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
--------------------------	--------------------------	---------	----------------------	----------------------

Question 39 I believe the communications between the elected committee and members, and the actions taken by the Committee are adequate.

Agree Strongly 69%	Agree Somewhat 31%	Neutral	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
--------------------------	--------------------------	---------	----------------------	----------------------

Sample Comments: Please see complete survey results.

General Matters

Sample Comments: Please see complete survey results.