



Report 14.314
 Date 9 June 2014
 File PK/12/07/03

Committee Parangarahu Lakes Parks Network Plan Hearing Subcommittee
 Authors Lynly Selby-Neal, Parks Planner
 Sharon Lee, Parks Planner

Summary of Submissions on the Parangarahu Lakes Area Co-Management Plan and Amendment to the GWRC Parks Network Plan

1. Purpose

To provide the Subcommittee with an overview of the submissions received on the Parangarahu Lakes Area Co-Management Plan and Amendment to the GWRC Parks Network Plan (the Co-Management Plan and Parks Network Plan Amendment) and provide officers recommendations on the issues raised by submitters.

This report complements **Report 14.309** which sets out the process for handling and consideration of submissions.

2. Consultation

Under the Reserves Act 1977 a minimum period of two months is required for the public to provide written submissions on a draft plan. The consultation was advertised in newspapers beginning 24 March 2014. The Co-Management Plan and Parks Network Plan Amendment were made available on the Greater Wellington Regional Council's website. Copies of the draft plan were also available for inspection at the offices of Greater Wellington Regional Council.

Those who had been involved in hui, workshops, submissions or attended meetings with Council officers were also invited to view the draft plan and comment. Officers also met with Fish & Game and the Department of Conservation to discuss the direction of the draft plan. Communication was also sent out to the wider Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust contact list.

During May there were two hui and two public drop-in sessions (in Lower Hutt and Wellington City) for the public and stakeholders to ask officers questions about the draft plan.

The submission period closed on Monday 26th May 2014. A total of 13 written submissions were received including one late submission. The make-up of these submissions and their content is as follows:

- 5 From supporters of duck hunting. Submissions questioned the evidence that duck hunting posed a risk to the health of the lakes and how PNBST is able to restrict access to its land for this recreational activity.
- 5 From members of Taranaki Whānui. Submissions noted the lack of involvement from Hutt City Council and the Department of Conservation, sought provision for rongoā (healing plants) and ways to involve whānui at an operational level.
- 3 From community organisations with an interest in the area.
- 13 Submissions in total.

Seven submitters wish to be heard in support of their submission.

3. Summary of submissions

This section summarises the key issues and provides officer comment. Officer recommendations to the Committee are noted in italics.

Overall, submitters generally supported:

- The vision-moemoeā of the Co-Management Plan;
- The retention and enhancement of ecological and cultural values of the area;
- The control of pest animals and plants, including aquatic weeds in the lakes;
- Efforts to secure recreational links between other parts of East Harbour Regional Park, and in particular Baring Head; and
- Increased opportunities for Taranaki Whānui to exercise kaitiakitanga.

The section that follows outlines the issues raised and officers' recommendations in respect to the Co-Management Plan and Amendment to the Parks Network Plan.

3.1 Support for increased kaitiakitanga and greater participation by Taranaki Whānui

There was general support for Objective 5 (pg. 42) in the Co-Management Plan but also a call for increased opportunities for all whānau age groups to connect, to visit, and to engage as kaitiaki with the Parangarahu Lakes Area. One submitter emphasised reducing barriers or restrictions to participation by iwi members through careful consideration of timing of events and using proven iwi engagement and communication methods and networks. Another submitter

suggested that a paid position is needed to undertake environmental management according to tikanga and matauranga of Taranaki Whānui.

3.1.1 Officers comment

When determining the work programme, specific attention can be given to identifying opportunities for collaboration and participation and then monitoring the uptake of these opportunities. This could include employment opportunities for Taranaki Whānui members on specific tasks such as cultural monitoring, cultural advice and assessment of proposals for development in the area.

Officers note that Actions 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 cover these issues; however, for further emphasis recommend that the Co-Management Plan:

- 1. Works programming and funding, Section 8 Page 49 be amended to include 'opportunities for collaboration and participation'.*
- 2. Monitoring, Section 8 Page 49 be amended to include the 'level of whānau engagement' as a measure of effectiveness.*

3.2 Improved access to dendroglyph sites

One submitter noted that it was hard to locate and access the dendroglyph sites, particularly for older kaumātua. They sought improved physical access to the dendroglyph sites with appropriate means of access such as a gate through the fence.

3.2.1 Officers comment

A balance is to be found between protecting the dendroglyph and enabling people to learn about and appreciate this taonga. Seeing the trees and the dendroglyph is part of this learning and this could be facilitated through the provision of access that can be controlled by the landowners when necessary to protect the trees.

Objective 4 of the Co-Management Plan provides for the protection and management of...sites of significance and other waahi taonga.

Officers recommend that Co-Management Plan Action 4.6 Page 41 be amended to include provision of appropriate access to the dendroglyph.

3.3 Support for restricted vehicle access

The concern about unauthorised and off-road vehicle access has been a common theme from the outset of consultation. A key message is a desire for vehicle access to the lakes to be restricted to better protect the natural environment and the experience of being in this remote location. Some vehicles visiting or passing by the lakes, including motorbikes, have been seen leaving the coastal road and driving on the shingle beaches, damaging the fragile flora and fauna that exists there.

3.3.1 Officers comment

Vehicle access to the area serves a number of purposes. Permission for use of the Pencarrow Coast Road is granted by Hutt City Council on the basis of the

Pencarrow Coast Road Policy for Vehicle Use 2012-2017. In practice, it is difficult to prevent vehicles accessing the coast entirely. However, officers and PNBST are working on a joint approach with other agencies and landowners to address this issue and encourage compliance. Letters from Hutt City Council to Burden's Gate 'key holders', additional signage and a rahui on vehicle use on the beach during the nationally vulnerable banded dotterel/pohowera nesting season are recent steps taken to alter behaviour.

The Roopu Tiaki can continue to actively engage with Hutt City Council regarding vehicle access issues.

Officers recommend that the Co-Management Plan Action 1.3 Page 39 be amended to include reference to vehicle access as a matter for regular communication with Hutt City Council.

3.4 Improving the freshwater fishery

Wellington Marine Fishers Association prepared a substantial submission. The submission included the following in relation to the Co-Management Plan:

- That the information in the plan is incorrect and the section on fish migration (pages 28-30) should be rewritten to include information about the importance of the inter-tidal zone on marine and freshwater species.
- That a suitable management regime should maintain flow to and from the sea all year round to facilitate unrestricted fish passage.
- That to deter pied shags from foraging on fish in the lakes, their nesting habitat (i.e. tall trees) adjacent the lakes should be removed.

3.4.1 Fish migration

This submission disputes the content in the Co-Management Plan in relation to the lifecycle of freshwater fish and eels in New Zealand. One example is where the submission states that the lifecycle of eels, as described in the Co-Management Plan, is "*illogical, technically impossible...obviously wrong..*" and that eels spawn in freshwater streams (pg. 6 & 7 of submission).

The submission also suggests the management goal should be a continuous flow of water to the sea year round.

(a) Officers Comment

Officers have reviewed the submitter's points and find the statements in the submission are at odds with current scientific-based understanding and literature available. For example, the migration undertaken by adult and larval eels is truly remarkable; however, this does not make it untrue. In many cases, these migratory periods have been known and exploited by fishers around New Zealand for consideration time, e.g. the eel and whitebait seasons.

Officers acknowledge the best outcome for the management of freshwater fish which require sea access, would be to maintain flow to and from the sea all year round, thus facilitating unrestricted fish passage. However, this is not practical given that either:

1. coastal barrier lakes naturally go through periods when they do not flow to the sea; or
2. anthropogenic impacts, such as the coastal road and associated culverts restrict the frequency and duration of flow to the sea.

With this in mind, a logical management option is to investigate options for artificially opening a channel to facilitate fish passage during known key migration periods of diadromous (migratory) fish. It is also appropriate, as a potential management option, to investigate and discuss excluding exotic species from migrating into the lakes. Options for excluding those species have been investigated across New Zealand and those that may work at Parangarahu Lakes, including a fish ladder, have been detailed in the report prepared by McEwan (2013) whose work is referenced in the Co-Management Plan.

The submission incorrectly assumes that the Co-Management Plan provides for a gate to be used to control fish passage according to season. There is no reference to gates in the plan, rather intent to find the best solution for the lakes within current natural and anthropogenic constraints.

Restoration of the eel fishery at Parangarahu is a priority objective of the Co-Management Plan. To realise this, Actions 3.1, 3.3 and 3.4 provide for the review and analysis of the current hydrology systems of the lakes, identification of the best options for improving flow to the sea, ongoing monitoring of eel habitats and stocks and continued research to increase both scientific knowledge and mātauranga Māori¹ of the eel fishery at the lakes.

Overall, while the Co-Management Plan is not a scientific document, the potential management approaches identified in the Co-Management Plan are logical, scientifically-based options and the information on freshwater fish is consistent with current scientific knowledge and is fit for its desired purpose.

Officers recommend no change to the information provided in the Co-Management Plan regarding freshwater fish and fish migration.

3.4.2 Pied Shags

The submission describes pied shags as a threat to freshwater fish in the lakes and asks for tall trees around the lakes to be removed to deter the shags nesting or roosting in the area.

(a) Officers Comment

This argument is based on the premise that nesting shags will forage in freshwater. Scientific literature states pied shags predominately forage in coastal marine and estuarine waters and only roost near or bathe in freshwater.

¹ Mātauranga Māori can be defined as 'the knowledge, comprehension, or understanding of everything visible and invisible existing in the universe', and is often used synonymously with wisdom. In the contemporary world, the definition is usually extended to include present-day, historic, local, and traditional knowledge; systems of knowledge transfer and storage; and the goals, aspirations and issues from an indigenous perspective. <http://www.landcareresearch.co.nz>

The pied shag (nationally vulnerable) and the black shag (at risk, naturally vulnerable) are both known to nest at the lakes and both are legally protected under the New Zealand Wildlife Act. The Co-Management Plan aims to restore and sustain vital and healthy indigenous flora and fauna populations in and around the lakes. To deter shags from nesting at the lakes would be in conflict with Objective 1 of the Co-Management Plan.

Officers recommend no additional policy regarding shags nesting at the Lakes.

3.5 Camping

One submitter suggested that camping is a managed activity rather than prohibited.

3.5.1 Officers comment

Officers note that there is no provision of services for overnight stays (toilets) and fire risk is particularly concerning in this remote location. Wilderness camping is possible in the nearby Northern Forest section of East Harbour Regional Park, behind Eastbourne.

Officers recommend no change to camping as a prohibited activity.

3.6 Concessions

One submitter requested that concessions are kept to a minimum or banned in order to prevent the area from becoming commercialised.

3.6.1 Officers comment

The Co-Management Plan and Amendment to the Parks Network Plan recognise the sensitive nature of the area and treats concessions as restricted activities. This means that each application is assessed on its merits, compatibility with plan vision and objectives and appropriateness to the location and may be subject to conditions and monitored (Action 7.4). In this regard, there are sufficient measures to manage the effects of activities.

Officers recommend no change to concessions as a restricted activity.

3.7 Governance

Submissions noted the need to have an agreed approach to management by all the agencies involved, or just have one agency managing the area.

3.7.1 Officers comment

The ownership of the land and the responsibilities of each agency mean that there must be a co-ordinated approach. The Co-Management Plan recognises that some agencies are more suited to lead particular actions, therefore strategic partnerships between agencies, landowners and community groups must be developed to achieve the vision of the plan (Objective 8).

A change to the Roopu Tiaki is outside the scope of this plan; however, officers note that the Memorandum of Understanding between Greater Wellington Regional Council and PNBST provides an opportunity for the

governance structure to be reviewed upon the adoption of the Co-Management Plan.

Officers recommend no change.

3.8 Duck Hunting and fishing, including eel fishing:

There were five submissions opposing the prohibition of duck hunting in the area, including a submission from Fish and Game New Zealand. Some also sought for fishing and hunting to be allowed activities at the Lakes.

The main points raised in these submissions are:

- That duck hunting has occurred at the lakes for decades and is a customary activity by those who participate.
- Request that the current practice, allowing duck hunting as a managed activity (noting restrictions on area to minimise risk of weed spread), be continued.
- Support for the control of pests and aquatic weeds and for the collaborative management of the lakes.
- That by prohibiting duck hunting the Co-Management Plan is in breach of Section 52 of the PNBS Act 2009 [that is, PNBST cannot restrict recreational access to their land unless “risk of significant adverse effect” present].
- That there is no evidence to justify a complete prohibition on duck hunting and angling, i.e. no proof that hunting is cause of weed occurrence or that when well managed hunting poses a risk.
- That the Co-Management Plan discriminates between recreational uses and equivalent customary rights, i.e. duck hunting poses no more risk than other activities in/on the lakes (such as customary harvest).

3.8.1 Officers comment

In determining the future of duck hunting it is important for the decision making body to consider the Port Nicholson Block (Taranaki Whanui ki Te Upoko Te Ika) Claims Settlement Act 2009 (the Settlement Act) and the conservation covenants’ requirements with regard to recreation. The Settlement Act and covenants state that the land must be managed to provide freedom of access to the public for the appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the land (and also for education, scientific study and research). However, under Section 52 of the Settlement Act and clause 3.1.10 of the covenants there is a basis for the restriction of activities, including recreation. Where a recreational activity poses a risk of a significant adverse effect to the conservation or reserve values of the lakes (as set out in the covenants for the lake beds and lake margins) then the recreational activity will not be protected by the Settlement Act or the covenants.

In the draft Co-Management Plan and Parks Network Plan Amendment, duck hunting is prohibited. This prohibition was included on the basis of an

environmental threat to the lakes through the spread of, or further introduction of new, aquatic plant pests.² As stated above, the prohibition needs to be based on the evidence available to decision-makers of the risk to the values of the lakes posed by duck hunting.

Page 28 of the Co-Management Plan, details how surveys have demonstrated that both lakes have outstanding botanical values and are amongst the best in the country, as is the Kohangapiripiri wetland. In the draft Regional Plan being prepared by Greater Wellington Regional Council, these lands are likely to be given the status of 'outstanding'. The conservation covenants note in the reserve values that *the Pencarrow Lakes have been ranked in the Wetlands of Ecological and Regional Importance (WERI) database of national (Lake Kohangatera) and regional (Lake Kohangapiripiri) significance*. It is these values which the decision making body is charged with protecting when considering allowing or restricting activities on covenanted land (i.e. the lake beds and lake margins).

As the Subcommittee will be aware, two highly invasive weeds have been found in the swamp area above Lake Kohangatera (which has the higher significance of the two lakes) that threaten the quality of this lake, as would the introduction of any new aquatic weeds to the catchment. The approach of Greater Wellington Regional Council and the Department of Conservation over the last three years has been to detail the extent of the incursion and look at ways to control these aquatic weeds.

As part of these measures, exclusion zones have been introduced to minimise the chance of existing weeds spreading within the lake, or between the lakes³. These exclusion zones are no-entry areas and have been identified on duck hunting permits. The reasoning is that boats and equipment are shown to be the carriers of these aquatic weeds and that any disturbance and movement could aid weed dispersal. This measure reduces, but does not remove, the risk of further spread or introduction of aquatic weeds to the lakes.

Greater Wellington Regional Council has sought advice from NIWA (prepared by Mary de Winton who is one of New Zealand's leading freshwater ecologists) on the best means to control existing and avoid introduction of aquatic weeds. de Winton states that the highly invasive aquatic weeds, such as elodea, egaria and hornwort do not produce seeds. Their transfer is only mediated by human activity and not by natural means such as waterfowl, as suggested by some submissions. She recommends focusing on the containment and control of the weed within Kohangatera, with preferable exclusion of vehicular and or boat access to the lakes. This measure is considered the most effective proactive biosecurity action addressing the highest risk pathway for new invasive weeds to enter the lakes.

² Note that this differs from other situations where duck hunting may be restricted or banned because of the a risk to public safety (the location makes duck hunting a low risk in that it occurs at times where there are unlikely to be others in the area and that there are ways to inform other park users).

³ In 2014 no movement of equipment, dogs or hunters was permitted between the two lakes or between the lakes and the nearby Wainuiomata River. Invasive hornwort is present in the Wainuiomata catchment.

On the basis of this advice, officers advise the Subcommittee that the activity of boats and equipment entering the water as part of duck shooting poses a risk of a significant adverse effect to the values of the lakes. There is, therefore, clear reason to exclude such an activity from the lakes to prevent new weeds entering or the current aquatic weeds spreading.

There remains duck shooting opportunities on private land and on the nearby Wainuiomata River in Baring Head/Ōrua-Pouanui, East Harbour Regional Park.

Officers recommend no change to the prohibition of duck hunting.

3.9 Addressing concerns of customary harvest

Some submissions also question the consistency of the Co-Management Plan with regard to allowing kaitiaki activities, and the seeming discrimination between recreational uses and 'equivalent' customary rights.

3.9.1 Officers comment

It is important to consider that the Settlement Act needs to be interpreted in the light of the Deed of Settlement including acknowledgement by the Crown that Taranaki Whānui ki To Upoko o Te Ika:

- Have suffered prejudice by being deprived of their resources and rights to develop, economic, social and cultural opportunities in respect of their lands in breach of the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles; and
- Have suffered a loss of connection with the harbour and their lands, forest, waters and natural resources which has adversely affected their ability to assert and exercise kaitiakitanga, manākitanga, whanaungatanga and other customary rights and responsibilities.

Notably, at no point in any of the documents or instruments are the rights and responsibilities regarding customary use by Taranaki Whānui ki Te Upoko o Te Ika said to be the same as those of the recreational rights of the wider public.

The Co-Management Plan advises that the Roopu Tiaki will consider permits for Taranaki Whānui Kaitiaki Activities (pg. 45), including cultural harvest of plants or collection of natural materials such as seeds or stones. Permission to carry out kaitiaki activities will be considered on a case by case basis.

Unlike duck hunting, where the retrieval of birds almost always involves contact with the wetlands and lakes, kaitiaki activities may or may not involve contact with the water. If approval was sought to collect material from the wetlands or lakes, officers recommend that the Roopu Tiaki apply a consistent approach to minimising the risk of spread or introduction of aquatic weeds.

For clarity, officers recommend that this is acknowledged in the Co-Management Plan and Parks Network Plan Amendment under section 7: Rules for use and development (Taranaki Whānui Kaitiaki Activities, pg 45). This approach accords with the conditions of the conservation covenants; that the

owner must not carry out or permit on or in relation to the land any other activity which might have an adverse effect on the conservation values or reserve values (cl 3.1.10).

Officers recommend amending Page 45 of the Co-Management Plan and Page 12 of the Parks Network Plan Amendment to include 'the conditions of the conservation covenant' as a criteria for Taranaki Whānui Kaitiaki Activities.

3.10 Controls on eeling and other fishing

In the Co-Management Plan and Parks Network Plan Amendment fishing is listed as a prohibited activity. Officers have reviewed this and consider that clarification is needed that it is fishing access that is banned or prohibited through the Plan.

The Fisheries (Amateur Fishing) Regulations 1986 provides for recreational fishing and issue of 'cultural take' permits. The legislation is permissive in that all areas can be fished in unless restricted. For example, in the Central North Island (including the Parangarahu Lakes area) up to 6 eels may be caught without any consent. If more than six eels are needed (such as for a hui) then a permit must be sought from a recognised kaitiaki. There are two kaitiaki in the Taranaki Whānui rohe (territory), including Teri Puketapu who currently sits on the Roopu Tiaki.

Currently, for the Parangarahu Lakes area, fishing can occur as there are no bylaws or māitaitai in place. It is the view of officers that the Roopu Tiaki could prevent access for fishing in the area through the plan but cannot prohibit fishing per se. Other measures to restrict fishing, such as through māitaitai bylaws (under Kaimoana Customary Fishing Regulations 1998) or by the Minister of Conservation restricting the taking and killing of fauna (Section 50 of the Reserves Act) in a scientific reserve could also be employed if thought necessary.

The Wellington Recreational Marine Fishers Association submission called for an indefinite ban on white bait netting to support native fresh water fish recovery. White bait netting is not provided for in the plan as the Department of Conservation is responsible for the management of the whitebait fishery and compliance with the regulations. Again, it is the view of officers that the Roopu Tiaki can turn down requests for access for white bait netting but may also want to explore what other measures are available to the Department of Conservation and advocate for localised controls. This may be appropriate given the potential effects on an already compromised fish migration path and the risk that equipment used is a pathway for aquatic weeds.

Officers recommend:

- 1. Inserting the word 'Fishing access' in the Activity Table on Page 47 of the Co-Management Plan and Page 14 of the Parks Network Plan Amendment, and*

2. *Adding to the explanation text on Page 47 of the Co-Management Plan and Page 13 of the Parks Network Plan Amendment an explanation regarding the relevant legislation governing this activity.*

3.11 Other minor issues raised

The consultative hui and submissions also raised some detailed suggestions for improvement to the draft Amendment that do not alter the overall intent. These have been noted by officers for inclusion in the final Amendment to the Parks Network Plan to be approved by Council.

Some submissions opposed the reclassification of the lakes from Wildlife to Scientific Reserve. The change to Scientific Reserve is a consequence of the Settlement Act and not a proposal of this plan. Any reservation of the lakes as a reserve for wildlife management purposes was revoked and the Crown Stratum (the space above the bed of the lakes occupied by water and air) was classified as Scientific Reserve subject to the provisions of the Reserves Act 1977.

Officers recommend that the Co-Management Plan and Parks Network Plan Amendment be amended for spelling and tabulation errors and where minor changes will not change the overall intent.

4. Communication

As noted in **Report 2014.309** the Subcommittee will need to prepare a report to Council setting out its recommendations on the Draft Parangarahu Lakes Co-Management Plan and the Draft Amendment to the Parks Network Plan. This report will be considered by the Council at its meeting on 27 August 2014.

The Subcommittee will also need to prepare a letter to PNBST setting out its recommendations on the Draft Parangarahu Lakes Co-Management Plan. These recommendations will be considered by PNBST at a subsequent board meeting.

If for any reason Council or PNBST have concerns with the amended Co-Management Plan or Parks Network Plan Amendment as proposed by the Subcommittee then this would be referred back to the Subcommittee for further consideration.

It is proposed that each submitter receives a copy of the report identifying the final changes to the Parks Network Plan agreed by Council and the Parangarahu Lakes Co-Management Plan agreed by the Council and PNBST, including commentary around the reasons for these recommendations.

5. The decision-making process and significance

The matters requiring decision in this report have been considered by officers against the requirements of Part 6 of the Local Government Act 2002.

5.1 Significance of the decision

Officers have considered the significance of the matter, taking into account the Council's significance policy and decision-making guidelines. Due to the procedural nature of this decision officers recommend that the matter be considered to have low significance.

Officers do not consider that a formal record outlining consideration of the decision-making process is required in this instance.

5.1.1 The decision-making process

This hearing considers the Co-Management Plan which has been prepared in accordance with clause 6.2 of the Conservation Covenant over PNBST land, which allows Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust (PNBST) to enter into an agreement, such as the draft plan, regarding the management of the land. It also considers an Amendment to the Parks Network Plan as the Parangarahu Lakes Area includes recreation reserve and therefore must follow the statutory plan process under the Reserves Act 1977.

The decision making process for management plans containing reserves is explicitly prescribed for by Section 41 of the Reserves Act 1977. This is as follows:

- Notify intention to draft a management plan
- Receive comments and ideas from the public and interested parties
- Officers prepare a draft plan
- Draft is approved for public consultation by the Committee
- Submissions received
- Submissions are heard and considered by the Committee, the recommendation to adopt the plan (with any changes identified) is taken to Council
- Council approve the management plan

Under section 41(5) of the Reserves Act 1977, an administering body is required to give public notice of its intent to prepare a plan or Amendment and invite persons to make written suggestions on the proposed plan. This is a pre-consultation step to elicit ideas and issues from the community. However, under section 41[(5A)] of the Reserves Act, the administering body may, by resolution, determine that written suggestions on the proposed plan or Amendment will not materially assist in its preparation and therefore section 41(5) shall not apply.

It was agreed by the Strategy and Policy Committee on the 18 February (**Report 2014.38**) that this pre-consultation step was not necessary or helpful. Consequently, the Council agreed to release the East Harbour Regional Park –

Parangarahu Lakes Draft Amendment to the Parks Network Plan for consultation.

6. Recommendations

That the Subcommittee:

1. **Receives** the report.
2. **Notes** the content of the report.
3. **Recommends** to Council and Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust the following changes to the draft Co-Management Plan:
 - a. *Works programming and funding, Section 8 Page 49 be amended to include opportunities for collaboration and participation.*
 - b. *Monitoring, Section 8 Page 49 be amended to include the level of whānau engagement as a measure of effectiveness.*
 - c. *Action 4.6 Page 41 be amended to include provision of appropriate access to the dendroglyph.*
 - d. *Action 1.3 Page 39 be amended to include reference to vehicle access as a matter for regular communication with Hutt City Council.*
 - e. *no change to the prohibition of duck hunting.*
 - f. *Include 'the conditions of the conservation covenant' as a criteria for Taranaki Whānui Kaitiaki Activities on Page 45.*
 - g. *Insert the word 'Fishing access' in the Activity Table on Page 47.*
 - h. *Add to the explanation text regarding the relevant legislation governing fishing in the area on Page 47.*
 - i. *That the plan is amended for spelling and tabulation errors and where minor changes will not change the overall intent.*
4. **Recommends** to Council the following changes to the draft Parks Network Plan Amendment:
 - a. *no change to the prohibition of duck hunting.*
 - b. *Include the conditions of the conservation covenant as a criteria for Taranaki Whānui Kaitiaki Activities, Page 12.*
 - c. *Insert the word 'Fishing access' in the Activity Table on Page 14.*
 - d. *Add an explanation regarding the relevant legislation governing fishing in the area to Page 13.*

e. That the plan is amended for spelling and tabulation errors and where minor changes will not change the overall intent.

5. ***Recommends*** to Greater Wellington Regional Council and Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust the approval of the Parangarahu Lakes Area Co-Management Plan subject to the changes as outlined in Recommendation Three (a-i).
6. ***Recommends*** that Council adopts the Parks Network Plan Amendment subject to the changes as outlined in Recommendation Four (a-e).

Report prepared by:

Lynly Selby-Neal
Parks Planner

Report prepared by:

Sharon Lee
Parks Planner

Report approved by:

Luke Troy
Manager, Corporate Planning

Report approved by:

Jane Davis
Manager, Strategy and
Community Engagement

Attachment 1: Summary of submissions and officers response