

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.002	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Considers that the blanket protections do not provide sufficient ability for pastoral farming practices such as fencing and vegetation clearance for farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent.	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission
Helen McIntosh	S24.002	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Considers that the blanket protections do not provide sufficient ability for pastoral farming practices such as fencing and vegetation clearance for farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent.	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission.
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.002	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Considers that the blanket protections do not provide sufficient ability for pastoral farming practices such as fencing and vegetation clearance for farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent.	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission. Change of chapter rules to allow good farming practices.
Karen Temple	S19.002	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Considers that the blanket protections do not provide sufficient ability for pastoral farming practices such as fencing and vegetation clearance for farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. Opposes the mapping, vehicle tracks and limited grazing.	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission. Change of chapter rules to allow good farming practices.
Department of Conservation	S109.047	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Neutral	The D-G generally supports the proposed approach to commit to mapping SNAs by August 2028 and once this is completed a variation to the proposed District Plan will occur. It is recommended that any SNA assessments that have been undertaken to date are included in the proposed plan in accordance with the NPS-IB. This is also consistent with Part 2, Section 6c of the RMA which requires, as matters of national importance, the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. In the interim period, the D-G recommends that there are provisions in the plan that capture the identification and protection of new SNAs that are not yet mapped and any highly mobile fauna areas at the resource consent stage. This is captured in the definition of SNAs and our suggested inclusion of a definition for highly mobile fauna areas but it is considered to provide more clarity by specifying this intent in the policies, rules and assessment matters. As noted above, this aligns better with the RMA provisions. The D-G supports the provisions of the proposed Plan where certain effects of new subdivision, use and development within a SNA are avoided as set out in the NPS-IB. However, it is not clear how the policies relating to SNAs (ECO P2, ECO P3, ECO P4 and ECO P9) work together and it is recommended that these are amended so that they accurately reflect the NPS-IB and how the relevant clauses which address exceptions due to the type of activity, are	It is recommended that any SNA assessments that have been undertaken to date are included in the proposed plan in accordance with the NPS-IB. In the interim period, the D-G recommends that there are provisions in the plan that capture the identification and protection of new SNAs that are not yet mapped and any highly mobile fauna areas at the resource consent stage.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					presented in the Plan. As the policies are written currently may confuse the resource consent assessment.	
Adrienne Crispin	S59.005	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	I do not agree that areas which meet SNA criteria are considered SNAs and that these areas are included in the plan.	SNAs should not be incorporated in the plan
Ronald Crispin	S60.002	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Does not agree with the inclusion of SNAs as this will cause more division.	SNAs should not be included in the plan.
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.021	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Identifies that further work required to give effect to NPSIB so current provisions a partial step.	Identifies that further work required to give effect to NPSIB so current provisions a partial step.
Southland District Council	S146.035	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Support	Good provisions on restoration of significant management areas.	None specified.
Jenny Campbell	S136.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	SNAs are as essential part of our environment and Native Biodiversity is our first consideration in responding to our current Climate Change and should take precedence.	Significant Natural Areas should be retained above all other considerations e.g., possible buildings.
Jenny Campbell	S136.008	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated		SNA's need to be identified & protected, with no grazing in them
Jenny Campbell	S136.009	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated		Ecological corridors in conjunction with SNA's are an imperative in order for organism to be able to travel along these eg between food sources & seasonally.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.177	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	We note that the Council did not include these chapters in the early consultation on the exposure draft. We believe these chapters need to be removed and rewritten with a more practical and enabling approach
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.116	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ian Davidson-Watts	S69.004	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Support in part	Considers that the number of consents applied for within existing SNAs to not be the best measure of effectiveness of the operative plan in the Section 32 report as these are scientific reserves. Biodiversity is critical to our communities economic, cultural, and social well-being. Natural capital (ecosystem services) can help in reducing flood events, improve water quality, and other ecosystem services such as pollination, soil health, and our general enjoyment of the outdoors which has so many physical and mental health benefits. SNAs in their own way are no different to someone have a heritage building in Gore Town and should be treated in the same way. The development of the NPS-IB (and whether it stays in force under the new Government) is irrelevant to GDCs responsibility to discharging their duties under S6c to indigenous fauna and vegetation, and if the new Government repeal this policy statement, the legal requirement to protect indigenous vegetation and fauna remains.	Agree with the proposed plan's approach to protect all indigenous vegetation until the SNA process is resolved. Identification of SNAs is completed ideally within 18 months of notification, engagement with affected landowners and full discussions about the value of their SNAs and the support they can receive can be undertaken. Recognition of those with the stewardship of these areas with rates relief, financial incentives and support, advice, management plan approach, free council consent process for agreed activities support, help for funding applications to assist with fencing, pest and weed control and work with local iwi.
Trudy Bokser	S113.116	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
Nathan Bokser	S116.116	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken	Withdraw chapter

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.116	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.118	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
Karen Temple	S19.118	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices	Withdraw chapter

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.118	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
Helen McIntosh	S24.118	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
John Baynes	S68.120	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems	Withdraw chapter

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.152	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.013	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	We do not support regulation regarding SNAs which will see them become a liability on private land as this will have negative consequences for biodiversity. SNAs must be mapped by the Council in collaboration with landowners before being included in any definition or rules. Requiring farmers to map these themselves via farm environment plans is Council "passing the buck". This will be costly work and does not belong in a document which is supposed to be a farm management tool that farmers can develop and maintain themselves.	If an SNA is not mapped, it cannot and should not have any restrictions on it.
Kevin Robertson	S115.178	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	We note that the Council did not include these chapters in the early consultation on the exposure draft. We believe these chapters need to be removed and rewritten with a more practical and enabling approach
Ronald Crispin	S60.180	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	We note that the Council did not include these chapters in the early consultation on the exposure draft. We believe these chapters need to be removed and rewritten with a more practical and enabling approach
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.189	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	We note that the Council did not include these chapters in the early consultation on the exposure draft. We believe these chapters need to be removed and rewritten with a more practical and enabling approach

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.190	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	We note that the Council did not include these chapters in the early consultation on the exposure draft. We believe these chapters need to be removed and rewritten with a more practical and enabling approach
John Baynes	S68.298	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	We note that the Council did not include these chapters in the early consultation on the exposure draft. We believe these chapters need to be removed and rewritten with a more practical and enabling approach
Robina Johnston	S140.006	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Southern Rata is a prolific species with a remarkable flowering mast and there is a vast amount along the Haumuri Reserve . Corridors for our native species can be assisted by growth. Education and advocacy are not the most effective techniques. Successful models need to be farmer led with goals and visions. A lot of the Hokonui zone is weed and pest especially on the southern faces.	Consider Southern Rata and Haumuri Reserve and native species corridors. Allow for eartworks for stock access via culvert crossings and conseted wetland
Greg Bokser	S117.116	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
Department of Conservation	S109.048	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Support in part	The D-G supports the setting out of relevant legislation in respect to indigenous biodiversity. It would also be relevant to mention in the overview the need to map any highly mobile fauna areas specific to the district (as per NPSIB clause 3).	Retain with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): - Provide a description of the important ecological values of Gore District and what the provisions are setting out to achieve. - Identify the issues for the District and how they are going to be addressed (drawing on issues from the Southland RPS and the s32 report). - Include a commitment to mapping any high mobile fauna areas and taonga species in consultation with Environment Southland and iwi (for example, river segments hosting threatened species, including non-diadromous galaxiids , kanakana lamprey larval rearing areas and spawning habitat, threatened blackbilled gulls and their habitats, lizards etc).
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.026	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Amend	This has been written before the release of the NPSIB, and needs to be updated.	Change: based on changes to national and regional policy direction, there is a gap in current identified SNAs that ~~will~~ needs to be addressed following the release of the National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity.
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.027	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Amend	This has been written before the release of the NPSIB, and needs to be updated.	A 10-year implementation timeframe for the NPSIB ~~is anticipated~~ has been given , which includes the development of a regional biodiversity strategy, an integrated approach across administrative boundaries, the need to work in partnership with tangata whenua

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Indigenous Biodiversity				and landowners, and notes that support will be provided from the regional council for mapping which must be completed by August 2028.
Environment Southland	S85.017	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Support in part		1. Remove 'While comprehensive mapping has not been undertaken to identify SNAs in the Gore District'... 2. Mandate consideration of wetlands for all proposed subdivisions, developments, or land uses.
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.011	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Support in part	The relationship of mana whenua with indigenous vegetation is recognised in ECO-O4 but is not discussed in the overview and purpose.	Add a new second paragraph after the first paragraph that reads: "All indigenous vegetation is a taonga to mana whenua. Many species are highly valued for mahinga kai (as food, fibre or medicine). Healthy, robust indigenous ecosystems are important to maintain the mauri of the whenua (land), wai (water) and te taiao (environment). Recognising and providing for the relationship of Māori and their customs and traditions with their ancestral lands, waters, sites wāhi tapu and other taonga is a Matter of National Importance under s6(c) of the RMA. For mana whenua the issue does not turn on the protection of specific sites which are identified as 'significant'. The takiwā is home so mana whenua have a relationship with all whenua, wai and ecosystems within the takiwā. Therefore, the focus is on enhancing the quality and quantity of indigenous biodiversity within the District: maintaining the ecological function, integrity and value of established indigenous ecosystems and the habitats that support them; and encouraging areas of regeneration and new planting. As such, mana whenua support an approach which encourages landholders to both retain and enhance indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems on-site. "
Oakland Farming Ltd	S153.002	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Wording should reflect the NPSIB and to be clear SNAs should be identified.	Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Department of Conservation	S109.049	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	The D-G supports this objective as it is consistent with the requirements of the RMA, NPS-IB and Southland RPS (OBJ BIO.2). However, it is considered that ECO-O1 should be amended in order to respond to the deterioration of indigenous biodiversity in the District as identified in the Overview, and to set out the outcomes the District intends to achieve with the ECO provisions in the plan.	Retain with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): Maintain, enhance and restore indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas).
Environment Southland	S85.018	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	"Support in part" is based on the interpretation that 'maintain indigenous biodiversity in Gore District' includes all indigenous biodiversity not just that in SNAs and that this "maintain" would result in the 'no overall loss' - as per the NPS-IB objectives. If this is not the intent of the objective then we recommend aligning the wording to the objective 1 in the NPS-IB.	Rearrange the objective so that the "protect" statement comes before the "maintain" statement. Maintain should also mean "no overall loss".
Alan Taylor	S142.002	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Support the alignment of the PGDP with the NPSIB and request that the wording Contained in the NPSIB is used within the objectives. The use of terminology such as "areas of significant vegetation" and "significant habitats of indigenous fauna" is unclear as they are not defined.	Align the wording with the NPSIB to protect indigenous biodiversity through the identification of SNAs is requested. Amend ECO-O1 to read.: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~) through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.012	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	The narrow focus of the objectives on SNAs alone fails to give effect to the purpose of the Act, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity or the Regional Policy Statement for Southland. It is also inconsistent with ECO-P8 & ECO-P10 which apply more broadly than SNAs. The objectives and policies should align under s75(1) of the RMA. Objectives should be written as outcomes not actions. ECO-O2, ECO-O3 and part of ECO-O4 are policies rather than objectives.	Delete ECO-O1 and replace with "The quantum, quality and health of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is enhanced within Gore District."
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.022	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support	Maintain IBD and protect SNA - consider this appropriate given focus on significant areas.	No amendments required
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.005	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.079	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O1: Maintain, through the identification of SNAs , indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas).
Trudy Bokser	S113.005	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Nathan Bokser	S116.005	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.005	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Karen Temple	S19.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Helen McIntosh	S24.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
John Baynes	S68.009	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.041	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Kevin Robertson	S115.080	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O1: Maintain, through the identification of SNAs , indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas).
Ronald Crispin	S60.082	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O1: Maintain, through the identification of SNAs , indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas).
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.091	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O1: Maintain, through the identification of SNAs , indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas).
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.092	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O1: Maintain, through the identification of SNAs , indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas).
John Baynes	S68.200	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O1: Maintain, through the identification of SNAs , indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (Significant Natural Areas).
Greg Bokser	S117.005	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (~~Significant Natural Areas~~). through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Department of Conservation	S109.050	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	The D-G supports this objective as it is consistent with the requirements of the NPS-IB and Southland RPS.	Retain as notified
Environment Southland	S85.019	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support in part	This aligns with 3.8(2) of the NPS-IB, however the addition of restore will give effect to 3.21	include the addition of "restore"
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.013	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Oppose	The narrow focus of the objectives on SNAs alone fails to give effect to the purpose of the Act, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity or the Regional Policy Statement for Southland. It is also inconsistent with ECO-P8 & ECO-P10 which apply more broadly than SNAs. The objectives and	Delete and replace ECO-O2 with "Sites of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use or development."

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					policies should align under s75(1) of the RMA. Objectives should be written as outcomes not actions. ECO-O2, ECO-O3 and part of ECO-O4 are policies rather than objectives.	
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.023	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Partnership approach to identify and protect IBD	No amendments required.
Southland District Council	S146.036	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	SDC and GDC could work together to ensure the region's criteria for significant natural areas are aligned. Potentially, some significant natural areas would be on the boundary between the two councils. The section could be served by addressing methods other than rules, as in the Operative Southland District Plan. Regarding future updates of this section, are there plans to identify more SNAs? and what mechanisms are in place to add new ones?	No decision requested
Ministry of Education	S125.031	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	The submitter supports ECO-O2.	Retain as proposed.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.080	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	We support the recognition of the need to work with landholders to successfully identify and protect sites which meet the criteria for significant natural areas. Method Bio.3 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement requires collaboration with key stakeholder groups in addressing biodiversity issues within the region including direct (one on one) consultation with land owners whose properties contain threatened, at risk or rare habitat types. The recognition of the key role of people-in-place in managing indigenous biodiversity through both kaitiakitanga and stewardship is paramount to maintaining and improving indigenous biodiversity, as is the need to focus more widely than on managing a limited number of sites which meet the criteria for 'significance'.	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.
Kevin Robertson	S115.081	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	We support the recognition of the need to work with landholders to successfully identify and protect sites which meet the criteria for significant natural areas. Method Bio.3 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement requires collaboration with key stakeholder groups in addressing biodiversity issues within the region including direct (one on one) consultation with land owners whose properties contain threatened, at risk or rare habitat types. The recognition of the key role of people-in-place in managing indigenous biodiversity through both kaitiakitanga and stewardship is paramount to maintaining and improving indigenous biodiversity, as is the need to focus more widely than on managing a limited	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					number of sites which meet the criteria for 'significance'.	
Ronald Crispin	S60.083	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	We support the recognition of the need to work with landholders to successfully identify and protect sites which meet the criteria for significant natural areas. Method Bio.3 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement requires collaboration with key stakeholder groups in addressing biodiversity issues within the region including direct (one on one) consultation with land owners whose properties contain threatened, at risk or rare habitat types. The recognition of the key role of people-in-place in managing indigenous biodiversity through both kaitiakitanga and stewardship is paramount to maintaining and improving indigenous biodiversity, as is the need to focus more widely than on managing a limited number of sites which meet the criteria for 'significance'.	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.092	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	We support the recognition of the need to work with landholders to successfully identify and protect sites which meet the criteria for significant natural areas. Method Bio.3 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement requires collaboration with key stakeholder groups in addressing biodiversity issues within the region including direct (one on one) consultation with land owners whose properties contain threatened, at risk or rare habitat types. The recognition of the key role of people-in-place in managing indigenous biodiversity through both kaitiakitanga and stewardship is paramount to maintaining and improving indigenous biodiversity, as is the need to focus more widely than on managing a limited number of sites which meet the criteria for 'significance'.	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.093	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	We support the recognition of the need to work with landholders to successfully identify and protect sites which meet the criteria for significant natural areas. Method Bio.3 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement requires collaboration with key stakeholder groups in addressing biodiversity issues within the region including direct (one on one) consultation with land owners whose properties contain threatened, at risk or rare habitat types. The recognition of the key role of people-in-place in managing indigenous biodiversity through both kaitiakitanga and stewardship is paramount to maintaining and improving indigenous biodiversity, as is the need to focus more widely than on managing a limited number of sites which meet the criteria for 'significance'.	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.
John Baynes	S68.201	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-O2	Support	We support the recognition of the need to work with landholders to successfully identify and	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Indigenous Biodiversity			protect sites which meet the criteria for significant natural areas. Method Bio.3 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement requires collaboration with key stakeholder groups in addressing biodiversity issues within the region including direct (one on one) consultation with land owners whose properties contain threatened, at risk or rare habitat types. The recognition of the key role of people-in-place in managing indigenous biodiversity through both kaitiakitanga and stewardship is paramount to maintaining and improving indigenous biodiversity, as is the need to focus more widely than on managing a limited number of sites which meet the criteria for 'significance'.	
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.051	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Support in part	Transpower supports the intent of Objective ECO-03 to the extent that the Objective recognises that activities in SNAs may be appropriate. However, Transpower considers that the Objective is more stringent than is appropriate or required by RMA or the SRPS and seeks that the Objective better reflects Policy BIO.2 of the SRPS.	Amend Objective ECO-03 as follows: ECO-03 Provide for ~~appropriate~~ subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area ~~can be~~ are maintained or and, where appropriate, enhanced.
Department of Conservation	S109.051	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Oppose	The D-G considers that this objective should be removed. It is considered that the policies already address where activities can be provided for in SNAs whilst still meeting ECO01.	Remove ECO-03: ~~Provide for appropriate subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be maintained and enhanced.~~
Environment Southland	S85.020	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Support	This meets the requirements of the NPS-IB providing the definition of 'appropriate' and the subsequent policies take account of sections 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 3.14 3.15 and 3.17.	We recommend that an additional objective is added to take account of section 3.16 in the NPS- IB
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S112.063	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this objective. as it provides for appropriate development and use within SNAs, which could include critical infrastructure like the state highway network, where the values of the SNAs can be maintained or enhanced.	Retain as notified
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.014	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Oppose	The narrow focus of the objectives on SNAs alone fails to give effect to the purpose of the Act, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity or the Regional Policy Statement for Southland. It is also inconsistent with ECO-P8 & ECO-P10 which apply more broadly than SNAs. The objectives and policies should align under s75(1) of the RMA. Objectives should be written as outcomes not actions. ECO-02, ECO-03 and part of ECO-04 are policies rather than objectives.	Delete and replace ECO-03 with Indigenous biodiversity is recognised as a taonga to mana whenua and the relationship of mana whenua and their customs and traditions with indigenous vegetation and ecosystems is recognised and provided for including: - Enabling the exercise of kaitiakitanga; - Enabling mahinga kai; and - Maintaining or where degraded restoring the mauri of indigenous ecosystems.
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.006	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-03 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.081	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Support in part	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-03: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be ~~maintained and enhanced~~ avoided or managed.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Mercury NZ Limited	S130.055	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Not Stated	REG activities require placement in proximity to energy resources. While it may not be feasible to maintain and enhance the values of the specific area directly affected, offsetting residual effects and potential compensation can contribute to the overall enhancement of biodiversity values throughout the district.	Provide for ~~appropriate~~ subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the ~~values of the area can be maintained and enhanced.~~ effects can be appropriately managed.
Trudy Bokser	S113.006	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Nathan Bokser	S116.006	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.006	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.008	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Karen Temple	S19.008	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.008	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Helen McIntosh	S24.008	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
John Baynes	S68.010	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.042	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Kevin Robertson	S115.082	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O3: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be ~~maintained and enhanced~~ avoided or managed.
Ronald Crispin	S60.084	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O3: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be ~~maintained and enhanced~~ avoided or managed.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.093	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-O3	Support in part	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O3: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be ~~maintained and enhanced~~

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Indigenous Biodiversity				avoided or managed.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.094	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O3: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be ~~maintained and enhanced~~ avoided or managed.
John Baynes	S68.202	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Amend ECO-O3: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be ~~maintained and enhanced~~ avoided or managed.
Greg Bokser	S117.006	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for ~~appropriate~~ new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~
Department of Conservation	S109.052	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support	The D-G supports this objective.	Retain as notified
Environment Southland	S85.021	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	The additional will help give affect to NPS-IB policy 1. Mana whenua have customs and traditions with all indigenous biodiversity, not just SNAs. The objective should be broadened to recognise that cultural values exist for all indigenous biodiversity.	Include a new sub point 'takes into account the principals to Te Titiriti' . Replace SNAs with "indigenous biodiversity" .
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.015	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Oppose	The narrow focus of the objectives on SNAs alone fails to give effect to the purpose of the Act, the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity or the Regional Policy Statement for Southland. It is also inconsistent with ECO-P8 & ECO-P10 which apply more broadly than SNAs. The objectives and policies should align under s75(1) of the RMA. Objectives should be written as outcomes not actions. ECO-O2, ECO-O3 and part of ECO-O4 are policies rather than objectives.	Delete ECO-O4.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.082	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Section 7 of the RMA requires that in the protection of natural and physical resources all persons shall have particular regard to kaitiakitanga. The objective is clear and adequately addresses the matters relating to mana whenua and the ongoing or potential loss of indigenous biodiversity, whilst meeting the requirements of the Southland Regional Policy Statement. A concern that has been raised is the level of public accessibility that may be required to be provided to enable customary use. While we agree that customary use should be recognised and provided for, we caution that this should not be provided to the detriment of efficient land management by private landowners.Consideration also may need to be given to appropriate compensation where protection / enablement of customary use comes at a cost to the landowner.	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '
Kevin Robertson	S115.083	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-O4	Support in part	Section 7 of the RMA requires that in the protection of natural and physical resources all persons shall have particular regard to	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Indigenous Biodiversity			kaitiakitanga. The objective is clear and adequately addresses the matters relating to mana whenua and the ongoing or potential loss of indigenous biodiversity, whilst meeting the requirements of the Southland Regional Policy Statement. A concern that has been raised is the level of public accessibility that may be required to be provided to enable customary use. While we agree that customary use should be recognised and provided for, we caution that this should not be provided to the detriment of efficient land management by private landowners.Consideration also may need to be given to appropriate compensation where protection / enablement of customary use comes at a cost to the landowner.	
Ronald Crispin	S60.085	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Section 7 of the RMA requires that in the protection of natural and physical resources all persons shall have particular regard to kaitiakitanga. The objective is clear and adequately addresses the matters relating to mana whenua and the ongoing or potential loss of indigenous biodiversity, whilst meeting the requirements of the Southland Regional Policy Statement. A concern that has been raised is the level of public accessibility that may be required to be provided to enable customary use. While we agree that customary use should be recognised and provided for, we caution that this should not be provided to the detriment of efficient land management by private landowners.Consideration also may need to be given to appropriate compensation where protection / enablement of customary use comes at a cost to the landowner.	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.094	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Section 7 of the RMA requires that in the protection of natural and physical resources all persons shall have particular regard to kaitiakitanga. The objective is clear and adequately addresses the matters relating to mana whenua and the ongoing or potential loss of indigenous biodiversity, whilst meeting the requirements of the Southland Regional Policy Statement. A concern that has been raised is the level of public accessibility that may be required to be provided to enable customary use. While we agree that customary use should be recognised and provided for, we caution that this should not be provided to the detriment of efficient land management by private landowners.Consideration also may need to be given to appropriate compensation where protection / enablement of customary use comes at a cost to the landowner.	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.095	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Section 7 of the RMA requires that in the protection of natural and physical resources all persons shall have particular regard to kaitiakitanga. The objective is clear and adequately	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					addresses the matters relating to mana whenua and the ongoing or potential loss of indigenous biodiversity, whilst meeting the requirements of the Southland Regional Policy Statement. A concern that has been raised is the level of public accessibility that may be required to be provided to enable customary use. While we agree that customary use should be recognised and provided for, we caution that this should not be provided to the detriment of efficient land management by private landowners. Consideration also may need to be given to appropriate compensation where protection / enablement of customary use comes at a cost to the landowner.	
John Baynes	S68.203	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Section 7 of the RMA requires that in the protection of natural and physical resources all persons shall have particular regard to kaitiakitanga. The objective is clear and adequately addresses the matters relating to mana whenua and the ongoing or potential loss of indigenous biodiversity, whilst meeting the requirements of the Southland Regional Policy Statement. A concern that has been raised is the level of public accessibility that may be required to be provided to enable customary use. While we agree that customary use should be recognised and provided for, we caution that this should not be provided to the detriment of efficient land management by private landowners. Consideration also may need to be given to appropriate compensation where protection / enablement of customary use comes at a cost to the landowner.	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '
Department of Conservation	S109.053	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	The D-G supports this policy.	Retain as notified
Environment Southland	S85.022	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support in part	The current wording is not consistent with the NPSIB.	Policy regarding SNAs should be " to identify all areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna and include them in the district plan as SNAs" Identify by undertaking a district wide assessment using partnerships, transparency, quality, access, consistency and boundaries ". Policy regarding Highly Mobile Fauna should be ' To provide information to the community about Highly Mobile Species, their habitat and the management of adverse effects ' and to amend the Plan, if required once Highly Mobile Species areas have been identified in the Policy Statement.
McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	S104.020	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Amend	This policy suggests that the whole Waterfall Range is an SNA-1 which is incorrect.	Amend ECO -P1 as follows: Work in partnership with Local Authorities, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to: 1. identify Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) to include: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (~~Waterfall Range~~) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps, and (b) A variation to the Proposed District Plan to identify areas that meet the criteria set out in Appendix 4; and 2. map and describe each specified highly mobile fauna area.
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.016	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P1	Support in part	The policy as written doesn't quite make sense and it is not clear if it intended to apply to sites that meet the criteria in Appendix 4 now or only once	Amend to read: 1. To identify as Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) ~~to include:~~ (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps, and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Indigenous Biodiversity			they are mapped and listed in the plan. To achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to higher order planning documents, the plan needs to manage effects of activities on indigenous ecosystems per se not just SNAs.	(b) ~~A variation to the Proposed District Plan to identify~~ areas that meet the criteria set out in Appendix 4 once they are assessed and shown on the planning maps ; and
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.083	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.
Farm Manager - Wantwood Station	S105.020	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Amend	This policy suggests that the whole Waterfall Range is an SNA-1 which is incorrect.	Amend ECO -P1 as follows: Work in partnership with Local Authorities, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to: 1. identify Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) to include: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (~~Waterfall Range~~) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps, and (b) A variation to the Proposed District Plan to identify areas that meet the criteria set out in Appendix 4; and 2. map and describe each specified highly mobile fauna area.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.020	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Amend	This policy suggests that the whole Waterfall Range is an SNA-1 which is incorrect.	Amend ECO -P1 as follows: Work in partnership with Local Authorities, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to: 1. identify Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) to include: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (~~Waterfall Range~~) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps, and (b) A variation to the Proposed District Plan to identify areas that meet the criteria set out in Appendix 4; and 2. map and describe each specified highly mobile fauna area.
Kevin Robertson	S115.084	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.
Ronald Crispin	S60.086	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.095	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.096	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.
John Baynes	S68.204	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.052	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	Transpower acknowledges that clause 3 of the Policy includes reference to an activity having a functional need for its location (it can only occur in that environment). However, Transpower considers that it is equally important to provide for activities that have an operational need for a location. That is, the need to traverse, locate or operate in a particular environment because of technical, logistical or operational characteristics or constraints. Transpower seeks an amendment to Policy ECO-P2 to reference 'operational need'. Such	Amend Policy ECO-P2 (...) 3. The activity has a functional need or operational need to be located in the area; or 4. (...)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					an approach is consistent with the direction in Policy 3 of the NPSET.	
Department of Conservation	S109.054	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	This policy should be rewritten to clarify that SNAs have the highest protection due to the values of the area (or that the protection and avoidance of adverse effects within SNAs - ECO-P7 and P3 is set out first). P2 as drafted does not currently accord with cl 3.10 and 3.11 of the NPS IB. The policy is less protective than those clauses require and so, does not give effect to the NPS-IB. In particular, ECO-P2 point 4 undermines the other proposed ECO policies and does not give effect to NPS-IB cl 3.10(2). The exceptions to the SNA provisions in the NPS-IB need to be carefully written so that they accurately reflect the thresholds in which these exceptions can occur. It is recommended that this Policy is either removed or rewritten to accurately reflect the NPS-IB exceptions for activities that may have adverse effects on an SNA and how these are managed by applying the effects management hierarchy and other requirements as specified in the NPS IB.	Remove ECO-P2 or re-write this policy to accurately reflect the exceptions and application of the effects management hierarchy and other requirements to align better with the NPS IB. ~~Allow activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional need to be located in the area; or 4. The activity has no more than minor adverse effects on the significant indigenous vegetation or fauna habitat, and/or Ngāi Tahu cultural purpose.~~
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.029	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Amend	In order for adverse effects to be avoided as much as possible and for SNAs to be protected, those proposing activities within these areas should have to demonstrate that there is nowhere else on their property where this activity can take place practicably (as well as having to demonstrate the need for it).	Amend: Allow activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where ... 3. The activity has a functional need to be located in the area and there are no practicable alternative locations; or
Environment Southland	S85.023	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	This change is required to make the policy consistent with the NPS-IB clause 3.15, 3.17 and 3,14. It is also less subjective that "less than minor".	Change point 4 to: The activity is no greater in intensity, scale or character and does not result in the loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S112.064	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of this policy as it allows activities within SNAs, where the activity may impact indigenous biodiversity values, where the activity is a lawfully established activity or has a functional need to be located in the area. However, there may be instances where the state highway network has an operational need to be located in these areas. It is recommended that the policy be amended to also include where the activity has an operational need.	Amend the policy as follows: 1. The activity has a functional need or operational need to be located in the area; or
Contact Energy Limited	S144.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Not Stated	ECO-P2 does not suitably recognise that certain activities may be appropriate to locate within SNAs provided that effects are managed.	N/A
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.018	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	ECO-P2, P3, P4, and P7 all direct the management of activities in SNAs and appear to contradict each other. we appreciate these may be directions from NPSIB and cannot be altered but if they can be, we request the amendments in our submission. There should also be some encouragement for	Delete and replace with: Allow subdivision, use or development of land or other activities in or adjoining Significant Natural Areas provided: (i) Any adverse effects of the activity on the ecological values, functioning or integrity of the site, its mauri or value as mahinga kai is minor; or (ii) The activity has a functional or operational need to occur in that area and any adverse effects on the matters listed in (i) above are avoided or offset in accordance with ECO-P11; or (iii) The activity is provided for and undertaken in accordance with an approved biodiversity management plan for the site.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					landholders to have sites assessed and manage their activities in accordance with them.	
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.024	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	Provides for activities with functional need which is important, but should also recognize locationally constrained activities. As the planning standards define both functional need and operational need both components should be included in the provision.	ECO-P2 Allow activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity is locationally constrained or has a functional and/or operational need to be located in the area; or 4. The activity has no more than minor adverse effects on the significant indigenous vegetation or fauna habitat, and/or Ngāi Tahu cultural purpose.
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.084	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	SFF understands the need to protect SNA's but considers that the proposed policy fails to fully acknowledge the role of landowners in achieving environmental outcomes. The plan needs to provide for minor works undertaken as part of normal farming activities to occur to ensure that landowners can continue with reasonable use of their interest in the land. It is critical to provide a pathway for maintenance, repair, replacement or minor upgrades of infrastructure and for new small scale activities integral to farm management to occur as a permitted activity even if this is located within SNA's and involves the removal of indigenous vegetation. Wording is proposed to provide clarity around the enablement of activities within a lawfully established activity.	Amend ECO-P2: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for the maintenance and development of a lawfully established activity;
Mercury NZ Limited	S130.057	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support	Retain	None specified.
Trudy Bokser	S113.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Nathan Bokser	S116.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.007	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Karen Temple	S19.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Helen McIntosh	S24.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
John Baynes	S68.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.043	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA ~~indigenous biodiversity values~~ where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Kevin Robertson	S115.085	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	SFF understands the need to protect SNA’s but considers that the proposed policy fails to fully acknowledge the role of landowners in achieving environmental outcomes. The plan needs to provide for minor works undertaken as part of normal farming activities to occur to ensure that landowners can continue with reasonable use of their interest in the land. It is critical to provide a pathway for maintenance, repair, replacement or minor upgrades of infrastructure and for new small scale activities integral to farm management to occur as a permitted activity even if this is located within SNA’s and involves the removal of indigenous vegetation. Wording is proposed to provide clarity around the enablement of activities within a lawfully established activity.	Amend ECO-P2:– ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for the maintenance and development of a lawfully established activity;
Ronald Crispin	S60.087	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	SFF understands the need to protect SNA’s but considers that the proposed policy fails to fully acknowledge the role of landowners in achieving environmental outcomes. The plan needs to provide for minor works undertaken as part of normal farming activities to occur to ensure that landowners can continue with reasonable use of their interest in the land. It is critical to provide a pathway for maintenance, repair, replacement or minor upgrades of infrastructure and for new small scale activities integral to farm management to occur as a permitted activity even if this is located within SNA’s and involves the removal of indigenous vegetation. Wording is proposed to provide clarity around the enablement of activities within a lawfully established activity.	Amend ECO-P2:– ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for the maintenance and development of a lawfully established activity;
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.096	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	SFF understands the need to protect SNA’s but considers that the proposed policy fails to fully acknowledge the role of landowners in achieving environmental outcomes. The plan needs to provide for minor works undertaken as part of normal farming activities to occur to ensure that landowners can continue with reasonable use of their interest in the land. It is critical to provide a pathway for maintenance, repair, replacement or minor upgrades of infrastructure and for new small scale activities integral to farm management to occur as a permitted activity even if this is located within SNA’s and involves the removal of indigenous vegetation. Wording is proposed to	Amend ECO-P2:– ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for the maintenance and development of a lawfully established activity;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					provide clarity around the enablement of activities within a lawfully established activity.	
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.097	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	SFF understands the need to protect SNA’s but considers that the proposed policy fails to fully acknowledge the role of landowners in achieving environmental outcomes. The plan needs to provide for minor works undertaken as part of normal farming activities to occur to ensure that landowners can continue with reasonable use of their interest in the land. It is critical to provide a pathway for maintenance, repair, replacement or minor upgrades of infrastructure and for new small scale activities integral to farm management to occur as a permitted activity even if this is located within SNA’s and involves the removal of indigenous vegetation. Wording is proposed to provide clarity around the enablement of activities within a lawfully established activity.	Amend ECO-P2:– ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for the maintenance and development of a lawfully established activity;
John Baynes	S68.205	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	SFF understands the need to protect SNA’s but considers that the proposed policy fails to fully acknowledge the role of landowners in achieving environmental outcomes. The plan needs to provide for minor works undertaken as part of normal farming activities to occur to ensure that landowners can continue with reasonable use of their interest in the land. It is critical to provide a pathway for maintenance, repair, replacement or minor upgrades of infrastructure and for new small scale activities integral to farm management to occur as a permitted activity even if this is located within SNA’s and involves the removal of indigenous vegetation. Wording is proposed to provide clarity around the enablement of activities within a lawfully established activity.	Amend ECO-P2:– ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within Significant Natural Areas that may impact indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. This is for the maintenance and development of a lawfully established activity;
Greg Bokser	S117.007	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read:– ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA-indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.053	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support in part	The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Section 32 Report confirms that Policy ECO-P3 is to give effect to the NPSIB. Clause 1.3(3) of the NPSIB confirms that the NPSIB does not apply to the National Grid as follows: “(3) Nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and	Amend ECO-P3 as follows: (...) Unless they relate to: x. The operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (...)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					activities and electricity transmission network assets and activities. For the avoidance of doubt, renewable electricity generation assets and activities, and electricity transmission network assets and activities, are not “specified infrastructure” for the purposes of this National Policy Statement.” For this reason, Transpower seeks that the Policy is explicit in excluding the National Grid.	
Department of Conservation	S109.055	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Retain as notified
Environment Southland	S85.024	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	This is consistent with the NPS-IB	Not stated
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S112.065	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this policy because it recognises that specified infrastructure, which includes state highway infrastructure, that provides significant national or regional benefit, as well as infrastructure that has a functional need or operational need to locate in a particular location where there are no practicable alternative locations, may not be able to avoid adverse effects on a SNA.	Retain as notified
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.019	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Oppose	ECO-P2, P3, P4, and P7 all direct the management of activities in SNAs and appear to contradict each other. we appreciate these may be directions from NPSIB and cannot be altered but if they can be, we request the amendments in our submission. There should also be some encouragement for landholders to have sites assessed and manage their activities in accordance with them.	Delete ECO-P3 and replace with new policy as per ECO-P2.
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.025	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	No amendments
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.008	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.085	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and developmen	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	S132.050	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Supportive of recognising the construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant benefits, and that there is a functional need or operational need to be in that particular location and there are no practicable alternative locations.	Retain ECO-P3 as proposed.
Mercury NZ Limited	S130.058	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support in part	The operation of specific infrastructure provides national benefits, but it remains unclear how a significant national benefit test would be applied in practice.	Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in: ... Unless they relate to: 6. Construction, development, upgrade, or maintenance of specified infrastructure that provides significant national benefit or significant regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand; 8. The operation or expansion of any coal mine that was lawfully established before 4 August 2023, except that after 31 December 2030 this exception applies only to coal mines that extract Coking coal; ~~and~~ 9. There is a functional need or operational need to be in that particular location and there are no practicable alternative locations.
Trudy Bokser	S113.008	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Nathan Bokser	S116.008	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.008	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Karen Temple	S19.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Helen McIntosh	S24.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
John Baynes	S68.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.044	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Kevin Robertson	S115.086	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and developmen	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.
Ronald Crispin	S60.088	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and developmen	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.097	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and developmen	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.098	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and developmen	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.
John Baynes	S68.206	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and developmen	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.
Greg Bokser	S117.008	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.054	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Oppose	The Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Section 32 Report confirms that Policy ECO-P4 is to give effect to the NPSIB. Because the NPSIB does not apply to the National Grid, it is inappropriate to impose a requirement to comply with the effects management hierarchy from the NPSIB (and embedded in Policy ECO-P4) on the National Grid, particularly because the NPSET includes specific approaches to the management of effects of the National Grid. Transpower therefore seeks that the Policy does not apply to the National Grid.	Amend Policy ECO-P4 as follows “ With the exception of the operation, maintenance, development and upgrading of the National Grid, m Manage any adverse effects on an SNA from a new subdivision, use or development relating to the following matters in accordance with the effects management hierarchy: ...”
Department of Conservation	S109.056	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Retain as notified
Environment Southland	S85.025	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support in part	The NSPIB allows for the harvesting of indigenous tree species carried out in accordance with a sustainable forest management plan or permit under Part 3A of the Forest Act 1949.	Remove 'but not the harvesting of trees itself'.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S112.066	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these policies	Retain as notified
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.020	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Oppose	ECO-P2, P3, P4, and P7 all direct the management of activities in SNAs and appear to contradict each other. we appreciate these may be directions from NPSIB and cannot be altered but if they can be, we request the amendments in our submission. There should also be some encouragement for landholders to have sites assessed and manage their activities in accordance with them.	Delete ECO-P4 and replace with new policy as per ECO-P2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.026	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	No amendments
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	S132.051	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	Supports providing for the management of adverse effects on an SNA from construction of infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit.	Retain ECO-P4 as proposed.
Department of Conservation	S109.057	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB, however recommends amendments to clarify what should be addressed under ‘long-term populations’ and that they are maintained and enhanced.	Retain ECO-P5 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): Plantation Forest activities in any existing plantation forest within a SNA must be managed in a manner that: 1. Maintains indigenous biodiversity in the SNA as far as practicable while providing for plantation forest activities to continue, and 2. Maintains and enhances the long-term populations (including population size, age structure and distribution) of any Threatened or At Risk (declining) species present in the area.
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.030	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Amend	This has been written before the amendment of the NESPF (now NESCF), and needs to be updated. Wilding seedling spread is a constant challenge with commercial forestry, and this must be addressed, especially if within an SNA.	Change: ~~Plantation Commercial~~ Forest activities in any existing ~~plantation-commercial~~ forest within a SNA must be managed in a manner that: 1. Maintains indigenous biodiversity in the SNA as far as practicable while providing for ~~plantation-commercial~~ forest activities to continue, and 2. Maintains the long-term populations of any Threatened or At Risk (declining) species present in the area; and 3. Does not produce any wilding seedlings or ongoing control must be implemented within a 10km distance of the planting.
Environment Southland	S85.026	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Support		Support
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.023	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Support in part	There are indigenous plant species that are important taonga species found in SNAs, but which are not included in subclause 2.	Add a new subclause 3 which reads: “ maintains the long-term population and health of all taonga species listed in schedule XX. ”
Department of Conservation	S109.058	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Retain as notified
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.031	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Amend	It seems entirely logical to begin with/prioritize council owned and/or managed land, such as parks and reserves, to promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity.	Add: 7. Land owned and/or managed by Council.
Environment Southland	S85.027	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support		Support
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.024	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	Restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity is important, but Hokonui Rūnanga Inc does not agree that areas should be prioritised based solely on their current state of ecological degradation as measured using western ecological criteria. Subclause 4 has been removed as wetlands are managed by the regional council under the direction in the Southland Regional Policy Statement, Statement of Local Authority Responsibilities (p.7) Subclause 5 should not be limited to Māori land; areas advanced by mana	Amend the policy: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: 1. ~~SNAs whose ecological integrity is degraded:~~ sites and areas with degraded ecological integrity or mauri ; 2. threatened and rare ecosystems representative of naturally occurring and formerly present ecosystems; 3. areas that provide important connectivity, seed sources or buffering functions; 4. ~~natural inland wetlands whose ecological integrity is degraded or that no longer retain their indigenous vegetation or habitat for indigenous fauna~~ areas advanced by mana whenua anywhere in the district ; 5. ~~areas of indigenous biodiversity on specified Māori land where restoration is advanced by the Māori landowners~~ areas identified by landholders in farm or site management plans ; 6. any

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					whenua anywhere in their takiwā for restoration should be a priority considering the duties local authorities have under s8 of the RMA & s.81 of the Local Government Act 2002.	other priorities specified in regional biodiversity strategies, iwi planning documents or any national priorities for indigenous biodiversity restoration.
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.027	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	No amendments
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.086	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Amend ECO-P6: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: (...) 7. initiatives by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Kevin Robertson	S115.087	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Amend ECO-P6: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: (...) 7. initiatives by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Ronald Crispin	S60.089	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Amend ECO-P6: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: (...) 7. initiatives by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.098	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Amend ECO-P6: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: (...) 7. initiatives by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.099	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Amend ECO-P6: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: (...) 7. initiatives by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
John Baynes	S68.207	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Amend ECO-P6: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: (...) 7. initiatives by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Department of Conservation	S109.059	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB. However, as it is directly linked to ECO-O1, the policies in the ECO chapter should be reordered so that this policy becomes ECO-P2. The D-G also considers that it is necessary to make mention of vegetation clearance within SNAs which is a non complying activity as set out in the corresponding rules (ECO-R3).	Retain ECO-P7 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): 6. Avoid the clearance of indigenous vegetation and earthworks within SNAs unless it is for ...(permitted activities listed in ECO R1(1)).
Environment Southland	S85.028	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support	The hierarchy of policies should have the “protect policy” either first or second not 6th. The ‘incentives and inclusion of conditions’ should be considered as part of clause 3.21 3 and 4.	This policy should be re-numbered to policy 2 as protection of SNAs should sit higher than the enabling policies (2-6). Also include incentives and the inclusion of conditions in resource consents.
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.021	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Oppose	ECO-P2, P3, P4, and P7 all direct the management of activities in SNAs and appear to contradict each other. we appreciate these may be directions from NPSIB and cannot be altered but if they can be, we request the amendments in our submission. There should also be some encouragement for landholders to have sites assessed and manage their activities in accordance with them.	Delete ECO-P7 and replace with new policy as per ECO-P2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.025	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The focus in the chapter on SNAs only does not achieve the purpose of the Act or give effect to the NPSIB or the Southland RPS. Maintenance , restoration and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity generally should be encouraged and can be achieved by working with willing landholders and others in the community. Combining ECO-P7 and ECO-p10 to create one policy is clearer and more concise. Promoting protected wildlife is a function of the Department of Conservation under the Wildlife Act 1953, not a district council RMA function.	Amend this policy to apply to all indigenous ecosystems not just significant sites and combine with ECO-P10 to read: Maintain, protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas-indigenous biodiversity by: 1. Minimising the loss, fragmentation and reduction of: (a) Significant Natural Areas (b) connections between Significant Natural Areas, and (c) threatened or at risk and indigenous species populations; and (d) the mauri of indigenous ecosystems 2. Enhancing mahinga kai ; 3. Promoting the creation of connections and ecological corridors between Significant Natural Areas-areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna ; 4. Maintaining viable populations of specified highly mobile fauna across their natural range ; 5. Promoting the use of eco-sourced species from the relevant ecological district ; 6. Enabling opportunities for mana whenua to exercise their customary rights and responsibilities and mana whenua responsibilities as kaitiaki in encouraging the restoration, protection and or enhancement of areas of significant indigenous biodiversity and habitats ; and 7. Supporting initiatives by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity and habitats ; 8. Applying the effects management hierarchy to address any adverse effects of subdivision, use or development ; 9. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including voluntary animal and plant pest control, livestock grazing management and legal protection ; and 10. Developing a Biodiversity Strategy to encourage non-regulatory assistance and landowner engagement. ”
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.087	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The key role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of land must not be understated. Landowners must receive not only support from the Council, but also enablement in this task.	Amend ECO-P7: Protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas by: (...)5. Supporting initiatives and enabling by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Kevin Robertson	S115.088	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The key role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of land must not be understated. Landowners must receive not only support from the Council, but also enablement in this task.	Amend ECO-P7: Protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas by: (...)5. Supporting initiatives and enabling by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Ronald Crispin	S60.090	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The key role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of land must not be understated. Landowners must receive not only support from the Council, but also enablement in this task.	Amend ECO-P7: Protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas by: (...)5. Supporting initiatives and enabling by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.099	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The key role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of land must not be understated. Landowners must receive not only support from the Council, but also enablement in this task.	Amend ECO-P7: Protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas by: (...)5. Supporting initiatives and enabling by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.100	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The key role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of land must not be understated. Landowners must receive not only support from the Council, but also enablement in this task.	Amend ECO-P7: Protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas by: (...)5. Supporting initiatives and enabling by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

John Baynes	S68.208	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	The key role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of land must not be understated. Landowners must receive not only support from the Council, but also enablement in this task.	Amend ECO-P7: Protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas by: (...)5. Supporting initiatives and enabling by landowners, community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Department of Conservation	S109.060	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy in general as it is consistent with the NPS-IB. However, At-Risk (Declining) species are moving towards becoming classified as Threatened and so closer to extinction “if population trends continue on their current trajectory” (NZTCS, (2008) p 10). Accordingly, point 3. should be extended to include At-Risk (Declining) species. Managing vegetation clearance and land disturbance in accordance with ECO-R1 should also be addressed within this policy.	Retain ECO-P8 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): When assessing resource consents for subdivision, land use and development, avoid effects which will ... In relation to ECO-P8, point 3. add the following wording: 3.... Categories 1 - nationally critical, nationally endangered, and nationally vulnerable, and At-Risk (Declining); Include a policy that addresses the management of indigenous vegetation clearance as set out in ECOR1.
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.026	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	Policies should be explicit about the cultural values activities may affect, to provide clarity and certainty. Mahinga kai is guaranteed under Article 2 of the Treaty and loss of mahinga kai or access to mahinga kai is one of the major and ongoing effects of subdivision and sale of land since colonisation.	Amend subclause 4 to read: ~~"discourage~~ Prevent or restrict mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose or use of mahinga kai"
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1 — 3a — nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.088	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development which recognises the existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the outstanding landscapes of the district. It is proposed to update the policy to apply to subdivision, use and development within an SNA, rather than preventing or limiting any subdivision, use or development within the whole District.	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)
Mercury NZ Limited	S130.059	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part		When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: 1. The necessity ~~for the activity~~ to provide for critical infrastructure or renewable electricity generation activities ; 2. Whether formal protection and active management of all or part of any Significant Natural Area will occur as part of the subdivision, land use or development; 3. The extent to which the proposed activity recognises and provides for Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes, rights and interests; 4. The cumulative effects of activities within or adjacent to any area of indigenous vegetation or habitat; 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction or spread of exotic weed species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; 6. The impacts on mahinga kai activities and species; 7. The impact of the activity on the values of any Significant Natural Area, rare or threatened indigenous species or taonga species and how any potential impact could be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation in accordance with ECO – P7 to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied.
Trudy Bokser	S113.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy. , avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1 – 3a – nationally critical, nationally

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Nathan Bokser	S116.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Karen Temple	S19.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Helen McIntosh	S24.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
John Baynes	S68.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.045	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1—3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						~~indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose~~
Kevin Robertson	S115.089	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development which recognises the existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the outstanding landscapes of the district. It is proposed to update the policy to apply to subdivision, use and development within an SNA, rather than preventing or limiting any subdivision, use or development within the whole District.	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)
Ronald Crispin	S60.091	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development which recognises the existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the outstanding landscapes of the district. It is proposed to update the policy to apply to subdivision, use and development within an SNA, rather than preventing or limiting any subdivision, use or development within the whole District.	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.100	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development which recognises the existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the outstanding landscapes of the district. It is proposed to update the policy to apply to subdivision, use and development within an SNA, rather than preventing or limiting any subdivision, use or development within the whole District.	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.101	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development which recognises the existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the outstanding landscapes of the district. It is proposed to update the policy to apply to subdivision, use and development within an SNA, rather than preventing or limiting any subdivision, use or development within the whole District.	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)
John Baynes	S68.209	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development which recognises the existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the outstanding landscapes of the district. It is proposed to update the policy to apply to subdivision, use and	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					development within an SNA, rather than preventing or limiting any subdivision, use or development within the whole District.	
Greg Bokser	S117.009	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy. , avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1–3a—nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Department of Conservation	S109.061	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	The D-G recommends the deletion of this policy for the following reasons: • It is unclear how this policy interacts with the other proposed policies in the ECO Chapter and may undermine the clear direction that they set; • It is not a comprehensive list of criteria that a decision-maker would consider (that will be contextual) and so serves to skew the decision-making process under s 104; • It is unclear what weight these criteria should attract in the decision-making process; • It does not foster transparency, clarity or ease of understanding; • It appears to replicate other policies and rules.	Remove policy P9
Environment Southland	S85.029	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	Pest as a restricted meaning under the Biosecurity Act and it's use here reduces the effectiveness of the clause.	Change wording 9. 5 - remove word ' ~~pest~~ ' and replace with ' invasive '.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S112.067	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these policies	Retain as notified
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.027	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	Policies should be explicit about the cultural values activities may affect. Subclause 6 is repetitive re effects on mahinga kai.	Amend subclause 3 to read:"The extent to which the proposed activity recognises and provides for Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes, rights and interests will effect the mauri of the area or its values as mahinga kai "Delete subclause 6.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Southland District Council	S146.038	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support	This provision addresses some siting of renewables and critical infrastructure.	None specified.
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal ~~weed~~ -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO – P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.089	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	The proposed policy acknowledges the role of existing activities within SNA's however the Council has failed to identify aspirations of rural communities. The current policies do not provide landowners the ability to respond to changing climates, respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. Changes are proposed to include development of existing pastoral farms in this policy. A nuanced approach that considers mitigation, design, and adaptive management can lead to better outcomes in terms of sustainable development, environmental stewardship, and social well-being. We believe that a more balanced and pragmatic approach is necessary to address the complexities of environmental and social challenges effectively. It is also recommended that this policy provide for lawfully established activities.	Include in ECO-P9: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 9. The necessity for the activity to provide for the maintenance and development of existing working pastoral farms to be innovative, to respond to changing climates, markets or global conditions, or to respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. 10. If the resource consent application is for a lawfully established activity.
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	S132.052	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support	KiwiRail supports this policy as it recognises when assessing resource consents that br /include Significant Natural Areas it is necessary to consider activities that provide for br /critical infrastructure. The policy allows the decision makers to consider the br /appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation to br /offset any residual adverse effects that may remain after avoiding, remedying and br /mitigating measures have been applied.	Retain ECO-P9 as proposed.
Trudy Bokser	S113.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction,

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO-P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Nathan Bokser	S116.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO-P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO-P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO-P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Karen Temple	S19.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO – P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO – P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Helen McIntosh	S24.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO – P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
John Baynes	S68.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation in accordance with ECO-P7 to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no greater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.046	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, or spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation in accordance with ECO-P7 to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no greater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Kevin Robertson	S115.090	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	The proposed policy acknowledges the role of existing activities within SNA's however the Council has failed to identify aspirations of rural communities. The current policies do not provide landowners the ability to respond to changing climates, respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. Changes are proposed to include development of existing pastoral farms in this policy. A nuanced approach that considers mitigation, design, and adaptive management can lead to better outcomes in terms of sustainable development, environmental stewardship, and social well-being. We believe that a more balanced and pragmatic approach is necessary to address the complexities of environmental and social challenges effectively. It is also recommended that this policy provide for lawfully established activities.	Include in ECO-P9: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 9. The necessity for the activity to provide for the maintenance and development of existing working pastoral farms to be innovative, to respond to changing climates, markets or global conditions, or to respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. 10. If the resource consent application is for a lawfully established activity.
Ronald Crispin	S60.092	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	The proposed policy acknowledges the role of existing activities within SNA's however the Council has failed to identify aspirations of rural communities. The current policies do not provide landowners the ability to respond to changing climates, respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. Changes are proposed to include development of existing pastoral farms in	Include in ECO-P9: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 9. The necessity for the activity to provide for the maintenance and development of existing working pastoral farms to be innovative, to respond to changing climates, markets or global conditions, or to respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. 10. If the resource consent application is for a lawfully established activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					this policy. A nuanced approach that considers mitigation, design, and adaptive management can lead to better outcomes in terms of sustainable development, environmental stewardship, and social well-being. We believe that a more balanced and pragmatic approach is necessary to address the complexities of environmental and social challenges effectively. It is also recommended that this policy provide for lawfully established activities.	
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.101	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	The proposed policy acknowledges the role of existing activities within SNA’s however the Council has failed to identify aspirations of rural communities. The current policies do not provide landowners the ability to respond to changing climates, respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. Changes are proposed to include development of existing pastoral farms in this policy. A nuanced approach that considers mitigation, design, and adaptive management can lead to better outcomes in terms of sustainable development, environmental stewardship, and social well-being. We believe that a more balanced and pragmatic approach is necessary to address the complexities of environmental and social challenges effectively. It is also recommended that this policy provide for lawfully established activities.	Include in ECO-P9: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 9. The necessity for the activity to provide for the maintenance and development of existing working pastoral farms to be innovative, to respond to changing climates, markets or global conditions, or to respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. 10. If the resource consent application is for a lawfully established activity.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.102	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	The proposed policy acknowledges the role of existing activities within SNA’s however the Council has failed to identify aspirations of rural communities. The current policies do not provide landowners the ability to respond to changing climates, respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. Changes are proposed to include development of existing pastoral farms in this policy. A nuanced approach that considers mitigation, design, and adaptive management can lead to better outcomes in terms of sustainable development, environmental stewardship, and social well-being. We believe that a more balanced and pragmatic approach is necessary to address the complexities of environmental and social challenges effectively. It is also recommended that this policy provide for lawfully established activities.	Include in ECO-P9: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 9. The necessity for the activity to provide for the maintenance and development of existing working pastoral farms to be innovative, to respond to changing climates, markets or global conditions, or to respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. 10. If the resource consent application is for a lawfully established activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

John Baynes	S68.210	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	The proposed policy acknowledges the role of existing activities within SNA's however the Council has failed to identify aspirations of rural communities. The current policies do not provide landowners the ability to respond to changing climates, respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. Changes are proposed to include development of existing pastoral farms in this policy. A nuanced approach that considers mitigation, design, and adaptive management can lead to better outcomes in terms of sustainable development, environmental stewardship, and social well-being. We believe that a more balanced and pragmatic approach is necessary to address the complexities of environmental and social challenges effectively. It is also recommended that this policy provide for lawfully established activities.	Include in ECO-P9: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 9. The necessity for the activity to provide for the maintenance and development of existing working pastoral farms to be innovative, to respond to changing climates, markets or global conditions, or to respond to technological advancements or changes in understandings around good management practice. 10. If the resource consent application is for a lawfully established activity.
Greg Bokser	S117.010	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal ~~weed~~ -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance with ECO-P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Department of Conservation	S109.062	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB and Southland RPS. However, the policy should also address the protection of indigenous biodiversity by managing the clearance of indigenous vegetation.	Retain ECO-P10 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): 9. Protect indigenous biodiversity by managing the vegetation clearance and land disturbance.
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.032	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	The effects should not have to be significant to justify a review of effects. Any effect should be managed to 'no more than minor' to fulfil the RMA purpose of sustainable management. The NPSIB Policy 15 does not require only viable populations of highly mobile fauna to be maintained, but all highly mobile fauna. 'Policy 15: Areas outside SNAs that support specified highly mobile fauna are identified and managed to maintain their populations across their natural range, and information and awareness of highly mobile fauna is improved.'	Change: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: 1. Managing any ~~significant~~ adverse effects of new subdivision, use or development by applying the effects management hierarchy; 2. Managing the adverse effects of new subdivision, use or development on highly mobile fauna areas in order to maintain ~~viable~~ viable populations of specified highly mobile fauna across their natural range.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Environment Southland	S85.030	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	Do not support the need for a separate Gore specific group/strategy. However, acknowledge that a local biodiversity incentives strategy that covers the topics listed would be of value. Subclause 8: the management of pests is regulated by the Biosecurity Act and the RPMP, it is not voluntary. Replacing the use of pest with invasive/harmful species will reduce confusion and improve the efficiency of the clause e.g. it will allow for feral deer control.	Remove sub clause 5, amend sub clause 6 to be a ' biodiversity incentives strategy '. Sub clause 8: change wording to ...including the voluntary control of invasive plant and animal species and stock...
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S112.068	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support	Waka Kotahi supports these policies	Retain as notified
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.028	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Oppose	ECO-P10 appears to cover the same activity as in ECO-P7.	Combine with ECO-P7 (as amended in accordance with submission) and delete ECO-P10.
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. /br /Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.090	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	We fully support the establishment of the Biodiversity Stakeholder Group. It will be important for this group to provide ongoing assistance to support landowners. SFF also supports developing a biodiversity strategy and urges the council to involve stakeholders and landowners in the development of this. The Biodiversity Stakeholder Group could be tasked with the drafting of the strategy. In the development of the Council's Long-Term Plan, the Council should look to provide financial assistance or rates rebates/remission for ratepayers with identified SNAs. Farm fencing helps to protect areas of indigenous biodiversity therefore it should be specifically identified in this policy.	Amend ECO-P10: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: (...) 5. Establishing a Biodiversity Stakeholder Group to review District Plan provisions, encourage ongoing non-regulatory assistance, and ~~enhance~~ support landowners in their engagement with Council ; (...) 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.
Trudy Bokser	S113.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Nathan Bokser	S116.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Karen Temple	S19.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Helen McIntosh	S24.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

John Baynes	S68.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.047	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Kevin Robertson	S115.091	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	We fully support the establishment of the Biodiversity Stakeholder Group. It will be important for this group to provide ongoing assistance to support landowners. SFF also supports developing a biodiversity strategy and urges the council to involve stakeholders and landowners in the development of this. The Biodiversity Stakeholder Group could be tasked with the drafting of the strategy. In the development of the Council's Long-Term Plan, the Council should look to provide financial assistance or rates rebates/remission for ratepayers with identified SNAs. Farm fencing helps to protect areas of indigenous biodiversity therefore it should be specifically identified in this policy.	Amend ECO-P10: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: (...) 5. Establishing a Biodiversity Stakeholder Group to review District Plan provisions, encourage ongoing non-regulatory assistance, and ~~enhance~~ support landowners in their engagement with Council ; (...) 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.
Ronald Crispin	S60.093	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	We fully support the establishment of the Biodiversity Stakeholder Group. It will be important for this group to provide ongoing assistance to support landowners. SFF also supports developing a biodiversity strategy and urges the council to involve stakeholders and landowners in the development of this. The Biodiversity Stakeholder Group could be tasked with the drafting of the strategy. In the development of the Council's Long-Term Plan, the Council should look to provide financial assistance or rates rebates/remission for ratepayers with identified SNAs. Farm fencing helps to protect areas of indigenous biodiversity therefore it should be specifically identified in this policy.	Amend ECO-P10: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: (...) 5. Establishing a Biodiversity Stakeholder Group to review District Plan provisions, encourage ongoing non-regulatory assistance, and ~~enhance~~ support landowners in their engagement with Council ; (...) 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.102	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	We fully support the establishment of the Biodiversity Stakeholder Group. It will be important for this group to provide ongoing assistance to support landowners. SFF also	Amend ECO-P10: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: (...) 5. Establishing a Biodiversity Stakeholder Group to review District Plan provisions, encourage ongoing non-regulatory assistance, and ~~enhance~~ support landowners in their engagement with Council ; (...) 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					supports developing a biodiversity strategy and urges the council to involve stakeholders and landowners in the development of this. The Biodiversity Stakeholder Group could be tasked with the drafting of the strategy. In the development of the Council's Long-Term Plan, the Council should look to provide financial assistance or rates rebates/remission for ratepayers with identified SNAs. Farm fencing helps to protect areas of indigenous biodiversity therefore it should be specifically identified in this policy.	management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.103	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	We fully support the establishment of the Biodiversity Stakeholder Group. It will be important for this group to provide ongoing assistance to support landowners. SFF also supports developing a biodiversity strategy and urges the council to involve stakeholders and landowners in the development of this. The Biodiversity Stakeholder Group could be tasked with the drafting of the strategy. In the development of the Council's Long-Term Plan, the Council should look to provide financial assistance or rates rebates/remission for ratepayers with identified SNAs. Farm fencing helps to protect areas of indigenous biodiversity therefore it should be specifically identified in this policy.	Amend ECO-P10: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: (...) 5. Establishing a Biodiversity Stakeholder Group to review District Plan provisions, encourage ongoing non-regulatory assistance, and ~~enhance~~ support landowners in their engagement with Council ; (...) 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.
John Baynes	S68.211	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	We fully support the establishment of the Biodiversity Stakeholder Group. It will be important for this group to provide ongoing assistance to support landowners. SFF also supports developing a biodiversity strategy and urges the council to involve stakeholders and landowners in the development of this. The Biodiversity Stakeholder Group could be tasked with the drafting of the strategy. In the development of the Council's Long-Term Plan, the Council should look to provide financial assistance or rates rebates/remission for ratepayers with identified SNAs. Farm fencing helps to protect areas of indigenous biodiversity therefore it should be specifically identified in this policy.	Amend ECO-P10: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: (...) 5. Establishing a Biodiversity Stakeholder Group to review District Plan provisions, encourage ongoing non-regulatory assistance, and ~~enhance~~ support landowners in their engagement with Council ; (...) 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.
Greg Bokser	S117.011	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.055	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	Transpower opposes Policy ECO-P11 to the extent that the Policy directs the offsetting of adverse effects. Transpower does not oppose the offsetting of residual effects, but considers that (for the National Grid where the NPSIB does not apply) offsetting measures should be offered, as required by the RMA (for instance, as required by section 104). Similarly, the NPSET does not requiring offsetting.	Amend ECO-P11 as followings: ECO-P11 Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: x. the offsetting measures are proposed or agreed to by an applicant or requiring authority; (...)
Department of Conservation	S109.063	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy but suggests amendments to align better with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Retain ECO-P11 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): Where more than minor residual effects of an activity cannot be avoided, minimised, or remedied, provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where it can meet the following: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting including in accordance with the principles set out in Appendix 3 and 4 of the NPS-IB and Appendix 6 and 7 of the NPS-FM; and 4. Off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes.
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.029	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	Policies should be explicit about the cultural values activities may affect.	Amend subclause 4 to read: " Any off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes appropriate considering the whakapapa, mauri and any mahinga kai values of both sites and areas "
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.028	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	No amendments
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.091	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	The provision for biodiversity offsets and clear guidance about how they may be used is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act. However, the policy may benefit from some clarification. It is unclear what constitutes a ‘residual’ adverse effect as opposed to an adverse effect, as defined in section 3 for the RMA.	Provide a definition of residual adverse effects. Amend ECO-P11: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity within an SNA where: (...)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Mercury NZ Limited	S130.060	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support		None specified.
Trudy Bokser	S113.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Nathan Bokser	S116.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Karen Temple	S19.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Helen McIntosh	S24.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						offsetting.; and 4. Off setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes
John Baynes	S68.016	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; and 4. Off setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.048	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; and 4. Off setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes
Environment Southland	S85.066	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support		Support
Kevin Robertson	S115.092	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	The provision for biodiversity offsets and clear guidance about how they may be used is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act. However, the policy may benefit from some clarification. It is unclear what constitutes a ‘residual’ adverse effect as opposed to an adverse effect, as defined in section 3 for the RMA.	Provide a definition of residual adverse effects. Amend ECO-P11: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity within an SNA where: (...)
Ronald Crispin	S60.094	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	The provision for biodiversity offsets and clear guidance about how they may be used is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act. However, the policy may benefit from some clarification. It is unclear what constitutes a ‘residual’ adverse effect as opposed to an adverse effect, as defined in section 3 for the RMA.	Provide a definition of residual adverse effects. Amend ECO-P11: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity within an SNA where: (...)

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.103	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	The provision for biodiversity offsets and clear guidance about how they may be used is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act. However, the policy may benefit from some clarification. It is unclear what constitutes a ‘residual’ adverse effect as opposed to an adverse effect, as defined in section 3 for the RMA.	Provide a definition of residual adverse effects. Amend ECO-P11: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity within an SNA where: (...)
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.104	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	The provision for biodiversity offsets and clear guidance about how they may be used is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act. However, the policy may benefit from some clarification. It is unclear what constitutes a ‘residual’ adverse effect as opposed to an adverse effect, as defined in section 3 for the RMA.	Provide a definition of residual adverse effects. Amend ECO-P11: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity within an SNA where: (...)
John Baynes	S68.212	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	The provision for biodiversity offsets and clear guidance about how they may be used is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the Act. However, the policy may benefit from some clarification. It is unclear what constitutes a ‘residual’ adverse effect as opposed to an adverse effect, as defined in section 3 for the RMA.	Provide a definition of residual adverse effects. Amend ECO-P11: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity within an SNA where: (...)
Greg Bokser	S117.012	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; ~~and 4. Off setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Department of Conservation	S109.064	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the Southland RPS however, it should not just be restricted to SNAs.	Retain ECO-P12 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): Avoid the planting of exotic weed species and the intentional release or farming of animal pests ~~within SNA's~~ that are likely to adversely affect indigenous biodiversity values.
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.033	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Amend	The community’s interpretation of what is a pest or not can change person to person. It is important that it is specified that these are the pests in the Regional Pest Management Plan.	Change: Avoid the planting of exotic weed species and the intentional release or farming of animal pests identified in the Regional Pest Management Plan within SNA’s.
Environment Southland	S85.031	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	Strengthening of the rule to prevent the planting of exotic plants is supported because it incorporates species not included in other legislation, changing the wording to domesticated/invasive animals prevents the	Change to ' prohibit the planting of exotic plant species and the release of domesticated or invasive animals within an SNA unless allowed by ECO -P2.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					release of all harmful animal species e.g. cats/birds etc that are not pests.	
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.030	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Oppose	The planting of plant pests or the farming of animal pests is managed under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Delete this policy.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.093	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities)	Include a definition of exotic weed.
Kevin Robertson	S115.094	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities)	Include a definition of exotic weed.
Ronald Crispin	S60.096	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities)	Include a definition of exotic weed.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.105	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities)	Include a definition of exotic weed.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.106	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities)	Include a definition of exotic weed.
John Baynes	S68.214	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities)	Include a definition of exotic weed.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.004	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Do not support the restrictions on maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading of existing infrastructure.	Maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading of existing infrastructure should be permitted.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Transpower New Zealand Limited	S101.056	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	Supports Rule ECO-R1 on the basis that the Rule provides for indigenous vegetation clearance for the safe operation or maintenance of the National Grid as a permitted activity. Such an approach gives effect to Policy 2 and Policy 5 of the NPSET and is appropriately aligned with the NESETA. That said, Transpower does not support Rule ECO-R1 to the extent that the Rule applies a non-complying activity status to indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for new or upgraded National Grid assets in an SNA. Such a stringent activity status is not necessary or appropriate, particularly when compared to the same activity regulated by the NESETA. Transpower therefore supports amending the Rule to provide for indigenous vegetation clearance for the National Grid (upgrading or development as a restricted discretionary activity, consistent with Regulation 32 of the NESETA.	Amend Rule ECO-R1 as follows: “Activity status where compliance is not achieved with ECOR1(1)(a)(i), ~~or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi)~~ or ECO-R1(d) : Restricted discretionary (...)Matters of Discretion: (...) x. The benefits of the National Grid. ”
Department of Conservation	S109.065	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	The D-G supports this rule which sets out permitted activity criteria and limits vegetation clearance and land disturbance within SNAs. These thresholds are necessary to recognise the significance of the indigenous biodiversity within these areas. This is in accordance with Part 2, Section 6(c) of the RMA, and in line with the Southland RPS and NPS-IB. Amend the provision for the National Grid to clarify that it only applies to the maintenance and operation of the exiting National Grid and not for an extension. Include a reference to Biodiversity Management Plans so that it is clear in the provisions about when these management plans may be required. Minor amendments are suggested to correct a spelling error.	Retain ECO-R1 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): d) For the safe operation or maintenance (but not extension) of the National Grid Matters of Discretion ... X. management of potential adverse effects through a Council Authorised Biodiversity Management Plan. emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Department of Conservation	S109.066	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	The D-G supports the activity status of discretionary for indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place outside a SNA. Supports the activity status of noncomplying for indigenous vegetation and land disturbance that takes place inside a SNA. It is recommended that reference to ECO-R1(2) is deleted in both instances. It is also recommended that it is amended to refer to any unmapped SNAs that are assessed as significant against the criteria AND any areas where there are highly mobile fauna AND any areas containing threatened plant or fauna species. Threatened species within the Gore District could be listed in an Appendix or reference to the NZ Threat Classification system could be made.	Retain the activity status of discretionary with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): ECO-R1(1) and ~~ECO-R1(2):~~ Discretionary (Outside an SNA) Retain the activity status of non complying with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): ECO-R1(1) and ~~ECO-R1(2):~~ Non-complying (Inside SNA). Where: 4. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area or unmapped SNA that has been assessed as significant against the criteria in Appendix 4 or any area identified as a highly mobile fauna area or any area containing threatened or at risk (declining) species as listed in Appendix X.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Environment Southland	S85.032	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Not Stated	Addition to 1e required to make consistent with the NPS-IB, change to 1 f required to align with section 3.10 .6.c. Section (i) should be considered on a case by case basis as per section 3.10.5. rather than allowed as a general permitted activity. The addition of the new out of region clause prevents the planting of natives from elsewhere e.g. the north island that may cause harm.	1(a) (i) leave fences in the permitted status but require a maximum width (eg 3m) and only allow fencing along property boundaries. Paddock fencing or vineyard fencing should be excluded from permitted status. 1 (e) add NPS-IB clauses 3.17 2 a and b. 1 (f): replace with wording 'work or activity of the crown within the boundaries of any area of land held or managed under the Conservation Act 1987 or any other act specified in schedule 1 of that act providing the activity does not have a significant adverse effect beyond the boundary of the crown land'. (g) remove 'structures' these are covered by 1 (a). remove section (i). add a new clause - the vegetation is not indigenous to the Southland Region emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	S104.021	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Although this is a permitted activity, it is highly restrictive on some activities that have nominal effects such as fencing. A clearance width of 1.5m is not a sufficient width. For example, if you are clearing an area to be fenced, the bucket of a digger would typically be approximately 2m wide and for a dozer 3m. In farming situations, a firebreak with a width of 1.5 meters falls below FENZ recommendations.	Amend ECO-R1 to accurately reflect the practicalities of these activities (based on the type of equipment required to complete them). For example, remove the width restriction associated with fencing, fire breaks and tracks. Clarification is required on whether this rule refers to the occasional bit of indigenous vegetation clearance that may have happen in the path of land disturbance or does this refer to solid areas of indigenous vegetation i.e. native bush. emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S112.069	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the permitted activity rule for indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance up to a width of 1.0 m from a road, network utility or critical infrastructure for the purpose of the maintenance, replacement or repair of those lawfully established structures, as well as permitting removal of vegetation causing imminent danger to structures and infrastructure. However, we consider that the non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance required to enable critical infrastructure maintenance/repair/replacement within a SNA that would go beyond the 1m width restriction, as well as new infrastructure works within a SNA, does not appear to align with the more enabling aspects of ECO policies, like ECO-P2, P3 and P4, and that a discretionary activity status may be more appropriate. Lastly, there appears to be an error in the activity status for a discretionary and non-complying activity, as these refer to ECO-R1(2). There is no clause (2) for rule R1.	Amend the rule to provide for indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with new critical infrastructure, as well as the repair, replacement and maintenance of existing critical infrastructure, as a discretionary activity. And amend the rule to correct the reference to R1(2) in the discretionary and non-complying activity status section
Contact Energy Limited	S144.008	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Amend	Indigenous vegetation clearance where associated with renewable electricity generation activities may be a non-complying activity. This status is too onerous where the effects are able to be suitably managed.	Contact seeks that clearance of indigenous vegetation within SNAs that may be ancillary to a large scale renewable electricity generation activity is a discretionary activity, with access to the effects management.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.036	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	A general indigenous vegetation clearance rule is needed to achieve the purpose of the Act and to give effect to the NPS for Indigenous Biodiversity and the Regional Policy Statement for Southland. However the rule as written seems unduly restrictive for day to day farming and other activities which involve extensive grazing of unimproved pasture or the incidental removal of a small quantities of indigenous vegetation, where those activities do not affect ecological function or integrity of site or the ability of the indigenous species to regenerate. The matters of discussion for noncompliance with ECO-R1(a)(i) and (vi) are too broad, especially matter of discretion 2 which refers back to a number of policies. The status of discretionary activity if the activity occurs outside an SNA and non-complying within an SNA seems overly restrictive alongside the low thresholds for permitted activities but may be appropriate if the thresholds are adjusted.	Amend ECO-R1 by: - Include a provision under clause 1(a) for clearing vegetation and land disturbance associated with erection of new fences, firebreaks for water crossings; - Amending the maximum width of clearance allowed under clause (1)(a) to 2.5m either side of the structure; - Removing subclauses (i) to (iii) from clause 3 and replacing with a subclause that reads: “ (i) Provided the clearance does not involve the burning, spraying, intensive grazing or other actions intended to permanently remove tussock lands or regenerating scrubland;” - Delete clause (f); - Increase the distance from buildings in clause (g) to 5m and apply to new buildings as well; - Increase the distance from buildings in clause (g) to 5m and apply to new buildings as well; - Add to clause (k) a new subclause (iii) & (iv) which reads: “or for landscaping or amenity purposes; or as part of indigenous plant propagation or nursery activities.” - Add a new clause (l) which reads: “The indigenous vegetation clearance or land disturbance is provided in and carried out in accordance with the conditions of an approved biodiversity management plan for the site.” - Make non-compliance with any of the minimum setback distances for any activity in subclause (i)(a) a restricted discretionary activity. - Amend the Matters of Discretion by: - Deleting matter (2); and - Adding a new matter of discretion which reads “The whakapapa of the site and effects on its mauri, mahinga kai values and taonga species;” emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Hamish Weir	S74.005	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	The Croydon Bush reserve has an extensive network of mountain bike tracks that require maintenance and repairs. It would be beyond the means of the groups/individuals responsible for the tracks to gain resource consent for works. Works required to maintain the permitted features will normally extend further than 1 metre beyond the feature. An example is a native tree falling in a storm crossing a walkway or mountain bike track. The tree needs to be dealt with at its stump which is often well removed from the track. Using the reworded ‘practically required’ allows scope for this to occur without resource consent as otherwise trail volunteer maintenance within native bush will not be feasible. Waterway setback planting should be encouraged by removing potential resource consent barriers. Mountain biking trails are scalable and technically challenging tracks using steep terrain natural features such as banks, hollows and tree stumps to provide challenging obstacles for advanced riders. Minimal modification is required for the trails which should be permitted. Similarly, more advanced hiking trails such as the East Peak tracks do not require significant clearance works should also be permitted. These trails differ from the more accessible Hokonui Water Race bike trail and Dolamore Park walking trails which are wide, level and require water table drains and gravelled surfaces.	1. An additional point needs to be added to ECO-R1 1. (a) as follows; (x) mountain bike tracks 2. The wording of the note at the bottom of ECO-R1 1. (a) needs to be rewritten as follows; the clearance or land disturbance is no more than ~~1.0m~~ practically required in width from those works in (i) (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), b (vi)/b, (vii), (viii) and (ix), NOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023 ~~and 1.5m for (i) and (vi).~~ 3. An additional point needs to be added to ECO-R1 1. (k) as follows; b(iii) planting for waterbody setbacks/b

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						4. An additional permitted rule for construction of mountain bike and hiking trails b(l) works associated with construction of mountain bike and hiking trails that utilise natural features and ground profile /b
Fulton Hogan	S122.006	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Fulton Hogan undertakes activities on behalf of our clients such as Waka Kotahi and Councils, that can sometimes be in SNAs or other areas of indigenous biodiversity. Therefore, while we appreciate these SNA need to be protected, we also believe that the rules and policy framework need to be pragmatic and provide for works where they are small scale and necessary, for example for maintenance of network utilities. Fulton Hogan considers that the status of noncomplying for activities such as maintenance of roads, network utilities and other significant infrastructure in an SNA is overly restrictive. Furthermore, it is not clear why fences and firebreaks should be given a less restrictive status than other necessary and lifeline infrastructure. This would be consistent with ECO-P2. Further, we note that it is not clear whether the clauses of this rule are conjunctive or not. Finally, the references to ECO-R1(2) appear to be a typo.	1. Add the following wording to make it clear that the clauses are not conjunctive “It is necessary for one of the following purposes:” 2. Delete all references to ECO-R1(2) 3. Delete the discretionary non-complying status for activities in SNAs, and default to restricted discretionary activities.
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.030	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Requiring a discretionary consent for all indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance outside SNA’s is considered overly onerous. The provisions do not implement ECO-P4. Having single activity status for clearance within an SNA does not reflect the nuance of the policy regime appropriately.	1. ECO-R(1) - restricted discretionary. A new rule be created for indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance within a Highly Mobile Fauna Specified Area - Discretionary. A new rule be created for activities addressed in ECO-P4 - Discretionary
Port Blakely Limited	S138.001	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	This rule is more stringent than the NES-CF, but does not have jurisdiction to be more stringent, as it relates to indigenous vegetation and not an SNA.	Amend ECO-R1 to include the permitted activities set out in Reg 93(2), (3), (4) &(5) of the NES-CF; orAmend the rule to have two classes of activities, one related to land uses excluding commercial forestry and one related to land uses associated with commercial forestry; orAmend the chapter to make it explicit that clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with a commercial forestry activity is regulated by the NES-CF.
Port Blakely Limited	S138.002	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Reg 94 makes the activity restricted discretionary where the clearance does not meet the permitted conditions. Amend to align with the NESCF regulations.	Amend ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2) to align with the standards contained in the NES-CF
Port Blakely Limited	S138.003	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	This rule is more stringent than the NES-CF. Reg 93(1) permits the clearance of indigenous vegetation in an SNA to clear forestry tracks. Reg 6 does allow District Plan rules to be more stringent in relation to SNA, however it needs to be justified, with the reasons set out in the s32 Report. There was no discussion in the s32 Report as to why it was justified in imposing more	Amend to allow for the maintenance of forestry tracks within SNAs, as set out in Reg 93 NES-CF.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					stringent standards than the NES-CF in relation to maintaining forestry tracks in SNAs.	
Fire and Emergency NZ	S124.024	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support	Fire and Emergency support ECO-R1 to the extent that it enables indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance of 1.5m for firebreaks as a permitted activity.	Retain as notified emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below). Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~ (e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an ~~uncultivated depositional landform,~~ and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk ~~(declining) species.~~ (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan. (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~ (ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows). Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionary Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi). Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values. 2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10....~~ 7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity. ECO-R1(3): Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.094	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Lawfully established’ appears in this rule in italics, implying it is defined in the interpretations, but there is no corresponding definition in the interpretations section. ECO-R1 as currently drafted is too restrictive and will not allow for reasonable farming activities to be easily carried out. Fencing is a clear example of where the 1m width is insufficient. Another example of where the proposed width is insufficient is firebreaks, which are proposed as 1.5m. Any firebreak that was only permitted 1.5m for the maintenance, repair, replacement of upgrade would not be fit for purpose. The District Plan needs permitted activities that allow clearance in line with existing farming practices, to enable people and communities to provide for their health and safety, economic, social and cultural well-being and to reflect s 5(2) of the RMA. It is important to specify that (e)(i) applies to mapped SNAs. It is our view that mapping of SNAs must occur before treating areas as SNAs. See full reason on pg 61 of submission	Include a definition for ‘lawfully established’ (if that is the intention) or remove italics. Amend ECO-R1: Where: 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (a) The maintenance, repair or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: (i) fences and farm fences (ii) vehicle and farm tracks; (...) (ix) network utilities and ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i) and (vi).~~ (...) (e) Maintenance of improved pasture where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a mapped SNA, and (...) emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences in ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023./em
Mercury NZ Limited	S130.061	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support	The submitter supports the acknowledgment of critical infrastructure.	None specified.
MacKenzie Aviation Ltd	S155.001	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Not Stated	Standards for working conditions need to be improved for agriculture aviation safety. Track building and maintenance a key factor. Farm tracks are used by many people involved in the farm production and for recreational use including heavy transport units and tractors. Refer to complete submission for full details.	Allow for track building and maintenance to be improved for agriculture aviation safety.
Farm Manager - Wantwood Station	S105.021	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Although this is a permitted activity, it is highly restrictive on some activities that have nominal effects such as fencing. A clearance width of 1.5m is not a sufficient width. For example, if you are clearing an area to be fenced, the bucket of a digger would typically be approximately 2m wide and for a dozer 3m. In farming situations, a firebreak with a width of 1.5 meters falls below FENZ recommendations.	Amend ECO-R1 to accurately reflect the practicalities of these activities (based on the type of equipment required to complete them). For example, remove the width restriction associated with fencing, fire breaks and tracks. Clarification is required on whether this rule refers to the occasional bit of indigenous vegetation clearance that may have happen in the path of land disturbance or does this refer to solid areas of indigenous vegetation i.e. native bush. NOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.021	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Although this is a permitted activity, it is highly restrictive on some activities that have nominal effects such as fencing. A clearance width of 1.5m is not a sufficient width. For example, if you are clearing an area to be fenced, the bucket of a digger would typically be approximately 2m wide and for a dozer 3m. In farming situations, a firebreak with a width of 1.5 meters falls below FENZ recommendations.	Amend ECO-R1 to accurately reflect the practicalities of these activities (based on the type of equipment required to complete them). For example, remove the width restriction associated with fencing, fire breaks and tracks. Clarification is required on whether this rule refers to the occasional bit of indigenous vegetation clearance that may have happen in the path of land disturbance or does this refer to solid areas of indigenous vegetation i.e. native bush.
Ian Davidson-Watts	S69.005	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose in part	Open scrub: May have ecological value for species and vegetation that benefit from disturbed areas (many invertebrates lay eggs on open ground sites amongst low level vegetation etc). These habitats are also quicker to reestablish and the process of reestablishment is of ecological value in its own right. Closed forest: retention of canopy linkage is often the one of the most important ecological factors associated with these habitats.	More flexibility depending on the habitat in respect of the maintenance of established activities: Open scrub, and grassland: 3m of disturbance Closed forest: 1.5m of disturbance with a structure over 4m in height. emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Trudy Bokser	S113.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below). Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~ (e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk ~~(declining) species.~~ (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan. (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is

						incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~(ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere:1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. ~~The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).~~Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.~~...7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Nathan Bokser	S116.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below).Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences, (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, and~~ ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~(e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species. (f) ~~In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan.~~(g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous

						vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~(ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere:1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. ~~The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).~~Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.~~...7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below).Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, and ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~(e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an ~~uncultivated depositional landform,~~ and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk ~~(declining) species.~~ (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan. (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than

						2.0m 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted: (i) ~~Within a domestic garden; or~~ (ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows). Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionary Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi). Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values. 2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.~~ 7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity. ECO-R1(3): Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values. 2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10. 3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works. 4. The benefits of the proposed activity. 5. The mitigation proposed. ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area. em NOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below). Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~ (e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, ~~where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species. (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan.~~ (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a

						potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~(ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere:1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. ~~2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).~~Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10....~~7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complyingWhere: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Karen Temple	S19.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below).Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~(ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~(e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, ~~where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species. (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan.~~(g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~(ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere:1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10~~....7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below).Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~(ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~(e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, ~~where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species. (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan.~~(g) For the maintenance, repair or

					Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~(ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere:1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10....~~7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Helen McIntosh	S24.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore,	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below). Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences

					Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities. (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)~~ ... (e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, ~~where:~~ ~~(i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and~~ ~~(ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and~~ ~~(iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.~~ ~~(f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan.~~
--	--	--	--	--	---

					(g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ... k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~ (ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows). Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)~~(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi)~~ Restricted discretionary Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. ~~2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).~~ Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values. 2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9~~ and ECO-P10. ... 7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity. ECO-R1(3): Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.
--	--	--	--	--	---

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10. 3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works. 4. The benefits of the proposed activity. 5. The mitigation proposed. ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): ~~Discretionary-Non-complying~~ Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area. NOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023
John Baynes	S68.017	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below). Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~ (e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, ~~where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species. (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan. (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than 2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous

						vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~(ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere:1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.~~...7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.049	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below).Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~(ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)....(e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species. (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan. (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~(ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere:1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. ~~2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).~~Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.~~7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed.ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary-Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Kevin Robertson	S115.095	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Lawfully established’ appears in this rule in italics, implying it is defined in the interpretations, but there is no corresponding definition in the interpretations section. ECO-R1 as currently drafted is too restrictive and will not allow for reasonable farming activities to be easily carried out. Fencing is a clear example of where the 1m width is insufficient. Another example of where the proposed width is insufficient is firebreaks, which are proposed as 1.5m. Any firebreak that was only permitted 1.5m for the maintenance, repair, replacement of upgrade would not be fit for purpose. The District Plan needs permitted activities that allow clearance in line with existing farming practices, to enable people and communities to provide for their health and safety, economic, social and cultural well-being and to reflect s 5(2) of the RMA. It is important to specify that (e)(i) applies to mapped SNAs. It is our view that mapping of SNAs must occur before treating areas as SNAs. See full reason on pg 61 of submission	Include a definition for ‘lawfully established’ (if that is the intention) or remove italics. Amend ECO-R1: Where: 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (a) The maintenance, repair or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: (i) fences and farm fences (ii) vehicle and farm tracks; (...) (ix) network utilities and ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i) and (vi).~~ (...) (e) Maintenance of improved pasture where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a mapped SNA, and (...) emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences in ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023./em
Ronald Crispin	S60.097	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Lawfully established’ appears in this rule in italics, implying it is defined in the interpretations, but there is no corresponding definition in the interpretations section. ECO-R1 as currently drafted is too restrictive and will not allow for reasonable farming activities to be easily carried	Include a definition for ‘lawfully established’ (if that is the intention) or remove italics. Amend ECO-R1: Where: 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (a) The maintenance, repair or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: (i) fences and farm fences (ii) vehicle and farm tracks; (...) (ix) network utilities and ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i) and (vi).~~ (...) (e) Maintenance of improved pasture where: (i) the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					out. Fencing is a clear example of where the 1m width is insufficient. Another example of where the proposed width is insufficient is firebreaks, which are proposed as 1.5m. Any firebreak that was only permitted 1.5m for the maintenance, repair, replacement of upgrade would not be fit for purpose. The District Plan needs permitted activities that allow clearance in line with existing farming practices, to enable people and communities to provide for their health and safety, economic, social and cultural well-being and to reflect s 5(2) of the RMA. It is important to specify that (e)(i) applies to mapped SNAs. It is our view that mapping of SNAs must occur before treating areas as SNAs. See full reason on pg 61 of submission	improved pasture has not become a mapped SNA, and (...) emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences in ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023./em
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.106	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Lawfully established’ appears in this rule in italics, implying it is defined in the interpretations, but there is no corresponding definition in the interpretations section. ECO-R1 as currently drafted is too restrictive and will not allow for reasonable farming activities to be easily carried out. Fencing is a clear example of where the 1m width is insufficient. Another example of where the proposed width is insufficient is firebreaks, which are proposed as 1.5m. Any firebreak that was only permitted 1.5m for the maintenance, repair, replacement of upgrade would not be fit for purpose. The District Plan needs permitted activities that allow clearance in line with existing farming practices, to enable people and communities to provide for their health and safety, economic, social and cultural well-being and to reflect s 5(2) of the RMA. It is important to specify that (e)(i) applies to mapped SNAs. It is our view that mapping of SNAs must occur before treating areas as SNAs. See full reason on pg 61 of submission	Include a definition for ‘lawfully established’ (if that is the intention) or remove italics. Amend ECO-R1: Where: 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (a) The maintenance, repair or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: (i) fences and farm fences (ii) vehicle and farm tracks; (...) (ix) network utilities and ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i) and (vi).~~ (...) (e) Maintenance of improved pasture where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a mapped SNA, and (...) emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences in ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023./em
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.107	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Lawfully established’ appears in this rule in italics, implying it is defined in the interpretations, but there is no corresponding definition in the interpretations section. ECO-R1 as currently drafted is too restrictive and will not allow for reasonable farming activities to be easily carried out. Fencing is a clear example of where the 1m width is insufficient. Another example of where the proposed width is insufficient is firebreaks, which are proposed as 1.5m. Any firebreak that was only permitted 1.5m for the maintenance, repair, replacement of upgrade would not be fit for purpose. The District Plan needs permitted	Include a definition for ‘lawfully established’ (if that is the intention) or remove italics. Amend ECO-R1: Where: 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (a) The maintenance, repair or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: (i) fences and farm fences (ii) vehicle and farm tracks; (...) (ix) network utilities and ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i) and (vi).~~ (...) (e) Maintenance of improved pasture where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a mapped SNA, and (...) emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences in ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023./em

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					activities that allow clearance in line with existing farming practices, to enable people and communities to provide for their health and safety, economic, social and cultural well-being and to reflect s 5(2) of the RMA. It is important to specify that (e)(i) applies to mapped SNAs. It is our view that mapping of SNAs must occur before treating areas as SNAs. See full reason on pg 61 of submission	
John Baynes	S68.215	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Lawfully established’ appears in this rule in italics, implying it is defined in the interpretations, but there is no corresponding definition in the interpretations section. ECO-R1 as currently drafted is too restrictive and will not allow for reasonable farming activities to be easily carried out. Fencing is a clear example of where the 1m width is insufficient. Another example of where the proposed width is insufficient is firebreaks, which are proposed as 1.5m. Any firebreak that was only permitted 1.5m for the maintenance, repair, replacement of upgrade would not be fit for purpose. The District Plan needs permitted activities that allow clearance in line with existing farming practices, to enable people and communities to provide for their health and safety, economic, social and cultural well-being and to reflect s 5(2) of the RMA. It is important to specify that (e)(i) applies to mapped SNAs. It is our view that mapping of SNAs must occur before treating areas as SNAs. See full reason on pg 61 of submission	Include a definition for ‘lawfully established’ (if that is the intention) or remove italics. Amend ECO-R1: Where: 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (a) The maintenance, repair or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: (i) fences and farm fences (ii) vehicle and farm tracks; (...) (ix) network utilities and ~~the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i) and (vi).~~ (...) (e) Maintenance of improved pasture where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a mapped SNA, and (...) emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences in ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023./em
Greg Bokser	S117.013	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below). Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes:

					activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	(aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)~~ ... (e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA, where: ~~(i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and~~ ~~(ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and~~ ~~(iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk~~
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

					~~(declining) species.~~ ~~(f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan.~~ (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ... k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted:~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~ (ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows). Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ~~ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi)~~ Restricted discretionary Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. ~~2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi).~~ Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values. 2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9~~ and ECO-P10. ... 7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by
--	--	--	--	--	--

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						the proposed activity. ECO-R1(3): Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values. 2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10. 3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works. 4. The benefits of the proposed activity. 5. The mitigation proposed. ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): ~~Discretionary~~ Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area. NOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023
Department of Conservation	S109.143	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	Amend the provision for the National Grid to clarify that it only applies to the maintenance and operation of the exiting National Grid and br /not for an extension.br /Include a reference to Biodiversity Management Plans so that it is clear in the br /provisions about when these management plans may be required.	Retain ECO-R1 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): d) For the safe operation or maintenance (but not extension) of the National Grid Matters of Discretion ...X. management of potential adverse effects through a Council Authorised Biodiversity Management Plan.
Department of Conservation	S109.067	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the Southland RPS and Pest Management Plan. However, it is recommended that the rule applies to all areas where there are adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity and not just SNAs.	Retain ECO-R2 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ All areas
Department of Conservation	S109.068	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support	The D-G supports a non-complying status.	Retain as notified.
Environment Southland	S85.033	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Use of the RPMP is unnecessary prohibitive in this instance and its use is unnecessary as the RPMP already prevents the planting of pest plants. Referring to the RPMP only in relation to SNAs adds confusions when the RPMP prohibits this activity anywhere not just in SNAs.	Change to ' planting of exotic plant species unless allowed for by ECO -P2 '.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.037	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Oppose	Propagation/planting of pest plants and animals is managed through regional strategies under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Delete the rule.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.095	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Kevin Robertson	S115.096	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Ronald Crispin	S60.098	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.107	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.108	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
John Baynes	S68.216	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.071	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Oppose in part	Requiring a discretionary consent for all indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance outside SNA's is considered overly onerous. The provisions do not implement ECO-P4. Having single activity status for clearance within an SNA does not reflect the nuance of the policy regime appropriately.	Amend activity status to restricted discretionary A new rule be created for activities addressed in ECO-P4 - Discretionary
Department of Conservation	S109.069	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the Southland RPS and Pest Management Plan. However, it is recommended that the rule applies to all areas that would affect indigenous biodiversity and not just SNAs. The D-G supports a non-complying status.	~~Significant Natural Areas:~~ All Areas Retain ECO-R3 Activity status: non-complying
Environment Southland	S85.034	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part		Change to domesticated/invasive animals unless allowed by Eco - P2.
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.038	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Oppose	Propagation/planting of pest plants and animals is managed through regional strategies under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Delete the rule.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.096	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of 'exotic weed species'. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Include a definition for animal pests. Amend ECO-R3: The intentional release or farming of animal pests identified in a the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Kevin Robertson	S115.097	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of 'exotic weed species'. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Include a definition for animal pests. Amend ECO-R3: The intentional release or farming of animal pests identified in a the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Ronald Crispin	S60.099	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of 'exotic weed species'. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Include a definition for animal pests. Amend ECO-R3: The intentional release or farming of animal pests identified in a the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.108	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of 'exotic weed species'. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Include a definition for animal pests. Amend ECO-R3: The intentional release or farming of animal pests identified in a the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.109	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Include a definition for animal pests. Amend ECO-R3: The intentional release or farming of animal pests identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
John Baynes	S68.217	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	This rule could be strengthened by providing a definition of ‘exotic weed species’. The classification of plants as a weed can be subjective, for example white clover is considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities). Typo must be amended.	Include a definition for animal pests. Amend ECO-R3: The intentional release or farming of animal pests identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.
Department of Conservation	S109.070	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-APP	Support	The D-G supports the criteria set out in Appendix 4.	Retain Appendix 4 as notified
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.028	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Amend	Increasing positive knowledge and education about SNAs and ecosystem services will inform the community of the numerous benefits of protecting and enhancing these areas, and may make the identification process easier.	Add: ECO-05 Utilise the identification and restoration of Significant Natural Areas to enhance ecosystem services, community knowledge and education.
Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	S110.034	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Amend	Grazing of an SNA could have a devastating effect to the area, especially if it contains species which are palatable to livestock. There is also potential of ground pugging/vegetation destruction from trampling, nutrient enrichment, loss of habitat/nesting sites and so on. However, there could be cases where livestock grazing is beneficial in controlling exotic weed spread, but the applicant would need to prove this in order to be able to graze these areas.	Add: ECO-R4 Livestock grazing within a Significant Natural Area Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion:1. Effects on Significant Natural Area values and indigenous biodiversity values. 2. The impact of the activity on any, rare or threatened indigenous species or taonga species and how any potential impact could be avoided, remedied or mitigated. 3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the activity. 4. The activity has a functional need to be located in the area. 5. An ongoing grazing plan to ensure the stock type, stock numbers and duration of grazing is combatable with the biodiversity values present. 6. the matters outlined in ECO-P2, ECO-P6, ECO-P7, ECO-P10, ECO-P11 and ECO-P12.
Environment Southland	S85.035	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	1. This is required to give full effect to 3.21 of the NPS-IB. 2. The current objectives do not adequate cover clause 3.16 and 3.20 of the NPS-IB. 3. The NPS requires mapping of SNAs across the district. 4. To fully give effect to NPS-IB policy 2.	1. The inclusion of a new objective that promotes the restoration of indigenous biodiversity. 2. The inclusion of an objectives to 'manage the effects of Indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs' to 'acknowledge and identify Taonga' and to 'manage adverse effects on Highly Mobile Species). 3. Mapping of SNAs throughout GDC area. 4. The inclusion of an objective that provides for Tangata Whenua's active participation in other decision making relating to Biodiversity. 5. Recommend you work in partnership with Maori to ensure the implementation meets section 3.18 of the NPS.
Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	S139.017	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Amend	The plan needs some policy guidance around the ability to remove small areas of indigenous vegetation as part of day to day farming and other land use activities in rural areas, where such activities do not compromise the ecological integrity of indigenous ecosystems on-site; while preventing the wholesale clearance or destruction of tussock grasslands, and regenerating scrubland. Allowing small scale removal or modification is vital if we are to encourage landholders to plant	Add a new policy that reads: “To prevent the clearance or destruction of established indigenous vegetation or habitats or changes in surrounding land conditions which will effect the destruction of established indigenous vegetation or habitats; and Provide for the removal of individual plants or modification of small areas of indigenous vegetation which is ancillary to undertaking other land uses on the site, provide these activities do not adversely affect the ability of the indigenous

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					and enhance areas and sites. This type of policy is needed to anchor general indigenous vegetation clearance rules.	vegetation to regenerate or compromise the ecological integrity of the site.”
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.029	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	New provision sought to provide for ecological enhancement on Highly Productive Land	ECO P11A - provide for ecological enhancement works that will enhance indigenous ecological biodiversity to occur on highly productive land.
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2):2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Stoney Creek Station Limited	S3.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3):Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	S126.097	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	We support the inclusion of a new rule which provides for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECO-R1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity. This would capture the ability to carry out minor indigenous vegetation clearance (i.e. the clearance of a single plant) for various purposes including beautification and normal farming activities. It is unreasonable to expect landowners to apply for a resource consent when carrying out minor clearance.	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.
Mercury NZ Limited	S130.056	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Not Stated		New objective: Recognise functional and operational needs of critical infrastructure, whilst managing effects on biodiversity values to maintain and enhance where practicable.
Ian Davidson-Watts	S69.006	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	These species often use nonnative habitats for part, or all of their lifecycle and it is important that these are properly addressed in the provisions.	We seek clarification on what rules apply to the protection of highly mobile fauna (of rare or threatened species etc).The rules to protect them when they are identified should be similar to those of SNAs
Trudy Bokser	S113.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2):2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation;

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Trudy Bokser	S113.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Nathan Bokser	S116.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Nathan Bokser	S116.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	S118.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.016	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	S18.017	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Karen Temple	S19.016	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Karen Temple	S19.017	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.016	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Sarah and Peter Barclay	S20.017	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

						effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Helen McIntosh	S24.016	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Helen McIntosh	S24.017	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
John Baynes	S68.018	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
John Baynes	S68.019	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.050	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.051	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Kevin Robertson	S115.098	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	We support the inclusion of a new rule which provides for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECO-R1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity. This would capture the ability to carry out minor indigenous vegetation clearance (i.e. the clearance of a single plant) for various purposes including beautification and normal farming activities. It is unreasonable to expect landowners to apply for a resource consent when carrying out minor clearance.	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.
Ronald Crispin	S60.100	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	We support the inclusion of a new rule which provides for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECO-R1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity. This would capture the ability to carry out minor indigenous vegetation clearance (i.e. the clearance of a single plant) for various purposes including beautification and normal farming activities. It is unreasonable to expect landowners to apply for a resource consent when carrying out minor clearance.	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.
Rural Ratepayers Group	S143.109	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	We support the inclusion of a new rule which provides for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECO-R1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity. This would capture the ability to carry out minor indigenous vegetation clearance (i.e. the clearance of a single plant) for various purposes including beautification and normal farming activities. It is unreasonable to expect landowners to apply for a resource consent when carrying out minor clearance.	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.
Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	S148.110	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	We support the inclusion of a new rule which provides for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECO-R1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity. This would capture the ability to carry out minor indigenous vegetation clearance (i.e. the clearance of a single plant) for various purposes including beautification and normal farming activities. It is unreasonable to	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

					expect landowners to apply for a resource consent when carrying out minor clearance.	
John Baynes	S68.218	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	We support the inclusion of a new rule which provides for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECO-R1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity. This would capture the ability to carry out minor indigenous vegetation clearance (i.e. the clearance of a single plant) for various purposes including beautification and normal farming activities. It is unreasonable to expect landowners to apply for a resource consent when carrying out minor clearance.	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.
Greg Bokser	S117.014	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Greg Bokser	S117.015	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Greenbriar Ltd.	S128.072	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Amend	The provisions do not implement ECO-P4. Having single activity status for clearance within an SNA does not reflect the nuance of the policy regime appropriately.	A new rule be created for indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance within a Highly Mobile Fauna Specified Area - Discretionary