

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S152.015	Nigel Cowburn	Appendix 4 - ECO-APP - Significant Natural Area Criteria	APP4-ECO-APP	Not Stated	Requests amended wording of "requires an ecologist with geothermal expertise)" to widen expertise input.	In NZ this is probably one person, this should be reworded as it sounds exclusive to a company.	Accept in part
S85.008	Environment Southland	Appendix 4 - ECO-APP - Significant Natural Area Criteria	APP4-ECO-APP	Support	The criteria is consistent with the NPS-IB		Accept
S148.009	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Appendix 4 - ECO-APP - Significant Natural Area Criteria	APP4-ECO-APP	Oppose	If an SNA is not mapped, it cannot and should not have any restrictions on it.	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	Reject
FS30.003	Transpower New Zealand Limited			Support	Allow	Transpower generally supports the submission on the basis that the inclusion of rules in the Proposed District Plan in respect of unmapped SNAs creates uncertainty for plan users to the extent that it is not clear or certain whether certain provisions or standards may apply to any proposed activity. Allow the submission.	Reject
FS22.069	Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates			Support	Allow	Support - this submission makes a valid practical point.	Reject
S109.002	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	Biodiversity Covenant	Support	Retain as notified	Support the proposed definition as it provides clarity and aligns with the NPS-IB definition	Accept
S109.012	Department of	Interpretation	biological diversity (or	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports the inclusion of the RMA definitions in the plan.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Conservation		biodiversity)				
S126.009	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Interpretation	biological diversity (or biodiversity)	Support in part	Amend term and make any necessary consequential amendments: Biological diversity (or biodiversity)	The notified definition follows the definition in the Resource Management Act 1991. However, in the RMA the shortened term of 'biodiversity' is not used as the Council has done in the Plan. It is suggested that if the Council is stating this is the RMA definition then only the RMA term should be used.	Reject
S115.010	Kevin Robertson	Interpretation	biological diversity (or biodiversity)	Support in part	Amend term and make any necessary consequential amendments: Biological diversity (or biodiversity)	The notified definition follows the definition in the Resource Management Act 1991. However, in the RMA the shortened term of 'biodiversity' is not used as the Council has done in the Plan. It is suggested that if the Council is stating this is the RMA definition then only the RMA term should be used.	Reject
S143.021	Rural Ratepayers Group	Interpretation	biological diversity (or biodiversity)	Support in part	Amend term and make any necessary consequential amendments: Biological diversity (or biodiversity)	The notified definition follows the definition in the Resource Management Act 1991. However, in the RMA the shortened term of 'biodiversity' is not used as the Council has done in the Plan. It is suggested that if the Council is stating this is the RMA definition then only the RMA term should be used.	Reject
S148.022	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	biological diversity (or biodiversity)	Support in part	Amend term and make any necessary consequential amendments: Biological diversity (or biodiversity)	The notified definition follows the definition in the Resource Management Act 1991. However, in the RMA the shortened term of 'biodiversity' is not used as the Council has done in the Plan. It is suggested that if the Council is stating this is the RMA definition then only the RMA term should be used.	Reject
S60.012	Ronald Crispin	Interpretation	biological diversity (or biodiversity)	Support in part	Amend term and make any necessary consequential amendments: Biological diversity (or biodiversity)	The notified definition follows the definition in the Resource Management Act 1991. However, in the RMA the shortened term of 'biodiversity' is not used as the Council has done in the Plan. It is suggested that if the Council is stating this is the RMA definition then only the RMA term should be used.	Reject
S68.130	John Baynes	Interpretation	biological diversity (or biodiversity)	Support in part	Amend term and make any necessary consequential amendments: Biological diversity (or biodiversity)	The notified definition follows the definition in the Resource Management Act 1991. However, in the RMA the shortened term of 'biodiversity' is not used as the Council has done in the Plan. It is suggested that if the Council is	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						stating this is the RMA definition then only the RMA term should be used.	
S109.004	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	Council Authorised Biodiversity Management Plan	Support in part	Amend the definition of 'Council Authorised Biodiversity Management Plan' as follows: "means a management plan that is approved by the Council and mana whenua as part of an assessment of the biodiversity values undertaken or reviewed by a Council endorsed ecologist. The plan will ensure that Significant Natural Area and taonga species values are protected.	Supports the inclusion of this definition however, there are no provisions in the plan that refer to this term. It is suggested that Biodiversity Management Plans are required as a matter of discretion for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas (refer to ECO-R1 and R2) and/or that it is made clear in the provisions about when these management plans may be required. Minor amendments are suggested to correct a spelling error.	Accept
S139.022	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	Add definition: "approved biodiversity management plan means a management plan approved by the council as appropriate for the management of the biodiversity values of a site and includes a QEII Trust management plan for the site or a mana whenua endorsed site plan."	New definition for Approved Biodiversity management plan.	Accept in part
S115.093	Kevin Robertson	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	Include a definition of exotic weed.	ECO-p12 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).	Reject
S143.104	Rural Ratepayers Group	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	Include a definition of exotic weed.	ECO-p12 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).	Reject
S148.105	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	Include a definition of exotic weed.	ECO-p12 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).	Reject
S60.095	Ronald Crispin	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	Include a definition of exotic weed.	ECO-p12 could be strengthened by providing a definition of 'exotic weed species'. The classification of plants as a	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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).	
S68.213	John Baynes	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	Include a definition of exotic weed.	ECO-p12 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).	Reject
S109.019	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	Insert a new definition for "biodiversity offset" as follows (or words to similar effect): Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: "means a measurable conservation outcome that meets the requirements in the NPS-IB Appendix 3 and results from actions that: a. redress any more than minor residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity after all appropriate avoidance, minimisation, and remediation measures have been sequentially applied; and b. achieves a measurable net gain compared to that lost.	Insert new definition of 'Biodiversity Offset'. Providing for the use of biodiversity offset (where the effects management hierarchy has been applied), enables Councils and applicants to address any residual adverse effects, that cannot otherwise be demonstrably avoided, minimised, or remedied as a result of the proposed activity. The draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB) contains a definition for 'Biodiversity Offset' which is recommended for the proposed plan. Biodiversity offset is a term used in the ECO chapter and therefore adding a definition provides clarity to plan users.	Accept
FS9.1	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow		Accept
FS20.001	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	Support in part. The plan must achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to relevant higher-order planning documents.	Accept
FS24.001	Contact Energy Ltd			Support	Allow	Contact agrees it is appropriate to ensure consistency with the NPSIB.	Accept
S109.020	Department of	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	Insert a new definition for "biodiversity compensation" as follows (or words to similar effect): Has the same meaning as per the	Insert new definition for "compensation", as the term is used within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, it is considered necessary to define the term so	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Conservation				National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: Means a measurable conservation outcome that meets the requirements of the NPS-IB Appendix 3 and results from actions that are intended to redress any positive actions (excluding biodiversity offsets) to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects arising from activities after all appropriate avoidance, remediation, mitigation and biodiversity offset measures have been sequentially applied.	it's meaning is clear. The draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB) contains a definition for 'Biodiversity Compensation' which is recommended for the proposed plan. Biodiversity compensation is a term used in the ECO chapter and therefore adding a definition provides clarity to plan users.	
FS9.8	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow	Consistent with NPS-IB	Accept
FS20.002	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	The plan must achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to relevant higher-order planning documents.	Accept
FS24.002	Contact Energy Ltd			Support	Allow	Contact agrees it is appropriate to ensure consistency with the NPSIB.	Accept
S126.092	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	Include a definition of exotic weed.	ECO-p12 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).	Reject
FS31.004	Department of Conservation			Support in part	Allow	The D-G agrees that for clarity a list of exotic weeds could be provided either in a definition, schedule or within rule ECO-R2 itself. It is recommended that the list is drawn from the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan and any other relevant list of unwanted pests, organisms. Allow the submission to clarify the provisions of the plan. Reference to the Southland Regional Pest Management plan could be included and/or a list could be provided within Rule ECO-R2	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S110.001	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	Add: Ecological District: A particular geographical region that has a characteristic landscape and range of biological communities.	No reasons given	Accept in part
FS17.101	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	The proposed definition does not align with the NPS-IB definition for ecological district.	Accept in part
S110.002	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	Add: Ecosystem Services: The benefits obtained from ecosystems such as: (a) supporting services, (e.g., nutrient cycling, soil formation, habitat creation); and (b) provisioning services, (e.g., food, freshwater, wood, fibre, fuel); and (c) regulating services, (e.g., water purification, climate regulation, flood regulation, disease regulation); and (d) cultural services, (e.g., aesthetic, spiritual, educational, recreational)	No reasons given	Reject
FS17.102	Federated Farmers			Oppose in part	Allow in part	The submitter references the NPS-IB as the source for the proposed definition, however the proposed definition does not follow the NPSIB definition verbatim. Partially allow the relief sought. Align definition with the NPSIB verbatim.	Reject
S128.029	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	ECO P11A - provide for ecological enhancement works that will enhance indigenous ecological biodiversity to occur on highly productive land.	New provision sought to provide for ecological enhancement on Highly Productive Land	Accept in part
S113.014	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S113.015	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S116.014	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S116.015	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S118.014	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S118.015	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S127.050	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S127.051	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			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.		
S18.016	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S18.017	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S19.016	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.	proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	
S19.017	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S20.016	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S20.017	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.		
S24.016	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S24.017	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S68.018	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S68.019	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S115.098	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.	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.	Accept in part
S143.109	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.	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.	Accept in part
S148.110	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						to apply for a resource consent when carrying out minor clearance.	
S60.100	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.	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.	Accept in part
S68.218	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.	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.	Accept in part
S117.014	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S117.015	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(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.		
S110.034	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Amend	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.	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.	Reject
FS5.44	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow	The recent large scale fires show that grazing is a necessary management tool to prevent buildup of fuel that causes these events. It also aids in the management of Gorse on landscapes such as the Hokonui Hills so should be encouraged with some simple restrictions otherwise grazing will not be cost effective to undertake due to costs associated with Resource Consent processes.	Accept
FS20.019	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	The plan must achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to relevant higher-order planning documents. However, any provisions must also be workable and encourage landowners to retain and enhance indigenous biodiversity.	Accept
FS17.045	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not agree with the proposed new rule ECO-R4. Under 3.15 of the NPSIB, protection is given to existing activities within SNAs, and existing use rights are protected under s 10 or 20A of the RMA. The intention	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						is that existing activities, such as grazing, can continue provided the effects do not increase the loss of native plants or animals in a SNA. There is no justification provided as to why a more stringent approach than the NPS-IB is required	
FS25.070	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek does not support any consent requirement for the grazing of stock due to the significant implications this will have on all pastoral farming in the District.	Accept
S85.035	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	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.	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.	Reject
FS5.45	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow		Accept
FS20.007	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	The plan needs to achieve the purpose of the RMA and to give effect to relevant higher-order documents. Mana whenua prefer the management of all indigenous vegetation as it is a taonga, rather than a focus on SNAs; and an approach that encourages landowners to protect and enhance indigenous biodiversity. However, where SNAs are mapped, we appreciate the cultural values associated with these places to be noted.	Reject
FS31.013	Department of Conservation			Support	Allow	The D-G agrees that new objectives are included to promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity and manage adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs and to work in partnership with iwi to ensure participation in decision making and that clause 3.18 of the NPS IB is met. Support this submission	Reject
S139.017	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems	ECO- Additional	Amend	Add a new policy that reads: "To prevent the clearance or destruction of established	The plan needs some policy guidance around the ability to remove small areas of indigenous vegetation as part of	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		and Indigenous Biodiversity	provisions sought		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 vegetation to regenerate or compromise the ecological integrity of the site."	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 and enhance areas and sites. This type of policy is needed to anchor general indigenous vegetation clearance rules.	
FS5.46	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Reject
FS25.071	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek supports the intention of this submission to enable vegetation removal for farming activities and therefore the relief sought which would enable areas of indigenous vegetation to be removed ancillary to farming activities.	Reject
S126.097	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	Include new rule providing for indigenous vegetation clearance for any purpose other than contained in ECOR1(1) or (3) as a permitted activity.	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.	Accept in part
FS5.47	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Accept in part
FS20.027	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	Managing the clearing of indigenous vegetation is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. However, we agree the current rules need refinement.	Accept in part
FS31.015	Department of Conservation			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Whilst the D-G recognises the need for normal farming activities to occur within the rural environment, the D-G would not support a rule with no parameters that permitted indigenous vegetation clearance for any other activities that are not listed in ECO-R1(1) or (3). For such a rule to	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						be supported, there would need to be thresholds in place i.e. the location (i.e. tighter thresholds for more environmentally sensitive areas) and by restricting the time period/scale of clearance with area/time period thresholds. The maintenance of indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs could be achieved through provisions targeted to areas considered likely to be sensitive to the effects of indigenous vegetation clearance. Decline this submission unless there are clear thresholds set out for indigenous vegetation clearance for other activities including restricting the location/area and over what time period clearance may occur.	
FS25.072	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission	Accept in part
FS11.051	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga			Oppose	Disallow	HNZPT acknowledges that the dominant land use within the district is agriculture and that the District Plan needs to enable sustainable primary production within appropriate zones. The previously stated activities will involve earthworks and land disturbance during establishment, maintenance, and use, which may affect identified and unknown archaeological sites. As stated in one of the submissions lodged, activities such as fencing require a significant amount of earthworks to provide a buffer for vegetation and allow heavy vehicle access for establishment and maintenance. Ongoing agricultural land use in areas that have undergone previous soil disturbance, such as ploughing, tilling, etc., are unlikely to encounter archaeology. However, earthworks or ground disturbance to areas that have been previously undisturbed, or go below the topsoil have the potential to uncover archaeology. Activities within these areas should have sufficient triggers in the District Plan to create awareness of the plan users' potential obligation under the archaeological provisions of the HNZPTA. For activities involving significant volumes of earthworks, such as quarries, mines, commercial forestry, and renewable electricity generation activities, or areas that have been largely undisturbed, such as significant	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						natural landscapes or features, the effects on archaeology require assessment and a permitted activity status is not appropriate.	
S110.028	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Amend	Add: ECO-05 Utilise the identification and restoration of Significant Natural Areas to enhance ecosystem services, community knowledge and education.	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.	Reject
FS20.018	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	The plan must achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to relevant higher-order planning documents.	Reject
FS17.019	Federated Farmers			Support in part	Allow in part	Federated Farmers supports promotion of education to manage SNAs, however the submitter's proposed wording goes beyond this. Federated Farmers proposes: Utilise the identification of Significant Natural Areas to enhance community knowledge and education.	Reject
S3.014	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
FS20.034	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Disallow in part	Managing the clearing of indigenous vegetation is necessary to achieve the purpose of the RMA and give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. However, we agree the current rules need refinement	Accept in part
FS31.014	Department of Conservation			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Whilst the D-G recognises the need for normal farming activities to occur within the rural environment, the D-G would not support a rule that permitted indigenous vegetation clearance for activities outside of SNAs where there was no assessment of the location, scale or what biodiversity values the area may have such as important habitat for indigenous fauna. A precautionary approach is	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						required given that there is limited knowledge of the ecological values of the areas of indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in the Southland Region (Southland RPS, page 81). This does not necessarily mean maintaining every individual specimen of plant or animal is required but rather it requires an understanding of the importance of an area or habitat and its contribution to maintaining genetic, species and ecosystem diversity. An ecological assessment for the Gore District addressing this issue could potentially inform a rule which created permitted activity thresholds for indigenous vegetation outside of SNAs and establish rules where resource consent would be required. Decline this submission.	
FS17.044	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the new rule which allows indigenous vegetation clearance outside a SNA for purposes other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3). The requirement for a resource consent should not be triggered by minor clearance, such as removing a single indigenous plant for constructing a farm shed.	Reject
S130.056	Mercury NZ Limited	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.		Reject
FS31.017	Department of Conservation			Oppose	Disallow	The D-G considers that objectives recognising the functional and operational need of infrastructure and managing effects are covered within the INFR chapter and that it is not necessary to duplicate this in the ECO chapter. Decline this submission.	Accept
FS24.037	Contact Energy Ltd			Support	Allow	Contact support the relief sought as it is consistent with the NPS-REG.	Reject
S69.006	Ian Davidson-Watts	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	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	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS31.018	Department of Conservation			Support	Allow	The D-G supports objectives, policies and rules that apply to the protection of highly mobile fauna (of rare or threatened species) and outside of SNAs in line with the NPS-IB provisions clause 3.20. Allow this submission	Reject
FS25.073	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek considers that the SNA provisions are the appropriate place for protection of indigenous species and another rule is not required.	Accept
S128.072	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Amend	A new rule be created for indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance within a Highly Mobile Fauna Specified Area - Discretionary	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.	Reject
FS25.113	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek does not support the inclusion of an additional rule for highly mobile fauna as the existing rule framework is considered to be sufficient.	Accept
S3.015	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- Additional provisions sought	Support	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.	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.	Reject
FS31.020	Department of Conservation			Oppose	Disallow	The D-G considers that the maintenance of improved pasture is covered in the proposed District Plan provisions under ECO-R1 (1)(e). A further rule would duplicate these provisions. Decline this submission.	Accept
S109.070	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-APP	Support	Retain Appendix 4 as notified	The D-G supports the criteria set out in Appendix 4.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity					
S128.021	Greenbriar Ltd.	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.	Accept in part
S146.035	Southland District Council	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Support	None specified.	Good provisions on restoration of significant management areas.	Accept
S18.002	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission	Consider 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.	Reject
S24.002	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission.	Consider 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.	Reject
S140.006	Robina Johnston	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Consider Southern Rata and Haumuri Reserve and native species corridors. Allow for earthworks for stock access via culvert crossings and consented wetland	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.	Accept in part
S20.002	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission. Change of chapter rules to allow good farming practices.	Consider 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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS9.9	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	'Good farming practice' is ambiguous and open to personal interpretation	Accept
S19.002	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Seeks the relief sought within the Stoney Creek submission. Change of chapter rules to allow good farming practices.	Consider 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.	Reject
FS9.10	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	'Good farming practices' is ambiguous and open to personal interpretation.	Accept
S109.047	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Neutral	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.	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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 presented in the Plan. As the policies are written currently may confuse the resource consent assessment.	
FS9.11	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow		Accept in part
FS20.004	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	The plan must achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to relevant higher-order planning documents	Accept in part
FS25.0010	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek submits that further work to implement the NPSIB should be paused until further direction is provided by the new Government. Stoney Creek does not support an additional interim process to protect "SNAs" that have not yet been mapped through a transparent and consistent process.	Reject
S59.005	Adrienne Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	SNAs should not be incorporated in the plan	I do not agree that areas which meet SNA criteria are considered SNAs and that these areas are included in the plan.	Reject
FS9.12	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	It is a requirement on territorial authorities to include SNA's in their District Plans in the NPS-IB (3.9)	Accept
S60.002	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO - General	Oppose	SNAs should not be included in the plan.	Does not agree with the inclusion of SNAs as this will cause more division.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity					
FS9.13	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	It is a requirement on territorial authorities to include SNA's in their District Plans in the NPS-IB (3.9)	Accept
S136.007	Jenny Campbell	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	Significant Natural Areas should be retained above all other considerations e.g., possible buildings.	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.	Accept in part
FS9.14	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow		Accept in part
FS25.011	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The decision requested in this submission is inconsistent with the provisions of the NPSIB which allow for some development and grazing within SNAs	Reject
S136.008	Jenny Campbell	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	SNA's need to be identified & protected, with no grazing in them		Accept in part
FS9.15	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow		Accept in part
FS17.008	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not agree that grazing within a SNA is a noncompliant activity. Grazing within SNAs produces many positive environmental benefits.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS25.012	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The decision requested in this submission is inconsistent with the provisions of the NPSIB which allow for some development and grazing within SNAs	Reject
S136.009	Jenny Campbell	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.		Reject
FS9.16	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow		Accept
FS25.013	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The decision requested in this submission is inconsistent with the provisions of the NPSIB which allow for some development and grazing within SNAs	Accept
S3.116	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject
FS9.17	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Zealand Incorporated					promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	
FS20.033	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	The plan needs to address matters in s6 of the RMA to achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. However, we agree that the approach in the proposed Gore DP needs refinement to ensure it is both comprehensive and workable.	Accept
FS17.009	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers agrees with the submitter that the chapter be withdrawn and consultation carried out with key stakeholders.	Reject
S126.177	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	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	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	Reject
FS9.18	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
FS20.026	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	The plan needs to address matters in s6 of the RMA to achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement. However, we agree that the approach in the proposed Gore DP needs refinement to ensure it is both comprehensive and workable.	Accept
FS25.014	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek agrees that the lack of consultation on the drafting of the NFL chapter resulted in impractical provisions in the plan as notified	Reject
S113.116	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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.	
FS9.19	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S116.116	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject
FS9.20	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S118.116	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity				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.	
FS9.21	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S18.118	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject
FS9.22	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S19.118	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity				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.	
FS9.23	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S20.118	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject
FS9.24	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S24.118	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject
FS9.25	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S68.120	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject
FS9.26	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Zealand Incorporated						
S127.152	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject
FS9.27	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S148.013	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	If an SNA is not mapped, it cannot and should not have any restrictions on it.	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.	Reject
FS9.28	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	There is particular and tight criteria for an area to be considered an SNA. Council still has a duty under the RMA and other legislation to protect significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS17.0010	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers agrees with the submitter and has made the same point in our submission.	Accept
FS25.016	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek agrees that restrictions on SNAs should not be in place until the mapping process has been completed.	Accept
S115.178	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	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	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	Reject
FS9.29	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S60.180	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	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	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	Reject
FS9.30	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S143.189	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	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	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	Reject
FS9.31	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Zealand Incorporated						
S148.190	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	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	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	Reject
FS9.32	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S68.298	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Not Stated	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	Lack of consultation on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes chapters	Reject
FS9.33	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S117.116	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS9.34	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	The protections offered in the ECO chapter are a minimum to achieve the NPS-IB objectives and RMA objectives to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, section 6(c) and others.	Accept
S69.004	Ian Davidson-Watts	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
FS25.015	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	Stoney Creek does not support the significant restrictions proposed through the protection of all indigenous vegetation until the SNA process is resolved.	Reject
S146.101	Southland District Council	Natural environmental Values map layers	ECO-MAP-Significant Natural Area	Support in part	Review cross-boundary issues with SDC.	SNA-1 borders Southland District.	Accept in part
S115.177	Kevin Robertson	Natural environmental Values map layers	ECO-MAP-Significant Natural Area	Not Stated	SFF does not agree with including areas that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs.	The definition of a SNA as per the NPS-IB states 'any area that, after the commencement date, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1'. Therefore, until the identification is carried out notification or inclusion in the plan takes place, the unmapped areas should not be	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						treated as SNAs. 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. We support nonregulatory approaches to managing SNAs and would be happy to work with the Council and our members to achieve this. There is a real risk of a perverse effect that SNAs will become something farmers are motivated to avoid having on their property. For instance, if there are significant costs and restrictions associated with SNAs, they will become a liability instead of something to be proud of. This will have implications for biodiversity, and farmers may choose to plant exotic species for artificial wetlands, shelterbelts or stock shade trees etc, which encourage a habitat for non-indigenous fauna, instead of being encouraged to choose indigenous species.	
S143.188	Rural Ratepayers Group	Natural environmental Values map layers	ECO-MAP-Significant Natural Area	Not Stated	SFF does not agree with including areas that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs.	The definition of a SNA as per the NPS-IB states 'any area that, after the commencement date, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1'. Therefore, until the identification is carried out notification or inclusion in the plan takes place, the unmapped areas should not be treated as SNAs. 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. We support nonregulatory approaches to managing SNAs and would be happy to work with the Council and our members to achieve this. There is a real risk of a perverse effect that SNAs will become something farmers are motivated to avoid having on their property. For instance, if there are significant costs and restrictions associated with SNAs, they will become a liability instead of something to be proud of. This will have implications for biodiversity, and farmers may choose to plant exotic species for artificial wetlands, shelterbelts or stock shade trees etc, which encourage a habitat for non-indigenous fauna, instead of being encouraged to choose indigenous species.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S148.189	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Natural environmental Values map layers	ECO-MAP-Significant Natural Area	Not Stated	SFF does not agree with including areas that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs.	The definition of a SNA as per the NPS-IB states 'any area that, after the commencement date, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1'. Therefore, until the identification is carried out notification or inclusion in the plan takes place, the unmapped areas should not be treated as SNAs. 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. We support nonregulatory approaches to managing SNAs and would be happy to work with the Council and our members to achieve this. There is a real risk of a perverse effect that SNAs will become something farmers are motivated to avoid having on their property. For instance, if there are significant costs and restrictions associated with SNAs, they will become a liability instead of something to be proud of. This will have implications for biodiversity, and farmers may choose to plant exotic species for artificial wetlands, shelterbelts or stock shade trees etc, which encourage a habitat for non-indigenous fauna, instead of being encouraged to choose indigenous species.	Accept in part
S60.179	Ronald Crispin	Natural environmental Values map layers	ECO-MAP-Significant Natural Area	Not Stated	SFF does not agree with including areas that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs.	The definition of a SNA as per the NPS-IB states 'any area that, after the commencement date, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1'. Therefore, until the identification is carried out notification or inclusion in the plan takes place, the unmapped areas should not be treated as SNAs. 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. We support nonregulatory approaches to managing SNAs and would be happy to work with the Council and our members to achieve this. There is a real risk of a perverse effect that SNAs will become something farmers are motivated to avoid having on their property. For instance, if there are significant costs and restrictions associated with SNAs, they will become a liability instead of something to be proud of. This will have implications for biodiversity, and farmers may choose to	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						plant exotic species for artificial wetlands, shelterbelts or stock shade trees etc, which encourage a habitat for non-indigenous fauna, instead of being encouraged to choose indigenous species.	
S68.297	John Baynes	Natural environmental Values map layers	ECO-MAP-Significant Natural Area	Not Stated	SFF does not agree with including areas that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs.	The definition of a SNA as per the NPS-IB states 'any area that, after the commencement date, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1'. Therefore, until the identification is carried out notification or inclusion in the plan takes place, the unmapped areas should not be treated as SNAs. 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. We support nonregulatory approaches to managing SNAs and would be happy to work with the Council and our members to achieve this. There is a real risk of a perverse effect that SNAs will become something farmers are motivated to avoid having on their property. For instance, if there are significant costs and restrictions associated with SNAs, they will become a liability instead of something to be proud of. This will have implications for biodiversity, and farmers may choose to plant exotic species for artificial wetlands, shelterbelts or stock shade trees etc, which encourage a habitat for non-indigenous fauna, instead of being encouraged to choose indigenous species.	Accept in part
S126.176	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Natural environmental Values map layers	ECO-MAP-Significant Natural Area	Not Stated	SFF does not agree with including areas that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs.	The definition of a SNA as per the NPS-IB states 'any area that, after the commencement date, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1'. Therefore, until the identification is carried out notification or inclusion in the plan takes place, the unmapped areas should not be treated as SNAs. 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. We support nonregulatory approaches to managing SNAs and would be happy to work with the Council and our members to achieve this. There is a real risk of a perverse effect that SNAs will become something farmers are motivated to avoid having	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						on their property. For instance, if there are significant costs and restrictions associated with SNAs, they will become a liability instead of something to be proud of. This will have implications for biodiversity, and farmers may choose to plant exotic species for artificial wetlands, shelterbelts or stock shade trees etc, which encourage a habitat for non-indigenous fauna, instead of being encouraged to choose indigenous species.	
FS25.138	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission	Reject
FS31.021	Department of Conservation			Oppose	Disallow	The D-G supports the SNA mapping layer as notified which currently includes two sites SNA-1 (Croydon Bush Reserve) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve). These reserves meet the criteria for significant natural areas as specified in Appendix 1 of the NPS-IB and Appendix 3 of the Southland Regional Policy Statement Significance assessment criteria. It is important to note that areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are identified as matters of national importance under the RMA and are required to be protected in accordance with Section 6(c). Territorial authorities are also responsible for controlling the effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of maintaining indigenous biological diversity (Section 31). This is also required under the Southland RPS through Objective BIO.2 & Policy BIO.2. These requirements are not new and whether areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are currently included in the mapping layer or not, they are still required to be protected. The primary mechanism for achieving these requirements is through regulatory provisions within the proposed Gore District Plan. Mapping is a tool that Councils use to identify areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna within their District. The identification of significant areas is an approach supported in the Southland RPS through Objective and Policy BIO.1. As is the same with other environmental and heritage overlays,	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						the benefits of using mapping as a method to protect areas of significance is that it makes the public aware of these areas and is an easy way to identify what specific rules apply in these locations. Mapping also provides certainty as to what is included and what is not included. Having a schedule of SNAs, that are mapped, can also assist with targeting incentives and other assistance to landowners. For Gore District Council, a schedule and map is appropriate to use given that it is a highly developed district where there is a depleted cover of indigenous vegetation and habitat, with smaller, discrete areas with distinctive boundaries that can be easily mapped and described. The D-G supports non regulatory measures to protect, restore and enhance indigenous biodiversity in combination with regulatory measures within the proposed District Plan. It is agreed that protection and enhancement of biodiversity values can also be achieved through other non-regulatory methods. It is acknowledged that Gore District Council are proposing to develop a regional biodiversity strategy and work in partnership with tangata whenua and landowners where other non-regulatory approaches can be promoted.	
S128.022	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support	No amendments required	Maintain IBD and protect SNA -consider this appropriate given focus on significant areas.	Accept
S142.002	Alan Taylor	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S85.018	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	Rearrange the objective so that the "protect" statement comes before the "maintain" statement. Maintain should also mean "no overall loss".	"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.	Reject
S127.041	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S24.007	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S68.009	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S115.080	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	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).	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Reject
S143.091	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	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).	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S148.092	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	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).	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Reject
S60.082	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	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).	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Reject
S68.200	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	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).	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Reject
S117.005	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S109.049	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	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).	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.	Reject
FS9.37	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow	Consistent with relief sought in the Forest & Bird submission	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS25.019	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought extends beyond the requirement of higher order documents	Accept
S3.005	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS9.38	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept
FS17.012	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The submitter's proposed wording is similar to the FFNZ submission.	Reject
S126.079	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Support in part	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).	This objective is supported, however, the focus should be on identification of SNAs as per the NPS-IB.	Reject
FS9.39	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept
FS25.021	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Aligns with Stoney Creek's submission	Reject
FS25.023	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	This submission is supported.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S113.005	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS9.40	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept
S116.005	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS9.41	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept
S118.005	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS9.42	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S18.007	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS9.43	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept
S19.007	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS9.44	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept
S20.007	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS9.45	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Oppose	Disallow	ECO-O2 covers the identification of SNAs, ECO-O1 is about maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Amendment not required.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S139.012	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Delete ECO-O1 and replace with "The quantum, quality and health of indigenous ecosystems and habitats is enhanced within Gore District."	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.	Reject
FS17.013	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not agree with the proposed amendment for ECO-O1, as the wording applies broadly to biological diversity across district. The submitter makes the point the wording is too narrow and only applies to SNAs.	Accept
FS25.020	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought extends beyond the requirement of higher order documents	Accept
S153.002	Oakland Farming Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	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.	Wording should reflect the NPSIB and to be clear SNAs should be identified.	Accept in part
FS25.018	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Aligns with Stoney Creek's submission	Accept in part
S109.050	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports this objective as it is consistent with the requirements of the NPS-IB and Southland RPS.	Accept
S125.031	Ministry of Education	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain as proposed.	The submitter supports ECO-O2.	Accept
S128.023	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems	ECO-O2	Support	No amendments required.	Partnership approach to identify and protect IBD	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		and Indigenous Biodiversity					
S146.036	Southland District Council	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	No decision requested	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?	Reject
S126.080	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.	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'.	Accept in part
S115.081	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.	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 landowners 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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						widely than on managing a limited number of sites which meet the criteria for 'significance'.	
S143.092	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.	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 landowners 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'.	Accept in part
S148.093	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.	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 landowners 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'.	Accept in part
S60.083	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.	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 landowners whose properties contain threatened, at risk or rare habitat types. The recognition of the key role of people-in-place in managing	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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'.	
S68.201	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Support	Retain ECO-O2 as drafted.	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 landowners 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'.	Accept in part
S139.013	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O2	Oppose	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."	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.	Reject
FS17.014	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not agree with the proposed amendment for ECO-O2. ECO-O2 is about working in partnership and is an important objective to include	Accept
FS25.022	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought changes the intent of this objective and is considered to be captured within other policies in this chapter.	Accept
S85.019	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-O2	Support in part	include the addition of "restore"	This aligns with 3.8(2) of the NPS-IB, however the addition of restore will give effect to 3.21	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity					
FS17.015	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not agree with the proposed addition of 'restore'. Under the NPS-IB, 3.21 refers to restoration to be a priority for 'SNAs whose ecological integrity is degraded'. Without mapping all SNAs the Council cannot make a claim on their ecological status.	Accept
S112.063	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support	Retain as notified	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.	Accept
S113.006	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S116.006	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S118.006	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S127.042	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S18.008	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-O3	Oppose	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for appropriate new subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~		
S19.008	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S20.008	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S24.008	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S68.010	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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.~~	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S115.082	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	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.	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Reject
S143.093	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	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.	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Reject
S148.094	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-O3	Support in part	Amend ECO-O3: Provide for appropriate new subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			~~area can be maintained and enhanced~~ avoided or managed.		
S60.084	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	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.	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Reject
S68.202	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Support in part	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.	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Reject
S117.006	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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 ~~maintained and enhanced.~~ avoided or managed.	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
S3.006	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	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 ~~maintained and enhanced.~~ avoided or managed.	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the "enhancement" of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Reject
FS17.016	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The submitter's proposed wording is similar to the FFNZ submission.	Reject
S109.051	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	Remove ECO-O3: ~~Provide for appropriate subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the values of the area can be maintained and enhanced.~~	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 ECOO1.	Reject
FS17.017	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the relief sought. It is important to provide for subdivision within SNAs.	Accept
FS24.028	Contact Energy Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Contact opposes the relief sought as the objective provides for appropriate development and use within	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						SNAs, which could apply to critical infrastructure which can occur while maintaining or enhancing values of SNAs.	
FS25.025	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek considers this objective, with the relief sought, is necessary.	Accept
S139.014	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Oppose	Delete and replace ECO-O3 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.	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.	Accept in part
FS17.018	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the relief sought. It is assumed the submitter's point relates to ECO-O4, in which case more detail is provided than required and is more applicable to the mana whenua chapter.	Reject
FS25.027	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought in this submission extends beyond the requirements of the RMA, SRPS or NPSIB.	Reject
S130.055	Mercury NZ Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O3	Not Stated	Provide for appropriate subdivision, use and development within Significant Natural Areas where the effects can be appropriately managed . ~~values of the area can be maintained and enhanced.~~	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.	Reject
FS24.029	Contact Energy Ltd			Support	Allow	Contact support the relief sought as it recognises that activities such as renewable electricity generation activities can be appropriately located in SNAs when effects are suitably managed.	Reject
FS24.033	Contact Energy Ltd			Support	Allow	Contact support the relief sought as it provides greater clarity and recognition of the benefits of specified infrastructure.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS25.047	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission as alternative relief to that proposed within our submission.	Reject
S101.051	Transpower New Zealand Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Support in part	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.	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.	Reject
FS25.024	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek agrees that ECO-03 as drafted extends beyond the requirements of the RMA or NPSIB.	Reject
S85.020	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Support	We recommend that an additional objective is added to take account of section 3.16 in the NPS-IB	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.	Reject
FS25.026	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	We do not support an additional objective and do not consider this necessary	Accept
S126.081	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-03	Support in part	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 .	Amendments are required to this objective to ensure alignment with Policy 7 of the NPS-IB.	Reject
FS25.046	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Aligns with Stoney Creek's submission	Reject
S109.052	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-04	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports this objective.	Reject
S139.015	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems	ECO-04	Oppose	Delete ECO-04.	The narrow focus of the objectives on SNAs alone fails to give effect to the purpose of the Act, the NPS for	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		and Indigenous Biodiversity				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.	
S85.021	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Include a new sub point 'takes into account the principles (sic) to Te Titiriri' . Replace SNAs with "indigenous biodiversity" .	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 recognize that cultural values exist for all indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part
S115.083	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '	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.	Accept in part
S143.094	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						landowners. Consideration also may need to be given to appropriate compensation where protection / enablement of customary use comes at a cost to the landowner.	
S148.095	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '	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.	Accept in part
S60.085	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '	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.	Accept in part
S68.203	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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.	
S126.082	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O4	Support in part	Amend ECO-O4: 3. 'enabling customary use upon landowner consent '	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.	Accept in part
FS25.028	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	This submission is supported.	Accept in part
S110.026	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Amend	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.	This has been written before the release of the NPSIB, and needs to be updated.	Accept in part
S110.027	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Amend	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 and landowners, and notes that support will be provided from the regional council	This has been written before the release of the NPSIB, and needs to be updated.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					for mapping which must be completed by August 2028.		
S85.017	Environment Southland	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.		Reject
S109.048	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Overview	Support in part	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).	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).	Accept in part
FS9.35	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow		Accept in part
FS20.005	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	The plan must achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to relevant higher-order planning documents	Accept in part
FS25.017	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek submits that further work to implement the NPSIB should be paused until further direction is provided by the new Government.	Reject
S139.011	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-Overview	Support in part	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	The relationship of mana whenua with indigenous vegetation is recognised in ECO-O4 but is not discussed in the overview and purpose.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			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. "		
FS9.36	The Royal Forest and Bird Society of New Zealand Incorporated			Support	Allow		Accept
FS17.011	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not agree with the submitter's proposed inclusion of a new paragraph in ECO Overview. The amendment would provide far more detail than other areas of the plan and emphasises the approach of classing the entire district as a site of significance, which we oppose.	Reject
S109.053	Department of	ECO - Ecosystems	ECO-P1	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports this policy.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Conservation	and Indigenous Biodiversity					
S139.016	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support in part	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 (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	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 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.	Accept in part
S85.022	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support in part	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.	The current wording is not consistent with the NPSIB.	Accept in part
S126.083	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Accept in part
S105.020	Farm Manager - Wantwood Station	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Amend	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	This policy suggests that the whole Waterfall Range is an SNA-1 which is incorrect.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					areas that meet the criteria set out in Appendix 4; and 2. map and describe each specified highly mobile fauna area.		
S127.020	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Amend	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.	This policy suggests that the whole Waterfall Range is an SNA-1 which is incorrect.	Accept in part
S115.084	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Accept in part
S143.095	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Accept in part
S148.096	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Accept in part
S60.086	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Support	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Accept in part
S68.204	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P1	Support	Retain ECO-P1 as notified.	We support this policy as, again, we stress the importance of working in partnership with landowners	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity					
S104.020	McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Amend	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.	This policy suggests that the whole Waterfall Range is an SNA-1 which is incorrect.	Accept in part
FS17.020	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The submitter makes a valid point regarding Waterfall Range being considered a SNA-1 in entirety.	Accept in part
S112.068	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support	Retain as notified	Waka Kotahi supports these policies	Accept in part
S113.011	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S116.011	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S118.011	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S127.047	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S18.013	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S19.013	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S20.013	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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 ,	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					and/or formal legal protection. ...		
S24.013	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S68.015	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S115.091	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S143.102	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.	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.	
S148.103	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S60.093	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S68.211	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	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	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	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, farm fencing and/or formal legal protection.	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.	
S117.011	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
S3.011	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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. ...	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.	Reject
FS17.034	Federated Farmers			Support in part	Allow in part	Federated Farmers agrees with the submitters amendments as they seek the same outcome as the FF submission. However, we suggest including a separate definition for 'farm fencing' and this is still our preferred approach. Any amendments to ECO-P10 should reflect this.	Reject
S85.030	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	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...	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.	Accept in part
FS17.035	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers supports the Biodiversity Working Group and other non-regulatory measures to maintain indigenous biodiversity which are provided by clause 5.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S109.062	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	Retain ECO-P10 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): 9. Protect indigenous biodiversity by managing the vegetation clearance and land disturbance.	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.	Reject
FS25.049	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought is already captured in clause 1 of this policy.	Accept
S110.032	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	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 populations of specified highly mobile fauna across their natural range.	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.'	Accept in part
FS25.050	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek does not support the removal of "significant" from the policy wording.	Accept
S139.028	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Oppose	Combine with ECO-P7 (as amended in accordance with submission) and delete ECO-P10.	ECO-P10 appears to cover the same activity as in ECO-P7.	Reject
FS25.051	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek considers there are substantial differences between ECO-P10 and ECO-P7 and therefore seeks to retain ECO-P10 as a separate policy.	Accept
S126.090	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Support in part	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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.	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.	
FS25.052	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission.	Accept in part
S128.028	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support	No amendments	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	Accept
S130.060	Mercury NZ Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support	None specified.		Accept
S113.012	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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~~	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S116.012	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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~~	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject
S118.012	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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~~	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject
S127.048	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P11	Oppose	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows:	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			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~~		
S18.014	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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~~	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject
S19.014	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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~~		
S20.014	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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~~	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject
S24.014	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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~~		
S68.016	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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~~	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject
S115.092	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	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: (...)	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.	Accept in part
S143.103	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	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: (...)	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S148.104	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	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: (...)	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.	Accept in part
S60.094	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	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: (...)	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.	Accept in part
S68.212	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	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: (...)	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.	Accept in part
S85.066	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support	Support		Accept in part
S117.012	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					biodiversity offsetting.; and 4. Off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes		
S3.012	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Reject
FS17.036	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the proposed amendments, however it is noted that in our submission we recommend ECO-P11 only applies for indigenous biodiversity within a SNA.	Accept
S139.029	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	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 "	Policies should be explicit about the cultural values activities may affect.	Accept
FS17.037	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the proposed amendments as it is important that the PDP policies link to the mana whenua cultural values identified by the PDP in the mana whenua chapter.	Reject
FS25.054	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek supports more specificity in terms of "Cultural Values" but seeks that this only apply in circumstances where offsetting is being undertaken to	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						achieve a cultural purpose, as offsetting could be undertaken for other values or drivers.	
S109.063	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Support in part	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.	The D-G supports this policy but suggests amendments to align better with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Accept in part
FS24.035	Contact Energy Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Contact opposes the relief sought as the NPS-IB does not apply to renewable electricity generation activities and this is inconsistent with Contact's primary submission.	Reject
S101.055	Transpower New Zealand Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	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; (...)	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.	Reject
FS25.053	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports offsetting measures where these are proposed or agreed to by an applicant.	Reject
S126.091	Southland Federated Farmers of	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P11	Support in part	Provide a definition of residual adverse effects. Amend ECO-P11: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	New Zealand	Indigenous Biodiversity			effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity within an SNA where: (...)	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.	
FS25.055	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission.	Accept in part
S85.031	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	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.	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 release of all harmful animal species e.g. cats/birds etc that are not pests.	Reject
S115.094	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	Include a definition of exotic weed.	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)	Accept in part
S143.105	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	Include a definition of exotic weed.	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)	Accept in part
S148.106	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	Include a definition of exotic weed.	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)	Accept in part
S60.096	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	Include a definition of exotic weed.	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)	Accept in part
S68.214	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P12	Support in part	Include a definition of exotic weed.	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity				considered to be a weed by some while its growth is encouraged by others (especially within rural communities)	
S110.033	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Amend	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.	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.	Accept
FS17.038	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the proposed amendments to ECO-P12 as the submitter's proposed wording adds clarity for plan users.	Accept
S109.064	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	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.	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the Southland RPS however, it should not just be restricted to SNAs.	Reject
FS17.039	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the proposed amendment of ECO-P12 as it is not necessarily to broaden the application of the policy beyond SNA's	Accept
S139.030	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Oppose	Delete this policy.	The planting of plant pests or the farming of animal pests is managed under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Accept
FS17.040	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes deletion of ECO-P12 as it adds clarity for plan users.	Reject
S126.093	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P12	Support in part	Include a definition of exotic weed.	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)	Accept in part
FS25.056	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S3.007	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S130.057	Mercury NZ Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support	None specified.	Retain	Accept in part
S113.007	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S116.007	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S118.007	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P2	Oppose	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			~~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 ...		
S127.043	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S18.009	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S19.009	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S20.009	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S24.009	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S68.011	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S115.085	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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;	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	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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.	
S143.096	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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;	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.	Accept
S148.097	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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;	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.	Accept
S60.087	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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;	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	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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.	
S68.205	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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;	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.	Accept
S117.007	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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 ...	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.	Accept in part
S109.054	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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~~	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,	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~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.~~	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.	
FS5.34	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow	This is unnecessarily restrictive	Accept in part
FS17.023	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not support removing ECO-P2 as it enables farmers to continue farming practices within SNAs for various purposes. Some on-farm activities such as fencing within SNAs provide positive benefits for pest control and protection for indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part
FS14.016	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi			Oppose	Disallow	The submission does not provide suggested text. Given the New Zealand Transport Agency has an interest in this topic this submission is rejected until such time we see the suggested text.	Accept in part
FS25.030	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought in this submission extends beyond the requirements of the RMA, SRPS or NPSIB.	Accept in part
S110.029	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Amend	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	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).	Accept
FS5.35	Hamish Weir			Support in part	Disallow in part	suggest reduction of tone to "and alternatives have been considered".	Reject
FS17.021	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the proposed wording for ECO-P2 as it would unnecessarily restrict normal farming activities. Farmers must have reasonable use of their land.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						If an activity has a functional need to be located within a SNA it should not be unreasonably restricted. ECO-P2(4) already ensures that the activity has 'no more than minor effects on the significant indigenous vegetation of fauna habitat' therefore there is no justification to add further restrictions as the submitter proposes.	
FS30.070	Transpower New Zealand Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Transpower does not support the relief sought because the additional text may have the effect of elevating the values of an SNA over other values that are similarly important under section 6 of the RMA. That is, there may be practicable alternative locations for activities, but these locations may have cultural or landscape values. The proposed amendment may have the effect of preferring impacts on other values. Transpower is of the view that applying a test of operational need and functional need allows a consideration of the necessity of the location. Disallow the submission.	Reject
FS24.031	Contact Energy Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Contact consider the relief sought is too restrictive and may have consequences for renewable electricity generation activities, which often have a functional and operational need to be located in certain areas	Reject
FS25.031	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought in this submission extends beyond the requirements of the RMA, SRPS or NPSIB.	Reject
S126.084	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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;	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.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS5.36	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Accept
FS25.037	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of "maintenance and development" in terms of lawfully established activities.	Accept
S101.052	Transpower New Zealand Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	Amend Policy ECO-P2 (...) 3. The activity has a functional need or operational need to be located in the area; or 4. (...)	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 an approach is consistent with the direction in Policy 3 of the NPSET.	Accept in part
FS17.022	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought as the amendment is logical and adds clarity for plan users.	Accept in part
FS25.029	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of "operational need" in this policy.	Accept in part
S139.018	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS17.024	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not support the relief sought as the submitter's proposed wording does not provide for existing lawfully established activities.	Accept
FS25.035	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought is inconsistent with the requirements of the NPSIB.	Accept
S144.007	Contact Energy Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Not Stated	N/A	ECO-P2 does not suitably recognise that certain activities may be appropriate to locate within SNAs provided that effects are managed.	Reject
FS21.075	Yrless Limited			Support	Allow	Recognises the importance of infrastructure to communities. Amend to provide reference that certain infrastructure may be appropriate to locate within SNAs	Reject
FS25.034	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	This submission is supported	Reject
S112.064	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	Amend the policy as follows: 1. The activity has a functional need or operational need to be located in the area; or	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.	Accept in part
FS14.017	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi			Amend	Allow	NZTA wishes to note an error in its original submission in respect to this policy. NZTA incorrectly cited clause "1" in its submission on this provision; it should have in fact referred to clause "3". The text within the other text cited in the submission correctly reproduces clause 3.	Accept in part
FS25.033	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of "operational need" in this policy.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S85.023	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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.	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".	Accept in part
FS24.032	Contact Energy Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Contact consider the relief sought is too onerous and does not recognise that the NPS-IB does not apply to renewable electricity generation activities.	Reject
FS25.032	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought seeks to limit activities that have less than minor effects on indigenous biodiversity.	Reject
S128.024	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
FS25.036	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of "operational need" in this policy.	Accept
S101.053	Transpower New Zealand Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support in part	Amend ECO-P3 as follows: (...) Unless they relate to: x. The operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (...)	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 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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						reason, Transpower seeks that the Policy is explicit in excluding the National Grid.	
S109.055	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Accept in part
S112.065	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain as notified	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.	Accept in part
S85.024	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Not stated	This is consistent with the NPS-IB	Accept in part
S126.085	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development	Accept in part
S132.050	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain ECO-P3 as proposed.	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.	Accept in part
S130.058	Mercury NZ Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support in part	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;	The operation of specific infrastructure provides national benefits, but it remains unclear how a significant national benefit test would be applied in practice.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.		
S113.008	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part
S116.008	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;		
S118.008	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part
S127.044	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part
S18.010	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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:~~	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					... 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;		
S19.010	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part
S20.010	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S24.010	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part
S68.012	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part
S115.086	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development	Accept in part
S143.097	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S148.098	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development	Accept in part
S60.088	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development	Accept in part
S68.206	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	Retain ECO-P3 as notified.	SFF supports the need for provisions within the District Plan to protect SNAs from inappropriate subdivision, use and development	Accept in part
S117.008	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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;	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.	Accept in part
S3.008	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;		
FS17.025	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought. The submitter's proposed wording ensures alignment with the NPS-IB.	Accept in part
S139.019	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Oppose	Delete ECO-P3 and replace with new policy as per ECO-P2.	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.	Reject
FS17.026	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not support deletion as ECO-P3 provides important provisions to protect SNAs	Accept
FS25.038	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought is inconsistent with the requirements of the NPSIB.	Accept
S128.025	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Support	No amendments	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	Accept in part
FS25.039	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek does not support retaining the policy as notified.	Accept in part
S101.054	Transpower New Zealand Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Oppose	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: ..."	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S109.056	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Accept
S112.066	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	Retain as notified	Waka Kotahi supports these policies	Accept
S128.026	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	No amendments	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	Accept
S139.020	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Oppose	Delete ECO-P4 and replace with new policy as per ECO-P2.	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.	Reject
S132.051	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support	Retain ECO-P4 as proposed.	Supports providing for the management of adverse effects on an SNA from construction of infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit.	Accept
S85.025	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P4	Support in part	Remove ~~'but not the harvesting of trees itself'.~~	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.	Reject
FS17.027	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the relief sought as the amendment aligns with the Forest Act 1949.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S109.057	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S139.023	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Support in part	Add a new subclause 3 which reads: "maintains the long-term population and health of all taonga species listed in schedule XX."	There are indigenous plant species that are important taonga species found in SNAs, but which are not included in subclause 2.	Reject
S85.026	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Support	Support		Accept in part
S110.030	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P5	Amend	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.	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.	Accept in part
FS10.001	Port Blakely Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Unnecessary duplication, wilding pines from commercial forestry is already regulated by the NES-CF and the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan. Oppose the inclusion of the text into ECO-P5: "and 3. Does not	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						produce any wilding seedlings or ongoing control must be implemented within a 10km distance of the planting."	
S109.058	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports this policy as it is consistent with the NPS-IB and NPS-FM.	Accept in part
S128.027	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support	No amendments	Sets out a regime consistent with the NPSIB.	Accept in part
S85.027	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support	Support		Accept in part
S115.087	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	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.	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Accept
S143.098	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	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.	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Accept
S148.099	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	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.	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Accept
S60.089	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P6	Support in part	Amend ECO-P6: Promote the restoration of indigenous biodiversity by prioritising: (...) 7. initiatives by landowners, community groups	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.		
S68.207	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	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.	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Accept
S126.086	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	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.	Landowners are best placed to promote restoration of indigenous biodiversity on their land.	Accept
FS5.37	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Accept
FS25.040	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	This submission is supported.	Accept
S110.031	Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Amend	Add: 7. Land owned and/or managed by Council.	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.	Accept in part
FS17.028	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers agrees that the Council owned/managed land should be the first priority in promoting the restoration of indigenous biodiversity.	Accept
S139.024	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P6	Support in part	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~~	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 whenua anywhere in their takiwā for restoration should be a priority considering the duties local	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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 other priorities specified in regional biodiversity strategies, iwi planning documents or any national priorities for indigenous biodiversity restoration.	authorities have under s8 of the RMA & s.81 of the Local Government Act 2002.	
FS17.029	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers does not support the proposed wording. As drafted in the PDP, ECO-P6 aligns with the NPS-IB (3.21), particularly regarding restoration of SNAs whose ecological integrity is degraded.	Accept in part
S139.021	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Oppose	Delete ECO-P7 and replace with new policy as per ECO-P2.	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.	Reject
S85.028	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support	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.	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.	Reject
S115.088	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept
S143.099	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P7	Support in part	Amend ECO-P7: Protect, enhance and restore Significant Natural Areas by: (...)5. Supporting initiatives and enabling by landowners,	The key role of landowners in the protection, enhancement and restoration of land must not be understated.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			community groups and others to protect, restore and maintain areas of significant indigenous biodiversity.	Landowners must receive not only support from the Council, but also enablement in this task.	
S148.100	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept
S60.090	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept
S68.208	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept
S109.059	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	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)).	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).	Reject
FS17.030	Federated Farmers			Oppose in part	Disallow	Federated Farmers partially opposes the proposed amendment to ECO-P7 as we do not agree with the list of permitted activities listed in ECOR1(1)	Accept
FS24.034	Contact Energy Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Contact opposes the relief sought as this is inconsistent with Contact's primary submission and consider this requirement is too stringent for activities of national and regional significance such as renewable electricity generation activities.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS25.041	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek does not support an "avoid" directive for activities not listed in ECO R1(1), given the substantial limitations identified the rule wording.	Accept
S139.025	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	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; 4. 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 5. 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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					legal protection; and 10. Developing a Biodiversity Strategy to encourage non-regulatory assistance and landowner engagement."		
FS17.031	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the combining of ECO-P7 and ECO-P10 as the policies as proposed in the PDP are partially supported.	Accept
FS25.042	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	The inclusion of "indigenous biodiversity" in place of "Significant Natural Areas" fundamentally changes the directive provided in this policy, making it unnecessarily restrictive. However, the recognition of the benefits of farm management in terms of pest control and other biodiversity benefits, is supported.	Accept
S126.087	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P7	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept
FS25.043	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	This submission is supported.	Accept
S139.026	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	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"	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.	Accept in part
S113.009	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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		
S116.009	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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		
S118.009	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part
S127.045	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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		
S18.011	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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		
S19.011	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part
S20.011	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P8	Oppose	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			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	SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	
S24.011	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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		
S68.013	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S115.089	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)	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.	Reject
S143.100	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)	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.	Reject
S148.101	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)	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.	Reject
S60.091	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S68.209	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)	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.	Reject
S117.009	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part
S3.009	Stoney Creek	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P8	Oppose	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Station Limited	Indigenous Biodiversity			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	SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	
FS17.032	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers fully supports withdrawal of ECO-P8. It is our view that there must be a balance between recognising that some vegetation clearance is necessary and providing for this by managing effects. This is our preferred relief sought. The alternative option proposed is also supported. In our submission we make the point that ECO-P8 should apply only within SNAs. A similar point is made by Stoney Creek who state that as drafted ECO-P8 places an unfair onus on applicants for works outside of a SNA. Effectively, the alternative option seeks a similar outcome as the Federated Farmers submission which is to ensure that subdivision, development or use within the district is not unreasonably limited.	Accept in part
S109.060	Department of	ECO - Ecosystems	ECO-P8	Support in part	Retain ECO-P8 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): When assessing resource	The D-G supports this policy in general as it is consistent with the NPS-IB. However, At-Risk (Declining) species are	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Conservation	and Indigenous Biodiversity			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.	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.	
FS25.044	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	The relief sought in this submission extends beyond the requirements of the NPSIB.	Accept
S126.088	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Support in part	Amend ECO-P8: When assessing consents for subdivision, use and development within SNAs , avoid effects which will: (...)	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.	Reject
FS25.045	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission as alternative relief to that proposed within our submission.	Reject
S130.059	Mercury NZ Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	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		Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.		
S109.061	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	Remove policy P9	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.	Accept in part
S112.067	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support	Retain as notified	Waka Kotahi supports these policies	Reject
S139.027	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	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.	Policies should be explicit about the cultural values activities may affect. Subclause 6 is repetitive re effects on mahinga kai.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S146.038	Southland District Council	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support	None specified.	This provision addresses some siting of renewables and critical infrastructure.	Reject
S85.029	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	Change wording 9. 5 - remove word 'pest' and replace with ' invasive '.	Pest has a restricted meaning under the Biosecurity Act and its use here reduces the effectiveness of the clause.	Accept in part
S132.052	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support	Retain ECO-P9 as proposed.	KiwiRail supports this policy as it recognises when assessing resource consents that include Significant Natural Areas it is necessary to consider activities that provide for critical infrastructure. The policy allows the decision makers to consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation to offset any residual adverse effects that may remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied.	Reject
S113.010	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S116.010	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S118.010	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S127.046	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-P9	Oppose	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	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			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.	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.	
S18.012	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S19.012	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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; ...	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.		
S20.012	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S24.012	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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,	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.		
S68.014	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
S115.090	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S143.101	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S148.102	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S60.092	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					changes in understandings around good management practice. 10. If the resource consent application is for a lawfully established activity.	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.	
S68.210	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S117.010	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.		
S3.010	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	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.	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.	Reject
FS17.033	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers agrees with the submitter regarding all points made. The submitter's proposed wording relative to existing use is more detailed than that of our submission. It provides greater clarity for plan users than our proposed wording. It is crucial that existing use is provided for within ECO-P9.	Reject
S126.089	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Support in part	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.	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						address the complexities of environmental and social challenges effectively. It is also recommended that this policy provide for lawfully established activities.	
FS25.048	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports the relief sought providing for the maintenance and development of existing working pastoral farms, and lawfully established activities.	Accept in part
S101.056	Transpower New Zealand Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	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."	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.	Reject
S112.069	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	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	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						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.	
S128.030	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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	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.	Reject
S144.008	Contact Energy Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Amend	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.	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.	Reject
S124.024	Fire and Emergency NZ	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support	Retain as notified 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	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.	Accept
S130.061	Mercury NZ Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support	None specified.	The submitter supports the acknowledgment of critical infrastructure.	Accept in part
S105.021	Farm Manager - Wantwood Station	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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 ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S127.021	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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.	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.	Accept in part
S113.013	Trudy Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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)~~ ...	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(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,		

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.<i>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</i>		
S116.013	Nathan Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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 ClearanceActivity 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 upgradeof existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(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.		

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					...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. <i>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</i>		
S118.013	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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,	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(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	under the NPSIB). Therefore, Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~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.<i>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</i>		
S127.049	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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 ClearanceActivity 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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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)	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.	

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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. <i>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</i>		
S18.015	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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	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.	

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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. <i>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</i>		
S19.015	Karen Temple	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-R1	Oppose	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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			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	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.	

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.<i>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</i>		

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S20.015	Sarah and Peter Barclay	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~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. <i>NOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance</i>		

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					<i>and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023</i>		
S24.015	Helen McIntosh	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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~~	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~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		

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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		
S68.017	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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~~	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~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~~		

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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.<i>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</i>		
S115.095	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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 (...) <i>NOTE - 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.</i>	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	Reject
S143.106	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-R1	Oppose	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	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity			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 (...) <i>NOTE - 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.</i>	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	
S148.107	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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 (...) <i>NOTE - 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.</i>	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	Reject
S60.097	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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~~	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~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 (...) <i>NOTE - 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.</i>	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	
S68.215	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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 (...) <i>NOTE - 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.</i>	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	Reject
S117.013	Greg Bokser	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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	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.	

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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. 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		
S109.143	Department of	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-R1	Support in part	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	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Conservation	Indigenous Biodiversity			Discretion ... X. management of potential adverse effects through a Council Authorised Biodiversity Management Plan.	clear in the provisions about when these management plans may be required.	
S109.066	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
FS10.002	Port Blakely Limited			Oppose	Disallow in part	The submission is contrary to how territorial authorities should assess and identify SNAs under the NPS-IB. Reg 3.20 of the NPS-IB states that the mapping of areas used by highly mobile fauna is the task of the regional council, not the district council. Oppose the following submission to amend ECOR1(1) and ECO-R1(2), with the text in bold, 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 ECOR1(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.	Reject
FS17.042	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the amendments as it is important for farmers to be able to carry out reasonable	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						farming activities within a SNA. Further, unmapped areas which are not included in the Plan should not be treated as SNA's.	
FS30.023	Transpower New Zealand Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Transpower opposes the relief sought because including unmapped areas is not sufficiently certain in the context of a Rule such that plan users are unable to determine whether an activity is compliant with the rule. Disallow the submission.	Reject
FS14.011	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi			Oppose	Disallow	The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) does not support the suggested change in activity status from discretionary to non-complying. NZTA also does not support the suggested inclusion of unmapped SNAs. From our interpretation of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB), this request is inconsistent with, Subpart 2, Section 3.9(2) of the NPS-IB. Any new SNA needs to be spatially identified in the District Plan; it cannot be left to the landowner to determine this through criteria. This further submission applies to the other provisions in other chapters where the submitter has made the same submission points.	Reject
FS24.036	Contact Energy Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Contact consider the relief sought is too onerous for activities associated with critical infrastructure, where these effects can be suitably managed. Further, the relief sought is inconsistent with Contact's primary submission.	Reject
FS25.059	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek agrees that vegetation clearance within and outside SNAs should be treated differently, however strongly opposes to rules controlling vegetation clearance within "unmapped SNAs" that have not been through a consistent and transparent identification process.	Reject
S109.065	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	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. <i>NOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land</i>	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					<i>disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023</i>	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.	
FS5.38	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow		Accept
FS30.022	Transpower New Zealand Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Transpower does not support the inclusion of "but not extension" in Rule ECO-R1 because it is unclear what the amendment achieves. It is noted that the Rule must give effect to Policy 5 of the NPSET that states the following: "When considering the environmental effects of transmission activities associated with transmission assets, decision-makers must enable the reasonable operational, maintenance and minor upgrade requirements of established electricity transmission assets. Disallow the submission.	Accept
FS25.058	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek agrees that vegetation clearance within and outside SNAs should be treated differently, however strongly opposes to rules controlling vegetation clearance within "unmapped SNAs" that have not been through a consistent and transparent identification process.	Accept
S126.094	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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 (...) <i>NOTE - 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.</i>	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	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						mapping of SNAs must occur before treating areas as SNAs. See full reason on pg 61 of submission	
FS5.39	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Reject
FS5.41	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Reject
FS25.067	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission as alternative relief to that proposed within our submission.	Reject
S122.006	Fulton Hogan	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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.	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 SNAs 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.	Accept in part
FS5.40	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Accept in part
S3.013	Stoney Creek Station Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					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~~	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.	

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(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. <i>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</i>		
FS17.041	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the submitter's preferred relief to withdraw ECO-R1. Consultation with stakeholders will ensure that the rules achieve a balance between being workable for farmers and protecting indigenous biodiversity. The submitter's alternative relief is similar to that of Federated Farmers's submission. We agree with the	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						submitter that there should be a distinction between 'fences, farm tracks and farm infrastructure' (proposed as (i),(ii) and (iii)) and 'existing lawfully established activities' (as drafted as (a)). However, our preference is still to maintain a definition for farm fences. Therefore we support the submitter's alternative relief with the inclusion of 'farm fences' as opposed to 'fences'.	
S85.032	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Not Stated	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 <i>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</i>	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.	Accept in part
FS17.043	Federated Farmers			Oppose	Disallow	Federated Farmers opposes the amendments as farm fences should be permitted with no width for indigenous vegetation clearance specified.	Accept in part
FS25.060	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek opposes a maximum width for fencing, and considers the restrictions on paddock fencing to be untenable for existing pastoral farming activities. We do not support the removal of "structures" from (g).	Accept in part
S148.004	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading of existing infrastructure should be permitted.	Do not support the restrictions on maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading of existing infrastructure.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS25.057	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports permitted activity status for infrastructure.	Accept in part
S104.021	McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	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. <i>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</i>	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.	Accept in part
FS25.061	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support	Allow	Stoney Creek supports this submission.	Accept in part
S139.036	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	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);	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.	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					• 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;" <i>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</i>		
FS25.062	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Neutral	Disallow in part	Stoney Creek agrees with the submission point that vegetation clearance for farming activities is unduly restricted by the proposed rule wording, however disagrees with the relief sought.	Accept in part
S74.005	Hamish Weir	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Support in part	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 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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m practically required in width from those works in (i) (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vi), (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; (iii) planting for waterbody setbacks 4. An additional permitted rule for construction of mountain bike and hiking trails (i) works associated with construction of mountain bike and hiking trails that utilise natural features and ground profile	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.	
FS25.063	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of "practically required" in terms of 1(a).	Reject
FS11.044	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga			Oppose	Disallow	HNZPT acknowledges that the dominant land use within the district is agriculture and that the District Plan needs to enable sustainable primary production within appropriate zones. The previously stated activities will involve earthworks and land disturbance during establishment, maintenance, and use, which may affect identified and unknown archaeological sites. As stated in one of the submissions lodged, activities such as fencing require a significant amount of earthworks to provide a buffer for vegetation and allow heavy vehicle access for establishment and maintenance. Ongoing agricultural land use in areas that have undergone previous soil disturbance, such as ploughing, tilling, etc., are unlikely to encounter archaeology. However, earthworks or ground disturbance to areas that have been previously undisturbed, or go below the topsoil	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						have the potential to uncover archaeology. Activities within these areas should have sufficient triggers in the District Plan to create awareness of the plan users' potential obligation under the archaeological provisions of the HNZPTA. For activities involving significant volumes of earthworks, such as quarries, mines, commercial forestry, and renewable electricity generation activities, or areas that have been largely undisturbed, such as significant natural landscapes or features, the effects on archaeology require assessment and a permitted activity status is not appropriate.	
S138.001	Port Blakely Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Amend ECO-R1 to include the permitted activities set out in Reg 93(2), (3), (4) &(5) of the NES-CF; or Amend 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; or Amend the chapter to make it explicit that clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with a commercial forestry activity is regulated by the NES-CF.	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.	Accept
FS25.064	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek supports alignment of rules to higher order documents such as the NES-CF, provided that this does not unduly restrict other activities such as pastoral farming.	Accept
S138.002	Port Blakely Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Amend ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2) to align with the standards contained in the NES-CF	Reg 94 makes the activity restricted discretionary where the clearance does not meet the permitted conditions. Amend to align with the NES-CF regulations.	Accept in part
FS25.065	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek supports alignment of rules to higher order documents such as the NES-CF, provided that this does not unduly restrict other activities such as pastoral farming.	Accept in part
S138.003	Port Blakely Limited	ECO - Ecosystems and	ECO-R1	Oppose	Amend to allow for the maintenance of forestry tracks within SNAs, as set out in Reg 93 NES-CF.	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	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
		Indigenous Biodiversity				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 stringent standards than the NES-CF in relation to maintaining forestry tracks in SNAs.	
FS25.066	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek supports alignment of rules to higher order documents such as the NES-CF, provided that this does not unduly restrict other activities such as pastoral farming.	Accept in part
S155.001	MacKenzie Aviation Ltd	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Not Stated	Allow for track building and maintenance to be improved for agriculture aviation safety.	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.	Accept in part
FS25.068	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Support in part	Allow in part	Stoney Creek agrees that farm tracks are used for many purposes and need to be fit for purpose to ensure the safety of all users.	Accept
S69.005	Ian Davidson-Watts	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose in part	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. <i>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</i>	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.	Accept in part
FS25.069	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek acknowledges the intent behind this submission but considers it introduces unnecessary complication for users of the plan.	Reject
S109.068	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support	Retain as notified.	The D-G supports a non-complying status.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S139.037	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Oppose	Delete the rule.	Propagation/planting of pest plants and animals is managed through regional strategies under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Accept
S85.033	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Change to ' planting of exotic plant species unless allowed for by ECO -P2 '.	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.	Reject
S115.096	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~the~~ Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.	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.	Reject
S143.107	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.	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.	Reject
S148.108	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.	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.	Reject
S60.098	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~a~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S68.216	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~the~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.	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.	Reject
S128.071	Greenbriar Ltd.	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Oppose in part	Amend activity status to restricted discretionary A new rule be created for activities addressed in ECO-P4 - Discretionary	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.	Reject
S109.067	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Retain ECO-R2 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): ~~Significant Natural Areas~~ All areas	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.	Reject
FS10.003	Port Blakely Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Unnecessary duplication, wilding pine are already regulated by the NES-CF and the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan Oppose amendment to ECOR2 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): Significant Natural Areas All areas	Accept
FS5.42	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow	Too general and will add significant burden to resource consent processes	Accept
S126.095	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R2	Support in part	Amend ECO-R2: Planting of exotic weed species identified in ~~the~~ the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.	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.	Reject
FS11.050	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga			Oppose	Disallow	HNZPT acknowledges that the dominant land use within the district is agriculture and that the District Plan needs to enable sustainable primary production within appropriate zones. The previously stated activities will involve earthworks and land disturbance during establishment, maintenance, and use, which may affect identified and unknown	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						archaeological sites. As stated in one of the submissions lodged, activities such as fencing require a significant amount of earthworks to provide a buffer for vegetation and allow heavy vehicle access for establishment and maintenance. Ongoing agricultural land use in areas that have undergone previous soil disturbance, such as ploughing, tilling, etc., are unlikely to encounter archaeology. However, earthworks or ground disturbance to areas that have been previously undisturbed, or go below the topsoil have the potential to uncover archaeology. Activities within these areas should have sufficient triggers in the District Plan to create awareness of the plan users' potential obligation under the archaeological provisions of the HNZPTA. For activities involving significant volumes of earthworks, such as quarries, mines, commercial forestry, and renewable electricity generation activities, or areas that have been largely undisturbed, such as significant natural landscapes or features, the effects on archaeology require assessment and a permitted activity status is not appropriate.	
S139.038	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Oppose	Delete the rule.	Propagation/planting of pest plants and animals is managed through regional strategies under the Biosecurity Act 1993.	Accept
S85.034	Environment Southland	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	Change to domesticated/invasive animals unless allowed by Eco - P2.		Reject
S126.096	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	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.	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.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S115.097	Kevin Robertson	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S143.108	Rural Ratepayers Group	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S148.109	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S60.099	Ronald Crispin	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S68.217	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	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.	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.	Accept in part
S109.069	Department of Conservation	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R3	Support in part	~~Significant Natural Areas: All Areas~~ Retain ECO-R3 Activity status: non-complying	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.	Accept in part
FS5.43	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow		Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S109.005	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	effects management hierarchy	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the inclusion of this definition and alignment with the NPS-IB.	Accept
S130.002	Mercury NZ Limited	Interpretation	effects management hierarchy	Amend	Biodiversity Effects Management Hierarchy	Refine to hierarchy for management of biodiversity, which sets out tests where avoiding, remedying, mitigating cannot be achieved, and offsetting/compensating becomes a necessary tool. (REG) activities require placement in proximity to renewable energy resources, and there may be instances where offsetting or compensation is necessary. The submitter supports the principle, if flexibility is offered for REG activities across all significant values not just biodiversity.	Reject
FS30.050	Transpower New Zealand Limited			Support	Allow	Transpower supports the relief sought because it is appropriate to confirm the definition of 'effects management hierarchy' to the management of effects on biodiversity values. Such an approach is consistent with the rule framework and the direction given in higher order planning instruments. Allow the submission.	Reject
FS24.003	Contact Energy Ltd			Support	Allow	Contact support the relief sought as it provides clarity.	Reject
S3.092	Stoney Creek Station Limited	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S113.092	Trudy Bokser	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S116.092	Nathan Bokser	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S118.092	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S127.128	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S18.094	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S19.094	Karen Temple	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S20.094	Sarah and Peter Barclay	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S24.094	Helen McIntosh	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S68.096	John Baynes	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S117.092	Greg Bokser	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S148.198	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Retain as notified	The notified definition follows the national policy statement for indigenous Biodiversity	Accept
S126.025	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain as notified	The notified definition follows the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept
S3.093	Stoney Creek Station Limited	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S113.093	Trudy Bokser	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S116.093	Nathan Bokser	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S118.093	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S127.129	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S18.095	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S19.095	Karen Temple	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S20.095	Sarah and Peter Barclay	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S24.095	Helen McIntosh	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S68.097	John Baynes	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S115.026	Kevin Robertson	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain as notified	The notified definition follows the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept
S143.037	Rural Ratepayers Group	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain as notified	The notified definition follows the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept
S148.038	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain as notified	The notified definition follows the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept
S60.028	Ronald Crispin	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain as notified	The notified definition follows the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept
S68.146	John Baynes	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain as notified	The notified definition follows the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept
S117.093	Greg Bokser	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S109.006	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Retain as notified	Supports the inclusion of this definition and alignment with the NPS-IB.	Accept
FS31.005	Department of Conservation			Support in part	Allow	A minor error has been identified with this definition which requires correction in line with the NPS-IB as the definition refers to the National Planning Standards which does not contain a definition of indigenous vegetation. It needs to be corrected to refer to the National Policy Statement. Retain the definition as notified with the following minor amendment to refer to the NPS IB:	Accept
S104.015	McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Amend	Clarification required for the reasoning of having two definitions for vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance or amalgamate them together.	Hard to distinguish the difference between vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance.	Accept
S109.007	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Support in part	Amend as follows: means any activity that destroys, damages or removes means the clearing or removal of 'indigenous vegetation' by any means, including clearing, cutting, crushing, cultivation, covering, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning, or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.	Supports the proposed definition however seeks amendments to make it explicit that this includes any activity that destroys and/or damages indigenous vegetation.	Accept
S126.026	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means the clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, , burning or any other mechanical means. as well as mob stocking. It does not include grazing of pasture or improved pasture species in that area of indigenous vegetation.	As drafted, the definition does not provide for excluding grazing as it states 'clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means'. Farmers graze in and around areas of indigenous vegetation or indigenous vegetation may be scattered amongst pasture which may result in some of the indigenous vegetation being 'cleared' pursuant to the current proposed definition. Indigenous vegetation and grazing can co-exist and is often considered good management practice in terms of fire protection and assisting with regeneration. It is not clear what is meant by 'overplanting'. Where the vegetation is within areas of improved pasture, especially on hill country, overplanting (e.g. by helicopter) followed by grazing to trample in the seed is common practice and allows for pasture renewal. It is crucial that this be removed from the definition.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S3.094	Stoney Creek Station Limited	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S105.015	Farm Manager - Wantwood Station	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Amend	Clarification required for the reasoning of having two definitions for vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance or amalgamate them together.	Hard to distinguish the difference between vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance.	Accept
S127.015	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Amend	Clarification required for the reasoning of having two definitions for vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance or amalgamate them together.	Hard to distinguish the difference between vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance.	Accept
S113.094	Trudy Bokser	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S116.094	Nathan Bokser	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely		
S118.094	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either:Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S127.130	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either:Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S18.096	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either:Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S19.096	Karen Temple	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S20.096	Sarah and Peter Barclay	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S24.096	Helen McIntosh	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S68.098	John Baynes	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking,~~	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely		
S115.027	Kevin Robertson	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means the clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, , burning or any other mechanical means. ~~as well as mob stocking.~~ It does not include grazing of pasture or improved pasture species in that area of indigenous vegetation.	As drafted, the definition does not provide for excluding grazing as it states 'clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means'. Farmers graze in and around areas of indigenous vegetation or indigenous vegetation may be scattered amongst pasture which may result in some of the indigenous vegetation being 'cleared' pursuant to the current proposed definition. Indigenous vegetation and grazing can co-exist and is often considered good management practice in terms of fire protection and assisting with regeneration. It is not clear what is meant by 'overplanting'. Where the vegetation is within areas of improved pasture, especially on hill country, overplanting (e.g. by helicopter) followed by grazing to trample in the seed is common practice and allows for pasture renewal. It is crucial that this be removed from the definition.	Reject
S143.038	Rural Ratepayers Group	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means the clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, , burning or any other mechanical means. ~~as well as mob stocking.~~ It does not include grazing of pasture or improved pasture species in that area of indigenous vegetation.	As drafted, the definition does not provide for excluding grazing as it states 'clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means'. Farmers graze in and around areas of indigenous vegetation or indigenous vegetation may be scattered amongst pasture which may result in some of the indigenous vegetation being 'cleared' pursuant to the current proposed definition. Indigenous vegetation and grazing can co-exist and is often considered good management practice in terms of fire protection and assisting with regeneration. It is not clear what is meant by 'overplanting'. Where the vegetation is within areas of improved pasture, especially on hill country, overplanting (e.g. by helicopter) followed by grazing to trample in the seed is common practice and allows for pasture renewal. It is crucial that this be removed from the definition.	Reject
S148.039	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means the clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation,	As drafted, the definition does not provide for excluding grazing as it states 'clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means'. Farmers graze in and around areas of indigenous vegetation or indigenous vegetation	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, , burning or any other mechanical means. ~~as well as mob stocking.~~ It does not include grazing of pasture or improved pasture species in that area of indigenous vegetation.	may be scattered amongst pasture which may result in some of the indigenous vegetation being 'cleared' pursuant to the current proposed definition. Indigenous vegetation and grazing can co-exist and is often considered good management practice in terms of fire protection and assisting with regeneration. It is not clear what is meant by 'overplanting'. Where the vegetation is within areas of improved pasture, especially on hill country, overplanting (e.g. by helicopter) followed by grazing to trample in the seed is common practice and allows for pasture renewal. It is crucial that this be removed from the definition.	
S60.029	Ronald Crispin	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means the clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, , burning or any other mechanical means. ~~as well as mob stocking.~~ It does not include grazing of pasture or improved pasture species in that area of indigenous vegetation.	As drafted, the definition does not provide for excluding grazing as it states 'clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means'. Farmers graze in and around areas of indigenous vegetation or indigenous vegetation may be scattered amongst pasture which may result in some of the indigenous vegetation being 'cleared' pursuant to the current proposed definition. Indigenous vegetation and grazing can co-exist and is often considered good management practice in terms of fire protection and assisting with regeneration. It is not clear what is meant by 'overplanting'. Where the vegetation is within areas of improved pasture, especially on hill country, overplanting (e.g. by helicopter) followed by grazing to trample in the seed is common practice and allows for pasture renewal. It is crucial that this be removed from the definition.	Reject
S68.147	John Baynes	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means the clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, , burning or any other mechanical means. ~~as well as mob stocking.~~ It does not include grazing of pasture or improved pasture species in that area of indigenous vegetation.	As drafted, the definition does not provide for excluding grazing as it states 'clearing or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means'. Farmers graze in and around areas of indigenous vegetation or indigenous vegetation may be scattered amongst pasture which may result in some of the indigenous vegetation being 'cleared' pursuant to the current proposed definition. Indigenous vegetation and grazing can co-exist and is often considered good management practice in terms of fire protection and assisting with regeneration. It is not clear what is meant by 'overplanting'. Where the vegetation is within areas of improved pasture, especially on hill country, overplanting (e.g. by helicopter) followed by grazing to trample in the	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
						seed is common practice and allows for pasture renewal. It is crucial that this be removed from the definition.	
S117.094	Greg Bokser	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or removal~~ of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Reject
S109.009	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports this definition as it aligns with the NPS-IB.	Accept
S3.098	Stoney Creek Station Limited	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S113.098	Trudy Bokser	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S116.098	Nathan Bokser	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S118.098	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S127.134	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	Interpretation	maintenance of	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
			improved pasture				
S18.100	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S19.100	Karen Temple	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S20.100	Sarah and Peter Barclay	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S24.100	Helen McIntosh	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S68.102	John Baynes	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S117.098	Greg Bokser	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Accept
S104.017	McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Amend	Amend the definition as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (~~Waterfall Range~~) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance	The whole waterfall range is not identified as SNA1, waterfall range is predominately identified as an ONL.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.		
S148.002	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	SNAs to be mapped in collaboration with landowners before being included in rules. Further, if an SNA is not mapped, it cannot and should not have any restrictions on it.	Do not support unmapped areas in the definition of SNAs. Also, do not support regulation regarding SNAs which will see them become a liability on private land as this will have negative consequences for biodiversity.	Reject
S105.017	Farm Manager - Wantwood Station	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Amend	Amend the definition as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.	The whole waterfall range is not identified as SNA1, waterfall range is predominately identified as an ONL.	Reject
S127.017	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Amend	Amend the definition as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.	The whole waterfall range is not identified as SNA1, waterfall range is predominately identified as an ONL.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S113.105	Trudy Bokser	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA- (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant. (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject
S116.105	Nathan Bokser	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA-	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					_____ (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant. _____ (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and _____ (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
S118.105	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA- _____ (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant. _____ (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
S127.141	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA— (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant. (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
S18.107	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA— (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant. (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject
S19.107	Karen Temple	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA— —(b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.——(a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
S20.107	Sarah and Peter Barclay	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA— ——(b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.——(a) any area that, after 4	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
S24.107	Helen McIntosh	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA— (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant. (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
S68.109	John Baynes	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: ~~(a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA—~~ ~~(b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~ (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject
S115.049	Kevin Robertson	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2	SFF Does not agree with including areas meeting the criteria in Appendix 1 that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs. We also do not agree with identifying SNAs through	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council in partnership with landowners determines that it is not an SNA; or (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 and in consultation with the landowner . ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~	resource consent applications or Farm Environment Plans (FEPs). FEPs are not intended to be used as a trigger document for identifying SNAs. FEPs are farmer driven, created and funded, therefore tacking on a Council requirement which requires external experts adds complexity and cost for farmers. The cost/expertise to carry out SNA mapping should lie with central and local government, not individuals. FEPs could include a note of any SNAs evident on the land, but the actual process of SNA identification must sit outside of these plans. We remind the Council that identification of SNAs must be carried out in consultation landowners, as per ECO-O2: 'Work in partnership with Local Authorities, Government agencies, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas'. Full reason pg. 21	
S143.060	Rural Ratepayers Group	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council in partnership with landowners determines that it is not an SNA; or (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 and in consultation with the landowner . ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~	SFF Does not agree with including areas meeting the criteria in Appendix 1 that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs. We also do not agree with identifying SNAs through resource consent applications or Farm Environment Plans (FEPs). FEPs are not intended to be used as a trigger document for identifying SNAs. FEPs are farmer driven, created and funded, therefore tacking on a Council requirement which requires external experts adds complexity and cost for farmers. The cost/expertise to carry out SNA mapping should lie with central and local government, not individuals. FEPs could include a note of any SNAs evident on the land, but the actual process of SNA identification must sit outside of these plans. We remind the Council that identification of SNAs must be carried out in consultation landowners, as per ECO-O2: 'Work in partnership with Local Authorities, Government agencies, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas'. Full reason pg. 21	Reject
S148.061	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for	SFF Does not agree with including areas meeting the criteria in Appendix 1 that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council in partnership with landowners determines that it is not an SNA; or (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 and in consultation with the landowner . ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~	included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs. We also do not agree with identifying SNAs through resource consent applications or Farm Environment Plans (FEPs). FEPs are not intended to be used as a trigger document for identifying SNAs. FEPs are farmer driven, created and funded, therefore tacking on a Council requirement which requires external experts adds complexity and cost for farmers. The cost/expertise to carry out SNA mapping should lie with central and local government, not individuals. FEPs could include a note of any SNAs evident on the land, but the actual process of SNA identification must sit outside of these plans. We remind the Council that identification of SNAs must be carried out in consultation landowners, as per ECO-O2: 'Work in partnership with Local Authorities, Government agencies, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas'. Full reason pg. 21	
S60.051	Ronald Crispin	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council in partnership with landowners determines that it is not an SNA; or (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 and in consultation with the landowner . ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~	SFF Does not agree with including areas meeting the criteria in Appendix 1 that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs. We also do not agree with identifying SNAs through resource consent applications or Farm Environment Plans (FEPs). FEPs are not intended to be used as a trigger document for identifying SNAs. FEPs are farmer driven, created and funded, therefore tacking on a Council requirement which requires external experts adds complexity and cost for farmers. The cost/expertise to carry out SNA mapping should lie with central and local government, not individuals. FEPs could include a note of any SNAs evident on the land, but the actual process of SNA identification must sit outside of these plans. We remind the Council that identification of SNAs must be carried out in consultation landowners, as per ECO-O2: 'Work in partnership with Local Authorities, Government agencies, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas'. Full reason pg. 21	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S68.169	John Baynes	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council in partnership with landowners determines that it is not an SNA; or (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 and in consultation with the landowner . ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~	SFF Does not agree with including areas meeting the criteria in Appendix 1 that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs. We also do not agree with identifying SNAs through resource consent applications or Farm Environment Plans (FEPs). FEPs are not intended to be used as a trigger document for identifying SNAs. FEPs are farmer driven, created and funded, therefore tacking on a Council requirement which requires external experts adds complexity and cost for farmers. The cost/expertise to carry out SNA mapping should lie with central and local government, not individuals. FEPs could include a note of any SNAs evident on the land, but the actual process of SNA identification must sit outside of these plans. We remind the Council that identification of SNAs must be carried out in consultation landowners, as per ECO-O2: 'Work in partnership with Local Authorities, Government agencies, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas'. Full reason pg. 21	Reject
S117.105	Greg Bokser	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: ~~(a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA~~ (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~ (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
S109.016	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Support in part	Retain with amendments as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: ~~–(a) Areas identified as SNA 1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA 2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve).~~ Any area that is identified as an SNA on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not a SNA. (b) Any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with the criteria set out in Appendix 4. For the avoidance of doubt, a SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 that may not yet be identified on the planning maps including those identified at the resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.	The D-G supports the inclusion of this definition and alignment with the NPS-IB but suggests some minor amendments to improve clarity.	Reject
FS10.006	Port Blakely Limited			Oppose	Disallow	Contrary to how territorial authorities should assess and identify SNAs under the NPS-IB. Reg 3.9 of the NPS-IB is very clear that an area only qualifies as an SNA if the SNA is included in the plan through a plan change process, which includes a map of the area and details about its location Oppose changes to the definition of significant natural area: Widening the definition of a SNA to include: "For the avoidance of doubt, a SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 that may not yet be identified on the planning maps including those identified at the resource consent stage ...	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S126.048	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council in partnership with landowners determines that it is not an SNA; or (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 and in consultation with the landowner . ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.~~	SFF does not agree with including areas meeting the criteria in Appendix 1 that have not been mapped as SNAs. It is our view that until areas are mapped and included in the plan, they should not be considered SNAs. We also do not agree with identifying SNAs through resource consent applications or Farm Environment Plans (FEPs). FEPs are not intended to be used as a trigger document for identifying SNAs. FEPs are farmer driven, created and funded, therefore tacking on a Council requirement which requires external experts adds complexity and cost for farmers. The cost/expertise to carry out SNA mapping should lie with central and local government, not individuals. FEPs could include a note of any SNAs evident on the land, but the actual process of SNA identification must sit outside of these plans. We remind the Council that identification of SNAs must be carried out in consultation landowners, as per ECO-O2: 'Work in partnership with Local Authorities, Government agencies, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas'. Full reason pg. 21	Reject
FS10.007	Port Blakely Limited			Support	Allow	This approach aligns with the NPS-IB and recognizing how responsible landowners can act as stewards of indigenous biodiversity. Support changes to the definition of a SNA	Reject
S3.105	Stoney Creek Station Limited	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: ~~(a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA~~ ~~(b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4~~ ~~SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a~~	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					~~Biodiversity Covenant.~~ (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and (b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.		
FS17.099	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports this amendment as the submitter seeks a similar relief to that of our submission. The submitter's proposed definition more closely aligns with the intention of the NPSIB and the related NPS-IB definition. We do, however, emphasise the importance of landowner consultation and propose: (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPS-IB and landowner consultation;	Reject
S109.017	Department of Conservation	Interpretation	specified highly mobile fauna	Support in part	~~Has the same meaning as the NPSIB –~~ means the Threatened or At Risk species of highly mobile fauna that are identified in Appendix 2 of the NPSIB or listed in an Appendix to this plan or are identified in an assessment of effects or evidence filed during the course of a resource consent application.	The NPS IB sets minimum standards of protection for indigenous biodiversity (see NPS IB cl 3.1). Councils can manage effects on additional species of highly mobile fauna and their habitat to comply with their functions under s 31(1)(b)(iii) of the Act.	Reject
S85.109	Environment Southland	SUB - Subdivision	SUB- Additional provisions sought	Support	The inclusion of 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). Recognition of the GNS natural hazard report findings about natural hazards with subdivisions.	The current objectives do not adequate cover clause 3.16 and 3.20 of the NPS-IB.	Reject
FS5.115	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow		Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS20.011	Hokonui Runanga Inc			Support in part	Allow in part	The plan needs to achieve the purpose of the Act and give effect to higher order planning documents	Reject
S113.030	Trudy Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S116.030	Nathan Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S118.030	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S127.066	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S18.032	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S19.032	Karen Temple	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S20.032	Sarah and Peter Barclay	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S24.032	Helen McIntosh	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S68.034	John Baynes	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S117.030	Greg Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S109.095	Department of Conservation	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Support in part	Retain SUB-R1 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): 6. The site does not contain 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 or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature; ...	The D-G supports a controlled activity status for the various subdivision activities provided that the site does not contain a SNA or ONL or ONF but recommends the rule is amended to capture any unmapped SNAs or highly mobile fauna area that are assessed as significant. This provides clarity for plan users that the rule applies to any unmapped SNAs or highly mobile fauna areas that have been assessed as such during the resource consent process.	Reject
FS5.88	Hamish Weir			Oppose in part	Disallow in part	If the boundaries support an SNA by delineating it then it should reduce to at the very least restricted discretionary	Accept
FS14.012	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi			Oppose	Disallow	The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) does not support the suggested change in activity status from discretionary to non-complying. NZTA also does not support the suggested inclusion of unmapped SNAs. From our interpretation of the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB), this request is inconsistent with, Subpart 2, Section 3.9(2) of the NPS-IB. Any new SNA needs to be spatially identified in the District Plan; it cannot be left to the landowner to determine this through criteria. This further submission applies to the other provisions in other chapters where the submitter has made the same submission points.	Accept
S74.014	Hamish Weir	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R1	Support in part	Amend as follows: The ~~site does not contain a~~ proposed new boundary do not bisect a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature;	It is necessary to minimise costs relating to correcting discrepancies between land occupation and Cadastral Records. Allotments containing features are generally large in size and the feature is a significant distance from the proposed boundary adjustment. These boundaries may need to be aligned with SNA or ONL for management purposes, which these subdivisions could facilitate. Positive effects will arise when the proposed boundary delineates the SNA or ONL and adverse effects when the boundary dissects the SNA or ONL. The amendment would result in activities being controlled, reducing costs which will likely result in more uptake of subdivisions improving the alignment of Cadastral Records with land use and physical layout of the land.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
FS22.013	Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates			Support	Allow	Support. There is no reason to restrict boundary adjustments from controlled activity status just because there is an SNA or ONL within the same large site, if the SNA or ONL is not adversely affected by the boundary adjustment.	Reject
S109.097	Department of Conservation	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Support	Retain as notified	The D-G supports a discretionary status for subdivision within any area of an ONL, ONF or SNA.	Accept
S113.032	Trudy Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S116.032	Nathan Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S118.032	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S127.068	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S18.034	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S19.034	Karen Temple	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.		
S20.034	Sarah and Peter Barclay	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S24.034	Helen McIntosh	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S68.036	John Baynes	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S117.032	Greg Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
S3.032	Stoney Creek Station Limited	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R11	Oppose	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Reject
FS5.110	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Reject
FS17.057	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the amendment as it provides clarity for plan users.	Reject
S113.031	Trudy Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S116.031	Nathan Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S118.031	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S127.067	Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S18.033	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S19.033	Karen Temple	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S20.033	Sarah and Peter Barclay	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S24.033	Helen McIntosh	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S68.035	John Baynes	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S117.031	Greg Bokser	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
S109.096	Department of Conservation	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Support in part	Retain SUB-R1 with the following amendments (or words to similar effect): 6. The site does not contain 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)	The D-G supports a controlled activity status for the various subdivision activities provided that the site does not contain a SNA or ONL or ONF but recommends the rule is amended to capture any unmapped SNAs or highly mobile fauna area that are assessed as significant. This provides clarity for plan users that the rule applies to any unmapped SNAs or highly mobile fauna areas that have	Accept in part

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					species as listed in Appendix X or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature; ...	been assessed as such during the resource consent process.	
FS5.93	Hamish Weir			Oppose	Disallow		Reject
S3.031	Stoney Creek Station Limited	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R4	Oppose	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Reject
FS5.96	Hamish Weir			Support	Allow		Reject
FS17.056	Federated Farmers			Support	Allow	Federated Farmers supports the deletion of clause 6 as there is limited rationale to not offer controlled activity status to sites containing SNAs or ONLs.	Reject
S152.009	Nigel Cowburn	NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-R6	Support in part	Requests provision for removal of trees with a large DBH of 200mm non-complying, unless covered by NFL R6.2	This represents major canopy loss and attendant effects on catchment hydrology and visibility changes	Reject
FS25.107	Stoney Creek Station Ltd			Oppose	Disallow	Stoney Creek does not support non-complying activity status for vegetation removal.	Accept
S122.002	Fulton Hogan	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose in part	Either extend the reference so that it is clear that it references back to the NES-F, for example: "(i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or 49 of the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater Regulations 2020 "; or delete the reference to regulations 48 and 49. "(i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or 49;"	Fulton Hogan supports national consistency and using appropriate definitions from national instruments instead of creating a new definition. However, in this instance the definition has been taken from the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater regulations (NES-F), and cross-references to clauses 48 and 48 of those regulations. This cross reference do not make sense in the Gore District Plan.	Reject
S126.049	Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Support in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means (...) (c) does not include vegetation clearance which is ancillary to primary production activities, such as-- (i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or (...) (v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland. pasture maintenance; (vi) clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks;	SFF requests this definition be amended to specifically exclude vegetation clearance undertaken in association with day-to-day farming. We are concerned that the definition will still catch many instances of ordinary pastoral farming practice in which vegetation clearance may have to be undertaken on a day-to-day basis and trigger the requirement for resource consent unnecessarily. Examples of such vegetation clearance include: clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks, pasture maintenance, clearance of airstrips,	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(vii) clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, accessways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways; (viii) clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs; (ix) cultivation; (x) clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing; (xi) activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations; and (xii) clearance of ve	helipads, vehicle entranceways, access ways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways, clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs, pest plant/weed management, cultivation, forestry harvesting, pruning and thinning, clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing, activities undertaken for the purpose of establishing a fence line, maintaining shelterbelts (including cutting of shelterbelt roots, activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations, clearance of vegetation that is fallen or dead, activities undertaken within the boundaries of any area of land, and clearance of pest plants. Farmers should not have to incur unnecessary delay and cost for routine vegetation clearance which will result in no more than minor adverse environmental effects.	
S3.106	Stoney Creek Station Limited	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and (b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject
S104.016	McLeod-Wantwood Trust/Wantwood Station	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Amend	Clarify the reasoning for having two definitions or amalgamate them into one. Remove references to application of seeds from exotic pasture species as a method of vegetation clearance.	Hard to distinguish the difference between Vegetation Clearance and Indigenous Vegetation Clearance. The submitter queries the inclusion of 'applying the seed of exotic pasture species' as a method of vegetation clearance.	Accept
S105.016	Farm Manager -	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Amend	Clarify the reasoning for having two definitions or amalgamate them into one. Remove references to application of seeds from	Hard to distinguish the difference between Vegetation Clearance and Indigenous Vegetation Clearance. The submitter queries the inclusion of 'applying the seed of	Accept

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
	Wantwood Station				exotic pasture species as a method of vegetation clearance.	exotic pasture species' as a method of vegetation clearance.	
S127.016	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Amend	Clarify the reasoning for having two definitions or amalgamate them into one. Remove references to application of seeds from exotic pasture species as a method of vegetation clearance.	Hard to distinguish the difference between Vegetation Clearance and Indigenous Vegetation Clearance. The submitter queries the inclusion of "applying the seed of exotic pasture species" as a method of vegetation clearance.	Accept
S113.106	Trudy Bokser	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and (b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) ~~the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland~~	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject
S116.106	Nathan Bokser	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and (b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) ~~the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland~~	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S118.106	AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and(b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) ~~the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland~~	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject
S127.142	Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and(b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) ~~the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland~~	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject
S18.108	Reaby Downs Farm Ltd	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and(b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland		
S19.108	Karen Temple	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and(b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject
S20.108	Sarah and Peter Barclay	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and(b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject
S24.108	Helen McIntosh	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example,	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and(b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include- ... v) ~~the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland~~	terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	
S68.110	John Baynes	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and(b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include-- ... v) ~~the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland~~	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Reject
S115.050	Kevin Robertson	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Support in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means (...) (c) does not include vegetation clearance which is ancillary to primary production activities, such as-- (i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or (...) (v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland, pasture maintenance; (vi) clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks; (vii) clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, accessways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways; (viii) clearance around farm buildings and farm	SFF requests this definition be amended to specifically exclude vegetation clearance undertaken in association with day-to-day farming. We are concerned that the definition will still catch many instances of ordinary pastoral farming practice in which vegetation clearance may have to be undertaken on a day-to-day basis and trigger the requirement for resource consent unnecessarily. Examples of such vegetation clearance include: clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks, pasture maintenance, clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, access ways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways, clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs, pest plant/weed	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs; (ix) cultivation; (x) clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing; (xi) activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations; and (xii) clearance of ve	management, cultivation, forestry harvesting, pruning and thinning, clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing, activities undertaken for the purpose of establishing a fence line, maintaining shelterbelts (including cutting of shelterbelt roots, activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations, clearance of vegetation that is fallen or dead, activities undertaken within the boundaries of any area of land, and clearance of pest plants. Farmers should not have to incur unnecessary delay and cost for routine vegetation clearance which will result in no more than minor adverse environmental effects.	
S143.061	Rural Ratepayers Group	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Support in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means (...) (c) does not include vegetation clearance which is ancillary to primary production activities, such as-- (i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or (...) (v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland, pasture maintenance; (vi) clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks; (vii) clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, accessways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways; (viii) clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs; (ix) cultivation; (x) clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing; (xi) activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations; and (xii) clearance of ve	SFF requests this definition be amended to specifically exclude vegetation clearance undertaken in association with day-to-day farming. We are concerned that the definition will still catch many instances of ordinary pastoral farming practice in which vegetation clearance may have to be undertaken on a day-to-day basis and trigger the requirement for resource consent unnecessarily. Examples of such vegetation clearance include: clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks, pasture maintenance, clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, access ways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways, clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs, pest plant/weed management, cultivation, forestry harvesting, pruning and thinning, clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing, activities undertaken for the purpose of establishing a fence line, maintaining shelterbelts (including cutting of shelterbelt roots, activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations, clearance of vegetation that is fallen or dead, activities undertaken within the boundaries of any area of land, and clearance of pest plants. Farmers should not have to incur unnecessary delay and cost for routine vegetation clearance which will result in no more than minor adverse environmental effects.	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
S148.062	Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Support in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means (...) (c) does not include vegetation clearance which is ancillary to primary production activities, such as-- (i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or (...) (v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland; pasture maintenance; (vi) clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks; (vii) clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, accessways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways; (viii) clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs; (ix) cultivation; (x) clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing; (xi) activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations; and (xii) clearance of ve	SFF requests this definition be amended to specifically exclude vegetation clearance undertaken in association with day-to-day farming. We are concerned that the definition will still catch many instances of ordinary pastoral farming practice in which vegetation clearance may have to be undertaken on a day-to-day basis and trigger the requirement for resource consent unnecessarily. Examples of such vegetation clearance include: clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks, pasture maintenance, clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, access ways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways, clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs, pest plant/weed management, cultivation, forestry harvesting, pruning and thinning, clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing, activities undertaken for the purpose of establishing a fence line, maintaining shelterbelts (including cutting of shelterbelt roots, activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations, clearance of vegetation that is fallen or dead, activities undertaken within the boundaries of any area of land, and clearance of pest plants. Farmers should not have to incur unnecessary delay and cost for routine vegetation clearance which will result in no more than minor adverse environmental effects.	Reject
S60.052	Ronald Crispin	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Support in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means (...) (c) does not include vegetation clearance which is ancillary to primary production activities, such as-- (i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or (...) (v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland; pasture maintenance; (vi) clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks; (vii) clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, accessways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways; (viii) clearance around farm buildings and farm	SFF requests this definition be amended to specifically exclude vegetation clearance undertaken in association with day-to-day farming. We are concerned that the definition will still catch many instances of ordinary pastoral farming practice in which vegetation clearance may have to be undertaken on a day-to-day basis and trigger the requirement for resource consent unnecessarily. Examples of such vegetation clearance include: clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks, pasture maintenance, clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, access ways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways, clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs, pest plant/weed	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission on Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs; (ix) cultivation; (x) clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing; (xi) activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations; and (xii) clearance of ve	management, cultivation, forestry harvesting, pruning and thinning, clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing, activities undertaken for the purpose of establishing a fence line, maintaining shelterbelts (including cutting of shelterbelt roots, activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations, clearance of vegetation that is fallen or dead, activities undertaken within the boundaries of any area of land, and clearance of pest plants. Farmers should not have to incur unnecessary delay and cost for routine vegetation clearance which will result in no more than minor adverse environmental effects.	
S68.170	John Baynes	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Support in part	Amend definition and make any necessary consequential amendments: Means (...) (c) does not include vegetation clearance which is ancillary to primary production activities, such as-- (i) the removal of sphagnum moss for the purpose of a harvest in accordance with regulation 48 or (...) (v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland, pasture maintenance; (vi) clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks; (vii) clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, accessways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways; (viii) clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs; (ix) cultivation; (x) clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing; (xi) activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations; and (xii) clearance of ve	SFF requests this definition be amended to specifically exclude vegetation clearance undertaken in association with day-to-day farming. We are concerned that the definition will still catch many instances of ordinary pastoral farming practice in which vegetation clearance may have to be undertaken on a day-to-day basis and trigger the requirement for resource consent unnecessarily. Examples of such vegetation clearance include: clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks, pasture maintenance, clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, access ways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways, clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs, pest plant/weed management, cultivation, forestry harvesting, pruning and thinning, clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing, activities undertaken for the purpose of establishing a fence line, maintaining shelterbelts (including cutting of shelterbelt roots, activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations, clearance of vegetation that is fallen or dead, activities undertaken within the boundaries of any area of land, and clearance of pest plants. Farmers should not have to incur unnecessary delay and cost for routine vegetation clearance which will result in no more than minor adverse environmental effects.	Reject
S117.106	Greg Bokser	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:-	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation	Reject

Appendix B – Proposed Gore District Plan – Recommendations on Submissions – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter

Submission Point	Submitter (S) / Further Submitter (FS)	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Decision Requested	Reasons	Officer recommendation
					(a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and (b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over-planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob-stocking~~ , or draining away water); but (c) does not include- ... v) the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland	clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	
S136.005	Jenny Campbell	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Not Stated	Restore habitat for all, native species which are often on the endangered list. These cover native plants which are in turn habitats for our endangered invertebrates, birds and fish		Accept in part
S103.031	McNab Management Ltd	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Support	Support whole plan except for specific provisions set out in submission		Accept
137.001	Hugh Gardyne	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Oppose	Defer plan review until RMA reforms settled		Reject
S66.001	Groundswell NZ	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Oppose	Defer plan review until RMA reforms settled		Reject
S68.001	John Baynes	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	Withdraw chapter	Lack of consultation and impact of provisions that have immediate legal effect	Reject