

Appendix I: Table of submission points

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
6.1	Rodney Ranstead	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Significant Natural Area on the property at 149 Cogswell Road, Raglan.	When the submitter moved into the property 19 years ago, the entire property was barren other than approximately 10 old fruit trees (see photographs in submission). Over the 19 years, screening, shelterbelt and landscaping plants have been planted, native and exotics as well as firewood trees. These trees are not significant or natural and have been planted for a specific reason (see photographs in submission). The submitter would like to retain the right to remove these plants and trees for firewood or landscaping purposes.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.67	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
9.1	Elvin Priest	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Significant Natural Area boundary for the property at 524B State Highway 1, Tamahere by determining the correct boundary on-site.	The indicated boundary may be incorrect. If the boundary is to follow the gully edge, the boundary is incorrect up to 40m (The correct boundary should be determined on site). This was raised at a community open day in Tamahere.	Accept	33.1
11.1	Jihong Chen	Oppose	Amend the Significant Natural Area on the property at 996 Te Papatapu Road, Raglan, as the south area of the property is not a Significant Natural Area.	Natural habitat within property does not meet criteria for Significant Natural Areas as per criteria outlined in the Waikato Regional Council Technical Report 2017/36. Gently sloping knoll previously recommended as building platform via geotechnical report. Aerial photography has been used for classifying Significant Natural Areas from 2012 and this is not accurate. See submission for geotechnical report. There are no Significant Indigenous	Accept	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Vegetation and Significant habitats of Indigenous fauna.		
FS1293.68	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
12.4	Carl Ammon	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 3 Natural Environment to strengthen the requirement for development to protect and improve biodiversity.	In this section there is a positive focus. However it is timid and vague in its commentary. There is a pressing need to address problems such as climate change and ecological degradation. Need to address the harm caused in the past in the main urban centres, agriculture and forestry. Development rules do not drive the aims of protecting biodiversity. For example developers should be obliged to set aside and restore natural areas in subdivision proposals. Presently little effort is made and areas are not protected even where established. The submission uses examples of the Te Ahiawa subdivision which restored significant native plants, improved water quality and soil protection, but are not formally protected. Excessive development as a rule is harmful and leaves a legacy for the future. Those planning subdivision should have to meet very high standards of environmental care and restoration. The costs associated with development will save money in the future and avoid problems with sewage, storm water, water supply, traffic congestion etc. The focus of Significant Natural Areas is positive but is a drop in the bucket and hides attention on the wider issues of degrading the natural environment. The classification needs extending to all the main valleys and waterways from mountain to the sea.	Reject	5.2
FS1342.5	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 12.4.	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission but considers the notified policies and rules, incorporating	Accept	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>the amendments sought by FFNZ, will provide appropriate protection when required and more generally improve biodiversity outcomes across the district and region.</i>		
FS1276.216	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	For the reasons given in the submission, they would make the plan accord better with the purpose of the RMA. Climate Change is inseparable from the reset of the plan.	Reject	5.2
17.1	Leigh Thompson	Oppose	Delete the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area from the property at 454 Pencarrow Road, Tamahere.	No information has been provided on what this change relates to. No mention of what it means to property owners in an area that covers a large part of the Waikato Region. Concerned this will mean an increase in rates.	Reject	28.2
20.2	Glenn Morse	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Significant Natural Area overlay affecting parts of the property located at 63 Parker Lane, Pukekohe to become a Queen Elizabeth II Trust area. OR Delete the Significant Natural Area from 63 Parker Lane, Pukekohe.	The area identified has minimal significant natural vegetation. The area is mostly pine trees and 50% of the ground covering is covered in wandering dew. Adding the Significant Natural Area to about 40% of our land will not support the submitter's aims of building another house on the property.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1293.69	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
21.1	Anthony Hutt	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlay from the property at 154 Orini Road, Taupiri.	The Significant Natural Area has only been identified aerially. The areas in question are naturally flood prone. The area is predominantly mangroves, willows and pines, many of which are old and have fallen. Water is not flowing, but stagnant in times of severe rain or in dryer times, no water is present. Two representatives from Waikato Regional Council have visited the site and agree that these areas do not qualify for Significant Natural Areas's due to the nature of the foliage and the lie of the land. The Significant Natural Area	Accept	33.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				overlay would limit further building or subdivisions in the future. The foliage is old and diminished since the aerial photo was taken and will continue to diminish. The submitter would like to be able to develop and plant the area further without restriction.		
FS1293.70	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point be disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.5
30.1	Henk Ensing	Neutral/Amend	Amend the boundaries of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 383 Karakariki Road, Hamilton as outlined on the maps provided with the submission.	The notified maps do not accurately represent the Significant Natural Area, and there are more practical boundaries for Significant Natural Areas on this property.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.71	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
46.3	Marc ter Beek	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from 49 Swallow Lane, Tamahere.	The vegetation in this mapped area is of low quality and contains many invasive pest plants such as ivy, Jerusalem cherry, privet and other climbing and ground covering weed plants. A substantial part of the identified Significant Natural Area does not have any undergrowth and is used for animal grazing. The Significant Natural Area unnecessarily limits the future development of this land. The narrow mapped area along the southern boundary of the site comprises exotic species only	Accept in part	33.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS/293.72	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.1
48.1	Beverley Bell	Support	Retain the Significant Natural Area mapped at 108c Ferguson Road, Whatawhata and neighbouring properties.	The native vegetation is restored in part of the Significant Natural Area along a stream and wetland, and predator control is occurring. The increase in native bird numbers and plant coverage is noticeable. The restored area is under threat from stock roaming into the area from an unfenced neighbouring property, through which the Significant Natural Area also goes.	Accept in part	33.3
48.2	Beverley Bell	Neutral/Amend	Add a rule to require fencing of Significant Natural Areas to exclude stock.	The existing legislation on fencing generally and Significant Natural Areas in particular does not go far enough to protect Significant Natural Areas from roaming stock and their environmental damage. Requests to the property owner from neighbours and Waikato District Council staff, and supplying educational materials have not changed the situation. Waikato District Council should have the power to back up the requirement to exclude stock.	Reject	25.2
FS/386.36	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Accept	25.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1342.6	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow the submission point 48.2.	FFNZ fundamentally opposes this relief sought; it is inconsistent with the enabling intent of the RMA and is not required to achieve improved protection over SNAs across the district. The FFNZ submission introduces a range of options that, if adopted, would help to achieve those goals without isolating the landowners whose buy-in is required to achieve successful outcomes.	Accept	25.2
53.1	Ollie Kesing	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a significant natural area to allow harvesting of forestry crops of manuka, blackwoods, pines and other crop trees.	The SNA covers areas of cropping Manuka, black woods, pines and other crops within the property. Will create issues on harvest. Others cropping Manuka may be affected.	Accept in part	18.1
53.2	Ollie Kesing	Neutral/Amend	Amend the boundaries of the significant natural area of the property #2003926 at Old Mountain Road, Waitetuna to align with the areas already protected through QEII covenants (see submission for mapped amendments).	The SNA covers areas of cropping Manuka, black woods, pines and other crops within the property.	Accept in part	33.3
FS1293.73	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.3
55.4	Shelley Munro	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to not allow commercial or rural pollutants such as fertiliser plants near Significant Natural Areas.	Protect the quality of our degrading environment. It is this Clean Green tourism tag that keeps visitors coming.	Reject	25.2
FS1342.8	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow the submission point 55.4.	FFNZ considers the notified policies and rules, incorporating the amendments sought by FFNZ, will provide appropriate controls on land use activities to ensure any adverse effects on SNAs are avoided, remedied or mitigated as is appropriate.	Accept	25.2
66.1	Andrew Loader for First Rock Consultancy Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend the approach to identifying Significant Natural Areas to allow any land owner to challenge the designation of a Significant Natural Area until a physical	The submitter considers that adopting the approach as sought will allow Council to protect areas deemed to be of significance from	Accept in part	25.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			audit of the area has been carried out by a specified panel and confirmed that the designation is appropriate.	inappropriate use or development, while still allowing landowners the opportunity to contest the designation. The majority of the problems landowners have with Significant Natural Areas is around the designation of the area as a Significant Natural Area rather than the definition. Allowing a Significant Natural Area to be contested until a physical audit of the designated area has been carried out and confirmed that the designation is appropriate will remove the time constraints of the current approach and remove the need for expensive legal action by either landowners or Council. Landowners will only challenge a Significant Natural Area designation where they consider the designation is inappropriate so there is unlikely to be a flood of applications to contest it.		
FS1062.3	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Support and allow submission point 66.1.	• Important that SNA's are properly identified.	Accept in part	25.2
FS1340.2	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter agrees that the decision to declare any area as a SNA should be contestable by the landowners. Often, what is represented as a SNA on a planning map does not accurately reflect what is present at the site.	Accept in part	25.2
75.1	Mark Emms	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 126C Woodcock Road, Tamahere.	The vast majority of the vegetation is pest species. Although a large amount of privet has been removed over the years, there remains a large amount of blackberry, gorse, honeysuckle, willow etc.	Reject	33.1
FS1293.74	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept	33.1
FS1051.1	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed, as there is no part of the original submitter's property that could seriously be listed a Significant Natural Area.	Live next door to the original submitter, and agree that, where Waikato District Council has listed the property as an SNA, the vast majority of vegetation, is pest species such as privet, blackberry, gorse etc.	Reject	33.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
77.3	Colette Hanrahan	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 126B Woodcock Road, Tamahere.	The indigenous vegetation mapped is of extremely low quality. The vegetation contains mainly pest species including blackberry, convolvulus, alligator weed, privet, gorse, jasmine, blackwood etc. The only native trees and plants in the gully surrounding the submitter's house are immature ones that have been planted in recent years. See attachment to submission for photos.	Reject	33.1
FS1051.6	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed, as there is not part of the property that could seriously be listed as a Significant Natural Area.	The gully on the submitter's property has been designated as a Significant Natural Area by Council. This gully runs at the end of, and around our property, and is extremely steep, and overridden with pest species. The eradication of these pest species needs to be undertaken extremely carefully, as the soil is easily subject to erosion. The vast majority of the vegetation is pest species, including gorse, blackberry, honeysuckle etc. Any native plants that are still in the gully have mainly been planted by the submitter, and are still immature. The fact that the Council is even suggesting this land is a Significant Natural Area is ridiculous and laughable, were the consequences not so severe.	Reject	33.1
FS1293.75	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept	33.1
FS1059.3	Mark Townsend Emms	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	• Live next door to Colette and agree that most of the vegetation is pest species in the area noted as SNA.	Reject	33.1
78.1	David Lawrie	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Significant Natural Area on the property at 52B Mill Road, Pukekohe to match the true natural area.	The natural areas are incorrectly marked on the property. The natural area on the map includes barberry and forestry. The true natural feature has a QEII covenant over it.	Accept	33.8
FS1293.76	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of	Reject	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
80.1	Dean Van Ingen	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 384A Karakariki Road, Hamilton.	The Significant Natural Area identified on the property consists of two plum trees. There are no other trees within the Significant Natural Area that are on the property. See photos attached to the submission for further information.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.77	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Reject	33.3
80.2	Dean Van Ingen	Oppose	Delete the overlay 'Hamilton basin ecological management area' from the property at 384A Karakariki Road, Hamilton.	No reason provided.	Reject	28.2
90.1	Kevin Vickers	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Significant Natural Area for the property at 38 Hermitage Road, Waiuku to only include the covenanted bush.	When making a resource consent application for a subsidiary dwelling, Councils consultant planner notified the applicant that the subsidiary dwelling was located inside the Significant Natural Area overlay when it was proposed to be located on a grassed area outside the covenanted bush shown on the title. This resulted in unnecessary assessment due to the overlay rule 22.2.7. This could cause the applicant unnecessary expense and delay if consent is required in the future on the area outside the covenanted bush.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1293.78	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties.</i>	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
99.4	Peter Roberts	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlay, including from the property at 87 Rataroa Road, Miranda.	Council hires contract ecologists to justify their work. Significant Natural Areas are a Council grab at property rights. Identifying these areas is the beginning of a hidden agenda. Poorly identified Significant Natural Area, shows lusitanica forestry. Council should stick to its knitting (i.e. Roads).	Accept in part	33.7
FS1293.79	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Accept in part	33.7
100.1	Medihah Bardsley on behalf of The Bardsley No. 1 Family Trust	Oppose	Amend the area of Significant Natural Area through reassessing and reducing the area located at 31 Birchwood Lane, Tamahere.	Most of the area is immature native trees planted by the landowner that does not warrant Significant Natural Area status. The Significant Natural Area unnecessarily restricts the subdivision potential of the property.	Reject	33.1
FS1293.80	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and</i>	Accept	33.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
101.1	Martin Bloxam	Neutral/Amend	Amend the area of Significant Natural Area on the property at 13 Te Awa Lane, Tamahere to the area of natural wetland.	The area identified on the planning maps exceeds the area of natural wetland that is considered of significant value. There is a large wetland at the rear of the property which does have significant value. The area identified appears to be based on an aerial photo taken when trees had leaves. The trees are not native. They are pin oaks and swamp cypress planted 25 years ago. The land under the tree shade is grassed and maintained by mowing.	Accept	33.1
FS1293.81	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.1
102.3	Lawrence and Audrey Cummings on behalf of Waiawa Downs Ltd	Oppose	Amend the thresholds for earthworks within a Significant Natural Area in Rule 22.2.3 PI (i) and (ii) Earthworks - Significant Natural area, to 200m3 volume and 800m2 area.	There is an existing farm track dissecting the Significant Natural Area and the amended thresholds would be more appropriate for maintaining this. Need more flexibility to cater for the characteristics of this particular property.	Accept in part	20.2
104.1	Tim Newton	Neutral/Amend	Amend the size of the proposed Significant Natural Area located on the property at 1665 Whaanga Road, Raglan to reflect areas of significant ecological value, as shown on the map attached to the submission.	Parts of the proposed Significant Natural Area are of low ecological value. Comprises recently regenerated Kanuka as well as exotic species and pest species including woolly nightshade and gorse. This area has been sustainably farmed for the past 100 years. These areas are important parts of the farm and the loss of these productive areas will seriously impact on the economic value of the farm. There are areas of vegetation that are of greater significance (see the map attached to the submission for further detail).	Accept in part	33.3
FS1293.82	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of	Accept in part	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
104.2	Tim Newton	Neutral/Amend	Amend the area of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 1665 Whaanga Road to exclude existing farm tracks.	To ensure sustainable farm operations can continue.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.83	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Reject	33.3
104.3	Tim Newton	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area by deleting "5m3" and replacing it with "1 per cent" AND Delete the words "outside the coastal environment" from Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	5m3 is insufficient to provide for the heating needs of farms, especially those with more than one dwelling. A 1 per cent allowance would have no adverse effects on sustainable management of the resource or on ecological values. Excluding the coastal environment from the firewood allowance is unnecessary and unreasonable.	Accept in part	18.3
FS1340.30	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	<i>The submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	Accept in part	18.3
FS1377.37	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	<i>HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	Accept in part	18.3
FS1007.3	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	18.3
104.5	Tim Newton	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, to permit earthworks to construct new tracks through Significant Natural Areas.	Rule 22.2.3.3 is silent about construction of new tracks in Significant Natural Areas. New tracks should be permitted to enable farming operations and farm development.	Reject	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1007.1	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Reject	20.2
104.6	Tim Newton	Neutral/Amend	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 1109 Whaanga Road, Raglan to reflect areas of significant ecological value worthy of protection.	Wish to ensure any further sites removed from current farming land use are surveyed and verified as worthy of protection. Some areas included in the proposed Significant Natural Area has been cleared regularly and is used for grazing stock. Areas typically around streams, gullies and significant natural diversity should be preserved. This property and neighbouring properties need to continue to be managed as working farms. Wish to work with Council to identify the truly significant natural areas on the farm and ensure it does not interfere with practical farm operations or compromise stock welfare.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.84	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
FS1007.4	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept	33.3
113.1	Dianne Murdoch	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission refers to Significant Natural Areas and provides an annotated map.	See map attached to submission for further detail. The areas highlighted in red are already covenanted, as are the rest of the trees on the property at 60 Kidd Road, Waiuku. These areas are already fenced.	Accept in part	32.3
FS1293.85	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	32.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
125.1	Guy Rathbone for Dunholme Farm	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 5254 Highway 22, Waingaro.	<p>The submitter had attended a meeting at the council in 2015 and was assured that they did not have any significant areas on the farm. 91% of what the submitters produce is exported. By protecting Manuka and Kanuka, both, which are very fast growing and spreading each year, restricts the farm use and production. Both Manuka and Kanuka protect and allow gorse, blackberry, privet, tobacco and heather to become established and spread under the cover of this environment. The submitter has controlled the spread of Manuka and Kanuka by using scrub cutter bars and not burning these plants - unlike other farms in the area. There is now over 500 Totara trees and other native trees, plus exotic trees they have planted. This is because they did not burn areas and did not clear all native trees, as they have more than protected native trees for future generations. In comparison to other cut and burn farms the submitter is now being penalised under the Significant Natural Area proposal. The submitter asks for their steady plan of control to be allowed so they can continue to be viable in the future and carry on protecting native trees. Farmers are being penalised by this scheme compared to other farmers who have burnt all trees and now have all their farm cleared and in pasture. By the Council imposing the proposed Significant Areas plan and telling farmers they are unable to control the re growth of Manuka and Kanuka, this is reducing the grazing land available to help increase the sheep numbers, which in turn will increase the export returns of the country. The submitter is a member of the NZ Tree Crops Association so is committed to the preservation of native trees for future generations and should be allowed to continue to preserve the countries heritage.</p>	Accept in part	33.4
FS/293.86	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an	Accept in part	33.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
126.1	Bonita Dean	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 523 Waingarō Road, Ngaruawahia.	The quality of the bush is low as it is regenerated tea tree and planted gum trees to prevent erosion (see the photos attached to the submission for further detail). It also includes undesirable species such as pine and pest species such as gorse and blackberry. Part of the mapped area is pasture. The land does not have any vegetation that has significant value as defined in the policy for significant natural areas. There will be a detrimental effect on farming activities through loss of productive area. The substantial fencing area costs would far outweigh the quality of the vegetation identified for protection. There would be no benefit in protection; only unjustified costs to the landowner.	Accept in part	33.4
FS/293.87	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Accept in part	33.4
132.1	Brett Harvey for B&A Harvey Ltd	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from all B & A Limited Properties, Te Kauwhata.	Render the land incapable of reasonable use. The land and values have been protected for as long as the family have owned it and there is no need for identification of a Significant Natural Area on the site. Negative effect on the land values and workability. Council can purchase property if it wants it to be a Significant Natural Area (refers to a property in the middle of Lake Waikare which is for sale). The submitter is concerned that Council is trying to steal the natural areas.	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS/293.88	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.6
135.1	John & Roselei Holland	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 368 Riverview Road, Huntly.	The bush is not high quality as it is a remnant of previously logging. The adjacent Aggregate Extraction Area and Aggregate Resource Area will be compromised by the Significant Natural Areas as the rock resource provides economic, social and environmental benefits to the district as per Objective 5.4.1.	Reject	33.5
FS/293.89	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept	33.5
153.1	Michael Shen	Neutral/Amend	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area at 68 Brown Road, Tuakau, to extend no further than the area to which the existing Conservation Covenant applies (see map attached to the submission for further information). OR Amend Rule 22.4.1.6 to allow for additional subdivision entitlement for the legal protection of any Significant Natural Area that is not subject to an existing conservation covenant. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide any alternative, additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.	Gives the landowner an incentive to legally protect the remaining half of the Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS/293.90	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
160.1	Anthony Armstrong	Not Stated	Delete the Significant Natural Area at property number 2018784, Kakakariki Road, Hamilton.	This was man made with pussy willow covering the dug out area for a duck pond approximately 10 years ago (see photos attached to the submission). The credibility of the SNAs initial identification need verification. Students were hired for holiday work to scout the district and identify what they thought were areas of SNA. They were not qualified to identify these. The Council then took this information as credible.	Accept in part	33.3
FS/293.91	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.3
176.1	Isobel Waitere	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from 511 Wharf Road, Te Akau South.	This land has been in the submitter's family for close to 100 years. In this time the submitter has protected it themselves and would like to continue to do so. A Covenant protecting the bush is already in place following a subdivision around 30 years ago.	Accept in part	33.4
FS/293.92	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant	Accept in part	33.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.		
202.1	Tom Hockley	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.2.2(b) Identify and Recognise, to ensure that the proposed Significant Natural Areas related regulations are only accepted with the full voluntary participation of the landowner.	<p>The proposed Plan, as it is currently presented, effectively removes a significant degree of the submitters rights and amenity over/of the land they purchased, without appropriate compensation.</p> <p>Previous correspondence from the Council recognised that "The reason many of these areas still exist is because past generations of farmers and landowners valued and looked after them." The submitters now find it perplexing that they are no longer trusted to continue that approach without coercion.</p> <p>The imposition of the proposed SNAs significantly devalues the affected properties. The submitter purchased this land because other properties had similar encumbrances.</p> <p>Landowners also have plans. In the submitters' case, forestry and agriculture are options that they have considered, but chose to leave that portion of land in order to enjoy it as it is. There seems to be no recognition in the proposed Plan of the fact that landowners have made commitments and investments, in accordance with their own (heretofore) legitimate and responsible plans, which are now considered illegal.</p> <p>This approach is counterproductive.</p> <p>The best means of achieving conservation is by the acquisition of suitable land tracts, zoning and caring for them appropriately. By these means, all ratepayers would then share the cost burden, and all would be able to share the enjoyment of visiting those areas. Other alternatives include the "Bush Tenancy" method recently used in Victoria, Australia. That arrangement protects large eligible tracts of land by voluntary contracts. The economic benefits of this dwarf carbon-tax scenarios.</p>	Accept in part	9.1
FS1062.21	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 202.1 in its entirety.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important that landowners rights and amenity value is maintained. • Important appropriate compensation is given if they are affected by 	Accept in part	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1267.1	Dermot Murphy	Support	I seek that the whole of the submission be allowed - see attached.	<p>designations.</p> <p>I would like to make a late submission on the proposed Waikato district plan and I would also like to make a further submission in support of submitter 202, Tom Hacklev in respect of point 3.2.2.b. Both concern the same matter. The decision he requested was that 3.2.2(b) be added to, or additional clauses be made, that ensure that the proposed SNA related-regulations are only accepted with the full voluntary participation of the owner. I support this proposed amendment to 3.2.2(b) because without owner participation and agreement the council is likely to alienate land owners. If there is a disagreement there needs to be a mechanism for agreeing the classification between council and landowner. In short, an SNA and SAL classification by the council extinguishes certain property rights that the owner has to its resource for the public good without compensation. I currently disagree with the council as to the size of the area they have classified as an SNA and SAL on my property and I describe it below. My submission I have a property at 243 Frost Road of 289.6ha of which approx 80ha has been classified a significant natural area (SNA) and approx 82ha has been classified a significant amenity landscape (SAL). I contest both classifications in part and would like them amended on the proposed WDC map. My submission is that the SNA and SNL overlays placed on 243 Frost road under the proposed WDC plan be amended as follows: The decision I would like is that the: The approx 80ha of SNA be amended to a reduced size of approx. 26ha; and The approx 82ha of SAL be amended to a reduced size of approx 26ha. Please refer to the map attached to see the areas described above. My reasoning is as follows: The proposed WDC plan has the entire 80ha classified as a significant natural area. I agree that a substantial part certainly meets the threshold in Appendix 2. However, a substantial part I believe does not. I understand and support the importance of preserving mature stands of native trees and would like in the future to retire approximately 26 ha under the protection of a legal covenant. This 26ha consists of: 1) Approximately 25ha at the southern end which</p>	Accept in part	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>consists of two fine stands of indigenous trees; along with 2) Approximately tha at the northern end (another stand of indigenous trees) (please refer the attached map) The balance area of 54ha is mainly alder forest, open areas, access tracks and drains. The alder trees are not indigenous and are weed trees, hence the area shouldn't be classified as an SNA or SAL. I propose retiring the approximately 26 ha under the protection of a legal covenant in exchange that the balance area of 54ha is deleted on the WDC plan as an SNA and SAL. Brief background I have owned the property at 243 Frost Road for nearly 40 years and have been under 3 different councils over this period, Raglan, Franklin and now Waikato District Council. The property is run as a bull beef finishing farm. I have improved the property considerably over this period and consider myself a good custodian of the land. The property at 243 Frost Road is made up of 2 parcels: Allot 99N1 Onewhero parish 211.8ha & Pt Allot 99J2B Onewhero Parish 77.8h Total area 289.6ha Of this, roughly 82ha is outside the stopbank and 207ha is inside the stopbank. Under the proposed Waikato District Plan map, two overlays that have been placed on the property. They are: 1) Significant amenity landscape (SAL) - approx 82ha & 2) Significant natural area (SNA) -approx 80ha (which is a slightly smaller area but pretty much the same area) Brief summary of the area classified as an SNA and SAL 1) The area occupies about 80ha of the left bank of the Waikato River roughly 15km upstream from the river mouth. 2) The area consists of forested areas (both indigenous and alder), open areas, access tracks and drains. 3) The area is flat with some low sandy ridges. 4) The forested area is mainly an alder canopy but there are some fine indigenous stands of Kahikatea interspersed with Puriri, Nikau and Pukatea on the southern boundary. There is also a small stand of native kahikatea trees at the northern end. 5) The area is outside the stopbank and floods when the river is in flood. 6) The area has been leniently grazed with stock for 40 years. The area classified SNA and SAL has enormous potential for various end uses including: 1) For conservation The area that I propose to retire would be approximately 2.5ha at the southern end</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>which consists of two fine stands of indigenous trees along with approximately 1ha at the northern end (another stand of indigenous trees) 2) For agriculture/horticulture The balance land of 54ha comprising the alder canopy and open areas is very fertile and flat. It has versatile high class soils that would be excellent for any number of uses. 3) For sand extraction The balance area of 54ha may contain significant deposits of sand. Future investigations will determine the extent of the deposit underneath but if it is under an SNA and/or SAL this will constrain the ability to make this a future extraction site. A source of sand relatively close to local markets will help to meet the anticipated population growth and urban expansion in the Waikato and Auckland region. 4) Freshwater fish farming, tourism, more conservation etc. Property rights 1) I agree that the 26ha area that I intend to covenant in the future be called an SNA and SNL. 2) However I would like the SNL and SNA classification deleted off the balance area of 54 ha (80ha less 26ha covenant) due to it not having any indigenous trees. 3) By placing the area under an SNL and SNA the council wishes to extinguish certain property rights to the resource for the public good without compensation to the private land owner. 4) "Farmers have a legitimate right to be able to use their land resource in a way that meets their social and economic wellbeing. This includes being able to respond to a range of variables including economic drivers and market trends." (Federated Farmers) 5) I have current and future plans for the area that are different to the council's plans for it. 6) "Private property rights do not conflict with human rights. They are human rights. Private property rights are the rights of humans to use specified goods and to exchange them. Any restraint on private property rights shifts the balance of power from impersonal attributes toward personal attributes and toward behaviour that political authorities approve. That is a fundamental reason for preference of a system of strong private property rights: private property rights protect individual liberty." (Armen A. Alchian) Council process of identifying SNA and SNL areas 1) There has been no discussion or agreement with me about the area to be placed under these classifications.</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>There should be meaningful consultation and agreement with the owner over classifications. 2) There should be ground-truthing to establish what is currently there. Landscapes change over time.</i>		
232.1	Mark Mathers	Not Stated	No decision sought (annotated map of proposed Significant Natural Area at 536 Wainui Road Raglan, photos and video footage provided).	No reasons stated.	Accept in part	33.3
235.2	Phyllis Luders on behalf of P.M. Luders Family Trust	Not Stated	Delete Significant Natural Areas from planning maps OR Add reason why they are deemed Significant Natural Areas AND Provide provisions to the effect that Waikato District Council will fund any fencing/pest control that may be required in the future and agree to give in return one additional title per Significant Natural Area.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	33.6
240.1	Steve Kirkbride	Oppose	Delete Significant Natural Area from the property at 35 Kakarariki Valley Road.	The area on the property identified as a Significant Natural Area contained gorse, privet and hawthorn and has since been cleared and planted in grass.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.93	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the whole submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
246.3	Tony Oosten	Oppose	Amend Appendix 29:6 Biodiversity Offsetting so that the use of biodiversity offsets is the last resort and the area is 200% of the impacted area.	Biodiversity offsets are not equivalent in quality to the original existing areas of biodiversity as it is impossible to replicate the exact geological and climatic conditions as well as relocate all species of flora and fauna.	Reject	27.2
FS1276.1	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Habitats important for ecology have largely been lost and further loss should be avoided.	Reject	27.2
FS1340.34	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes 246.3 as a Biodiversity Offset	Accept	27.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>should be proposed on a qualitative basis not a quantitative basis. Assigning a value of 200% would not necessarily capture, and respond appropriately, to the values that are being impacted by a proposal.</i>		
257.3	Stuart Chisnall on behalf of Estate of Alwynne McDonald Chisnall	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.8 (PI) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area to allow farmers to maintain productive pastures by controlling non-pasture species.	The rule unreasonably restricts the ability of farmers to maintain productive pasture in accordance with ordinary farming practices, outside Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	22.2
261.3	Rita Carey	Oppose	Amend the approach to Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes through the following: Council purchase the land; Council to fund fencing; Council to maintain those areas or promote acknowledgement of the areas; Reward landowners for past care; Create an incentive programme for future care; and Initial capital outlay such as fences be at Council cost.	Appears the council is determined to penalize, persecute and generally make life and business difficult for land owners for having areas of 'national treasure' on their land. Will have to argue with lawyers at a huge cost in the future if ever it is necessary to do something in and around those areas. Appears to the submitter council want to take land from them but expect them to pay for the upkeep. Purchased land legally and should be able to do with it what they like. If council want it, they should purchase it of the submitter at riverfront, riparian right prices and pay for the upkeep themselves.	Reject	25.2
268.1	Warwick Cheyne	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.3.3 Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas.	Submitter proposes if they were to have an access track through an Significant Natural Area proposed area it will be problematic to maintain, which becomes a health and safety issue. Under the proposal, on a track approximately 3.5m wide, the submitter will only be allowed to do maintenance on around 80m in length per year. The track is around 200m long and submitter questions whether they will have to do maintenance over a 3 year period.	Accept	20.2
268.3	Warwick Cheyne	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	Total of 1000m2 seems overly restrictive. Could result in land outside an Significant Natural Area becoming incapable of reasonable use as persistent invasive weeds (e.g. Manuka, Totara and Tutu) encroach on the pasture. Not clear to submitter what 'outside an Significant Natural Area' means. Submission questions how the Waikato District Council seeks to place restrictions what can be done on	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				their land, beyond specific Significant Natural Area land they are interested in.		
FS1340.35	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	<i>The submitter opposes submission point 268.3 as deletion of the rules for indigenous vegetation clearance inside an SNA in the Rural Zone would result in uncertain direction for this activity.</i>	Accept	21.1
268.4	Warwick Cheyne	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from property number 1003679 until there are clear benefits to the landowner in having this on their property. The submitter outlines options which Council could have explored before notifying the proposed plan: Petition the government using the local government association to restore tradeable carbon credits on stands of native timber of 2 hectares or more. Transferable titles, with not less than one transferable title per hectare of land taken 100% rates relief from those areas affected by designations Council to lease the Significant Natural Area Council to pay landowners per year based on the area of Significant Natural Area to preserve it	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No wish to have this designation on the property. • The submitter wishes to have a free title on their property with all their entitlement's privileges • Having native timber as carbon credits would do more to preserve these stands than any threats and/or theft by zoning. • Submitter questioned the use of the word "significant" and whether this word adds value to their land. • Submitter questioned who benefits from a Significant Natural Area • Council appears to be penalising farmers who early on decided to keep the bush on their property rather than applying for a subsidy from the government to remove it. • Patches of bush are useful as shelter for stock in rough and hot weather, and are a source of firewood or building materials. • There are risks, as in all businesses, in choosing the right use for the land in question. How to utilise the resource so it is beneficial to the landowner and his family, as well as to the land, so that with minimal inputs it will continue to produce a stable income and be around for future generations to have a go. • Forestry requires waiting 25 years or more to generate income after harvest which is not an incentive. • There is no mention of who or what will benefit from these proposals. It does not appear to benefit the landowner, whose income is dependent on utilising the land to its maximum economic potential. To affect economic potential and restrict income does not benefit the country. Questions why have all these rules and regulations if nobody benefits. 	Accept in part	33.6
FS1293.94	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-</i>	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
268.7	Warwick Cheyne	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.8 PI (a) (ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	A total of 1000m2 seems overly restrictive and could result in the land outside a Significant Natural Area being incapable of reasonable use as persistent invasive weeds (such as manuka, totara and tutu) encroach on pasture. It is not clear what "outside a Significant Natural Area" means and questions is it theb whole farm or some defined area adjacent to the Significant Natural Area Questioned how the Waikato District Council can see to place restrictions on what can be done on the submitter's land beyond the specific Significant Natural Area No benefit economically and is likely to cause undue financial hardship Considers it theft when a plan, objective, policy or rule is out to remove the rights of ownership, or right of use as the landowner sees fit Does not believe the NZ Government promotes theft Uncertain who benefits from these designations Seeks to pursue a course of action through the NZ Police if the designations remain on the submitter's property due to restricting use of the property as a place of business and potentially lowering its value.	Reject	22.2
273.2	Russell Luders	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.3.3 PI (a) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	The submitters must be able to maintain existing farm tracks to meet health and safety standards. It is not possible to repair a track or fence or drain with a volume limit of 50m3. 200m of track 3m wide skimming 10cm of soil amounts to 60m3. A 12 tonne digger has a 0.65m bucket. 50m3 would allow the submitter to move 76.92 buckets of soil. Hill country boundary fence lines often need earthworks to provide a foundation for a long lasting quality fence. Traditional post wire and batten fence is an expensive farm investment and needs to be erected on a well prepared line to get the longest life from this investment. Provision must be allowed for earthworks for	Accept	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				new farm infrastructure such as fencing, tracks and drains.		
273.4	Russell Luders	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.7 P3 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The locations of building sites are highly dependent on topography and access. 250m2 is not enough allowance when building platform, access, stormwater, sewage systems fencing and landscaping are required.	Reject	21.5
273.8	Russell Luders	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.3.3 P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Area and the limits on imported fill.	Sometimes the only option to repair a track or fence lines is to import fill.	Accept	20.2
273.9	Russell Luders	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Significant Natural Areas being identified on private land.	The submitter takes pride in the private bush area which their predecessors chose not to develop. Strongly oppose being dictated and restricted on what can and cannot be done on these areas. These areas in the future could possibly have significant value, however consultation needs to be undertaken prior. The Waikato District Council has not presented a practical plan for the direction of future management of Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	33.6
278.2	Simpson Trevor for Simpsons Farms Ltd	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlay on the properties owned by Simpsons Farms Ltd.	Object to the application of the Significant Natural Areas overlay without direct consultation and prior knowledge of the submitter.	Accept in part	33.3
<i>FS1293.95</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>33.3</i>
282.1	Diane Emms	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from 126C Woodcock Road, Tamahere.	The area is mainly weeds, boggy, willows and blackberry. There is hardly anything except pest	Accept in part	33.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				species growing there.		
FS1293.96	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.1
FS1051.8	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed, as there is no part of the original submitter's property that could seriously be listed as a Significant Natural Area.	Agree that, where the Waikato District Council, has listed the property as an Significant Natural Area, the vast majority of vegetation, is pest species such as privet, blackberry, gorse etc.	Accept in part	33.1
FS1059.6	Mark Townsend Emms	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	• The gully area has been designated an SNA. This is totally inappropriate as the majority of vegetation is pest species.	Accept in part	33.1
301.2	Lizbeth Hughes	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 17 Calvert Road, Raglan.	All vegetation on this property was planted by previous owners and the landowner wishes to manage this as a personal property right.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.97	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
FS1276.3	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	This area is important in the visual and natural linkage to Karioi to the sea.	Reject	33.3
327.1	Jon Harris	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 140B Woodcock Road, Tamahere.	The area indicated contains predominantly introduced and pest species of vegetation, such as willow trees.	Reject	33.1
FS1051.11	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed, as there is no part of the original submitter's property that could seriously be listed as a Significant Natural Area.	Live close to the submitter, along the gully, and agree that, where the Waikato District Council has listed the property as Significant Natural Area, the vast majority of vegetation, is pest species such as privet, blackberry, gorse, etc.	Reject	33.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1059.4	Mark Townsend Emms	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	• Live further along the same gully and agree that the majority of vegetation is pest species.	Reject	33.1
FS1293.98	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept	33.1
328.3	Paula Dudley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.7 (vii) Managing Significant Natural Areas to extend the role of kaitiaki to the neighbouring property owners residing next to historical reserves, to include daily upkeep and management of lawns, gardens and rubbish. Kaitiaki to be supported by WDC to maintain grounds.	Historical site proposed on south boundary of the property at 524A State Highway 1, Tamahere, but concerns are raised as to who will be responsible for its upkeep/maintenance. If a property owner has links to Tainui, consideration could be made to be supported by WDC to manage and maintain the lawns and rubbish of the reserve and turning bay at the entrance of the submitter's property and the neighbouring reserve.	Reject	14.1
330.2	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Retain the provisions restoring and enhancing the gully systems throughout the Waikato Region.	No reasons provided.	Accept	25.2
331.1	Roderick MacRae	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 142 Woodcock Road, Tamahere.	The area does not meet the definition of a Significant Natural Area and therefore should not be identified as a Significant Natural Area. There are some indigenous plants, however the majority of the plants are pests species including willow trees, gorse convolvulus, Japanese honey suckle, blackberry etc.	Reject	33.1
FS1293.99	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping	Accept	33.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
FS1059.9	Mark Townsend Emms	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	• Live further along the same gully. • Agree that the majority of vegetation is pest species.	Reject	33.1
FS1051.13	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed, as there is no part of the original submitter's property that could seriously be listed as a Significant Natural Area.	Live close to the submitter, along the gully, and agree that, where Council has listed the property as a Significant Natural Area, the vast majority of vegetation is pest species such as privet, blackberry, gorse etc.	Reject	33.1
332.1	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new clause to Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, as follows: (b) <u>Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity, legal and physical protection of areas that are of a suitable size and meet the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.</u>	Support incentivising the protection of existing biodiversity with the ability to subdivide subject to meeting certain criteria. Policy 3.2.8 should be expanded to include provision for the enhancement and/or restoration of areas, when once restored, would be a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning ecosystem. Appendix 2 of the Proposed District Plan could provide a basis for assessing the eligibility of these areas. Incentivising restoration is in line with the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Reject	15.1
FS1386.456	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	15.1
332.8	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Neutral/Amend	Retain the definition of Significant Natural Area in Chapter 13: Definitions, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend the definition of Significant Natural Area in Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: Means an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area on the planning maps <u>or has been assessed as meeting one or more of the Criteria for</u>	The definition needs to be expanded to include areas that have been assessed by a suitably qualified Ecologist as meeting one more of the criteria in Appendix 2 of the Proposed District Plan. This would align with the wording of the Conservation Lot Subdivision provisions which allow for subdivision where a Significant Natural Area is identified as being protected or meets	Accept in part	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity (Appendix 2) by a suitably qualified Ecologist.</u>	the criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity.		
FS1377.53	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports greater clarity in the Plan about what areas should be mapped as a Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	29.2
340.2	Stuart Jefferis for Ruakiwi Graziers Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision sought, however submission states that the Significant Natural Area identified on the property at Jefferis Road, Waerenga is not significant to Council.	Sites were identified prior to 2008, however under the Public Works Act Transpower removed a significant area of mature native trees so new pylons could be erected. Submitter has protected the trees for close to 145 years, yet they can be removed with a 'stroke of a pen.' Mature strands of trees are significant to the submitter's family.	Accept in part	33.7
FS1293.100	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.7
346.1	Robert Morton-Jones	Oppose	Delete the Significant Green Zone from the property at 35A Norrie Avenue, Raglan.	There were two old pine trees in the middle of the property that were removed approximately 5 years ago and a second dwelling has been built in its place, approved by Waikato District Council. There is a Reserve next to the property which is a Significant Green Zone.	Accept in part	33.3
349.1	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Add the criteria for each Significant Natural Area, as these are what should be relevant when assessing appropriate for Significant Natural Areas.	Section 32 analysis noted that mapping was mainly a desktop exercise. Rules don't identify the characteristics being protected. This submission point applies equally to all Significant Natural Areas.	Reject	9.1
FS1062.24	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 349.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All overlays for SNAs need expert analysis. Desktop exercise is not acceptable when this has potential to affect many land owners rights. 	Reject	9.1
FS1386.495	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective,	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1198.8	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	Given the implications of Significant Natural Areas in the proposed plan the criteria should be capable of challenge and "ground truthed" based on clear and objective criteria.	Reject	9.1
349.2	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Retain the intent of Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity offsetting.	No reasons stated.	Accept in part	11.1
349.3	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Add rules and assessment criteria that provide for biodiversity offsetting where an activity might cause effects on a Significant Natural Areas or on Indigenous Biodiversity outside a Significant Natural Area.	There does not appear to be any reference to biodiversity offsetting in the methods or rules for the Rural Zone.	Reject	11.1
FS1258.39	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point seeks to expand the applicability of biodiversity offsetting, beyond identified areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats if indigenous fauna. The submission point does not provide for environmental compensation for unavoidable residual adverse effects.	Accept	11.1
352.1	Terence Denton on behalf of Terence Denton & Bernardina van Loon	Oppose	Delete the portion of Significant Natural Area on the property at 40 Cameron Town Road, Pukekohe that does not meet any of the Significant Natural Area criteria in Section 11A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (see maps attached to the submission).	The notified Significant Natural Area overlay erroneously includes large proportions of garden, amenity and livestock areas which do not meet any of the criteria for significance of indigenous criteria listed in section 11A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The area is used as a garden/stock/amenity/yard area and contains significant infrastructure as well as a substantial number of non-indigenous plant species. 85% of the property is already protected by covenant. The remaining 15% should not fall under the Significant Natural Area classification.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1293.102	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
352.2	Terence Denton on behalf of Terence Denton & Bernardina van Loon	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a), P2 and RD1 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	The plan does not adequately address rules applying to existing non-compliant elements or activities within the overlay.	Accept	20.2
352.3	Terence Denton on behalf of Terence Denton & Bernardina van Loon	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.7 P1 (a), P3 (a) and D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The Plan does not adequately address rules applying to existing non-compliant elements or activities with the overlay.	Reject	21.1
358.1	Caroline Swann	Oppose	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 1384 Whaanga Road, Raglan by reducing the size (see map attached to the submission).	Kanuka/Manuka is a regenerated tree over grassland. These trees are not significant compared to other areas on this farm.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.103	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Reject	33.3
358.2	Caroline Swann	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, by deleting 5m3 and the words "outside the coastal environment".	5m3 is not enough for heating needs within the coastal environment. Need to be able to cut kanaka/manuka for firewood.	Accept	18.2
FS1377.60	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation,	Accept	18.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>offsetting and compensation.</i>		
358.3	Caroline Swann	Oppose	Amend the proposed Significant Natural Area on the property at 1384 Whaanga Road, Raglan, to exclude existing farm tracks.	To ensure sustainable farm operations can continue.	Accept	33.3
<i>FS1293.104</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Reject	33.3
359.1	Phillip Swann	Oppose	Amend the size of the proposed Significant Natural Areas on the property at 1665 Whaanga Road, Raglan, to reflect areas of significant ecological value (see map attached to submission).	Parts of the proposed Significant Natural Area are of low ecological value. Comprises recently regenerated Kanuka as well as exotic species and pest species including woolly nightshade and gorse. This area has been sustainably farmed for the past 100 years. These areas are important parts of the farm and the loss of these productive areas will seriously impact on the economic value of the farm. There are areas of vegetation that are of greater significance (see the map attached to the submission for further detail).	Accept	33.3
<i>FS1293.105</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Reject	33.3
359.2	Phillip Swann	Oppose	Amend the area of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 1665 Whaanga Road, Raglan, to exclude existing farm tracks.	This is to ensure sustainable farm operations can continue.	Accept	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1293.106	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
359.3	Phillip Swann	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, by deleting "5m3" and replacing it with "1 per cent" AND Delete the words "outside the coastal environment" from Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	5m3 is insufficient to provide for the heating needs of farms, especially those with more than one dwelling. A 1 per cent allowance would have no adverse effects on sustainable management of the resource, or on ecological values. Excluding the coastal environment from the firewood allowance is unnecessary and unreasonable.	Accept in part	18.2
FS1377.61	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	18.2
359.4	Phillip Swann	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas to permit earthworks, to construct new tracks through Significant Natural Areas.	Rule 22.2.3.3 is silent about construction of new tracks in Significant Natural Areas. New tracks should be permitted to enable ongoing farming operations and farm development.	Reject	20.2
362.1	CYK Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, as follows: <u>(b) Incentivise subdivision in the Rural zone when there is the enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity, legal and physical protection of areas that are of a suitable size and meet the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.</u>	Support incentivising the protection of existing biodiversity with the ability to subdivide subject to meeting certain criteria. Policy 3.2.8 needs to be expanded to include provision for the enhancement and/or restoration of areas, when once restored, would be of a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning ecosystem. Appendix 2 of the Proposed Plan - 'Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity' could provide the basis for assessing the eligibility of these areas. Eligible areas would likely be wetlands and waterways which are degraded in the Waikato District due to farming activities such as stock and cropping. Incentivising restoration is in line with The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.	Reject	15.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1062.29	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 362.1.	• Agree subdivision should be incentivized with biodiversity.	Reject	15.1
362.8	CYK Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13: Definitions, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the wording of the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13: Definitions, as follows: Means an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area of the planning maps or has been assessed as meeting one or more of the <u>Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity (Appendix 2) by a suitably qualified Ecologist.</u>	Support the inclusion of Significant Natural Area's definition. Would like to see definition expanded to also include areas that have been assessed by a suitably qualified Ecologist as meeting one or more of the criteria in Appendix 2 of the Proposed Plan - Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity. Aligns with the wording of the Conservation Lot Subdivision provisions which allow for subdivision where an identified as Significant Natural Area is being protected or an area meeting the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept in part	29.2
FS1377.64	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports greater clarity in the Plan about what areas should be mapped as a Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	29.2
363.4	Divina Libre	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Significant Natural Area near Yumelody Lane further along the gully, past 60 Yumelody Lane.	Significant bird life wild life and large trees in the gully adjacent to 60 Yumelody land that justify this being a Significant Natural Area.	Reject	33.1
380.5	Norman Hill for Waahi Whaanui Trust	Neutral/Amend	Amend the rules to enable earthworks in Significant Natural Areas associated with Marae, Papakaainga and dwellings as a permitted activity.	No reasons provided.	Accept	20.2
388.6	Sonny Karena for Tangata Whenua Working Group	Support	Retain policies that require that the overall quality of freshwater is to be maintained or improved, while protecting the significant values of outstanding freshwater bodies and wetlands, and improving water quality in waterbodies that have been degraded to the point of being over-allocated.	The innate relationship between te hauora o te wai (the health and mauri of water) and te hauora o t taio (the health and wellbeing of the environment) and their ability to sustain tte hauora o te tangata (the health and mauri of people).	Reject	5.2
FS1388.89	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy	Accept	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1139.95	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	General support for the principle.	Reject	5.2
FS1045.5	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We support the retention of policies that require that the overall quality of freshwater is to be maintained or improved, while protecting the significant values of outstanding freshwater bodies and wetlands, and improving water quality in waterbodies that have been degraded to the point of being over-allocated.		Reject	5.2
FS1045.6	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We support the retention of policies that require that the overall quality of freshwater is to be maintained or improved, while protecting the significant values of outstanding freshwater		Reject	5.2
FS1108.108	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	General support for the principle.	Reject	5.2
394.6	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Neutral/Amend	Add a new objective to Chapter 3 Natural Environment, to encourage the restoration and/or rehabilitation of indigenous ecosystems to encourage new significant ecological areas to be established to replace, in part, what has been lost. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to set realistic and achievable goals for subdivision reliant on the protection, enhancement or establishment of significant ecological areas and therefore set the bar too high which then creates a disincentive for achieving good biodiversity outcomes. The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to appropriately identify the issues and challenges facing Waikato District; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to have appropriate regard to the Regional Policy Statement and/or misapplies the strategic direction of that document; and Council has failed to undertake an adequate section 32 analysis with respect to subdivision opportunities for ecological enhancement or protection.	Reject	16.1
FS1342.68	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 394.6.	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission but considers the provisions of the notified proposed plan, along with FFNZ's proposed amendments, will address the submitters concerns, without the need for this new objective.	Accept	16.1
FS1062.35	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 394.6.	• Council has failed to undertake adequate analysis in regard to subdivision, opportunities for ecological advancement.	Reject	16.1
394.7	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Neutral/Amend	Add new policies to Chapter 3 Natural Environment to implement the additional objective requested (in submission point 394.6) which provide,	The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to set realistic and achievable goals for subdivision reliant on the protection, enhancement or	Reject	16.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			interalia, subdivision incentives for creating areas with significant indigenous biodiversity value, including the encouragement, establishment or protection of: (i) Significant linkages between large (significant) areas of native bush, wetland, scrubland and dunelands; (ii) Significant enhancement of an area which is already significant in terms of bush or natural values; (iii) Significant restoration or enhancement of areas which are largely depleted, highly modified or destroyed in terms of native biodiversity within the district; (iv) Compensation, mitigation or remediation to offset the adverse effects of subdivision or development. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	establishment of significant ecological areas. The lack of uptake of such enhancement subdivision means that the biodiversity outcomes envisaged are unlikely to be achieved; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to appropriate identify the issues and challenges facing Waikato District; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to have appropriate regard to the Regional Policy Statement and/or misapplies the strategic direction of that document; and Council has failed to undertake an adequate section 32 analysis with respect to subdivision opportunities for ecological enhancement or protection.		
FSI342.69	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 394.7.	FFNZ supports the intent of this submission. These incentives can be incorporated as a new policy under the notified objective.	Reject	16.1
394.8	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Not Stated	Amend Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, as follows: (a) Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the legal and physical protection of Significant Natural Areas, provided the areas are of a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning ecosystem material ecological benefit. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	The submitter states that the Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to set realistic and achievable goals for subdivision reliant on the protection, enhancement or establishment of significant ecological areas.	Reject	15.1
400.1	Andrew Kerr	Oppose	Amend the Significant Natural Areas maps so that these are agreed with land owners before Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, is approved.	The mapping used to identify Significant Natural Areas is very out of date. The submitter has images from 1947 when their property was cleared and the submitter has to be able to maintain that state of land clearance as the submitter depends on it for their livelihood. As the submitter develops the farm they need to be able to maintain fence lines and build new ones. This requires clearing of vegetation to maintain them. The farm suffers from lots of wind damage to the trees and these need to be cleared each year over 50m3 per annum in windfall alone. The identification of Significant Natural Areas has been done without	Accept in part	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				consultation with the submitter and was not identified in the LIM report when the property was purchased. Also 5m3 is an insignificant amount of firewood per annum.		
FS1062.37	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 400.1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The mapping of SNAs should be done by experts and in full communication with landowners. 	Accept in part	32.2
400.2	Andrew Kerr	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 862B Waikare Road, Waeranga.	The area that has been assigned is based on old images and a lot of the area has been cleared already. The maps used are from 2012. The submitter already has a large Covenant block on the property which was established 21st November 1999. The submitter prides themselves on keeping this area locked up with stock exclusion and pest management plans in place. The area of land identified by council in the Proposed District Plan very close to half of the entire property. The submitter grazes the property in its entirety excluding the covenant block and the waterways. The submitter farms beef and sheep which do not eat Kanuka. The submitter also produces honey from the property. Locking these areas up as Significant Natural Areas will significantly impact the livelihood of the submitter. The property is mainly kanuka and the submitter has planted some manuka this year to enhance waterways. The submitter has identified 3 areas on the property which they would be happy to change to Significant Natural Areas, 2 of these contain good regenerating native bush and the other is a wetland area the submitter would like to protect. The long term plan is to fence them off and improve them further.	Accept in part	33.7
FS1293.108	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.7
400.3	Andrew Kerr	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside	The mapping used to identify Significant Natural	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			a Significant Natural Area, to enable clearance of vegetation for maintenance of fence lines, new fence lines, clearing of wind damage and increased amount of firewood.	Areas is very out of date. The submitter has images from 1947 when their property was cleared and the submitter has to be able to maintain that state of land clearance as the submitter depends on it for their livelihood. As the submitter develops the farm they need to be able to maintain fence lines and build new ones. This requires clearing of vegetation to maintain them. The farm suffers from lots of wind damage to the trees and these need to be cleared each year over 50m3 per annum in windfall alone. The identification of Significant Natural Areas has been done without consultation with the submitter and was not identified in the LIM report when the property was purchased. Also 5m3 is an insignificant amount of firewood per annum.		
407.4	Mel Libre	Neutral/Amend	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area to extend further along the gully past 60 Yumelody Lane, Tamahere.	There is significant bird life and large trees in the gully adjacent to 60 Yumelody Lane, Tamahere that justify assessment of the gully as a Significant Natural Area.	Reject	33.1
410.2	Trevor Weaver	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Significant Natural Area (B7) from the submitter's property located at Te Onetea Road, Rangiriri, east of Lake Kopuera.	The mapped Significant Natural Area on their property does not contain bush as it is affected from flooding from Lake Kopuera when there are overflows of the normal lake margins. This area is used as a pastoral runoff for drystock and dairy replacements. Considers this is a sneak attack to turn private land into wetland.	Accept in part	33.6
<i>FS1293.109</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>33.6</i>
412.2	David Saxton	Oppose	Amend the planning maps by only mapping Significant Natural Areas after direct and meaningful consultation with an affected landowner and a site visit by a suitably	Council's mapping of Significant Natural Areas so far has been crude and has likely alienated landowners. It has involved a desk top	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			experienced council officer which is authorised by that landowner.	exercise using dated satellite imagery and best guess decision making which has resulted in anomalies and landowner frustrations. This mapping will mean the loss of property rights, despite on-going costs of land ownership. There needs to be additional incentives to affected landowners such as rates relief and/or increased subdivision potential. The submitter supports the principle of protecting Significant Natural Areas.		
437.1	KCH Trust	Oppose	Amend the planning maps to reduce the extent of the Significant Natural Area at 170 Port Waikato-Waikaretu Road, Tuakau. AND Any further relief or amendments to address the concerns outlined in the submission.	The mapped Significant Natural Area in the Proposed District Plan is based on the criteria in Section 11A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement states that the identification of significant indigenous vegetation has been undertaken "primarily as a desktop analysis to which varying degrees of confidence are assigned." Further, that "Before information is included in regional or district plans further verification and validation may be required to confirm whether the identified area meet the criteria for significance in section 11A." The site has no property information supporting the application of the Significant Natural Area. The submitter appreciates the considerable cost involved in 'ground-truthing', however the District Council could include a rule in the Proposed District Plan that provides for the verification of the mapped Significant Natural Area by a suitably qualified ecologist when the Significant Natural Area is to be subject to subdivision or development or used for the purposes of conservation lot subdivision.	Accept in part	33.8
<i>FS1293.110</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>33.8</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
437.4	KCH Trust	Not Stated	Add a rule to the Proposed District Plan that provides for the verification of the mapped Significant Natural Area by a suitable qualified ecologist when the Significant Natural Area is to be subject to subdivision or development used for the purposes of conservation lot subdivision.	Appreciates that there is considerable cost involved in ground-truthing the district-scale information. Rule 22.4.1.6 (a)(i) already goes some way to achieving this outcome.	Reject	25.2
<i>FS1388.263</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>25.2</i>
437.6	KCH Trust	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	These provisions are consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act. These provisions meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the Resource Management Act. These provisions will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. These provisions are consistent with sound resource management practice.	Accept in part	20.2
437.7	KCH Trust	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	These provisions are consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act. These provisions meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the Resource Management Act. These provisions will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. These provisions are consistent with sound resource management practice.	Accept	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
450.1	Alison Green for Rushala Farm Ltd	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but the submitter refers to Policy 3.2.7 Managing Significant Natural Areas, and considers costs for protecting these should be borne by Council rather than farmers.	The submitter considers that because it is Council's decision to protect Significant Natural Areas, the costs of protection should be borne by Council rather than landowners.	Reject	14.1
466.7	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Area to allow for ground truthing of all Significant Natural Areas prior to inclusion as a property record and on planning maps.	Many of the identified SNA's do not meet the criteria set out in section 11A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. Edge effects, fragmentation, cost of management and lack of ecological significance of some of the areas identified raises concerns. Ground truthing should be enabled, for all Significant Natural Areas, prior to inclusion on a property record or planning map. Where Significant Natural Areas have been ground truthed and confirmed as significant then this rule should apply.	Accept in part	20.2
FS1388.402	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	20.2
FS1345.106	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	Genesis supports the intent of the submission to ground truth the SNA's in the PDP.	Accept in part	20.2
466.8	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.8 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area PI to allow for ground truthing of all Significant Natural Areas prior to inclusion as a property record and on planning maps.	The submitter supports this rule, if provision is made for ground truthing of Significant Natural Area at a property level.	Reject	21.1
FS1377.111	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. HVL also supports accurate mapping of SNAs.</i>		
481.1	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Oppose	Amend the approach to identifying Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes from private land so that identification is provisional based on owners acceptance and therefore contestable submission seeks that Council has discloses the specific criteria and significance levels for each of these areas, followed by ground-truthing and acceptance by the landowner.	The mapped Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes have not been fully investigated and it is unclear how these area have been identified or what a landowner's obligations are. Rules for these areas potentially render land incapable of reasonable use and could impact on health and safety standards, existing farm practices and a property's capital value. The consultation process for the Proposed District Plan has not provided sufficient information on how each Significant Natural Area or Significant Amenity Landscape has been defined on private land. Ecologists report noted that there was incomplete information and it was a desktop exercise. It can have a serious impact on the farming use of parts of properties and should be properly investigated before being imposed on landowners.	Accept in part	32.2
481.5	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Neutral/Amend	Delete the limits on volume, area and cut in Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas where the purpose is to maintain existing farming infrastructure. AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas, to allow earthworks for new farming infrastructure including fencing, tracks and drains. AND No specific decision sought but submission opposes limits on earthworks within 1.5m of boundaries in Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas.	Landowners must be able to maintain existing farm tracks to meet health and safety standards, It is not possible to repair a track, fence or drain with a volume limit of 50m3. Fencelines are often along property boundaries and may need earthworks to provide a stable platform.	Reject	20.2
481.7	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Oppose	Amend the limit of 250m2 for indigenous vegetation clearance for building and access in Rule 22.2.7 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as it is not enough allowance for both a platform for building and driveway.	The location of any building site is highly dependent on topography and access and the 250m2 area limit is not sufficient for a building platform and driveway.	Reject	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.116	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.5
FS1340.80	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter agrees that 250m2 of indigenous vegetation clearance does not provide enough area for both a building and a driveway.	Reject	21.5
481.8	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Neutral/Amend	Delete the limits in respect to area, species, height, age and location of indigenous vegetation removal in Rule 22.2.8 PI Indigenous Vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area for the maintenance of productive pasture. AND Amend Rule 22.2.8 PI Indigenous Vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to allow vegetation clearance for new farming infrastructure including fencing, tracks and drains; AND Amend Rule 22.2.8 PI Indigenous Vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to allow vegetation clearance for new dwellings and buildings including access.	It is not clear what "outside a Significant Natural Area" means. Indigenous vegetation clearance for any farming purpose should be permitted because farming is a permitted activity. The setback distance between cleared indigenous vegetation and a waterbody is excessive and inconsistent with other proposed land use policies. Over the long term this rule will render land that is not a Significant Natural Area incapable for reasonable use as persistent invasive species encroach on pasture.	Reject	22.2
482.2	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Oppose	Amend the limit of 250m2 for indigenous vegetation clearance for building and access in Rule 22.2.7 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as it is not enough allowance for both a platform for building and driveway.	The location of any building site is highly dependent on topography and access and the 250m2 area limit is not sufficient for a building platform and driveway.	Reject	21.5
FS1377.117	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.5
FS1340.81	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter agrees that 250m2 of indigenous vegetation clearance does not provide enough area for both a building and a driveway.	Reject	21.5
482.3	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Neutral/Amend	Delete the limits in respect to area, species, height, age and location of indigenous vegetation removal in Rule 22.2.8 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area for the maintenance of productive pasture. AND Amend Rule 22.2.8 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to allow vegetation clearance for new farming infrastructure including fencing,	It is not clear what "outside a Significant Natural Area" means. Indigenous vegetation clearance for any farming purpose should be permitted because farming is a permitted activity. The setback distance between cleared indigenous vegetation and a waterbody is excessive and inconsistent with other proposed land use policies. Over the long term this rule will render land that is not a Significant Natural Area	Reject	22.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			tracks and drains; AND Amend Rule 22.2.8 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to allow vegetation clearance for new dwellings and buildings including access.	incapable for reasonable use as persistent invasive species encroach on pasture.		
FS1340.82	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 482.3 as it will provide a more permissive framework for the maintenance of a productive rural land use, maintenance of existing infrastructure, and the removal of vegetation outside of SALs.	Reject	22.1
482.5	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Oppose	Amend the approach to identifying Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes, for private land so that identification is provisional based on owners acceptance and therefore contestable. Submission seeks that Council discloses the criteria and significance levels for each of these areas, followed by ground-truthing and acceptance by the landowner.	The mapped Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes have not been fully investigated and it is unclear how these areas have been identified or what a landowner's obligations are. Rules for these areas potentially render land incapable of reasonable use and could impact on health and safety standards, existing farm practices and a property's capital value. The consultation process for the Proposed District Plan has not provided sufficient information on how each Significant Natural Area or Significant Amenity Landscape has been defined on private land. Ecologist's reports notes that there is incomplete information and it was a desktop exercise. It can have a serious impact on the farming use of parts of properties and should be properly investigated before being imposed on landowners.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1340.84	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports in part submission point 482.5 in that identified SALs often do not accurately reflect what is present at the subject site and should be contestable if this is in fact the case. However, the submitter does not agree that it should be based on owners' acceptance. Moreover, a researched and ground truthed method (which can be contestable on qualitative matters) should occur.	Accept in part	32.2
482.8	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Oppose	Delete limits on area, and cut in Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks - Significant Natural Area where the purpose is to maintain existing farm infrastructure. AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, to allow earthworks for new farming infrastructure including fencing, tracks and drains. AND	Landowners must be able to maintain existing farm tracks to meet health and safety standards, It is not possible to repair a track, fence or drain with a volume limit of 50m ³ . Fencelines are often along property boundaries and may need earthworks to provide a stable platform.	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			No specific decision sought, but submission opposes limits on earthworks within 1.5m of boundaries in Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.			
482.9	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Oppose	Delete the proposed limit of 20m3 for fill in Rule 22.2.3.3 P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	There is no reason for a 20m3 limit to bring in fill to repair a fenceline or track.	Accept	20.2
484.1	Rudy Van Spreeuwel on behalf of Emza Zader Australia Pty Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Significant Natural Area 3578 from 189 Settlement Road, Pukekohe (see map attached to submission) AND Amend the Significant Natural Area 3579 by increasing it to the boundary line of the property at 189 Settlement Road, Pukekohe (see map attached to submission).	There are no trees, only marked garden land in area 3578 (as marked red on attachment to the submission). There are native trees in the suggested area (as marked green on attachment to the submission).	Accept in part	33.8
<i>FSI293.111</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>33.8</i>
493.4	Jackie Colliar	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to integrate the concept of environmental enhancement including in the Biodiversity Offsetting provisions.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	11.1
<i>FSI035.57</i>	<i>Pareoranga Te Kata</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Agree and support the whole submission.</i>	<i>• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>11.1</i>
494.2	Derek Tate on behalf of D & J Tate	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 72 James Road, Huntly.	The mapped Significant Natural Area contains no significant vegetation or natural habitat. The land is in pasture. It has a high water table when Lake Hakanoa is flooding during the winter. There are some bushes growing due to the wet area. Council have previously visited the site and agreed to remove the	Accept	33.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Significant Natural Area in 2015.		
FS1293.112	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.5
494.4	Derek Tate on behalf of D & J Tate	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 185B Hakarimata Road, Ngaruawahia.	The proposed is not just a name change. It is changing the property from making the owner able to making the owner unable to do anything easily, such as cutting the tree. The proposed overlay is changing this property into a Reserve for the public, with no compensation for landowners.	Accept in part	33.5
495.3	Norris Peart	Oppose	Amend the boundary of the Significant Natural Area at 274 Okete Road, Raglan so that the southern boundary is aligned with the existing fence put in place over 40 years ago, in consultation with Council to protect these areas, including Maaori Site of Significance R14/51.	The existing protected area was put in place over 40 years ago in consultation with Council. The proposed area has large open spaces of grazing land.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.113	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
501.1	John Swann	Oppose	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 65 Karioi Road, Raglan to reduce the size of it as shown on the map attached to the submission.	Parts of proposed Significant Natural Area is 20-30 year old Kanuka/Manuka. These are low quality trees. There is also gorse woolly nightshade, blackberry. The attached map to the submission indicates areas that have higher value vegetation.	Accept in part	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.507	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	33.3
FS1293.114	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.3
501.2	John Swann	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, to permit earthworks to construct new tracks through Significant Natural Areas.	This rule needs to enable the construction of tracks in Significant Natural Areas associated with farming operations and developments.	Reject	2.1.1
FS1276.66	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be disallowed.	SNAs are designated for protection. Changes within them need to consider the effect on the whole SNA.	Accept	2.1.1
501.3	John Swann	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area by deleting '5m ³ ' and 'coastal environment'.	Kanuka/Manuka matures quickly and spreads easily. Kanuka/Manuka is good firewood. Kanuka/Manuka does not need protecting.	Accept	18.3
FS1276.67	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Opposed	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be disallowed.	SNAs are designated for protection. Changes within them need to consider the effect on the whole SNA.	Reject	18.3
506.2	Dean Hansen for Hansens Farms Ltd	Oppose	Clarify why three Significant Natural Areas have been identified on 83 Paulsen Road, Waerenga.	Submitter has not been informed or convinced by Waikato District Council how they decided these were Significant Natural Areas or what makes them Significant Natural Areas. Two of the Significant Natural Areas are thin patches of T-Tree which you can see through. These	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				areas do not warrant being called or identified as Significant Natural Areas.		
FS1293.115	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.6
510.1	Bob Carter	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 57 Upper Wainui Road, Raglan.	This is perhaps due to aerial image distortion as the area is lawn.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.116	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Reject	33.3
510.6	Bob Carter	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Naturally Occurring Vegetation Clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	Council should not be involved with privately planted trees/vegetation, whether exotic or indigenous, unless they are part of a consent notice or conservation order. There are number of reasons why trees may need removal such as size, storm damage, damage to private drainage and infrastructure and for maintaining view shafts, open-space and daylight.	Reject	22.2
514.1	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise Subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise Subdivision, as follows: <u>(b) Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity, legal and physical protection of areas that are of a suitable size and</u>	Supports incentivising the protection of existing biodiversity with the ability to subdivide subject to meeting certain criteria. Seeks Policy 3.2.8 be expanded to include provision for the enhancement and/or restoration of areas, when once restored, would be of a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning ecosystem.	Reject	15.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>meet the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous biodiversity.</u>	Appendix 2 of the Proposed Plan - 'Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity' could provide the basis for assessing the eligibility of these areas. Eligible areas would likely be wetlands and waterways which are degraded in the Waikato District due to farming activities such as stock and cropping. Incentivising restoration is in line with the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.		
514.8	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an areas of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area on the Planning maps <u>or has been assessed as meeting one or more of the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity (Appendix 2) by a suitably qualified Ecologist.</u>	Support definition with amendments to be assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist. This would align with the wording of the Conservation Lot Subdivision provisions which allows for subdivision where an area meets the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept in part	29.2
529.8	Wilcox Properties Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13: Definitions, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13: Definitions, as follows; Means an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area on the planning maps <u>or has been assessed as meeting one or more of the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity (Appendix 2) by a suitably qualified Ecologist</u>	Support definition in part. Definition for Significant Natural Area needs to be expanded to include areas assessed by a suitably qualified Ecologist. This would align with the wording of the Conservation Lot Subdivision provisions.	Accept in part	29.2
535.7	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.4 - Biodiversity Offsetting. AND Add to Chapter 22 Rural Zone a new subdivision rule that provides specifically for biodiversity offsetting, does not set a minimum lot size and requires the lot and any areas subdivided under such a framework to be restored and protected in perpetuity. AND	The submitter supports the concept and use of a biodiversity offsetting tool when in line with the criteria in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and Appendix 6 in the Proposed Plan. Dialogue is also welcomed between Waikato District Council, Hamilton City Council and Waikato Region to investigate opportunities for potentially placing offsets generated within	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Add to Chapter 23 Country Living Zone a new subdivision rule that provides specifically for biodiversity offsetting, does not set a minimum lot size and requires the lot and any areas subdivided under such a framework to be restored and protected in perpetuity. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Hamilton City to locate within Waikato District, where appropriate rather than within Hamilton City. This type of subdivision rule would be a type of biodiversity offsetting tool.		
FS1062.72	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 535.7 in part.	• Subdivision that supports biodiversity should be encouraged. However HCC should not offset into WDC.	Reject	11.1
FS1342.131	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 535.7.	FFNZ supports these amendments for the reasons outlined by the submitter.	Reject	11.1
535.8	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 3.2.6 (a)(iv) Providing for vegetation clearance. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Any vegetation clearance within a Significant Natural Area is inappropriate because the protection of significant vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance and should therefore not be eroded through a harvesting activity.	Reject	13.1
FS1342.130	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 535.8.	Policy 3.2.6(a)(iv) is designed to make provision for existing use right activities. The submitter outlines effects based concerns as reasoning for the opposition to this policy. Those same concerns are not identified if the activity takes place on Maaori Freehold land, as per Policy 3.2.6 (b)(iv). FFNZ does not understand the inconsistent response.	Accept	13.1
FS1345.107	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	There are some circumstances where it is appropriate to clear vegetation from an SNA. These circumstances need to be provided for in the plan.	Accept	13.1
540.8	Glen Alvon Farms Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area on the planning maps <u>or has been assessed as meeting one or more of the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity (Appendix 2) by a suitably qualified Ecologist.</u>	Supports the inclusion of Significant Natural Area's definition. This definition needs to be expanded to include areas that have been assessed by a suitably qualified ecological as meeting the criteria in Appendix 2 of the Proposed Plan (Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity). This would align with the wording of the subdivision rule for conservation lots.	Accept in part	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.133	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports greater clarity in the Plan about what areas should be mapped as a Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	29.2
548.2	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area on the property at 62 Bluff Road, Pokeno, identified as a wetland. AND Retain the Significant Natural Area on the property at 62 Bluff Road, Pokeno identified as boulder stream (see diagram attached to the submission).	The wetland does not drain freely into the Mangatawhiri wetlands and the culverts are clogged. Ecological assessment provided with submission. The boulder stream is relatively unique and merits inclusion as a Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1341.10	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Allow- deletion of wetland as Significant Natural Area.	This submission point seeks changes to the Significant Natural Area identified on the property at 62 Bluff Road, Pokeno so that the part identified as wetland is deleted, and the part identified as a boulder stream is retained. Hynds also opposes identification of the wetland as a Significant Natural Area and supports the relief sought for deletion of the wetland on the property. The reasons for this include that the ecological functioning of this wetland area is low. The identified SNA is not significant below the boulder stream. The "wetland" is not natural and was formed by construction of the southern motorway which dammed the lower valley. Hynds further relies on the ecology report lodged in support of the Grander Investments Limited submission.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1293.117	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1306.11	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	Hynds Foundation supports the removal of the wetland area as an SNA and inclusion of the boulder stream as an SNA. An Ecological Report provided by this submitter confirms the actual ecological values of this area are low and this should be accurately reflected in the overlays in the Proposed Plan. It is understood based on the reporting Ecologist's observations and historical photos that the wetland is	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>artificially created due to the size and settling of the culvert under State Highway 1 which drains to the Mangatawhiri Wetlands.</i>		
574.9	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Retain Policy 3.2.8 - Incentivise subdivision	Supports Policy 3.2.8 regarding the incentives for subdivision.	Accept	15.1
FS1303.51	Charlie Harris	Support	<i>I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.</i>	<i>Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.</i>	Accept	15.1
FS1301.51	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	<i>Support the submission in its entirety.</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.</i>	Accept	15.1
575.6	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.2 (b) Identify and Recognise, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Policy 3.2.2 (b) Identify and Recognise, as follows (or words to similar effect): (b) Recognise and protect Significant Natural Areas by ensuring the characteristics that contribute to their significance are not adversely affected by activities other than mineral and aggregate extraction. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Fulton Hogan supports the intent of the policy but seeks amendments, noting that the RPS specifically protects mineral extraction activities, which is currently not achieved by the proposed wording of Policy 3.2.2. Proposed amendments make it clear that extraction activities may removal stands of indigenous vegetation without impacting on the characteristics that contribute to the significance of SNA. While not a matter for the relief sought on this submission point, the submission notes that Fulton Hogan request that the SNA overlays imposed over its properties are removed in their entirety, so as to ensure that the commercial viability of these quarries are not unreasonably obstructed.	Reject	9.1
FS1377.143	Havelock Village Limited	Support	<i>Support.</i>	<i>As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity and flexibility for extractive industries.</i>	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1332.26	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	9.1
FS1319.5	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	As per its original submission point, NZS considers the appropriate way to address this point is through an exception in Policy 3.2.6, and explicit recognition in Policy 3.2.2 does not apply to the WNH site.	NZS has sought that the SNAs at the Waikato North Head Mine site be removed (827.4). The mining licence authorises all land use activities associated with iron sand mining operations at WNH. No further authorisations are required under the RMA including for vegetation clearance. Accordingly, Policies 3.2.2 to 3.2.5 and 3.2.7 should not apply to the WNH site and an exception should be included in Policy 3.2.6.	Reject	9.1
FS1292.21	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in full.	McPherson recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS. However, the RPS also provides protection for mineral and aggregate extraction activities and therefore the policy should reflect this.	Reject	9.1
FS1293.33	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	The Director-General considers that the proposed amendments are too permissive for significant natural areas and allowing this point would be contrary to the purpose of the act and section 6 (c).	Accept	9.1
FS1198.10	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission be allowed in full.	The application of SNAs should not act to prevent mineral extraction that by its nature needs to take place in areas where minerals are located.	Reject	9.1
575.7	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy, as follows: (i) avoiding the significant adverse effects of vegetation clearance and the disturbance of habitats unless specific activities need to be enabled such as mineral and aggregate extraction activities; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Support the intent of this policy but concerned that it would hinder the lawful operations of existing quarries. Amendment is sought as the removal of indigenous forestry may be necessary to support growth of the district and region.	Reject	10.1
FS1319.6	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part. As per its original submission point, NZS considers the appropriate way to address this point is through an exception in Policy 3.2.6 (and explicit recognition that Policy 3.2.3 does not apply to the WNH site).	NZS has sought that the SNAs at the Waikato North Head Mine site be removed (827.4). The Mining Licence authorises all land use activities associated with iron sand mining operations at WNH. No further authorisations are required under the RMA, including for vegetation clearance. Accordingly, Policies 3.2.2 to 3.2.5 and 3.2.7 should not apply to the WNH site and an exception should be included in Policy 3.2.6.	Reject	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1292.25	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in full.	McPherson recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS, but are concerned that it may unreasonably hinder their existing quarries. Therefore it is appropriate that the policy enables mineral and aggregate extraction activities where such activities support the future growth of the district and region.	Reject	10.1
FS1293.34	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	The Director-General considers that the proposed amendments are too permissive for significant natural areas and allowing this point would be contrary to the purpose of the act and section 6(c).	Accept	10.1
FS1198.11	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	The application of SNAs should not act to prevent mineral extraction that by its nature needs to take place in areas where minerals are located.	Reject	10.1
FS1332.27	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	10.1
575.8	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity offsetting.	Supports the use of offsetting noting that mineral and aggregate extraction activities can create adverse effects on significant natural areas. Also support the signal that applications that may result in any adverse effects on any SNAs or indigenous biodiversity outside an SNA be allowed to be offered by a resource consent applicant.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1292.30	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in full.	McPherson support the use of biodiversity offsetting while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1198.14	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	The opportunity to use biodiversity offsetting where there are adverse effects is appropriate.	Accept in part	11.1
575.9	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.7 Managing Significant Natural Areas, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Policy 3.2.7 (a)(v) Managing Significant Natural Areas, as follows (or words to similar effect): (v) avoiding physical and legal fragmentation AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Fulton Hogan supports a policy that sets out the management of Significant Natural Areas. There are instances where significant natural areas may be physically separated due to expansion in lawfully established quarries. Proposed amendment would still safeguard significant natural areas while ensuring that extractive industries near significant natural areas can stay viable. While not a matter for the relief sought on this submission point, the submission notes that Fulton Hogan request that the SNA overlays imposed over its properties are removed in their entirety, so as to ensure that the commercial viability of these quarries are not unreasonably obstructed.	Reject	14.1
FS1332.28	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1292.33	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in full.	McPherson supports the recognition of SNAs but seeks removal of the corresponding overlays which include their quarry. Further, SNAs may be physically separated as a result of quarry expansion while legal fragmentation will remain, as practical.	Reject	14.1
FS1293.35	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	The Director-General considers that the proposed amendments are too permissive for Significant Natural Areas and allowing this point would be contrary to the purpose of the act and section 6(c).	Accept	14.1
577.4	Dilworth Trust Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 PI (a) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains, and for <u>the purpose of remediation and stabilisation of banks of a stream, river or other water body</u> , within an identified Significant Natural Area must meet all of the following conditions.. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any further or other consequential relief required to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.	The Rural Campus site is bordered by the Mangatawhiri stream that floods and as such, represents a risk to the site. Stream restoration and erosion control works have been undertaken previously by way of resource consent. A portion of the area requiring works is within a Significant Natural Area. As such, the Proposed Plan needs to be enabling of earthworks for erosion control works for the remediation and stabilisation of stream banks to protect the health and safety of the students, staff and visitors to the site, and the buildings and property. Considers that this is an issue that is relevant for all rural land in the Waikato District, and that the provisions for the Rural Zone must provide for earthworks for such a purpose.	Accept in part	20.2
577.5	Dilworth Trust Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 PI (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (i) Gathering plants in accordance with Maaori customs and values; or ... (vi) <u>Remediating or stabilising the banks of a stream, river or other water body</u> . AND Amend the Proposed District Plan for any further or other consequential relief required to give effect to the relief sought in this submission	There is no provision for indigenous vegetation clearance for the purpose of erosion control works for the remediation and stabilisation of banks of streams and rivers. The Proposed Plan must be enabling of erosion control works to protect the health and safety of the students, staff and visitors to the site, and the buildings and property, and to enable vegetation management and removal along the banks of streams and rivers for such purposes.	Reject	21.1
577.6	Dilworth Trust Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 PI (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (vii) A building platform and associated access, parking and manoeuvring up to a total of 500m ² clearance of indigenous vegetation.; or (viii) <u>Remediating or stabilising the banks of a stream, river or other water body</u> . AND	Provisions that apply to vegetation clearance outside of Significant Natural Areas are similarly not enabling of vegetation modification for the purposes of remediation and stabilisation of the banks of streams and rivers. Vegetation clearance must provide for such works.	Reject	22.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend the Proposed District Plan for any further or other consequential relief required to give effect to the relief sought in this submission			
585.2	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.2.6(b) Providing for vegetation clearance.	This policy is too permissive for vegetation clearance within a Significant Natural Area.	Reject	13.1
FS1342.149	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.2.	FFNZ opposes the deletion sought and largely supports the notified version of Policy 3.2.6 which, in part, is designed to acknowledge existing use right activities. This is an appropriate planning approach that provides certainty for plan users.	Accept	13.1
FS1340.90	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission point 585.2 as some vegetation clearance needs to be able to occur within SNAs. The submitter disagrees that this policy makes vegetation clearance within an SNA too permissive.	Accept	13.1
FS1345.5	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis supports the retention of this policy, subject to the amendments set out in Genesis primary submission.	Accept	13.1
FS1377.157	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	No reasons provided.	Accept	13.1
585.8	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend the forestry provisions in the Proposed District Plan to afford greater protection to indigenous vegetation and Significant Natural Areas within or adjacent to plantation forestry.	Under regulation 6(2)(b) of the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry, a district plan may be more stringent than the regulations if the rule recognises and provides for Significant Natural Areas. The Director-General considers it necessary for the Plan to recognise and provide for the protection of Significant Natural Areas within or adjacent to plantation forest.	Reject	25.2
FS1342.152	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.8.	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be; we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities adjacent to plantation forestry.	Accept	25.2
585.9	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Add a new definition of "Biodiversity offset" to Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: <u>Biodiversity offsets are measurable conservation outcomes resulting from actions designed to compensate for significant residual adverse biodiversity impacts arising from project development after appropriate prevention and mitigation measures have been taken. The goal of biodiversity offsets is to achieve no net loss and preferably a net gain of biodiversity on the ground.</u>	The addition of a definition for biodiversity offsetting will reflect the Guidance for Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand.	Accept	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1258.25	Meridian Energy Limited	Support	Allow in part	Meridian agrees that the insertion of a new definition of "biodiversity offset" may be helpful. However, Meridian does not agree with the proposed emphasis given to 'net gain', where this is specified as a minimum requirement. The concept of 'biodiversity offsetting' is potentially complex and the definition may benefit from additional explanatory material in an Appendix. Also, the definition needs to clearly distinguish between 'mitigation', 'biodiversity offsetting' and compensation'. Meridian's view is that the wording proposed requires amendment.	Accept	
FS1330.54	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Grant the relief sought.	Definition proposed or similar is appropriate.	Accept	29.2
FS1340.91	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports the submission point in principle subject to drafting.	Accept	29.2
FS1377.158	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	Support amendments to provisions that enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation, subject to drafting.	Accept	29.2
FS1345.6	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept in part.	Genesis supports the inclusion of a definition for biodiversity offsets, provided that a similar definition for "Environmental Compensation" also be included in the District Plan and that environmental compensation measures are recognised and provided for in a similar way to offsets.	Accept	29.2
587.3	Bruce Cameron	Not Stated	Amend the Significant Natural Areas to be confirmed through direct consultation with the landowner.	The Significant Natural Areas must only come about with direct consultation with the landowner. The landowners are the ones that need to drive it with support from Council.	Accept	13.3
587.4	Bruce Cameron	Opposed	Amend Policy 3.2.7(a) (i) Managing Significant Natural Areas, to enable conservation subdivision with transferable titles to support stock exclusion from Significant Natural Areas.	Provides the landowner an opportunity to sell the title and afford to undertake fencing to exclude stock from the Significant Natural Area. Gives the landowner an incentive to conserve the Significant Natural Area and does not require Council to financially contribute.	Reject	14.1
FS1138.10	Glenn Michael Soroka and Louise Claire Mered as Trustees of the Pakau Trust	Support	In part. This is an appropriate environmental mechanism, but it must be refined and workable.		Reject	14.1
587.5	Bruce Cameron	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 5m3 of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per single consecutive 12 month period per property Significant Natural Area...	A landowner could have a 2000ha property and not be permitted to remove more than 5m2 of vegetation even though there is only one Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	18.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
587.6	Bruce Cameron	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to allow removal of bastard Totara trees.	Bastard totara trees are thinly dispersed totara trees that have grown a wide spread of low branches and needs to be added to the list.	Reject	18.1
587.7	Bruce Cameron	Not Stated	Amend Policy 3.2.7 Managing Significant Natural Areas, to not require fencing of a Significant Natural Area if no transferable title is granted or other sources of financing are available.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	14.1
591.2	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity rule within Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: <u>P3 Earthworks for extractive industry within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps provided that sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls.</u>	Provision should be made for earthworks in association with extractive industry within Aggregate Extractive Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on planning maps as a permitted activity including within the Significant Natural Area.	Reject	20.3
FS1292.76	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow along with the relief sought by submission point 691.9.	McPherson supports the intent of this submission to include a rule which allows for earthworks that are ancillary to extraction activities to be undertaken as of right. It is noted that the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay has not been applied to McPherson's existing quarry operations. This relief is sought as per submission point 691.9. Therefore, as drafted, the proposed rule will not provide for ancillary earthworks at the McPherson quarry unless the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay is applied. Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate.	Reject	20.3
FS1334.79	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Fulton Hogan support the inclusion of a rule which allows for earthworks that are ancillary to extraction activities to be undertaken as of right, particularly where the site has been identified as being with the Aggregate Extraction Overlay. Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate.	Reject	20.3
FS1319.16	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part (subject to NZS's original submission point 827.4).	NZS has sought that the SNAs at the Waikato North Head Mine site be removed (original submission point 827.4). The Mining Licence	Reject	20.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				authorises all land use activities associated with iron sand mining operations at WNH. No further authorisations are required under the RMA including for vegetation clearance.		
FS1377.173	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to provide greater flexibility in addressing the potential effects arising from earthworks. In addition, as an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.	Reject	20.3
FS1146.15	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	The submission identifies that there are general earthworks associated with extractive industries and by including it as permitted activity within Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource areas will limited it within this overlay area.	We seek that the whole of the submission is allowed in order to enable the continuous and sustainable management of extractive industries.	Reject	20.3
591.3	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity rule within Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas, as follows: <u>P7 Indigenous Vegetation clearance for extractive industry within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps.</u>	Provision should be made for vegetation clearance in association with extractive industry in the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps as a permitted activity including within Significant Natural Area.	Reject	21.9
FS1146.16	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	The submission identifies that indigenous vegetation clearance is required in order to be able to extract the minerals and by including it as a permitted activity within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource areas will limited it within this overlay area already earmarked for mineral extraction.	We seek that the submission is allowed in order to allow indigenous vegetation clearance within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas.	Reject	21.9
FS1319.17	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part (subject to NZS's original submission point 827.2).	In line with NZS's original submission point 827.2. Provision should be made for vegetation clearance in association with extractive industry in the Aggregate Extraction Areas shown on the planning maps as a permitted activity including within Significant Natural Areas.	Reject	21.9
FS1377.174	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.	Reject	21.9
591.4	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity rule within Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: <u>P4 Indigenous Vegetation clearance for extractive industry within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps.</u>	Provision should be made for vegetation clearance in association with extractive industry in the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps as a permitted activity.	Accept in part	23.1
FS1146.17	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	The submission identifies that indigenous vegetation clearance is required in order to be able to extract the minerals and by	We seek that the submission is allowed in order to allow indigenous vegetation clearance within the	Accept in part	23.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>including it as a permitted activity within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource areas will limited it within this overlay area already earmarked for mineral extraction.</i>	Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas.		
FS1319.18	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part (subject to NZS's original submission point 827.2).	In line with NZS's original submission 827.2. Provision should be made for vegetation clearance in association with extractive industry in the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps as a permitted activity.	Accept in part	23.1
FS1377.175	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	23.1
591.5	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.2.6(a) Providing for vegetation clearance as follows: (a) Provide for the clearance of indigenous vegetation in Significant Natural Areas when: (i) maintaining tracks, fences and farm drains (ii) avoiding loss of life injury or damage to property (iii) collecting material to maintain traditional Maaori cultural practices (iv) collecting firewood for domestic use (v) <u>undertaking extractive industry within Aggregate Extraction and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps.</u>	Supports providing for the clearance of indigenous vegetation in Significant Natural Areas for a range of activities but seeks that the policy be extended to cover the extractive industry, where Significant Natural Areas are shown within these areas. There is little point in identifying areas for aggregate extraction or future aggregate extraction if it is prevented by the presence of a Significant Natural Area.	Reject	13.1
FS1146.4	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	<i>The submission identifies that indigenous vegetation clearance is required in order to be able to extract the minerals and by including it as a permitted activity within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource areas will limited it within this overlay area already earmarked for mineral extraction.</i>	We seek that the submission is allowed in order to enable indigenous vegetation clearance within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas which has already been earmarked for mineral extraction.	Reject	13.1
FS1198.17	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	<i>The submission point be allowed in full.</i>	Mineral extraction can only take place where the minerals are located and if an SNA has been superimposed on a mineral deposit provision should be made to allow removal of indigenous vegetation to access the deposit as anticipated by the District Plan.	Reject	13.1
601.1	Robert Limmer on behalf of Limmer Ltd	Oppose	Amend the area of Significant Natural Area at 596 Waikare Road, Te Kauwhata, to reflect the original bush area of seven acres that existed in 18 September 1987.	The proposed Significant Natural Area will impose costs and limit the farming potential of the land. The original seven acres of bush from 1987 is the best quality bush of the property. No persons allowed on property. The farm is for sale.	Accept in part	33.6
FS1293.122	Department of Conservation	Oppose	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
601.2	Robert Limmer on behalf of Limmer Ltd	Oppose	Amend the area of Significant Natural Area on the property at 209 Whangamarino Road, Te Kauwhata.	The proposed Significant Natural Area will impose costs on the landowner and limit the farming potential of the land. No persons allowed on the property.	Accept in part	33.6
<i>FS1293.123</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Accept in part	33.6
611.1	David Gibberd	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that further restrictions are not imposed on the farming operation at 53B McGovern Road, Taniwha, Waerenga.	Submitter has chosen not to eradicate several native areas and have fenced some to prevent stock from entering. Have also fenced some waterways. Do not think it is appropriate that the Waikato District Council is wanting to impose further restrictions on our farming operation. Submitter disagrees with the limiting of track and road maintenance per year on their farm, as this is necessary for Health and Safety management of their operation.	Accept in part	25.2
623.1	Paul Hoogeveen	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 156 Paddy Road, Te Kauwhata.	This small area of the Significant Natural Area is poor quality vegetation with recent regrowth of undesirable species.	Accept	33.6
<i>FS1293.124</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant</i>	Reject	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
643.1	Peter & Dianne Bullock	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 40B Cameron Town Road, Pukekohe (Property no. 301359).	Proposed Significant Natural Area is purely a commercial cropping area being a Pinus Radiata and Eucalyptus plantation first established 25 years ago. No original component of natural bush except minor secondary growth at foot of pines and is grazed by sheep. Prior to the establishment of the pine and gum plantation, the site was a scoria quarry abandoned in 1950s and stripped of soil and any natural growth. The Existing plantation has now reached maturity and needs to be harvested and replanted. Suggests the Significant Natural Area is an error and the aerial survey misidentified the submitter's pine and gum crop as natural vegetation, which it is not and never has been.	Accept in part	33.8
<i>FS1293.125</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>33.8</i>
644.2	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas,	Accept in part	6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
FS1350.2	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	The submission point is supported and Transpower concurs with the reasoning that the provisions in Chapter 3 are to be read in conjunction with Chapter 6. The retention of the objective reflects the relief sought in the Transpower submission.	Accept in part	6.1
644.3	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain 3.1.2 Policy - Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	7.1
644.4	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	8.1
644.5	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.2 Identify and Recognise, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
644.6	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	10.1
644.7	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its	Accept in part	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
644.8	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.5 Biodiversity in the coastal environment, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	12.1
644.9	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	13.1
646.2	Vodafone New Zealand Limited		Retain Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems, as notified.		Accept in part	6.1
646.5	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.2- Identify and recognise as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
646.6	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3- Management hierarchy as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	10.1
646.7	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.4- Biodiversity Offsetting as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	11.1
646.8	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.5- Biodiversity in the coastal environment as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and	Accept in part	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
646.9	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain 3.2.6- Providing for vegetation clearance as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	13.1
648.3	Chorus New Zealand Limited		Retain 3.1.2 Policy – Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats, as notified.		Accept in part	7.1
648.5	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.2- Identify and Recognise as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10.	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
648.6	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3 - Management hierarchy as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	10.1
648.7	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.4- Biodiversity Offsetting as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	11.1
648.8	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.5 - Biodiversity in the coastal environment as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new	Accept in part	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
648.9	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.6 - Providing for vegetation clearance as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	13.1
669.7	Bernard Brown	Oppose	Delete Significant Natural Area overlay from property located at 759 Wainui Road, Raglan (Property Number 1013542).	Complex overlay designations infringe on individual property rights. Request removal.	Accept	33.3
FS1040.7	Bernard Brown Family Trust	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.		Accept	33.3
FS1276.149	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	Natural vegetation in these areas is important for retaining the natural links between Karioi and the sea.	Reject	33.3
FS1293.126	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 1 IA of the WRPS. Removal of	Reject	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
677.1	Arthur Raymond Wright	Oppose	Delete areas of the Significant Natural Area from the property at 314 Murray Road, Pukekawa that do not meet the significant natural area status.	The mapped Significant Natural Areas on this property do not meet the criteria and no information has been provided to justify their significance. Without this information, the goal of protecting Significant Natural Areas will not be met and farm activities will be unnecessarily restricted. Refer to maps and photos attached to submission for further detail. Council needs to communicate more with landowners. Supports Council in their endeavours to protect Significant Natural Areas and preserve true significant natural areas. Gorse infested sidings, scrub lands that will be developed into grazing land, trees planted for firewood have been identified as significant natural areas and other areas which should have been marked as significant natural areas have not been identified.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1293.127	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Accept in part	33.8
FS1007.15	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	33.8
678.1	Christine Madsen on behalf of Madsen & Holmes	Oppose	Amend Rule 21.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to permit the removal of invasive weeds to maintain open water for birds.	The submitter refers to their own experience and states that habitats need to be maintained for the benefit of game bird shooters. Refer to submission which contains an excerpt from an article written by Tom Caithness ('A Summary of the 1991 Waterfowl Shooting Season').	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
678.2	Christine Madsen on behalf of Madsen & Holmes	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, to permit the removal of accumulated silt to maintain open water for water birds.	The submitter refers to their own experience and states that habitats need to be maintained for the benefit of game bird shooters. Refer to submission which contains an excerpt from an article written by Tom Caithness ('A Summary of the 1991 Waterfowl Shooting Season').	Accept in part	20.2
680.2	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan to acknowledge and recognise that biodiversity gains are best achieved with landowner buy-in. AND Adopt a biodiversity policy and management framework which facilitates a collective and collaborative response to this public good issue which could be achieved by non-regulatory methods that include such as: increasing the contestable conservation fund as recommended in the Kessels Ecology report assistance with stock exclusion and pest control raising education and awareness about the importance of biodiversity. AND Any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought and/or concerns raised in the submission.	Submission indicates that the consultation process for Significant Natural Areas was not robust or engaging, and there is no evidence in the Proposed District Plan that raised issues were heard, understood or addressed by the Council. The best outcomes are achieved when Councils have a good understanding of the issues facing landowners, and acknowledge the public good aspect which is provided (at the expense of landowners). This includes utilising Council ratepayers' money to provide meaningful incentives to enable good biodiversity management, such as provision of information and advice, assistance with pest control and other non-regulatory tools that reflect a partnership approach to achieve biodiversity gains. The majority of indigenous biodiversity which remains in the district is found on private land. The submitter's experience is that the best biodiversity outcomes are achieved when Councils have a good understanding of the issues facing landowners, acknowledge the public good aspect which is created and work to provide meaningful incentives and information. This important partnership approach is currently missing under the Proposed District Plan planning response.	Accept in part	5.2
FS1387.157	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is	Accept in part	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1330.58	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Support in principle. Grant the relief subject to final wording.	It is now clear that while biodiversity has suffered as a result of human impacts, that fate of biodiversity in NZ depends on positive human intervention. E.g. predator control to increase kiwi populations.	Accept in part	5.2
680.29	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		<p>Amend Policy 3.1.2 (a) Policies, as follows:</p> <p>(a) Enable <u>Incentivise</u> activities that maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity including:</p> <p>(i) planting using indigenous species suitable to the habitat;</p> <p>(ii) the removal or management of pest plant and animal species;</p> <p>(iii) biosecurity works</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add to Policy 3.1.2 (a) Policies, as follows:</p> <p>(iv) <u>encouraging voluntary planting of indigenous plant specimens suitable to each habitat, whilst anticipating flexibility to appropriately manage planted vegetation in a way that is integrated with other land management practices</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add to Policy 3.1.2 new policies, as follows:</p> <p>(d) <u>Council will coordinate with other agencies and organisations in identifying risks, requirements, opportunities and effective methods for maintaining and enhancing Waikato's biodiversity and will support landowners with a range of regulatory and non-regulatory initiatives to maintain and enhance biodiversity</u></p> <p>(e) <u>Consider additional subdivision opportunities where significant biodiversity gains can be achieved in the following priority areas or locations:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>peat lakes and rivers: by permanently providing significant buffer areas around peat lakes and rivers; or</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>wetlands, kahikatea stands, riparian margins and bush stands on the low lands, by providing permanent</u></p>	<p>Submitter supports the enabling intent of this policy, however the proposed rules framework designed to implement this policy are not consistent. Activities such as the removal or management of pest plant and animal species can require vegetation clearance and earthworks for conservation fencing to exclude stock or pests. The proposed rules only enable the vegetation clearance activity under Rule 22.2.7, P1(a)(ii), earthworks for a new fence or track would require a Restricted Discretionary resource consent as per Rule 22.2.3.3, RDI(a). This requirement introduces consent costs, on top of labour and materials and creates time constraints – all of which have the ability to stifle good intentions and hinder rather than enable activities which ultimately maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity. It is widely accepted that the enhancement indigenous vegetation and ecosystems is difficult to achieve without assistance and co-operation from landowners and other parties. Landowners need support from a range of authorities and agencies for initiatives to protect and maintain biodiversity.</p>	Accept in part	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>protection; or</u></p> <p><u>(iii)significant natural areas being aggregated to form one large more ecologically sustainable area and being permanently protected; or</u></p> <p><u>(iv)biodiversity corridors: by the permanent protection of significant areas of indigenous forest within biodiversity (indigenous forest) corridors; or</u></p> <p><u>(v)biodiversity corridors: by permanently protecting significant riparian or wetland areas within identified biodiversity (river or stream) corridors.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.</p>			
FS1293.42	Department of Conservation		Oppose		Accept in part	7.1
FS1308.101	The Surveying Company		Support		Accept in part	7.1
686.8	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area of the planning maps <u>or has been assessed as meeting one or more of the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity (Appendix 2) by a suitably qualified Ecologist.</u>	Support the inclusion of Significant Natural Area's definition, but would like to see definition expanded to also include areas that have been assessed by a suitably qualified Ecologist as meeting one or more of the criteria in Appendix 2 of the Proposed Plan - Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity. Aligns with the wording of the Conservation Lot Subdivision provisions which allow for subdivision where an identified Significant Natural Area is being protected or an area meeting the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept in part	29.2
FS1387.262	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate	Accept in part	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1138.20	Glenn Michael Soroka and Louise Claire Mered as Trustees of the Pakau Trust	Support	Null		Accept in part	29.2
691.3	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.2.2 (b) Identify and Recognise, as follows (or words to similar effect): (b) Recognise and protect Significant Natural Areas by ensuring the characteristics that contribute to their significance are not adversely affected by activities other than mineral and aggregate extraction. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	To ensure that mineral extraction industry (particularly the McPherson Quarry) is not unreasonably hindered by the existence of indigenous forestry in near proximity to the quarry itself This is in line with the Regional Policy Statement, which makes specific reference to the importance of mineral extraction and the benefits to be derived for the region from allowing further extraction of the same.	Reject	9.1
FS1334.21	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in full.	Fulton Hogan recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS. However, the RPS also provides protection for mineral and aggregate extraction activities and therefore the policy should reflect this.	Reject	9.1
FS1198.12	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	The application of SNAs should not act to prevent mineral extraction that by its nature needs to take place in areas where minerals are located.	Reject	9.1
691.4	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.2.3 (a)(i) Management hierarchy, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity within Significant Natural Areas by: (i) avoiding the significant adverse effects of vegetation clearance and the disturbance of habitats unless specific activities need to be enabled, such as for mineral and aggregate extraction activities; AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	To ensure that mineral extraction industry (particularly the McPherson Quarry) is not unreasonably hindered by the existence of indigenous forestry in near proximity to existing quarries This is in line with Regional Policy Statement which makes specific reference to the importance of mineral extraction and the benefits to be derived for the region from allowing further extraction of the same. In the event that the SNA overlay is not removed from the McPherson's property Policy 3.2.4 needs to be amended to ensure the McPherson's quarry can offer up such biodiversity offsets, even if it impacts on an areas with the SNA overlay. McPherson Supports the use of biodiversity offsetting as they accept that operations involving mineral and aggregate extraction can sometimes result in residual adverse effects. It is appropriate to provide policy guidance that can be used in circumstances where applications	Reject	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				received are non-complying but would be acceptable based on the use of a biodiversity offset.		
FS1334.90	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in full.	Fulton Hogan recognises the important of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS, but are concerned that it may unreasonably hinder their existing quarries. Therefore it is appropriate that the policy enables mineral and aggregate extraction activities where such activities support the future growth of the district and region.	Reject	10.1
691.5	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.2.4 (b) Biodiversity offsetting, in the event that the Significant Natural Area overlay is not removed from the McPherson's property (as addressed elsewhere in the submission), as follows (or words to similar effect): (b) Within a Significant Natural Area <u>not otherwise subject to mineral or aggregate extraction activities</u> , a biodiversity offset will only be considered appropriate where adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with the hierarchy established in Policy 3.2.3. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	This is in line with Regional Policy Statement which makes specific reference to the importance of mineral extraction and the benefits to be derived for the region from allowing further extraction of the same. In the event that the SNA overlay is not removed from the McPherson's property Policy 3.2.4 needs to be amended to ensure the McPherson's quarry can offer up such biodiversity offsets, even if it impacts on an areas with the SNA overlay. McPherson Supports the use of biodiversity offsetting as they accept that operations involving mineral and aggregate extraction can sometimes result in residual adverse effects. It is appropriate to provide policy guidance that can be used in circumstances where applications received are non-complying but would be acceptable based on the use of a biodiversity offset.	Reject	11.1
FS1334.29	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in full.	Fulton Hogan support the use of biodiversity offsetting while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Reject	11.1
691.6	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Amend 3.2.7 Policy (a)(v) Managing Significant Natural Areas, as follows (or words to similar effect): (v) Avoiding physical and <u>legal fragmentation where practicable</u> . OR Amend Policy 3.2.7 (a)(v) Managing Significant Natural Areas, as follows if the Council does not want to remove the words "physical" (or words to similar effect): (v) Avoiding physical and legal fragmentation <u>where practicable</u> . AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	To cater for the existing situation at the McPherson Quarry, where the Significant Natural Area has long been physically separated by the quarry activities. The aim of the proposed change is to retain the ability to have extractive industries within the district in a way that acknowledges that in some instances, physical separation is already existing and a necessity to allow for the continued extraction of minerals. The use of the word 'physical' unreasonably limits the ability to continue extracting aggregate at the McPherson Quarry, in that it would hinder the ability to	Reject	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				grow the footprint of the quarry. Quarry activities naturally require the expansion of the quarry footprint over time, as and when a certain area is exhausted of the particular resource being extracted. For the McPherson Quarry, which has been in operation for over 60 years in the same location, the footprint will continue to expand slowly and over a long period of time (between 50-100 years) meaning that the effects of the growth can be managed to ensure that the environmental effects are reasonable.		
FS1377.197	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	14.1
FS1334.32	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in full.	Fulton Hogan supports the recognition of SNAs but seeks removal of the corresponding overlays which include their quarries. Further, SNAs may be physically separated as a result of quarry expansion while legal fragmentation will remain as practical.	Reject	14.1
701.1	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	Delete all Significant Natural Areas from 747 Rutherford Road, Ohinewai.	This policy encourages the public to regard working productive landscapes on private property as desirable for the community but at the landowner's cost. The submitter states they may wish to use this land in a different manner in the future. Unnecessarily restricting farming activities, especially without giving something in return, does not incentivise one to protect their own property for someone else's enjoyment. This is unreasonable. If permanent protection of a part of private property is deemed of value to the public, the landowner must be compensated either under the Public Works Act or incentivised in some other manner. Many of the areas included in the Significant Natural Area have already been cleared under resource consent. The submitter wishes to retain the right to choose which areas are best to leave in a natural stated based on animal welfare, ease of stock flow and personal preference.	Accept in part	33.5
FS1207.5	Ohinewai Area Committee	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	There are a number of properties that came up in searching the council submission database, using the term 'Ohinewai.' These properties are on the Ohinewai RD run. They are not technically within the	Accept in part	33.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>OAC zone, but one is right on the border, and another very close to the border. However, upon examining this issue, it would appear that an examination of Google satellite imagery (or other similar images) has been done and it was determined that any land that has tree cover, that is not plantation or associated with gardens, is a Significant Natural Area (SNA) as there is an overwhelming correlation between the satellite imagery and these areas. It does not appear that anyone from WDC has visited the site. This is shown well illustrated in that the area between the river edge, and the stop bank through the Ohinewai area has been designated a SNA. Many residents back onto this area, and ask any one of them about what is there, and they would answer it is overrun with willow, alder and a mixture of invasive weeds. How this could be considered a SNA does not make sense. It would also appear that other farmers in surrounding district have also had SNA areas designated, where they are in fact 'waste' lands and of no significant value what so ever. It appears that the blunt tool of Google has been used, rather than a consultation with the people neighbouring/owning this land to find out what exactly occurs here and to see if there is any significant value. Thus we fully support the above submission to have SNA removed.</p>		
FS1293.129	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<p>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</p>	Accept in part	33.5
701.4	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: P1 (a) Earthworks for the maintenance or upgrade of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area must meet all of the following conditions are permitted. AND</p>	<p>These rules are overly restrictive, especially for larger properties as regards the constraints on volume and area in a 12-month period. Due to finances, weather, maintenance requiring earthworks for maintaining/upgrading tracks, stock races, fencing etc. may be delayed for</p>	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Delete Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a) (i)-(vii) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas; AND Delete Rule 22.2.3.3 P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, and replace with the following: <u>P2 (a) Earthworks within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Do not exceed a volume of more than 1000m3 and an area of more than 2000m3 over any single consecutive 12-month period on a property (ii) Do not exceed a volume of more than 3000m3 and an area of more than 6000m2 over any single consecutive 12-month period on a property ≥40ha.</u> AND Delete Rule 22.2.3.3 RD1 Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas.</p>	<p>several years. When circumstances then allow, a larger than average volume and/or area may need be shifted in a year to bring infrastructure up to an acceptable standard. Other years no earthworks at all may get done. The proposed restrictions are too onerous, especially for larger farming properties. Many tracks were put in decades ago when tractors were smaller. With larger and wider modern tractors, many races and tracks may need to be upgraded for health and safety reasons.</p>		
701.5	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	<p>Delete Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area and replace with the following: <u>P1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats- Permitted activity (a) Any activity involving disturbance, removal, damage or destruction (modification) of kanuka, and/or manuka and/or totara. (b) The removal of up to 50m3 of timber per 1-year period per Certificate of Title for personal use (c) The harvesting of indigenous timber undertaken in accordance with an approval under Part IIIA of the Forests Act 1949. (d) The disturbance, removal, damage or destruction of naturally occurring indigenous vegetation that has grown under the canopy of a plantation forest. (e) The clearance or modification of indigenous vegetation that has been planted and managed specifically for commercial production forestry horticulture or agriculture purposes. (f) The disturbance or damage, but not destruction of naturally occurring indigenous vegetation as a consequence of harvesting of plantation forest, including where the harvesting involves: (i) The lifting and/or dragging of logs. (ii) The construction and maintenance of forestry roads and stream crossings. (g) The disturbance, removal, damage or destruction ("modification") of naturally occurring indigenous vegetation by any network utility operator to ensure the safety and integrity of any network utility or to maintain access to the network utility. h) The disturbance, removal, damage or destruction ("modification") of naturally occurring indigenous vegetation associated with the</u></p>	<p>The proposed rule is overly restrictive. It is mainly sheep and beef farms that would most likely wish to clear scrub as many years of lower financial returns have impeded their ability to keep their pastures clear. Much scrub they wish to clear is regenerated vegetation. They become captured by the height and age restrictions in clearing kanuka and manuka.</p>	Accept in part	22.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>maintenance of existing access tracks, fence-lines and firebreaks and the construction of new fence-lines and firebreaks. (i) Any activity involving disturbance, removal, damage or destruction ("modification") of indigenous vegetation and habitats necessary for the avoidance of imminent danger to human life or property. (j) Activities are carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements entered into with the District Council, or Waikato Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust.</u>			
703.1	Sara Brown on behalf of S & J Brown	Oppose	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 538 Te Papatapu Road, Te Mata, to remove area 4364 and add area 4279 (see maps included in the submission for more details).	The following points apply to area 4364: - Contains exotic vegetation (mainly Barbury) and weeds. - Not considered to contain significant Indigenous vegetation. - Not considered a SNA in submitters ecological assessment. The following points apply to area 4279: - Submitter's ecological assessment, conducted by Kessels Ecology Ltd, conclude Area 4279 is a good, diverse and contains mostly healthy examples of under-represented. See assessment report attached to the submission for details. - Is fenced off from stock and also contains an internal fence line. - Understory and groundcover are healthy in majority of the stands and their regeneration is profuse. - Considered ecologically significant natural features in terms of Section 6 (c) of the Resource Management Act in accordance with WRC RPS Criteria. - Formal protection of the forest and wetland remnants at this site would be a significant positive addition to the Protected Natural Area Network in the Kawhia Ecological District.	Accept	33.3
FS1293.130	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of</i>	Reject	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
704.3	Margaret Millard for The C. Alma Baker Trust	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes the volume limit and time limit in Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	This limit is not practical on a working farm which has a considerable percentage of land identified as Coastal Environment, Natural Character, Significant Amenity Landscapes and/or Significant Natural Area. During extreme weather events or when normal repair and maintenance tasks occur, the cost of obtaining resource consents would be onerous. The requirements of this rule need to be achievable and able to be monitored.	Accept	20.2
704.5	Margaret Millard for The C. Alma Baker Trust	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes the volume limit of 5m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka per property within a 12 month period for use as domestic firewood in Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area	The Limestone Downs property contains 10 homesteads and the extent of land identified as Coastal Environment, Natural Character, Significant Amenity Landscape and/or Significant Natural Area would make it impossible to provide for the health and wellbeing of its staff and add costs if all houses were to be heated solely by electricity. This rule is contrary to Part 2 of the Resource Management Act regarding social and economic wellbeing of the working farm employees. The rule will burden landowners with unreasonable costs and will be difficult to monitor.	Accept	18.1
706.1	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes being identified on private land.	No consultation and data on the identified areas. This has the potential to have far reaching implications on private property rights, farm profitability and farm values. Unclear and inaccurate provisions mean that it is impossible to make informed decisions.	Accept in part	33.6
<i>FS1387.786</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>33.6</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1007.14	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	33.6
706.3	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, in respect to the proposed limits, including 50m3 volume and the 1.5m boundary setback and limits on imported fill.	The limits will not maintain of existing farm infrastructure and will create potential health and safety issues if repairs are not completed properly. Limiting earthworks will create health and safety issues for the future running of the farm. They hinder safe farming practices when establishing boundary fences. Infill limits reduce options to safely repair fences and tracks.	Accept	20.2
FS1007.8	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept	20.2
706.7	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision is sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.7 P3 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, particularly the 250m2 limit.	The limit of 250m2 cleared area will not provide a suitable area in some locations because of slope and access requirements. Building areas are dependent on location, position and access.	Reject	21.5
706.8	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.8 P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area and questions what is the definition of "outside a Significant Natural Area."	It is unclear what area this rule applies to and what the definition of "outside a Significant Natural Area" means. Indigenous vegetation often needs to be cleared for maintenance of farming infrastructure and maintaining productive pasture.	Reject	22.2
718.1	Helen Gray on behalf of Selwyn Leonard Taylor & Helen Stewart Gray	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 69 Morrison Road, Pukekawa (Property No. 305956).	The area nominated as a significant natural area there is a summer drain. This is dry in the summer and flows when excessive rain flows in winter. There is no native vegetation, only overgrown blackberry, row of bamboo on southern boundary and some gorse. The kiwifruit orchard on one side and cropping land on the other makes spraying weeds difficult. On the eastern side, the gardeners (Balle Bros) on the adjoining property have many silt traps and needed on several occasions to enter the submitter's side of the boundary and clear the drain. If silt is not removed it will flood the property. Western side of drain is good for grazing submitter's horses and therefore does not warrant Significant Natural Area classification. Submitter met with the	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				WDC at a meeting on 28th October 2015 about potential Significant Natural Areas and was agreed that the property was not a significant area. Submission has an attached copy of 2015 decision to not designate as Significant Natural Area .		
FS1293.131	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
719.3	Rob Waddell on behalf of Riverdale Group Ltd	Oppose	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area on the property at 102 Hooker Road, Tamahere, to match the esplanade strip shown on the Scheme Plan of subdivision (see map attached to the submission).	The Proposed District Plan identifies a strip of the submitter's property along the margin on the Waikato River as a Significant Natural Area and Significant Amenity Landscape. Classification of the property is contrary to a conclusion reached by Waikato District Council in relation to a subdivision consent where it was determined the area was not a Significant Natural Area. Extent of classification should be amended to not include areas of exotic vegetation and not arbitrarily extend to the top of the bank.	Reject	33.1
FS1293.132	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept	33.1
723.2	Tyler Sharratt on behalf of Winstone Aggregates	Neutral/Amend	Delete the two Significant Natural Areas from the Meremere Quarry (see Appendix 2 of the submission for their locations).	Meremere Quarry has two areas of Significant Natural Area partially overlain on the identified Aggregate Extraction Area, and also an area consented to accept clean fill. The two	Accept in part	33.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Significant Natural Areas need to be removed from map overlays.		
FS1293.133	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.9
724.9	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Support	Retain the mapping of Significant Natural Areas provided that there is further investigative work to ensure consistency across the district (involving landowner consultation and site visits by an ecologist) and confirmation that the mapping of these areas will not be recorded on affected titles.	The process of identifying Significant Natural Areas and communicating that to landowners has not been ideal. There seems to be inconsistencies in the consideration of these features between some neighbouring properties.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1387.806	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1091.39	GD Jones	Support	The mapping of Significant Natural Areas requires review, but the existing mapping should not be retained unless the District Plan includes provisions that recognise potential errors and the relevant rules should not apply to an area that an SNA has been incorrectly identified	The submission is allowed insofar that a review of Significant Natural Areas is undertaken and until this is complete, alternative relief enables the extent of SNAs to be disputed	Accept in part	32.2
728.2	Seumas MacDonald	Oppose	Amend the Significant Natural Area located on the property at 658 Te Akau South Road, Te Akau by removing the south-east portion of the Significant Natural Area. (Refer to map provided in submission).	Area to be removed from the Significant Natural Area map comprises only re-growth gorse, woolly nightshade with no native vegetation present. It is unnecessary to map this as	Accept in part	33.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Significant Natural Area. Significant Natural Area would unreasonably limit the future development options.		
FS1293.134	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.4
731.1	Jean Tregidga	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.1.2 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats, to permit the active management of indigenous vegetation.	Active management of indigenous vegetation should be permitted as it provides opportunities to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity, will attain Objective 3.1.1 and implement policy.	Accept in part	7.1
FS1180.1	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted. Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values. Reasons for my support are: In my original submission asked that if my application under 731-District Plan (Proposed) was accepted I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.	Accept in part	7.1
731.3	Jean Tregidga	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Area, by permitting earthworks for new tracks within Significant Natural Areas.	There is no provision for earthworks required to construct new tracks. This is unreasonable as the properties owned by this submitter at	Reject	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri have no practical access which renders the land useless for all practical purposes. This rule does not enable the sustainable management of land as required by the Resource Management Act.		
FS1180.3	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values. Reasons for my support area: In my original submission I asked that if my application under 731- District Plan (Proposed) was accepted. I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.	Reject	20.2
731.4	Jean Tregidga	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P3(a)(ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, by increasing the allowable limit of indigenous vegetation clearance to 8000m2 to provide for building, access, parking and manoeuvring as follows: (ii) The total indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 250m2 8000m2.	A nursery for propagation and potting of existing small native plants is an appropriate use of land within a Significant Natural Area, Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape as it will attain Objective 3.1.1 to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity values. The 250m2 restriction is unnecessary and unreasonable for any practical building work. At least 8000m2 is needed.	Reject	21.5
FS1277.145	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain Rule 22.2.7 P3 (a)(ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as notified.	The proposed amendment would have a significant impact on SNA by allowing such a large area of clearing and potential for a large cumulative impact. A resource consent should be required for this level of clearing to ensure adverse impacts are avoided. As such it does not give effect to Chapter 11 of the WRPS.	Accept	21.5
FS1377.237	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable	Reject	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.		
FSI 180.4	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values. Reasons for my support area: In my original submission I asked that if my application under 731- District Plan (Proposed) was accepted. I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.	Reject	21.5
731.5	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Delete Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems.	This objective is unreasonable and unnecessary as the majority of landowners take a responsible approach to managing indigenous vegetation on their properties.	Reject	6.1
FSI 180.5	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests	Reject	6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>natural values.</i>		
731.6	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.1.2 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats.	These policies are unreasonable and unnecessary as the majority of landowners take a responsible approach to managing indigenous vegetation on their properties.	Reject	7.1
<i>FS1180.6</i>	<i>Jean Tregidga</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values. Reasons for my support area: In my original submission I asked that if my application under 731- District Plan (Proposed) was accepted. I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.</i>	Accept	7.1
731.7	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Delete all rules in Section C relating to indigenous vegetation and habitats.	These rules are unreasonable and unnecessary as the majority of landowners take a responsible approach to managing indigenous vegetation on their properties.	Reject	20.2
<i>FS1180.7</i>	<i>Jean Tregidga</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned</i>	Reject	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values.		
FS1387.809	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	20.2
731.8	Jean Tregidga	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 22.2.7 PI (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, a new sub-clause (vi) as follows: <u>(vi) gathering and re-potting plants for indigenous nursery.</u>	A nursery for indigenous trees, shrubs and ferns, etc, is an appropriate use of land containing a Significant Natural Area, Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Landscape as it will contribute to attaining Objective 3.1.1 which is to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity values and it will supply local communities with plants from the local area. The submitter's proposed nursery and buildings would be located on Lot 3 DP 6284 (rather than Lot 5 DP 62084).	Accept in part	21.1
FS1180.8	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem.	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values. Reasons for my support area: In my original submission I asked that if my application under 731- District Plan (Proposed) was accepted. I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.</i>		
731.9	Jean Tregidga	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to permit active management of indigenous vegetation including thinning and pruning in order to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity.	Active management of indigenous vegetation provides opportunities to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity and will attain Objective 3.1.1 and implement policy.	Accept in part	21.4
<i>FS1180.9</i>	<i>Jean Tregidga</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>These are the only properties in NZ that I am aware of that have been planted and left to mature with Indigenous species. Conservation lands administered by DOC are protected under the Conservation Act and no harvesting is permitted Therefore it leaves a private land owner to supply interested parties with a supply of indigenous timber. My blocks were set up for the long term supply of specialised timber for use in boat building, furniture, poles, farm gates, fence posts/batteries and other small items. Nothing was ever wasted right down to even small branches. The Forest Act recognises the rights of land owners to obtain an economic return from a privately owned asset but also identifies their responsibility to maintain a healthy forest and functioning ecosystem. It aims to achieve an appropriate balance between productive use and maintenance of the forests natural values. Reasons for my support area: In my original submission I asked that if my application under 731- District Plan (Proposed) was accepted. I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>21.4</i>
<i>FS1377.238</i>	<i>Havelock Village Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>21.4</i>
737.1	Ronald Rumbal on behalf of Ronald Rumbal and Catherine Evison	Oppose	Amend the boundaries of the proposed Significant Natural Area on property number 2010658 (1807 Whaanga Road, Ruapuke), to the area currently protected by WDC covenant (see map attached to submission for more detail).	The amount of the property already protected as covenanted bush is enough, and the submitters do not wish to give up further rights on their property. The proposed Significant Natural Area indicated when combined with the covenanted bush would cover approximately	Accept in part	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				75% of the property. The proposed Significant Natural Area includes pine trees and orchard. Remaining bush is regenerating and older and the submitter wishes to have freedom to use it. Moved to the property for it's bush and have no intentions of diminishing it, but want to be able to build tracks, buildings (cabin), fences etc. The proposed Significant Natural Area will decrease the value of the property as it will severely restrict any development a future owner may want to do. Council needs to trust the landowners do the right thing with it regarding conservation. While the submitters do not want to clear it for farming, they want control of it. One of the reasons given for Significant Natural Area is to allow wildlife to travel from the mountain to the coast. The birds are able to fly from bush block to bush block and the only animals that will benefit from such bush are possums, stoats, rats, feral cats and wild pigs. The property and surrounding covenanted bush is blocked from ever making a connection with the coast by existing paddocks and farmland.		
FS1007.18	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	33.3
FS1293.136	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.3
737.2	Ronald Rumbal on behalf of Ronald Rumbal and Catherine Evison	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, to retain the amount of earthworks contained in the Operative District Plan.	No specific reasons stated.	Reject	20.2
FS1007.9	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Reject	20.2
737.3	Ronald Rumbal on behalf of Ronald Rumbal and Catherine Evison	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to allow additional volume of Manuka and/or Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes.	Limiting the cutting of firewood to 5m3 is overly restrictive. The submitter relies solely on a log burner for heating and hot water. Burnt through 7m3 of firewood this winter (even	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				though not cold). Kanuka is an invasive tree species and regenerates very quickly.		
FS1007.11	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	
737.4	Ronald Rumbal on behalf of Ronald Rumbal and Catherine Evison	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous Vegetation - outside a Significant Natural Area, to allow additional volume of Manuka and/or Kanuka for removal for domestic firewood purposes.	Limiting the cutting of firewood to 5m3 is overly restrictive. The submitter relies solely on a log burner for heating and hot water. Burnt through 7m3 of firewood this winter (even though not cold). Kanuka is an invasive tree species and regenerates very quickly.	Accept in part	18.1
FS1007.12	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	18.1
745.2	Brian Butt and Sheryl Kruger - for Kiana Lace Limited on behalf of Year 91 Family Trust	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from 399 Bedford Road, Te Kowhai.	The vegetation in the proposed Significant Natural Area of 399 Bedford Road is of low quality including willows, gorse, bracken, privet and other pest species. There are no native trees, shrubs or plants in the proposed Significant Natural Area of 399 Bedford Road. The only native trees are a small number of pongas and one nikau, all of which sit outside the eastern boundary of 399 Bedford Road.	Accept in part	33.2
FS1293.137	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.2
747.1	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property legally described as Lot 4, DP 182809 on Certificate of Title NA113D/782. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	Whereas the property may have qualified as a Significant Natural Area in the past (perhaps when the original Council survey work was undertaken), this was compromised when a Waikato Regional Council consent was granted to an adjoining landowner to lower the stream feeding the wetland. The wetland may have also been since further compromised by other unconsented diversions to the stream feeding it. The area identified as an Significant Natural Area on the property, has been predominantly dry in recent times and has limited natural habitat value (see attached aerial photo). The vegetation on the site is	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				sparse with predominantly willows around the perimeter of the property. For these reasons the area identified does not meet the criteria for identification of a Significant Natural Area and this identification should be removed.		
FS1293.138	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
747.2	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas to acknowledge that enhancement may not always be practicable or achievable and restoration is a desirable management outcome with the following amendments: Indigenous biodiversity in Significant Natural Areas is protected and enhanced restored or enhanced where appropriate. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	The Waikato Regional Policy Statement requires, at Policy 11.2, that significant indigenous vegetation and the significant habitats of indigenous fauna be protected by ensuring the characteristics that contribute to its significance are not adversely affected to the extent that the significance of the vegetation or habitat is reduced. This is consistent with RMA 1991 s6(c) requirements. Proposed District Plan Objective 3.2.1 also seeks enhancement as an outcome. The Objective should acknowledge that enhancement of Significant Natural Areas may not always be practicable or achievable and that in addition, restoration is also a desirable management outcome.	Reject	8.1
FS1377.256	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. It is not always practicable or achievable to enhance the indigenous biodiversity in SNAs.	Reject	8.1
FS1007.6	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Reject	8.1
747.3	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.2 - Identify and recognise as follows (or similar such amendments to give effect to the relief sought in this submission): (a) Identify significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in accordance with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and identify	Proposed Policy 3.2.2 applies a no adverse effects approach to managing effects on the characteristics of Significant Natural Areas. This goes beyond the requirements of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, which seeks to ensure	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			as Significant Natural Areas. (b) Recognise and protect Significant Natural Areas by ensuring the characteristics that contribute to their significance are not adversely affected to the extent that the significance of the vegetation or habitat is reduced. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	that the characteristics that contribute to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna are not adversely affected to the extent that the significance of the vegetation or habitat is reduced. The policy should be tempered to recognise that the characteristics that contribute to the significance of the Significant Natural Area are not adversely affected to the extent that the significance of the vegetation or habitat is reduced.		
FS1377.257	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Policy 3.2.2 should have some flexibility to accept that there is potential for SNAs to be affected without altering the significance of the area. In addition, there should be policy recognition that effects on SNA values can also be mitigated, offset or compensated for.	Accept	9.1
FS1292.22	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Reject and ensure that the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per McPherson's original submission (691.3).	McPherson recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS.	Reject	9.1
FS1334.22	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Reject and ensure that the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per Fulton Hogan's original submission (575.6).	Fulton Hogan recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS.	Reject	9.1
747.4	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a)(i)-(iv) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas AND Delete Rule 22.2.3.3 P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a) and P2 apply conditions to earthworks for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences, or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area. The conditions specifying volumes, depth and setback ((i)-(iv)) should be deleted from the maintenance of existing tracks, fences, or drains in these rules. Maintenance of these features as they are, and within the footprints already occupied, will ensure the characteristics that contribute to the significance of the Significant Natural Area are not adversely affected and that vegetation or habitat is not reduced. The conditions at (v)-(vii) provide standards for the reinstatement of earthworks, including re-vegetation, sediment control and natural water flow requirements. There is no reason to apply additional limitations on volumes, depth and setback of earthworks given the earthworks are for physical features already in place.	Accept in part	20.2
FS1045.14	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We agree that there is no reason to apply additional limitations on volumes, depth and setback of earthworks for physical features such as existing tracks, fences, and drains.		Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1007.10	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	20.2
747.5	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area to ensure the link from the term "Indigenous vegetation clearance" does not go to the more generally defined "vegetation clearance" and that the rule only limits the clearance indigenous vegetation. AND Add an additional definition of "Indigenous vegetation clearance" if necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	The online version of Rule 22.2.8 links the term "Indigenous vegetation clearance" to a more general definition of "vegetation clearance", which includes for example cutting of all forms or vegetation, indigenous or otherwise. This is not the intent of the rule and a link to a more specifically defined "Indigenous vegetation clearance" should be made in the rule.	Accept in part	22.2
747.8	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to provide for the following additional permitted activity: Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area for the purposes of ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	Rule 22.2.7 has a limited list of permitted indigenous vegetation clearance in Significant Natural Areas. Its reference to "conservation fencing to exclude stock or pests" does not provide for the full range of clearance that might be required to protect the characteristics of a Significant Natural Area. Allowance for a full range of ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works should be made in the rule.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1045.15	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We agree that the rule 22.2.7 should be amended to provide for a full range of ecosystem protection, rehabilitation and restoration works.		Accept in part	21.1
FS1340.142	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 747.8 as it seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs that provide greater flexibility and enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1377.258	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	21.1
747.9	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area to provide for the following additional permitted activity: Indigenous vegetation clearance for the purposes of ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such	Rule 22.2.8 has a limited list of permitted indigenous vegetation clearance in Significant Natural Areas. Its reference to "conservation fencing to exclude stock or pests" does not provide for the full range of clearance that might be required to protect the characteristics of a Significant Natural Area. Allowance for a full	Accept in part	22.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	range of ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works should be made in the rule.		
760.2	Patrick Day on behalf of P & B Day	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlay from 656 Wainui Road, Raglan.	Object to compulsory covenanting of a large part of the subject property. No suggestion of compensation or quid pro quo arrangements. Areas within proposed Significant Natural Area is currently used for other rural purposes. Area south and east of subject property should not be designated Significant Natural Area as: -There are some small trees very close to the house which may need removal if they become a safety threat. - Is already a service area containing a water tank and pump shed present. - Adjacent to the water tank (south) is a storage area for country property equipment, hosing, metal and fence materials. - Adjacent to the water tank (north) is a shed storing beekeeping equipment. - From the storage area south to the road was a former road the submitter replanted and submitter would like to retain right to use this area as required for rural purposes and as an attractive local native flora entrance. The area to the north of the property should not be a Significant Natural Area as: - Boundary fences protecting the bust must be kept clear of vegetation. -Pathways (low impact) within the bush, built by the submitters, allowed access to the property and the beach which must be kept clear. Such pathways are also used as access for pest eradication and the Karioi project people seem to place all their traps adjacent to the constructed paths. - Additional low impact pathways may also need constructing for firefighting access as previous experiences proved such access was difficult.	Accept in part	33.3
FS1293.139	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to	Accept in part	33.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
FS1276.153	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	This area is important for maintaining natural links between Karioi and the sea. The purpose of the RMA is to restrict development to achieve the RMA's aims.	Accept in part	33.3
FS1007.17	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	33.3
771.7	Alison Brown for Bathurst Resources Ltd and BT Mining Ltd	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlay from areas within the Rotowaro coal mining licence 37 355, ancillary coal mining licence 37 155/01, mining permit 60 422, exploration permits 40 698 and 56 220 and the extended Rotowaro coalfield areas. AND Any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The identification of Significant Natural Areas within the areas, is not warranted. These areas are already mined or consented to be mined and for other areas will have the effect of sterilising the future extraction of the coal resource.	Accept in part	33.9
FS1293.140	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Accept in part	33.9
771.8	Alison Brown for Bathurst Resources Ltd and BT Mining Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to ensure that where an activity is regionally significant and cannot be located other than where it is proposed, provisions for offsets should be considered as mitigation for adverse effects on areas of Significant Natural Areas which cannot be avoided. AND Any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Where there is a regionally significant mineral resource consideration of a significant natural area should be given to balancing the needs of the community by allowing offsets to mitigate the temporary effects of any mineral extraction.	Accept	6.1.1
780.1	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental	Oppose	Add areas of Significant indigenous vegetation or habitat through the use of LENZ and in consultation with conservation and environment groups. AND	Large amount of indigenous forest and scrub in the Waikato District and that up to 50% of it is threatened and most of that is not legally protected. The NZ Biodiversity Strategy	Reject	24.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Defence Incorporated Society		Add rules for Significant indigenous vegetation and habitat as follows: <u>In a significant indigenous vegetation or habitat area the following are discretionary activities:-</u> <u>Cultivation. Spreading soil or other material (including fertilizer or lime) in excess of existing routine application rates. Drainage works, apart from routine maintenance. Land reclamation from estuary or other wetlands. Modifications to watercourses apart from routine maintenance. Flood defences. Infilling ditches, ponds, pits, pools, marshes or historic earthwork features. Clearing vegetation or land (by physical removal, burning, application of herbicides, or deliberate overgrazing, trampling, or rooting by livestock) in preparation for cultivation. Introducing livestock (including poultry) at intensive stocking rates, or increasing stocking rates to intensive levels.</u>	(page 33) set the 2020 goal as, "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats (such as lowland forests and grasslands, wetlands and dunelands) have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."		
FSI387.1188	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	24.2
FSI198.34	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	Given the implications of identification of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat, identification of such areas should only be with the consent of the relevant landowner and based on a site specific ecological assessment. Place limits on volume of earthworks over a 12 month period in all zones fails to recognise the nature of mineral extraction and would prevent large scale mining activities.	Accept	24.2
FSI342.210	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 780.1.	FFNZ opposes the submission. Desktop analysis is one tool that can be used to inform an SNA identification process; however, there are limitations that can only be overcome with ground truthing and landowner consultation. Isolating landowners from	Accept	24.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>the process will only reduce buy-in from the very people who can make a material difference towards achieving improved biodiversity outcomes.</i>		
794.5	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems as follows: (a) Indigenous biodiversity values and the life-supporting capacity of indigenous ecosystems are maintained or enhanced. (b) <u>New areas of indigenous biodiversity are established.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including <i>Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council</i>, <i>Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council</i>, <i>Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council</i> are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. <i>Cabra v Auckland Council</i> case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing</p>	Reject	6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils were practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.		
FS1308.136	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support this submission as it relates to the incentivisation subdivision and biodiversity enhancement in the Waikato District. The enhancement of existing areas and establishment of new areas of indigenous biodiversity accords with the WRPS, The Vision and Strategy and Part 2 of the RMA.	Reject	6.1
FS1342.219	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 794.5.	Whilst FFNZ understands the intent of the submission, we consider the amendment is unnecessary. New areas of indigenous biodiversity being established may be a consequence of the notified Objective 3.1.1(a), it doesn't need to be an Objective on its own to achieve the outcome.	Accept	6.1
794.6	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.1.2 Policies as follows: (a) Enable activities that maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity including: (i) planting using indigenous species suitable to the habitat; (ii) the removal or management of pest plant and animal species; (iii) biosecurity works. (iv) incentivised subdivision (b) Consider the following when avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity: (x) ecological corridors, natural processes and buffer areas; (xi) connections and linkages that integrate habitats and resources; (xii) the appropriateness of landuse activities, including primary production; (xiii) legal and physical production of existing habitat; (c) Provide for the removal of manuka or kanuka on a sustainable basis.	Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not quality as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>AND Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils were practicable</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.		
FS1308.137	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support this submission as it relates to incentivized environmental subdivision for the reasons provided in submission point 794.5.	Reject	7.1
794.7	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Not Stated	Retain Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	8.3
794.8	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.2 Identify and Recognise as follows: (a) Identify significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in accordance with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and identify as Significant Natural Areas. (b) Recognise and protect Significant Natural Areas by ensuring the characteristics that contribute to their significance are not adversely affected. (c) <u>Incentivise subdivision for ecological enhancement where it will maintain and support the viability of existing Significant Natural Areas.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.	Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.</p>		
FS1308.138	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support this submission as it relates to incentivized environmental subdivision for the reasons provided in submission point 794.5	Reject	9.1
794.9	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Support	<p>Amend Policy 3.2.7 (a) (i) Managing Significant Natural Areas as follows: (a) Promote the management of Significant Natural Areas in a way that protects their long-term ecological functioning and indigenous biodiversity values, through such means as: (i) permanently excluding stock through voluntary covenants and conservation <u>incentive</u> subdivisions AND Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas</p>	Reject	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including <i>Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council</i>, <i>Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council</i>, <i>Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council</i> are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. <i>Cabra v Auckland Council</i> case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the <i>Cabra</i> case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.		
797.8	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy as notified.	The provisions provide appropriate recognition of the need to enable activities within Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	10.1
797.9	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance as notified.	The provisions provide appropriate recognition of the need to provide for vegetation clearance to enable the maintenance of farm tracks, drains and fences.	Accept in part	13.1
799.1	Leo Koppens	Oppose	Delete Chapter 3: Natural Environment.	Chapter 3 and Council's maps do not meet Waikato Regional Policy Statement requirement that significant indigenous areas be identified on Council maps. Maps do not show all significant area of bush (mainly Kahikatea) throughout the District.	Reject	5.2
799.2	Leo Koppens	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan to allow all significant indigenous areas to be protected the same as identified Significant Natural Areas.	Chapter 3 and Councils maps do not meet Waikato Regional Policy Statement requirement that significant indigenous areas be identified on Council maps. Maps do not show all significant area of bush (mainly Kahikatea) throughout the District. Rule 22.2.8 offers very little protection for bush areas.	Accept in part	25.2
<i>FS1342.226</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 799.2.</i>	<i>FFNZ opposes this submission; it is unclear how the submitter wants this approach to be implemented. We wish to alert Council that the use of rules and the consent process as a mechanism to assess whether a site of indigenous vegetation is to be considered significant is putting at risk the acceptance and buy in of landowners. One of the biggest issues when a site is identified by way of a rule, is that the affected landowner has no greater rights to submit on the proposal than those of the general public, and therefore indigenous vegetation on privately owned land is often treated as a public or free good. By adopting the consent process as the primary mechanism for the identification of significant natural areas the onus of proof shifts, and elevates all sites to a significance status until proven otherwise by the applicant.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>25.2</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
799.3	Leo Koppens	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to prevent cattle grazing in Significant Natural Areas.	No reasons provided.	Reject	25.2
FS1342.227	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 799.3.	FFNZ fundamentally opposes this relief sought; it is inconsistent with the enabling intent of the RMA and is not required to achieve improved protection over SNAs across the district. The FFNZ submission introduces a range of options that, if adopted, would help to achieve those goals without isolating the landowners whose buy-in is required to achieve successful outcomes.	Accept	25.2
81.20	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide a mechanism to manage areas that meet the WRPS IIA criteria and have not been identified and mapped in the Proposed Plan.	The submitter notes that not all areas of significance under section 6c of the Resource Management Act (RMA) and IIA of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement will have been identified and mapped in the development of the Proposed Plan. The plan needs to provide for those areas that meet the SNA criteria, but which were not known about until an activity is proposed.	Accept	25.2
FS1342.43	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.20.	FFNZ opposes this submission; it is unclear what mechanism the submitter proposes. We wish to alert Council that the use of rules and the consent process as a mechanism to assess whether a site of indigenous vegetation is to be considered significant is putting at risk the acceptance and buy in of landowners. One of the biggest issues when a site is identified by way of a rule, is that the affected landowner has no greater rights to submit on the proposal than those of the general public, and therefore indigenous vegetation on privately owned land is often treated as a public or free good. By adopting the consent process as the primary mechanism for the identification of significant natural areas the burden of proof shifts, and elevates all sites to a significance status until proven otherwise by the applicant.	Reject	25.2
FS1223.6	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Accept	25.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1340.7	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes this submission as it is considered that the recommended approach results in high levels of uncertainty. The submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	25.2
FS1258.1	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The request creates uncertainty about exactly which areas are to be brought within the scope of the policies referred to. It is not clear exactly which objectives, policies and rules are intended to apply to these additional, identified, areas. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.	Reject	25.2
81.21	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add advice notes drawing attention to the provisions of the Waikato Pest Management Plan, particularly for earthworks and fill activities.	There is potential for a number of activities to exacerbate the spread of pest plants and diseases, e.g. earthworks and filling. The spread of such pests and diseases poses a risk to the regional economy as well as indigenous biodiversity. While the Regional Pest Management Plan provides controls around the management of pests and diseases, it is important to recognise that activities controlled by the Proposed District Plan may also have implications in terms of biosecurity.	Accept	5.2
FS1342.44	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 81.21.	Support is extended to this submission. The plan would benefit from better use of advice notes.	Accept	5.2
FS1223.7	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Accept	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
81.23	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add issues, objectives, policies and rules to address the spread of Kauri Dieback Disease.	Kauri dieback is caused by a pathogen that is spread through soil, and is threatening kauri with functional extinction. Its spread can be facilitated by footwear, gear and machinery that is not cleaned of soil before going near kauri, and again before leaving an area with kauri. Provisions are sought to manage the effects of land use and development on the spread of kauri dieback. There is an opportunity to protect kauri. This will require changes in behaviour. The submission contains some details on environment court proceedings that the submitter are a party to.	Accept in part	17.1
FS1342.46	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.23.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC to implement a planning response over and above what is being undertaken at a national and regional level. Further, it is not specific as to what the planning response may be and so we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming.	Accept in part	17.1
81.27	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain mapping of the coastal environment and consider a section that sets out the approach to the coastal environment.	The submitter supports the mapping of the Coastal Environment. The submitter considers that it would be helpful to plan users if there were a section in the Proposed District Plan that sets out the approach to the Coastal Environment.	Accept	12.1
FS1381.1	Counties Power Limited	Support	Support in part.	Counties Power Limited (CPL) support this submission in part, on the proviso that the proposed Coastal Environment overlay can be retained upon further detailed assessment of the Coastal Environment being undertaken as outlined in Section 4.1.8 b) ii) of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The proposed Coastal Environment overlay as notified is very broad and its mapping criteria not well understood. A section within the Proposed District Plan is required that outlines the methodology undertaken for the identification of the proposed Coastal Environment overlay and the associated issues, objectives, policies and implementation methods. It is unclear if the provision of nationally or	Accept	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>regionally significant infrastructure (including network utilities and the provision of renewable energy) is provided for within the proposed Coastal Environment overlay and clarification is sought.</i>		
81.28	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed Plan to take into account activities that may impact on the significant habitats of indigenous fauna that have been identified and mapped in the planning maps.	Section 6(c) of the RMA and Chapter 11 of the WRPS both require the protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna. Consideration needs to be given to the SNAs identified on the planning maps and whether provisions that focus on the clearance of indigenous vegetation and earthworks are enough to ensure that significant habitats are protected. For example clearance of exotic vegetation may in certain circumstances adversely affect significant habitats of indigenous fauna (e.g. bats).	Reject	25.2
FS1342.49	Federated Farmers	Support	Support in part submission point 81.28. Support is extended to the principle of site-specific controls for SNAs. This will involve ground truthing and landowner involvement to implement.	Support is extended to site-specific planning responses; however, until that degree of knowledge is obtained via ground truthing, the notified rules, with amendments sought by FFNZ, provide the controls necessary to negate land use impacts on SNAs.	Reject	25.2
FS1293.13	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General supports the consideration of provisions which are adequate to ensure that significant habitats are protected. This would ensure the Proposed Plan gives effect to Section 6 (c) and Chapter 11A of the WRPS.	Reject	25.2
FS1340.8	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter seeks amendments to provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	25.2
FS1062.7	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Oppose and disallow all of submission point 81.28.	• It is important that SNA are properly identified by experts before overlays are set.	Accept	25.2
81.29	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 P1 (a) (ii) and P2 (a)(ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area to exclude clearance in wetlands.	The submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands, this is potentially permitted through P1 (a)(ii) and P2(a)(ii). Wetlands are underrepresented with approximately 20% of original extent remaining in the Waikato District.	Accept	22.2
FS1293.14	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Waikato District has a significant proportion of indigenous wetlands in the district. The Director-General considers that the proposed amendment identifies a practical intervention to protect values of wetlands.	Accept	22.2
FS1342.25	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.29.	FFNZ opposes the restrictions on clearing indigenous vegetation proposed by the submitter as being unduly onerous and unnecessary to achieve positive biodiversity outcomes for the district.	Reject	22.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
81.30	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add an additional clause to Rule 22.2.8 P1 (a) (vii) and P3 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area as follows: <u>There is no alternative development area on the site outside of the area of indigenous vegetation clearance.</u>	P1 and P3 encourage dwellings, marae and papakainga to locate outside of areas of indigenous vegetation, as is the case for SNAs.	Accept	22.2
FS1342.26	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.30.	FFNZ opposes the restrictions on clearing indigenous vegetation proposed by the submitter as being unduly onerous and unnecessary to achieve positive biodiversity outcomes for the district.	Reject	22.2
81.31	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area to provide a total cap on clearance, after which a consent for a restricted discretionary activity is required.	P3 does not provide a total cap for clearance, at which point a restricted discretionary activity will be triggered. An unlimited amount of clearance could occur under this rule with no ability to require avoid, remedy, mitigate or offset.	Reject	22.3
FS1342.27	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.31.	FFNZ opposes the restrictions on clearing indigenous vegetation proposed by the submitter as being unduly onerous and unnecessary to achieve positive biodiversity outcomes for the district.	Accept	22.3
FS1315.13	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	The activities listed in P2 that have no cap in P3 relate to existing and essential farming activities. The caps and reasons set out in the LFL submission should also apply on Maaori Freehold or Customary land outside a SNA.	Reject	22.3
81.32	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.8 RD1 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area for where the permitted thresholds become a restricted discretionary activity.	The submitter supports clearance beyond the permitted thresholds becoming a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	22.4
FS1315.14	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Support in part.		Accept in part	
81.33	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add additional assessment criteria to Rule 22.2.8 RD1 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area as follows: <u>the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied, mitigated or offset.</u>	Discretion should include the adverse effects on the indigenous biodiversity on the site and the extent to which these adverse effects have been avoided, remedied, mitigated or offset to allow consideration of the mitigation hierarchy in WRPS Implementation Method 11.1.3.	Accept in part	22.4
FS1315.15	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Support in part.		Accept in part	22.4
FS1345.86	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Accept in part / reject in part.	Genesis supports the intent of the submission; however any assessment criteria of this nature needs to include "environmental compensation" as well as offsetting.	Accept in part	22.4
FS1340.9	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Submission 81.33 seeks to add an assessment criteria to reflect provision 11.1.3 of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter notes that	Accept in part	22.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>the amendment as written would not accurately reflect provision 11.1.3 which requires adverse effects of the loss or degradation of indigenous biodiversity to be avoided, remedied or mitigated - but only promote biodiversity offsets where significant residual adverse effects are unable to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i>		
81.34	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.9 P1 (a)(ii) and P2(a)(ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area to exclude clearance in wetlands.	The submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands, this is potentially permitted through P1 (a)(ii) and P2(a)(ii). Wetlands are underrepresented with approximately 20% of original extent remaining in the Waikato District.	Accept	22.2
<i>FS1342.28</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 81.34.</i>	<i>FFNZ opposes the restrictions on clearing indigenous vegetation proposed by the submitter as being unduly onerous and unnecessary to achieve positive biodiversity outcomes for the district.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>22.2</i>
81.35	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add an additional clause to Rule 23.2.9 P1(a)(vii) and P3(a) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area as follows: <u>There is no alternative development area on the site outside of the area of indigenous vegetation clearance.</u>	P1 and P3 encourage dwellings, marae and papakainga to locate outside of areas of indigenous vegetation, as is the case for SNAs.	Accept	22.2
<i>FS1342.29</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 81.35.</i>	<i>FFNZ opposes the restrictions on clearing indigenous vegetation proposed by the submitter as being unduly onerous and unnecessary to achieve positive biodiversity outcomes for the district.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>22.2</i>
81.36	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.9 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area to provide a total cap on clearance, after which a consent for a restricted discretionary activity is required.	P3 does not provide a total cap for clearance, at which point a restricted discretionary activity will be triggered. An unlimited amount of clearance could occur under this rule with no ability to require avoid, remedy, mitigate or offset.	Reject	22.3
81.37	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.9 RD1 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area with the permitted thresholds becoming a restricted discretionary activity.	The submitter supports clearance beyond the permitted thresholds becoming a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	22.4
81.38	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add an additional assessment criteria to Rule 23.2.9 RD1 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area as follows: <u>the extent to which adverse effects have been avoided, remedied, mitigated or offset.</u>	Discretion should include the adverse effects on the indigenous biodiversity on the site and the extent to which these adverse effects have been avoided, remedied, mitigated or offset to allow consideration of the mitigation hierarchy in WRPS Implementation Method 11.1.3.	Accept	22.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
81.39	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend to clarify the application of the earthworks rule (Rule 16.2.4.3) in terms of whether it includes indigenous biodiversity vegetation clearance.	The submitter seeks clarity as to whether the earthworks rules for SNA include the clearance of vegetation as a result of earthworks or if that will be subject to Rule 16.2.8 respectively.	Reject	20.2
FS1377.4	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports greater clarity within the plan provisions.	Reject	20.2
81.40	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend to clarify the application of the earthworks rule (Rule 22.2.3.3) in terms of whether it includes indigenous biodiversity vegetation clearance.	The submitter seeks clarity as to whether the earthworks rules for SNA include the clearance of vegetation as a result of earthworks or if that will be subject to Rule 22.2.7 respectively.	Reject	20.2
81.41	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The submitter is supportive of indigenous vegetation clearance beyond permitted thresholds becoming a discretionary activity (D1).	Accept	21.8
81.42	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.7 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The submitter is supportive of indigenous vegetation clearance beyond permitted thresholds becoming a discretionary activity (D1).	Accept	21.8
81.43	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The submitter is supportive of indigenous vegetation clearance beyond permitted thresholds becoming a discretionary activity (D1).	Accept	21.8
81.44	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 24.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The submitter is supportive of indigenous vegetation clearance beyond permitted thresholds becoming a discretionary activity (D1).	Accept	21.8
81.45	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 28.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The submitter is supportive of indigenous vegetation clearance beyond permitted thresholds becoming a discretionary activity (D1).	Accept	21.8
81.46	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND	The submitter supports the provision for sustainable clearance of regenerating Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes or for arts or crafts in P2. However, the	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend Rule 16.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to exclude clearance of Manuka and Kanuka in wetlands and the coastal environment from this rule.	submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands or vegetation that is naturally short in stature. It is important to ensure that vegetation that is naturally short does not get included in the rules intended to provide for clearance of Manuka and Kanuka colonising pasture. Manuka, in particular, can be a permanent and important component of some types of ecosystems. These are generally wetlands, dunes and other coastal vegetation, but can be gumland vegetation that remains in the leached soils following kauri forest removal. These persistent shrublands are important habitats for lizards, orchids, mistletoes and a range of threatened species. Exclusion of permitted clearance of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands and from the Coastal Environment is likely to prevent clearance of these ecosystems of concern. The exclusion of Manuka and/or Kanuka clearance in the Coastal Environment from this rule would give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and Policy 11.4 of the WRPS. Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).		
FS1377.5	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	18.1
81.47	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to ensure that weeds are controlled in the cleared area and native vegetation is allowed to regenerate.	Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).	Reject	18.1
FS1377.6	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	18.1
81.48	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete P6 of Rule 16.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	P6 duplicates P2.	Accept	18.1
81.49	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the	The submitter supports the provision for sustainable clearance of regenerating Manuka or	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to exclude clearance of Manuka and Kanuka in wetlands and the coastal environment from this rule.</p>	<p>Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes or for arts or crafts in P2. However, the submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands or vegetation that is naturally short in stature. It is important to ensure that vegetation that is naturally short does not get included in the rules intended to provide for clearance of Manuka and Kanuka colonising pasture. Manuka, in particular, can be a permanent and important component of some types of ecosystems. These are generally wetlands, dunes and other coastal vegetation, but can be gumland vegetation that remains in the leached soils following kauri forest removal. These persistent shrublands are important habitats for lizards, orchids, mistletoes and a range of threatened species. Exclusion of permitted clearance of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands and from the Coastal Environment is likely to prevent clearance of these ecosystems of concern. The exclusion of Manuka and/or Kanuka clearance in the Coastal Environment from this rule would give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and Policy 11.4 of the WRPS. Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).</p>		
81.50	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to ensure that weeds are controlled in the cleared area and native vegetation is allowed to regenerate.	Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).	Reject	18.1
815.1	Louise Milne on behalf of H&P Fyers Ltd	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Areas from the property at 442 Waikare Road, Ohinewai.	The land has recently been inherited and has been managed by the same family for 100 years and will continue in the future, as such, it has been proven that the land has been taken care of. The Significant Natural Areas significantly reduces the area of land available causing decreased income, rates etc will still need to be paid, increasing costs. The Significant Natural Areas decreases the value of the farm and makes it less attractive for sale to potential	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>purchasers if it is to be sold. As the current custodian the submitter will not be planting any more natives during my tenure as they do not want future generations to have to experience what is effectively a private property land-grab, carbon credits etc in 10-20 years time. This is New Zealand, not South Africa or Zimbabwe. It renders the land incapable of reasonable use now and in the future. It is private property.</p>		
FS1207.18	Ohinewai Area Committee	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	<p>Upon examining this issue, it would appear that an examination of Google satellite imagery (or other similar images) has been done and it was determined that any land that has tree cover, that is not plantation or associated with garden, is a Significant Natural Area (SNA) as there is an overwhelming correlation between the satellite imagery and these areas. It does not appear that anyone from WDC has visited the site. This is shown well illustrated in that the area between the river edge, and the stop bank through the Ohinewai area has been designated as a SNA. Many residents back onto this area, and ask any one of them about what is there, and they would answer it is overrun with willow, alder and a mixture of invasive weeds. How this could be considered a SNA does not make sense. It would also appear that other farmers in surrounding district have also had SNA areas designated, where they are in fact 'waste' lands and of no significant value what so ever. It appears that the blunt tool of Google has been used, rather than a consultation with the people neighbouring/owning this land to find out what exactly occurs here and to see if there is any significant value. Thus we fully support the above submission to have SNA removed.</p>	Accept in part	33.6
FS1293.141	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<p>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of</p>	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.		
FS1145.20	Ohinewai Area Committee	Support	Upon examining this issue, it would appear that an examination of google satellite imagery (or other similar images) has been done and it was determined that any land that has tree cover, that is not plantation or associated with gardens, is a Significant Natural Area (SNA) as there is an overwhelming correlation between the satellite imagery and these areas. It does not appear that anyone from WDC has visited the site. This is shown well illustrated in that the area between the river edge, and the stop bank through the Ohinewai area has been designated a SNA. Many residents back onto this area, and ask any one of them about what is there, and they would answer it is overrun with willow, alder and a mixture of invasive weeds. How this could be considered a SNA does not make sense. It would also appear that other farmers in surrounding district have also had SNA areas designated, where they are in fact 'waste' lands and of no significant value what so ever. It appears that the blunt tool of Google has been used, rather than a consultation with the people neighbouring/owning this land to find out what exactly occurs here and to see if there is any significant value. Thus we fully support the above submission to have SNA removed.		Accept in part	33.6
FS1007.24	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	33.6
81.51	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete P6 of Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	P6 duplicates P2.	Accept	18.1
81.52	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 23.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 23.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to exclude clearance of Manuka and Kanuka in wetlands and the coastal environment from this rule.	The submitter supports the provision for sustainable clearance of regenerating Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes or for arts or crafts in P2. However, the submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands or vegetation that is naturally short in stature. It is important to ensure that vegetation that is naturally short does not get included in the rules intended to provide for clearance of Manuka and Kanuka colonising pasture. Manuka, in particular, can be a permanent and important component of some types of ecosystems. These are generally wetlands, dunes and other coastal vegetation, but can be gumland vegetation that remains in the leached soils following kauri forest removal. These persistent shrublands are	Accept in part	18.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				important habitats for lizards, orchids, mistletoes and a range of threatened species. Exclusion of permitted clearance of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands and from the Coastal Environment is likely to prevent clearance of these ecosystems of concern. The exclusion of Manuka and/or Kanuka clearance in the Coastal Environment from this rule would give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and Policy 11.4 of the WRPS. Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).		
81.53	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to ensure that weeds are controlled in the cleared area and native vegetation is allowed to regenerate.	Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).	Reject	18.1
81.54	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete P6 of Rule 23.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	P6 duplicates P2.	Accept	18.1
81.55	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 28.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 28.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to exclude clearance of Manuka and Kanuka in wetlands and the coastal environment from this rule.	The submitter supports the provision for sustainable clearance of regenerating Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes or for arts or crafts in P2. However, the submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands or vegetation that is naturally short in stature. It is important to ensure that vegetation that is naturally short does not get included in the rules intended to provide for clearance of Manuka and Kanuka colonising pasture. Manuka, in particular, can be a permanent and important component of some types of ecosystems. These are generally wetlands, dunes and other coastal vegetation, but can be gumland vegetation that remains in the leached soils following kauri forest removal. These persistent shrublands are important habitats for lizards, orchids, mistletoes and a range of threatened species. Exclusion of permitted clearance of Manuka or Kanuka	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from wetlands and from the Coastal Environment is likely to prevent clearance of these ecosystems of concern. The exclusion of Manuka and/or Kanuka clearance in the Coastal Environment from this rule would give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and Policy 11.4 of the WRPS. Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).		
81.56	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 28.2.8 P2 to ensure that weeds are controlled in the cleared area and native vegetation is allowed to regenerate.	Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).	Reject	18.1
81.57	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete P6 of Rule 28.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	P6 duplicates P2.	Accept	18.1
81.58	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain provisions for sustainable clearance of regenerating Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes or for arts or crafts in any chapters not covered in previous submission points, and except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend provisions to exclude clearance of Manuka and Kanuka in wetlands and the coastal environment from this rule (Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area) any other area of the Proposed Plan where similar provisions apply.	The submitter supports the provision for sustainable clearance of regenerating Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes or for arts or crafts. However, the submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands or vegetation that is naturally short in stature. It is important to ensure that vegetation that is naturally short does not get included in the rules intended to provide for clearance of Manuka and Kanuka colonising pasture. Manuka, in particular, can be a permanent and important component of some types of ecosystems. These are generally wetlands, dunes and other coastal vegetation, but can be gumland vegetation that remains in the leached soils following kauri forest removal. These persistent shrublands are important habitats for lizards, orchids, mistletoes and a range of threatened species. Exclusion of permitted clearance of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands and from the Coastal Environment is likely to prevent clearance of these ecosystems of concern. The exclusion of Manuka and/or Kanuka clearance in the	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Coastal Environment from this rule would give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and Policy 11.4 of the WRPS. Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii). The submission notes a number of rules that have amendments or retention sought as relief (subject to separate submission points)		
FS1342.22	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow the submission point 81.58.	FFNZ opposes the blunt planning response. If manuka and kanuka contributes to the values of the particular SNA then it may be appropriate, but if not then some clearance should be allowed. FFNZ supports more site-specific planning responses to better protect SNAs and enable resource use when appropriate.	Accept in part	18.1
81.59	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend provisions to ensure that weeds are controlled in the cleared area and native vegetation is allowed to regenerate in a Significant Natural Area, in any chapters not covered in previous submissions.	Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii). The submission notes a number of rules that have amendments or retention sought as relief (subject to separate submission points)	Reject	25.2
81.60	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete duplicate provisions for the Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area rules in any chapters not covered in previous submissions.	P6 duplicates P2. The submission notes a number of rules that are duplicates (subject to separate submission points) but has requested that the duplicates be removed for any other area of the Proposed Plan where similar provisions apply.	Accept	21.1
81.61	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.8 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area by giving it restricted discretionary activity status. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	P3 Provides for clearance of 250m2 of indigenous vegetation removal within an SNA for building/access purposes if there is no alternative development area on the site outside the SNA. Natural values will not necessarily be evenly spread across the SNA and it is likely that some parts will be of higher natural value or of greater sensitivity than others. It is appropriate to retain discretion about the location of clearance in order to avoid as much as possible the adverse effects of the vegetation clearance. It is appropriate to require mitigation or offsetting to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(iii) or (iv). As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4	Accept in part	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for the coastal environment.		
FS1377.7	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	21.5
FS1293.15	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General considers that providing tighter controls in the Coastal environment will give better effects to the NZCPS.	Reject	21.5
81.62	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area by giving it restricted discretionary activity status. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	P3 Provides for clearance of 250m2 of indigenous vegetation removal within an SNA for building/access purposes if there is no alternative development area on the site outside the SNA. Natural values will not necessarily be evenly spread across the SNA and it is likely that some parts will be of higher natural value or of greater sensitivity than others. It is appropriate to retain discretion about the location of clearance in order to avoid as much as possible the adverse effects of the vegetation clearance. It is appropriate to require mitigation or offsetting to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(iii) or (iv). As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.	Accept in part	21.5
FS1342.30	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.62.	FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.	Accept in part	21.5
81.63	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.8 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area by giving it restricted discretionary activity status. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	P3 Provides for clearance of 250m2 of indigenous vegetation removal within an SNA for building/access purposes if there is no alternative development area on the site outside the SNA. Natural values will not necessarily be evenly spread across the SNA and it is likely that some parts will be of higher natural value or of greater sensitivity than others. It is appropriate to retain discretion about the location of clearance in order to avoid as much as possible the adverse effects of the vegetation clearance. It is appropriate to require mitigation or offsetting to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(iii) or (iv). As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.	Accept in part	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1342.31	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.63.	FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.	Accept in part	21.5
81.64	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.8 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area by giving it restricted discretionary activity status. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	P3 Provides for clearance of 250m2 of indigenous vegetation removal within an SNA for building/access purposes if there is no alternative development area on the site outside the SNA. Natural values will not necessarily be evenly spread across the SNA and it is likely that some parts will be of higher natural value or of greater sensitivity than others. It is appropriate to retain discretion about the location of clearance in order to avoid as much as possible the adverse effects of the vegetation clearance. It is appropriate to require mitigation or offsetting to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(iii) or (iv). As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.	Accept in part	21.5
FS1342.32	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.64.	FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.	Accept in part	21.5
81.65	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 28.2.8 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area by giving it restricted discretionary activity status. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	P3 Provides for clearance of 250m2 of indigenous vegetation removal within an SNA for building/access purposes if there is no alternative development area on the site outside the SNA. Natural values will not necessarily be evenly spread across the SNA and it is likely that some parts will be of higher natural value or of greater sensitivity than others. It is appropriate to retain discretion about the location of clearance in order to avoid as much as possible the adverse effects of the vegetation clearance. It is appropriate to require mitigation or offsetting to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(iii) or (iv). As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.	Accept in part	21.5
81.66	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend provisions for Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area (P3) by giving it restricted	P3 Provides for clearance of 250m2 of indigenous vegetation removal within an SNA for	Accept in part	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			discretionary activity status. AND/OR Amend provisions to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	building/access purposes if there is no alternative development area on the site outside the SNA. Natural values will not necessarily be evenly spread across the SNA and it is likely that some parts will be of higher natural value or of greater sensitivity than others. It is appropriate to retain discretion about the location of clearance in order to avoid as much as possible the adverse effects of the vegetation clearance. It is appropriate to require mitigation or offsetting to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(iii) or (iv). As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment. The submission lists a number of rules subject to the above (subject to their own submission points).		
FS1308.153	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	<i>A prohibited status is not needed to achieve Policy 14.2 of the WRPS, is unnecessarily restrictive and may result in unintended limitations on the rural production activities. Policy 14.2 seeks to avoid the decline in the availability of high-class soils for primary production due to the inappropriate subdivision, use or development. The strength of the objectives and policies of the Proposed Plan, together with a Non-Complying Activity status will give effect to this Policy. The loss of high-class soils needs to be considered in balance with many other factors such as rural landscape and character, and rural production. Subdivision around existing, established activities such as greenhouses, packing sheds etc. may also be economically enabling for the primary production industry and should not be unnecessarily prohibited, but rather considered on a case by case basis. Prohibiting any subdivision of a lot previously amalgamated for the purpose of a transferable lot subdivision is restrictive well beyond the intent of the Legacy Plan and will result in rural landowners being unable to use boundary relocation as a land management tool. Inclusion of PR4 is completely contrary to the direction of Plan which is to enable rural production.</i>	Accept in part	21.5
FS1342.33	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.66.	<i>FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	21.5
81.67	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance	P4 provides for up to 1500m2 of vegetation	Accept in part	21.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to a restricted discretionary activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 16.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to assign a lower threshold than clearance off indigenous vegetation outside of SNA for the same activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 16.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to provide an overall cap on clearance as a permitted activity. AND/OR Amend to clarify the location and extent of areas that might be subject to this rule in order to determine if it is likely to have a significant effect on indigenous biodiversity. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.</p>	<p>removal for marae complex, 500 m2 /dwelling, 500 m2 / building, as a permitted activity. Cumulatively this could be a large loss of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat without the ability to address adverse effects through avoiding, remedying, mitigating or offsetting. It is noted that this is the same amount of clearance is provided for non-significant indigenous vegetation. As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.</p>		
FS1377.8	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	21.6
81.68	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.2.7 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to a restricted discretionary activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 22.2.7 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to assign a lower threshold than clearance off indigenous vegetation outside of SNA for the same activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 22.2.7 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to provide an overall cap on clearance as a permitted activity. AND/OR Amend to clarify the location and extent of areas that might be subject to this rule in order to determine if it is</p>	<p>P4 provides for up to 1500m2 of vegetation removal for marae complex, 500 m2 /dwelling, 500 m2 / building, as a permitted activity. Cumulatively this could be a large loss of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat without the ability to address adverse effects through avoiding, remedying, mitigating or offsetting. It is noted that this is the same amount of clearance is provided for non-significant indigenous vegetation. As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.</p>	Accept in part	21.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			likely to have a significant effect on indigenous biodiversity. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.			
FS1342.34	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.68.	FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.	Accept in part	21.6
81.69	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 23.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 23.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to a restricted discretionary activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 23.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to assign a lower threshold than clearance off indigenous vegetation outside of SNA for the same activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 23.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to provide an overall cap on clearance as a permitted activity. AND/OR Amend to clarify the location and extent of areas that might be subject to this rule in order to determine if it is likely to have a significant effect on indigenous biodiversity. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	P4 provides for up to 1500m2 of vegetation removal for marae complex, 500 m2 /dwelling, 500 m2 / building, as a permitted activity. Cumulatively this could be a large loss of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat without the ability to address adverse effects through avoiding, remedying, mitigating or offsetting. It is noted that this is the same amount of clearance is provided for non-significant indigenous vegetation. As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.	Accept in part	21.6
FS1342.35	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.69.	FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.	Accept in part	21.6
81.70	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 24.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 24.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to a restricted discretionary activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 24.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to assign a lower threshold than clearance off indigenous vegetation outside	P4 provides for up to 1500m2 of vegetation removal for marae complex, 500 m2 /dwelling, 500 m2 / building, as a permitted activity. Cumulatively this could be a large loss of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat without the ability to address adverse effects through avoiding, remedying, mitigating or offsetting. It is noted that this is the same amount of clearance is provided for non-significant indigenous vegetation. As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the	Accept in part	21.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			of SNA for the same activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 24.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to provide an overall cap on clearance as a permitted activity. AND/OR Amend to clarify the location and extent of areas that might be subject to this rule in order to determine if it is likely to have a significant effect on indigenous biodiversity. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.		
						21.6
81.71	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 28.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 28.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to a restricted discretionary activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 28.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to assign a lower threshold than clearance off indigenous vegetation outside of SNA for the same activity. AND/OR Amend Rule 28.2.8 P4 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to provide an overall cap on clearance as a permitted activity. AND/OR Amend to clarify the location and extent of areas that might be subject to this rule in order to determine if it is likely to have a significant effect on indigenous biodiversity. AND/OR Amend to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.	P4 provides for up to 1500m2 of vegetation removal for marae complex, 500 m2 /dwelling, 500 m2 / building, as a permitted activity. Cumulatively this could be a large loss of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat without the ability to address adverse effects through avoiding, remedying, mitigating or offsetting. It is noted that this is the same amount of clearance is provided for non-significant indigenous vegetation. As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment.	Accept in part	21.6
						21.6
81.72	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend provisions for Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area (P4) in any chapters not covered in previous submissions to a restricted discretionary activity. AND/OR Amend provisions for Indigenous vegetation clearance	P4 provides for up to 1500m2 of vegetation removal for marae complex, 500m2 /dwelling, 500m2 / building, as a permitted activity. Cumulatively this could be a large loss of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat without the ability to address adverse effects	Accept in part	21.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>inside a Significant Natural Area (P4) to assign a lower threshold than clearance off indigenous vegetation outside of SNA for the same activity.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Amend provisions for Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area (P4) to provide an overall cap on clearance as a permitted activity.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Amend to clarify the location and extent of areas that might be subject to this rule in order to determine if it is likely to have a significant effect on indigenous biodiversity.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Amend provisions to provide tighter thresholds/ activity status in the Coastal Environment.</p>	<p>through avoiding, remedying, mitigating or offsetting. It is noted that this is the same amount of clearance is provided for non-significant indigenous vegetation. As currently drafted this rule does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Policy 11.4 for the coastal environment. The submission lists a number of rules subject to the above and these are provided for as separate submission points.</p>		
FS1342.36	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.72.	FFNZ opposes the submitter's relief sought. In our view the notified planning approach, incorporating FFNZ amendments, is appropriate.	Accept in part	21.6
FS1293.16	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General agrees that as currently drafted the rule could provide a mechanism for a large loss of significant indigenous vegetation clearance and does not give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the NZCPS and Policy 11.4 RPS for the coastal environment.	Accept in part	21.6
81.92	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 3.1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats to provide for the opportunity to offset non-significant biodiversity.	The submitter is generally supportive of Section 3.1 indigenous Vegetation and Habitats. However a number of amendments are sought in order to give effect to the WRPS and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. No Hierarchy or offsetting for non-significant biodiversity as per 11.1/ 11.1.3 WRPS.	Accept	5.2
FS1342.13	Federated Farmers	Support	Disallow the submission point 81.92. Provisional support is extended but more detail is required to allow a more informed decision to be made.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission, however without proposed policy wording or specific amendments, it is difficult to assess the merits or otherwise of the submission. FFNZ accepts that opportunities for offsetting non-significant biodiversity maybe useful for a resource user but that opportunity is not precluded under the notified plan.	Accept	5.2
FS1345.87	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis considers that amendments are not required, given that section 104 of the RMA enables an applicant to offer an offset or compensatory measure.	Reject	5.2
FS1377.13	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	It is not appropriate or necessary to require offsetting for non-significant biodiversity.	Reject	5.2
FS1258.4	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not detail the specific provisions intended to give effect to the Waikato RPS	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>and the NZCPS. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.</i>		
FS1202.42	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 81.92.	The Transport Agency supports offsetting as a potential tool for managing effects on indigenous biodiversity.	Accept	5.2
81.93	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems to clearly state that the outcome that is being worked towards is to achieve no net loss.	The Proposed District Plan does not clearly state that it seeks to maintain or enhance biodiversity in order to work towards achieving no net loss. Policy 11.1(a), Implementation Method 11.1.3 and 11.2.2 of the WRPS seek to achieve no net loss.	Accept	6.1
FS1045.7	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We support the objective of no net loss of ecosystems, especially wetlands.		Accept	6.1
FS1198.60	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	This is a blanket restriction that is not warranted. Policy 11.2.2 does not apply as it related to significant biodiversity only which is addressed by section 2. The proposed relief goes further than the directive in the Regional Policy Statement including 11.1. Policy 11.1 is given effect to by the Implementation Methods and implementation method 11.1.3 only requires no net loss of indigenous biodiversity where there are significant residual adverse effects. This is followed by Implementation Method 11.1.4 which explicitly recognises that minor adverse effects can be permissible.	Reject	6.1
FS1340.17	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission point 81.93 because it is not considered necessary. Overall, the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	6.1
FS1377.14	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	No net loss is appropriate for significant indigenous biodiversity but not for all biodiversity. HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	6.1
FS1258.5	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Policy 11.1(a) of the Waikato RPS seeks no net loss at a regional scale. The submission point seeks no net loss in an absolute sense. Also, the submission point does not detail the specific wording intended to give effect to the Waikato RPS. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine implications for land in which Meridian many have an interest.	Reject	6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1342.14	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow the submission point 81.93.	<i>It is not necessary to include that level of detail in the objective. The relief sought may be more appropriate for a policy.</i>	Reject	6.1
FS1045.8	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We support no net loss of ecosystems, especially wetlands.		Accept	6.1
81.94	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 3.1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats to provide a mitigation hierarchy for indigenous biodiversity outside of a Significant Natural Area.	Policy 3.2.4 provides for offsetting where there are significant residual effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of an SNA. However, there is no policy that sets out a mitigation hierarchy for indigenous biodiversity outside of an SNA. It is important to link offsetting to a mitigation hierarchy to ensure that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated before offsetting significant residual adverse effects is considered. Implementation Method 11.1.3 of the WRPS provides direction in terms of biodiversity offsets for indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs. Implementation Method 11.1.3 (a)(ii) states that district plans should promote biodiversity offsets as a way to achieve no net loss of indigenous biodiversity where significant residual adverse effects are unable to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept	5.2
FS1345.88	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis opposes a mitigation hierarchy for indigenous biodiversity outside of an SNA.	Reject	5.2
FS1342.15	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.94.	A mitigation hierarchy is not required for indigenous biodiversity outside of an Significant Natural Area (WRPS 11.1.3(a)(i)).	Reject	5.2
FS1198.61	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Not Stated	Allow the submission point but amend to include environmental compensation.	Offsetting and environmental compensation should be an optional tool to address any residual effect.	Accept	5.2
FS1258.6	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The requested amendment creates uncertainty about exactly what areas are to be within the scope of the mooted provisions. Also, the submission point does not detail the specific provisions intended to apply to these additional unidentified areas. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.	Reject	5.2
FS1377.15	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	In principle, a mitigation hierarchy is logical to ensure that the adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Offsetting or compensation are not appropriate steps for non-significant biodiversity. In general, HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
81.95	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas to ensure that policies related to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Area are not under section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas,	There are provisions in section 3.2 SNAs that apply to indigenous biodiversity outside of an SNA. Implementation Method 11.1.3 of the WRPS provides direction in terms of biodiversity offsets for indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs. Implementation Method 11.1.3 (a)(ii) states that district plans should promote biodiversity offsets as a way to achieve no net loss of indigenous biodiversity where significant residual adverse effects are unable to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept	8.3
FS1258.7	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The requested amendment creates uncertainty about exactly what areas are to be within the scope of the mooted provisions. Also, the submission point does not detail the specific provisions intended to apply to these additional unidentified areas. In the absence of this detail it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.	Reject	8.3
FS1340.18	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 81.95 in that provisions related to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas should not be included within section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas as this is confusing for the user.	Accept	8.3
FS1342.16	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 81.95.	FFNZ agrees the amendments would provide useful clarification and avoid confusion.	Accept	8.3
FS1377.16	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	For clarity, any policies related to areas outside of a SNA should not be within 3.2.	Accept	8.3
FS1345.89	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the submission.	Accept	8.3
81.96	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats to ensure that policies related to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Area are not under section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas.	There are provisions in section 3.2 SNAs that apply to indigenous biodiversity outside of an SNA. Implementation Method 11.1.3 of the WRPS provides direction in terms of biodiversity offsets for indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs. Implementation Method 11.1.3 (a)(ii) states that district plans should promote biodiversity offsets as a way to achieve no net loss of indigenous biodiversity where significant residual adverse effects are unable to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accept	5.2
FS1258.8	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The requested amendment creates uncertainty about exactly what areas are to be within the scope of the mooted provisions. Also the submission point does not detail the specific provisions intended to apply to these additional unidentified areas. In the absence of	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.</i>		
FS1340.19	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 81.96 in that provisions related to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas should be included within section 3.1 (and not section 3.2) because as written under the heading of section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas, this is confusing for the user.	Accept	5.2
FS1377.17	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	For better clarity, there should be clear separation of the objectives and policies related to indigenous biodiversity inside and outside of SNAs.	Accept	5.2
FS1342.17	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 81.96.	FFNZ agrees the amendments would provide useful clarification and avoid confusion.	Accept	5.2
FS1345.90	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the submission.	Accept	5.2
81.97	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.1.2(c) Policies as follows: (c) Provide for the removal of Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood or arts and crafts on a sustainable basis.	The level of Manuka or Kanuka removal identified in 22.2.7 P2 and the purpose of that removal is acceptable to the submitter. However, further detail needs to be added to the policy to ensure that the effects of this type of clearance remain minor. This is in line with the WRPS Implementation Method 11.1.4.	Reject	18.1
FS1342.37	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.97.	The policy direction provided in the notified version of Policy 3.1.2(c) is appropriate. The rules framework addresses submitter concerns.	Accept	18.1
81.98	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas.	Objective 3.2.1 is supported as it gives effect to Policy 11.2 of the WRPS.	Accept in part	8.3
81.99	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.2 Identify and Recognise.	The submitter supports the approach of identification and mapping of SNAs. This approach provides landowners with greater certainty and assists with achieving Policy 11.2 of WRPS.	Reject	9.1
FS1139.102	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Retain-we sought to amend.	Reject	9.1
FS1340.20	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission point 81.99 as the relief sought does not provide certainty.	Reject	9.1
825.1	John Lawson	Oppose	Add areas of Significant Indigenous vegetation or habitat by use of LENZ and in consultation with conservation and environment groups. AND Add rules for significant indigenous vegetation and habitat as follows: <u>In a significant indigenous vegetation or habitat area the following are discretionary activities:-</u> Cultivation. Spreading soil or other material (including	The 2005 WDC State of Environment Report (page 66) states that "Since 1992 the Waikato District has experienced a of approximately 1,345 ha (which could be as high as 1,508ha) of indigenous forest and 1,388ha (which could be as high as 1,706 ha) of indigenous scrub. Large amount of indigenous forest and scrub in the Waikato District and that up to 50% of it is	Reject	24.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>fertilizer or lime) in excess of existing routine application rates. Drainage works, apart from routine maintenance. Land reclamation from estuary or other wetlands. Modifications to watercourses apart from routine maintenance. Flood defences. Infilling ditches, ponds, pits, pools, marshes or historic earthwork features. Clearing vegetation or land (by physical removal, burning, application of herbicides, or deliberate overgrazing, trampling, or rooting by livestock) in preparation for cultivation. Introducing livestock (including poultry) at intensive stocking rates, or increasing stocking rates to intensive levels.</u>	threatened and most of that is not legally protected. The NZ Biodiversity Strategy (page 33) set the 2020 goal as, "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats (such as lowland forests and grasslands, wetlands and dunelands) have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."		
FS1387.1310	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	24.2
827.1	3.2 Significant Natural Areas New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission does not oppose section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas provided that the amendments are made to Policy 3.2.6 as sought below.	There is a need to recognise the ironsand mining operations at Waikato North Head.	Reject	8.1
FS1323.40	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned that the proposed additions could result in unfettered activity, and therefore result in adverse effects on the historical and cultural heritage values as currently it is not clear what the applicant intends in the words "provide for existing extractive industries."	Accept	8.1
827.2	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Add a clause (v) to Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance as follows (or words to similar effect): (v) located in the Aggregate Extraction Area in Waikato	The mining licence authorises all land use activities associated with ironsand mining operation at WNH. No further authorisation	Reject	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			North Head	is required under the Resource Management Act 1991, including for vegetation clearance. Accordingly Policies 3.2.2 to 3.2.5 and 3.2.7 should not apply to the mine site and an exception should be included in Policy 3.2.6		
827.3	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Add a new clause to Rule 22.2.7 P1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows (or words to similar effects): P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) for the following purposes: (ia) <u>Removing vegetation within the Aggregate Extraction Area at Waikato North Head</u> ; (i) Removing vegetation that endangers human life or existing buildings or structures; ...	The mining licence authorises all land use activities associated with ironsand mining operation at the mine. No further authorisations are required under the Resource Management Act 1991, including for vegetation clearance. An exception should be included in Rule 22.2.7 P1	Reject	21.4
827.4	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Areas on the Waikato North Head site as shown on Figure 3, Appendix A of the submission including: on the northern side of the site near Boundary Road. running north-south along the western coastal edge of the site. in the middle of the site. surrounding the lagoon.	The Significant Natural Areas have been applied in this instance to a highly modified areas. which will continue to be mined. Seeks clarification on how these sites were identified as this is potentially misleading. Regardless if the Significant Natural Area is correctly identified, the mining license authorises all land uses in relation to the Waikato North Head Mining site and therefore the Proposed District Plan should recognise that the Significant Natural Areas protections do not apply. Inappropriate to set such an expectation.	Reject	Withdrawn
FS1293.142	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	
830.2	Linda Silvester	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.9 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Removing up to 53m2 of Manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal	Manuka and kanuka are important environments and 3m3 should be adequate for heating well insulated homes.	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Environment per single...			
831.3	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.9 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Removing of up to 53m3 of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per ...	Manuka and kanuka are important environments and 3m3 should be adequate for heating well insulated homes.	Accept in part	18.1
<i>FS1007.21</i>	<i>Phillip John Swann</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>3m cu is insufficient to heat a dwelling</i>	<i>3m cu is insufficient to heat a dwelling</i>	Accept in part	18.1
832.2	Niksha Farac on behalf of Hounsell Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area from the property at 268 Te Kowhai Road, Te Kowhai; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The site has no significant ecological constraints and should therefore not be included in the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area. Query the reasoning for the inclusion of the land in the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management area The Proposed District Plan does not clearly explain how the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area impacts the land. Rule 22.4.1.6 should not apply to the site.	Reject	28.2
832.5	Niksha Farac on behalf of Hounsell Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area from the property at 284 Onion Road, Te Kowhai; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The site has no significant ecological constraints and should therefore not be included in the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area. Query the reasoning for the inclusion of the land in the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management area The Proposed District Plan does not clearly explain how the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area impacts the land. Rule 22.4.1.6 should not apply to the site.	Reject	28.2
834.1	Marshall & Kristine Stead	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Areas overlay from the property at 703B Te Kowhai Road, Te Kowhai.	The Significant Natural Area is not a true reflection of the site There are two man-made ponds and some native planting our our grounds and garden, which the submitter will protect. The driveway is occupied mainly by polar, oak, pine, and plum trees. The majority is man-made and not natural.	Accept	33.2
<i>FS1293.143</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-</i>	Reject	33.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.		
835.1	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Significant Natural Areas overlay from KiwiRail's designations.	Significant Natural Areas apply to protect and enhance indigenous biodiversity. Land transport corridors, such as KiwiRail's designations are highly modified areas and therefore do not meet the identity and management hierarchy requirements for Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	32.2
<i>FS1293.61</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>SNAs are identified for their biodiversity values (which meet a list of criteria identified in Section 11A of the WRPS). This is not influenced by the existence of a designation. The Director-General opposes reviewing the SNA overlay to remove designations. KiwiRail designations can be broad and have a large impact on SNAs. However, the Director-General is not opposes to the removal of SNAs where there is a mapping error.</i>	Accept in part	32.2
<i>FS1369.20</i>	<i>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the request to "delete" the "Significant Natural Area" overlay from KiwiRail's' designations.</i>	<i>The Whangamarino wetland is an outstanding natural area and is a RAMSAR site of international, national and regional importance.</i>	Accept in part	32.2
844.1	Brett McDougall on behalf of Churchill Property	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlays from 980 Churchill Road, Otuiti, Pukekawa.	These are low areas, not suitable for maize crops. It is a drain but is grey willow and elders. The predominant vegetation dries out naturally 4-5 months per year (January to May, sometimes to June), but are also prone to flooding. See submission for photos.	Accept in part	33.6
<i>FS1293.144</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Seek that the submission point is disallowed.</i>	<i>A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>	Accept in part	33.6
845.1	Grace M Wilcock	Not Stated	Amend maps to show the Significant Natural Areas in Tamahere gullies as being only of local significance and no regional significance.	There is little or no endangered flora or fauna in gullies that are severely compromised due to their content being mostly exotics and weed species such as grape, ivy, hops, blackberry, even in QEII areas.	Reject	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
845.2	Grace M Wilcock	Not Stated	Add to the text that the Tamahere gully systems are an ecological corridor.	There are few endangered flora/fauna in gullies that are severely compromised - they are mostly exotics and weed species such as grape, ivy, hops, blackberry.	Reject	25.2
845.4	Grace M Wilcock	Neutral/Amend	Amend the maps to show the boundary of the Significant Natural Areas in Tamahere gullies are at the exact top edge of the gully.	The new Significant Natural Areas appears on the maps to extend beyond the gully edge. This may be a fence line set back from the gully edge. The Significant Natural Area boundary should be at the exact top edge of the gully.	Accept in part	32.2
845.5	Grace M Wilcock	Not Stated	Add text to assure the owners at 117 Windmill Road, RD3, Hamilton that there will be no future incremental/creep on more stringent conditions/rules on Significant Natural Area compliance but still be included as part of land calculations for possible future subdivision.	Meetings in 2015 and 2016 informed residents of Significant Natural Areas, but this review has changed the areas without directly contacting owners. Some property owners may not be aware of a Significant Natural Area on their land and all the associated requirements that go along with a Significant Natural Area. The responsibility should be 100% the owners, and 0% the responsibility of the Waikato District Council.	Reject	25.2
855.1	Peter Buckley	Not Stated	Amend the identification of Significant Natural Areas so that any areas identified as a Significant Natural Areas remain contestable by the landowners until there has been a physical audit undertaken of the area and this audit should be carried out by a panel which should be made up of: An independent Rural representative; A Council representative; An ecologist; and The Landowner or their representative.	Majority of problems landowners have with Significant Natural Areas is around the designation rather than definitions of Significant Natural Area. By allowing the right to contest the designation at any time up until the audit is carried out means any areas that been designated as part of a desktop exercise can either then be accepted or rejected based on scientific and onsite results of an audit. It would give time for Council to designate the areas that they deem to be Significant Natural Areas, notify all landowners of the designation of a Significant Natural Area and then allow land owners to either agree with designation or to lodge a request for an audit of the area (within a three month window of time from being notified by Council). The requirement to allow the designation to be contestable would remove the time constraints that are imposed by the current proposal and remove the need for expensive	Accept	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				legal action by either landowners or Council due to the arbitrary decision to make all Significant Natural Areas come into force on the date of the enabling legislation without the automatic right of challenge by the landowner. There is unlikely to be a flood of applications to contest the designation of Significant Natural Areas, unless the Council got the original designation decision wrong based on a lack of adequate scientific information or onsite knowledge underpinning the decision. Taking away time constraints will remove a lot of heat and angst from this issue, whilst allowing the council to protect any areas that may be Significant Natural Areas from any inappropriate use or development. Even though contestability would be within any time frame up until a physical audit has been carried out to confirm the designation, the designation in itself would protect the areas from any inappropriate use or development in spite of the contestability remaining.		
FS1007.22	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept	32.2
FS1342.247	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 855.1.	Support is extended to the process and reasoning for this relief sought.	Accept	32.2
855.2	Peter Buckley	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes the Significant Natural Area on the property at 1036 Island Block Road, Te Kauwhata, due to the impact that this has on their ability to carry out day to day maintenance work like cleaning of drains within the Significant Natural Area.	Within the area designated as a Significant Natural Area, landowners cannot carry out any work and this can have a severe effect on their livelihood and land value.	Reject	32.2
FS1293.145	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept	32.2
FS1007.23	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Reject	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
862.26	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Amend the extent of the Significant Natural Area located between 88 and 242 Bluff Road in accordance with the plan in Appendix L of the submission. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The Significant Natural Area identified by Council flanks either side of what is proposed to be a key feature road corridor connecting 88 and 242/278 Bluff Road. The Significant Natural Area has already been compromised due to previous vegetation clearance to establish the paper road. This area is required for the construction of the access road it should not be identified as Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1090.4	Jenny Forsyth	Oppose	<i>I oppose the submission to amend the extent of this significant natural area. These areas should never be sacrificed in the name of development, but should be preserved and protected for future generations. This is paramount.</i>	<i>I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed for the reasons given in my opposition. If the submitter believes that this significant natural area has already been compromised, then there is all the more reason to preserve and protect what is left.</i>	Accept in part	33.8
FS1086.26	Yashili Dairy Company Limited	Support	Support the original submission.	Yashili supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited subject to the inclusion of adequate mitigation measures and/or an appropriate set back distance between the proposed residential development and its industrial site(s) within the provisions of the Proposed Plan to address any potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, in particular in respect of noise, related to this interface. Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Yashili's dairy plant. Havelock Village's submission seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Yashili is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Yashili's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Yashili's plant. Provided the matters raised above are sufficiently addressed through the provisions of the Proposed	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Plan, Yashili seeks that submission 862 be allowed.		
FS1186.26	Pokeno Nutritional Park Limited	Support	Pokeno Nutritional supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Pokeno Nutritional's new dairy plant. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the Site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Pokeno Nutritional is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. Finally, Pokeno Nutritional's supports the inclusion within the Masterplan for the Site of reserve land on the eastern boundary of the Site. This reserve land will provide an appropriate set back between the residential development and the adjacent industrial land and address any potential adverse effects related to this interface.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1281.52	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	PVHL opposes amendments to the extent of the Significant Natural Area located between 88 and 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1301.26	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Health Food Park's property. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Health Food Park is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Potter Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan allowing the residents on Potter Road, Ewing Road and Trig Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.</p>		
FS1303.26	Charlie Harris	Support	<p>I support the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.</p>	<p>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88.242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to my property. Havelock Villager's submission seeks amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. I am strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, I support the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Bluff Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan which would allow residents on Bluff Road, Pioneer Road and Miller Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community. As a resident of Miller Road, I consider this would provide a much-improved connection for the Pokeno South community.</p>	Accept in part	33.8
FS1369.22	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose		<p>The applicant has requested that the identified Significant Natural Area and Significant Amenity Landscape be deleted from this land. This is not supported, and should be approached on a case by case basis, as and when land is proposed to be developed.</p>	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1293.146	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1340.173	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 862 in its entirety. In particular, the submitter supports rezoning TaTa Valley as requested in its submission to provide for additional economic opportunities and amenities with Pokeno. There are also potential efficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure if both TaTa Valley and Havelock Village are rezoned and developed.	Accept in part	33.8
862.27	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13: Definitions and replace with a more descriptive definition of Significant Natural Area. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter seeks to amend the definition of Significant Natural Area as it is currently written. Significant Natural Areas can be comprised of significant indigenous vegetation, exotic vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. As such, the current definition provided for Significant Natural Areas is deemed to be inadequate by the submitter.	Reject	10.2
FS1009.1	Te la Trust	Oppose	I am a trustee of the Te la Trust, a 22 ha area covenanted under the Queen Elizabeth II Trust located at 373 Bluff Road, Pokeno. This submission is made to oppose portions of district plan submission number 862 filed by the company Havelock Village Limited (HVL) - Company number 7033802. It specifically opposes subsection 862.26 within the submission, but also generally opposes all aspects of submission number 862 that request the weakening of various protections for the area of remnant native woodland designated as a Significant Natural Area (SNA) between 88 and 242 Bluff Road. (Submission points 32, 33, 34, 35, and 36 in the HVL supporting document: 'Submission Birch.pdf'). I am submitting because the weakening of any protections on the SNA referred to in the submission will have a negative on the Te la Trust Covenant due to the reduction in habitat for native birds in the Bluff Road area, and also in the reduction of an	The reasons for opposing the submission are given below: (details for each point provided in attached supporting document)1) Incompatibility with the direction of the Resource Management Act (RMA)2) Inaccuracy in the supporting data provided by the submitter3) Inconsistency between the submission and its supporting documentation.4) The SNA would rapidly improve under correct management.5) The submitter's business remains viable if the SNA is retained at its currently planned extent and level of protection6) The ecological value of the SNA in relation to the wider landscape and to the Council's prior investment in the protection of this landscape.7) The value of the SNA to the local community.8) The wider context of the state of our environment in 2019	Accept	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			available seed source for the regeneration of this and adjacent covenants in the area.			
FS1086.27	Yashili Dairy Company Limited	Support	Support the original submission.	<p>Yashili supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited subject to the inclusion of adequate mitigation measures and/or an appropriate set back distance between the proposed residential development and its industrial site(s) within the provisions of the Proposed Plan to address any potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, in particular in respect of noise, related to this interface. Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the Site). That land is in proximity to Yashili's dairy plant. Havelock Village's submission seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Yashili is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Yashili's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Yashili's plant. Provided the matters raised above are sufficiently addressed through the provisions of the Proposed Plan, Yashili seeks that submission 862 be allowed.</p>	Reject	10.2
FS1186.27	Pokeno Nutritional Park Limited	Support	Pokeno Nutritional supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	<p>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Pokeno Nutritional's new dairy plant. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the Site to residential zone in order to provide for</p>	Reject	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Pokeno Nutritional is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. Finally, Pokeno Nutritional's supports the inclusion within the Masterplan for the Site of reserve land on the eastern boundary of the Site. This reserve land will provide an appropriate set back between the residential development and the adjacent industrial land and address any potential adverse effects related to this interface.</p>		
FS1301.27	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	<p>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Health Food Park's property. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Health Food Park is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An</p>	Reject	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Potter Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan allowing the residents on Potter Road, Ewing Road and Trig Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.		
FS/303.27	Charlie Harris	Support	I support the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88.242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to my property. Havelock Villager's submission seeks amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. I am strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, I support the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Bluff Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan which would allow residents on Bluff Road, Pioneer Road and Miller Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community. As a resident of Miller Road, I consider this would provide a much-improved connection for the Pokeno South community.	Reject	10.2
FS/340.174	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 862 in its entirety. In particular, the submitter supports rezoning TaTa Valley as requested in its submission to provide for additional economic opportunities and amenities with Pokeno. There are also potential efficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure if both TaTa Valley and Havelock Village are rezoned and developed.	Reject	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
924.6	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete the areas identified on the planning maps as Significant Natural Areas on the Huntly Power Station site.	The submitter supports the Waikato District Council's general approach towards management and identification of the District's Significant Natural Areas (SNA) and acknowledges WDC's response to the feedback provided by the submitter on the Draft Proposed Plan. However, the submitter remains concerned with the extent of SNAs identified on the Huntly Power Station site, ancillary land and enhancement sites. Such enhancement sites having been planted and maintained by the submitter as requirements of regional resource consents. The Proposed Plan defines an SNA as "an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified on the planning maps." From this definition there doesn't appear to be anything 'natural' about areas defined as SNAs and the term is therefore a misnomer when applied to created areas such as the Genesis River site planting projects. The areas currently by managed by the submitter for enhancement planting are subject to ongoing maintenance to enhance the values within the sites for the purpose of improving biodiversity but should not be protected in the same way as an existing natural area. The additional restrictions and rules as drafted in the Plan would impact the management of the enhancement plantings and the submitter's ability to meet conditions imposed by resource consents.	Accept in part	33.5
862.28	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Amend the objectives and policies within section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas and related rules for Significant Natural Areas and biodiversity to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation or offsetting. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The objectives and policies in section 3.2 relating to Significant Natural Areas are overly restrictive.	Reject	8.1
FS1086.28	Yashili Dairy Company Limited	Support	Support the original submission.	Yashili supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited subject to the inclusion of adequate mitigation measures and/or an appropriate set back distance between the proposed residential development and its industrial site(s) within the provisions of the Proposed Plan to address any potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, in	Reject	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>particular in respect of noise, related to this interface. Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Yashili's dairy plant. Havelock Village's submission seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Yashili is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Yashili' plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Yashili's plant. Provided the matters raised above are sufficiently addressed through the provisions of the Proposed Plan, Yashili seeks that submission 862 be allowed.</p>		
FSI 186.28	Pokeno Nutritional Park Limited	Support	Pokeno Nutritional supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	<p>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Pokeno Nutritional's new dairy plant. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the Site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Pokeno Nutritional is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a</p>	Reject	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. Finally, Pokeno Nutritional's supports the inclusion within the Masterplan for the Site of reserve land on the eastern boundary of the Site. This reserve land will provide an appropriate set back between the residential development and the adjacent industrial land and address any potential adverse effects related to this interface.		
FS1301.28	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Health Food Park's property. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Health Food Park is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the da-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Potter Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan allowing the residents on Potter Road, Ewing Road and Trig Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.	Reject	8.1
FS1303.28	Charlie Harris	Support	I support the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and relatwed companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88.242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site).That land is in proximity to my property.Havelock Villager's submission seeks amongst other things, the rezoning or the site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre.In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. I am strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno.As a result, I support the additional housing and population that would be	Reject	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Bluff Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan which would allow residents on Bluff Road, Pioneer Road and Miller Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community. As a resident of Miller Road, I consider this would provide a much-improved connection for the Pokeno South community.		
FS1277.154	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Do not amend objectives and policies within section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas as requested.	The first step is to avoid adverse effects and then minimise adverse effects. An applicant should not jump straight to mitigation and/or offsetting. This does not give effect WRPS Implementation Method 11.2.2.	Accept	8.1
FS1340.175	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support	The submitter supports submission 862 in its entirety. In particular, the submitter supports rezoning TaTa Valley as requested in its submission to provide for additional economic opportunities and amenities with Pokeno. There are also potential efficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure if both TaTa Valley and Havelock Village are rezoned and developed.	Reject	8.1
862.29	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Amend the rules relating to earthworks and indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area in Chapter 16 Residential Zone to enable the implementation of the masterplan attached in the original submission and the bespoke approach requested elsewhere in the submission. AND Any consequential amendments and alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter seeks a bespoke approach to the management of biodiversity including Significant Natural Areas.	Reject	25.2
FS1086.29	Yashili Dairy Company Limited		Support the original submission.	Yashili supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited subject to the inclusion of adequate mitigation measures and/or an appropriate set back distance between the proposed residential development and its industrial site(s) within the provisions of the Proposed Plan to address any potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, in particular in respect of noise, related to this interface.	Reject	25.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the Site). That land is in proximity to Yashili's dairy plant. Havelock Village's submission seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative its seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Yashili is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Yashili's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Yashili's plant. Provided the matters raised above are sufficiently addressed through the provisions of the Proposed Plan, Yashili seeks that submission 862 be allowed.</i></p>		
FS1186.29	Pokeno Nutritional Park Limited		<p><i>Pokeno Nutritional supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.</i></p>	<p><i>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Pokeno Nutritional's new dairy plant. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the Site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Pokeno Nutritional is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater</i></p>		25.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. Finally, Pokeno Nutritional's supports the inclusion within the Masterplan for the Site of reserve land on the eastern boundary of the Site. This reserve land will provide an appropriate set back between the residential development and the adjacent industrial land and address any potential adverse effects related to this interface.		
FS1301.29	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited		Support the submission in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Health Food Park's property. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Health Food Park is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the da-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Potter Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan allowing the residents on Potter Road, Ewing Road and Trig Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.	Reject	25.2
FS1303.29	Charlie Harris		I support the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and relatwed companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88.242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site).That land is in proximity to my property.Havelock Villager's submission seeks amongst other things, the rezoning or the site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre.In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. I am strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno.As a result, I support the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site.The additional	Reject	25.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Bluff Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan which would allow residents on Bluff Road, Pioneer Road and Miller Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community. As a resident of Miller Road, I consider this would provide a much-improved connection for the Pokeno South community.		
FS1340.176	TaTa Valley Limited		Support.	The submitter supports submission 862 in its entirety. In particular, the submitter supports rezoning TaTa Valley as requested in its submission to provide for additional economic opportunities and amenities with Pokeno. There are also potential efficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure if both TaTa Valley and Havelock Village are rezoned and developed.	Reject	25.2
FS1387.1410	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D				Accept	25.2
862.33	Havelock Village Limited	Not Stated	Add a bespoke approach regarding the management of indigenous vegetation and Significant Natural Area within the Havelock Village development at 88, 242 and 278 Bluff Road that will efficiently implement the recommendations of the Wildlands Report (attached to the submission). AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter opposes the approach (including rules) to the management of Significant Natural Areas on their land and seeks the application of a bespoke approach to the management of indigenous biodiversity and Significant Natural Areas on the Havelock Village site. That approach recognises that some areas of indigenous biodiversity will be removed to allow for development of the Havelock Village development but overall biodiversity across the site will be maintained through a combination of ecological mitigation, enhancement, offset, compensation and protection. The submitter's proposed approach to the management of Significant Natural Areas and indigenous biodiversity at the Havelock Village development is informed by the assessment and reporting undertaken by Wildlands Consultants Ltd to support the ongoing resource consent process being undertaken to enable the development of the Havelock Village.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1086.33	Yashili Dairy Company Limited	Support	Support the original submission.	Yashili supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited subject to the inclusion of adequate mitigation measures and/or an appropriate set back	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>distance between the Proposed Plan to address any potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, in particular in respect of noise, related to this interface. Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Yashili's dairy plant. Havelock Village's submission seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Yashili is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees at Yashili's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Yashili's plant. Provided the matters raised above are sufficiently addressed through the provisions of the Proposed Plan, Yashili seeks that submission 862 be allowed.</p>		
FS1186.33	Pokeno Nutritional Park Limited	Support	<p>Pokeno Nutritional supports the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.</p>	<p>Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Pokeno Nutritional's new dairy plant. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the Site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Pokeno Nutritional is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. The rezoning will provide much needed residential land and will promote more affordable houses and housing choice, including for employees</p>	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community, including new residents and employees at Pokeno Nutritional's plant. Finally, Pokeno Nutritional's supports the inclusion within the Masterplan for the Site of reserve land on the eastern boundary of the Site. This reserve land will provide an appropriate set back between the residential development and the adjacent industrial land and address any potential adverse effects related to this interface.		
FS1301.33	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88, 242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to Health Food Park's property. Havelock Village's submissions seeks, amongst other things, the rezoning of the site to Residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. Health Food Park is strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and development of Pokeno. As a result, it supports the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the site. The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno. In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Potter Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan allowing the residents on Potter Road, Ewing Road and Trig Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1303.33	Charlie Harris	Support	I support the original submission by Havelock Village Limited in its entirety.	Havelock Village Limited and related companies control land in southern Pokeno at 88.242 (in part) and 278 Bluff Road (the site). That land is in proximity to my property. Havelock Villager's submission seeks amongst other things, the rezoning or the site to residential zone in order to provide for approximately 1025 new residential lots and new neighbourhood centre. In the alternative it seeks the rezoning of the Site to Aggregate Extraction Zone. I am strongly supportive of the ongoing growth and	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development of Pokeno.As a result, I support the additional housing and population that would be created by the rezoning of the Site.The additional population will assist to improve the economic vitality of Pokeno.In addition, the proposed new neighbourhood centre will provide a range of amenities and commercial services to cater for the day-to-day needs of the local community. An additional benefit of the Havelock Village Development is the direct linkage between the Pokeno Town Centre and Bluff Road proposed on the Havelock Village Masterplan which would allow residents on Bluff Road, Pioneer Road and Miller Road to be more connected to the Pokeno community.As a resident of Miller Road, I consider this would provide a much-improved connection for the Pokeno South community.		
FS1340.180	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 862 in its entirety. In particular, the submitter supports rezoning TaTa Valley as requested in its submission to provide for additional economic opportunities and amenities with Pokeno. There are also potential efficiencies in the delivery of infrastructure if both TaTa Valley and Havelock Village are rezoned and developed.	Accept in part	33.8
924.7	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete the areas identified on the planning maps as Significant Natural Areas on 'Scott Farm,' Te Ohaki Road, Huntly as identified on the submission map.	The submitter supports the Waikato District Council's general approach towards management and identification of the District's Significant Natural Areas (SNA) and acknowledges WDC's response to the feedback provided by the submitter on the Draft Proposed Plan. However, the submitter remains concerned with the extent of SNAs identified on the Huntly Power Station site, ancillary land and enhancement sites. Such enhancement sites having been planted and maintained by the submitter as requirements of regional resource consents. The Proposed Plan defines an SNA as "an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified on the planning maps." From this definition there doesn't appear to be anything 'natural' about areas defined as SNAs and the term is therefore a misnomer when applied to created areas such as the	Accept in part	33.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Genesis River site planting projects. The areas currently by managed by the submitter for enhancement planting are subject to ongoing maintenance to enhance the values within the sites for the purpose of improving biodiversity but should not be protected in the same way as an existing natural area. Drafted additional restrictions and rules as drafted in the Plan would impact the management of the enhancement plantings and Genesis' ability to meet conditions imposed by resource consents.		
FS1293.147	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.5
924.8	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.3 (a) (iv) - Management Hierarchy as follows: iv.) After remediation or mitigation has been undertaken, offset or compensate any significant residual adverse effects in accordance with Policy 3.2.4.	The submitter supports the general approach to management of Significant Natural Areas (SNA) as detailed in Policy 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. The submitter considers that there may be circumstances where it is impractical for "no net loss" to be achieved. In that regard, the submitter considers that environmental compensation be included as a mechanism to manage effects, specifically for regionally significant industry and regionally significant infrastructure. This approach has been used widely around New Zealand in District Plans for managing biodiversity.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1258.36	Meridian Energy Limited	Not Stated	Allow to the extent that the requested relief is consistent with submission number 580	Meridian's own submission proposes amendments to Policy 3.2.4 to allow for environmental compensation. Meridan request that is be included in any meetings or discussions about the requested amendments to provide for environmental compensation.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1350.4	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	The submission point is supported on the basis that it provides recognition of compensation as a method to manage effects, particularly in circumstances where it is impractical for no net loss to be achieved.	Accept in part	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.299	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Null	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	10.1
924.9	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.4- Biodiversity Offsetting as follows: (a) Allow for a biodiversity offset or <u>compensatory measure</u> to be offered by a resource consent applicant where an activity will result in significant residual adverse effects on a Significant Natural Area, or on indigenous biodiversity outside such Significant Natural Areas. (b) Within a Significant Natural Area, a biodiversity offset or <u>compensatory measure</u> will only be considered appropriate where adverse effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated in accordance with the hierarchy established in Policy 3.2.3; and (i) The biodiversity offset is consistent with the framework detailed in Appendix 6 Biodiversity Offsetting; and (ii) The biodiversity offset can achieve no net loss of indigenous biodiversity: Preferably in the affected area of Significant Natural Area; Or Where that is not practicable, in the ecological district in which the affected area of Significant Natural Area is located. (iii) <u>Environmental compensation will be considered for effects associated with operation, maintenance and enhancement of regionally significant industry and regionally significant infrastructure.</u>	The submitter supports the general approach to management of Significant Natural Areas (SNA) as detailed in Policy 3.2.3 and 3.2.4. The submitter considers that there may be circumstances where it is impractical for "no net loss" to be achieved. In that regard, the submitter considers that environmental compensation be included as a mechanism to manage effects, specifically for regionally significant industry and regionally significant infrastructure. This approach has been used widely around New Zealand in District Plans for managing biodiversity.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1377.300	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1350.5	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	The submission point is supported on the basis that it provides recognition of compensation as a method to manage effects, particularly in circumstances where it is impractical for no net loss to be achieved.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1334.31	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	Fulton Hogan supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1333.6	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	For the reasons stated in the submission.	Accept in part	11.1
FS1258.37	Meridian Energy Limited	Not Stated	Allow to the extent that the requested relief is consistent with submission number 580.	Meridians' own submission proposes amendments to Policy 3.2.4 to allow for environmental compensation. Meridian requests that it be include in any meetings or discussions about the requested amendments to provide for environmental compensation.	Accept in part	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI 292.32	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	McPherson supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept in part	11.1
FSI 198.16	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	Compensatory measures or environmental compensation should be available where there are adverse effects within SNAs and particularly where regionally significant industry, including mineral extraction activities, are seeking to continue or expand existing operations.	Accept in part	11.1
944.1	Janet Evans on behalf of Brodick Farms Ltd	Oppose	Amend the planning maps by deleting the identified areas (Significant Natural Area and Significant Amenity Landscape) from the property at 849 Matahuru Road, Matahuru.	Because the site has "identified features", tracks and earthworks are limited by Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas. The only access to the property to farm it in an economic and safe way is by tracks. Under the rules, maintenance would be problematic, becoming a health and safety issue and therefore making the land incapable of reasonable use. The submission includes photos of the tracks on the property. The submitter does not consider that the property meets either Significant Natural Area or Significant Amenity Landscape status as they were not clearly identified on the map that was sent to the submitter and, as such, the submitter does not have enough information to make an informed decision. The property has not been ground-truthed and therefore, there are no accurate details as to why the land qualifies for the Significant Natural Area and Significant Amenity Landscape overlays.	Accept in part	33.6
FSI 293.148	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.6
961.1	Yeungjun Yoo on behalf of Kyung Koo Han & Sun Kyung Kang	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 7C Ridge Road, Tuakau.	It is just around 5m2 (see photos attached to the submission).	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
964.1	Marcus Ralph for Ohinewai Heights Ltd	Oppose	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property at 260 Ralph Road, Huntly.	Other parts of Significant Natural Area have been removed from this area previously. There was land closer to the lake which had Significant Natural Area removed so this should be done as well. The vegetation is willow, gorse and blackberry. Removing the Significant Natural Area will allow the weed species to be cleared up and returned back into paddock.	Accept	33.5
FS1207.20	Ohinewai Area Committee	Support	Seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	There are a number of properties that came up in searching the council submission database, using the term 'Ohinewai.' These properties are on the Ohinewai RD run. They are not technically within the OAC zone, but one is right on the border, and another very close to the border. However, upon examining this issue, it would appear that an examination of Google satellite imagery (or other similar images) has been done and it was determined that any land that has tree cover, that is not plantation or associated with gardens, is a Significant Natural Area (SNA) as there is an overwhelming correlation between the satellite imagery and these areas. It does not appear that anyone from WDC has visited the site. This is shown well illustrated in that the area between the river edge, and the stop bank through the Ohinewai area has been designated a SNA. Many residents back onto this area, and ask any one about what is there, and they would answer it is overrun with willow, alder and a mixture of invasive weeds. How this could be considered a SNA does not make sense. It would also appear that other farmers in the surrounding district have also had SNA areas designated, where they are in fact 'waste' lands and of no significant value what so ever. It appears that the blunt tool of Google has been used, rather than consultation with the people neighbouring/owning this land to find out exactly occurs here and to see if there is any significant value. Thus we fully support the above submission to have the SNA removed.	Accept	33.5
FS1293.149	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an	Reject	33.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.		
FS1145.18	Ohinewai Area Committee	Support	There are a number of properties that came up in searching the council submission database, using the term 'Ohinewai'. These properties are on the Ohinewai RD run. They are not technically within the OAC zone, but one is right on the border, and another very close to the border. However, upon examining this issue, it would appear that an examination of google satellite imagery (or other similar images) has been done and it was determined that any land that has tree cover, that is not plantation or associated with gardens, is a Significant Natural Area (SNA) as there is an overwhelming correlation between the satellite imagery and these areas. It does not appear that anyone from WDC has visited the site. This is shown well illustrated in that the area between the river edge, and the stop bank through the Ohinewai area has been designated a SNA. Many residents back onto this area, and ask any one of them about what is there, and they would answer it is overrun with willow, alder and a mixture of invasive weeds. How this could be considered a SNA does not make sense. It would also appear that other farmers in surrounding district have also had SNA areas designated, where they are in fact 'waste' lands and of no significant value what so ever. It appears that the blunt tool of Google has been used, rather than a consultation with the people neighbouring/owning this land to find out what exactly occurs here and to see if there is any significant value. Thus we fully support the above submission to have SNA removed.		Accept	33.5
986.6	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.4(b) Biodiversity offsetting except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.2.4(b)(ii) Biodiversity offsetting as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>the biodiversity offset can achieve an equivalent level of no net loss of indigenous biodiversity.</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail supports the management of Significant Natural Areas and the recognition that where development is necessary Significant Natural Area values are protected by avoiding, remedying, mitigating and offsetting any effects. • KiwiRail has a narrow, linear corridor which cannot easily be relocated nor can the effects of works to maintain it be completely avoided be times. The ability to off-set is important for linear infrastructure providers, such as KiwiRail, where functional and locational constraints apply. • Offsetting and its application to projects 	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				are part of the RMA framework, and the term is not exclusive to biodiversity values e.g. this could include a financial offset. In some cases, it may not be possible to achieve a 100% 'no net loss' and the policy should be broadened to accommodate acceptable proposals. • It is noted that the imperative is inconsistent with Policy 11.1 of the Regional Policy Statement.		
FS1340.197	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Opposes	The submitter opposes submission point 986.6 as no net loss provides a measurable level for the biodiversity offset to achieve. Removing it and replacing it with an equivalent level of will make it hard to quantify and justify the need for a biodiversity offset.	Accept	11.1
986.5	3.2.3 Policy - Management hierarchy Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management Hierarchy as notified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail supports the management of Significant Natural Areas and the recognition that where development is necessary these effects on Significant Natural Area values can be managed by a suite of options including avoiding, remedying, mitigating and offsetting. The rail network is not able to be easily relocated and given the function it provides for the region and the country, the rail network may cross or run parallel Significant Natural Areas. • Given KiwiRail's operational need to maintain existing corridor, it is important that it is able to utilise the measures identified in the Policy to address any adverse environmental effects. 	Accept in part	10.1
FS1176.285	Watercare Services Ltd	Support		Watercare agrees with submission and supports the management hierarchy approach proposed in the submission.	Accept in part	10.1
986.7	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (v) to Policy 3.2.6(a) Providing for vegetation clearance as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Provide for the clearance of indigenous vegetation in Significant Natural Areas when: ... <u>(v) operating, maintaining or upgrading existing infrastructure</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable works required to keep tracks and equipment functioning and clear of vegetation should be permitted in SNAs to ensure existing infrastructure is able to be maintained in an operational condition. 	Accept	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1350.6	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow in so far as the relief sought is consistent with the relief sought in Transpower's original submission to amend the policy.	The submission point is supported as it reflects the relief sought in Transpower's original submission to amend this policy to include vegetation clearance associated with the operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure.	Accept	13.1
FS1176.286	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports this submission as it efficiently provides for the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing infrastructure.	Accept	13.1
FS1345.138	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons set out in the KiwiRail submission.	Accept	13.1
986.8	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)		Amend Policy 3.2.8 - Incentivise subdivision as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): 3.2.8 Policy - Incentivise subdivision that Protects Significant Natural Areas (a) Incentivise appropriate subdivision in the Rural zone when there is which provides for the legal and physical protection of Significant Natural Areas, provided the areas are of a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning ecosystem. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy can be read as though widespread subdivision in the Rural zone is encouraged rather than the object, which is to incentivise the legal protection of Significant Natural Areas where rural subdivision is otherwise appropriate. KiwiRail would be concerned if the policy promoted subdivision which could have adverse effects on land transport infrastructure by being encouraged where it otherwise does not meet the Rural subdivision rules. As notified, the policy could be read as supporting ad-hoc rural subdivision and not as it is intended to be, which is to incentivise sustainable subdivision in and around Significant Natural Areas. 	Accept in part	
273.11	Russell Luders	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.8 PI (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	There is not enough clarity on what Outside a Significant Natural Area means. Indigenous vegetation clearance for any farming purpose should be permitted given that farming is a permitted activity. Over time, invasive indigenous vegetation will revert productive land unusable as it overruns productive pasture. Provision must be allowed for indigenous vegetation clearance for the purpose of new farming infrastructure such as fences, tracks, drains and keeping productive land clear. Provision must be allowed for indigenous vegetation clearance for the purpose of new dwellings and buildings including access.	Reject	22.2
286.29	Lorraine Dixon for Waikato-Tainui	Support	Retain the activity status and clearance thresholds for indigenous vegetation clearance for marae, dwellings and papakainga on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land.	Waikato-Tainui supports the ability to clear indigenous vegetation for the purpose of establishing these activities on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land.	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1035.35	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support the submission in full.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council needs to partner with Kaitiaki, mana whenua or review strategies with Waikato Tainui to ensure preservation and restoration of the Waikato River. 	Accept in part	21.1
286.30	Lorraine Dixon for Waikato-Tainui	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for earthworks in Significant Natural Areas that are for the establishment of marae, papakainga, dwellings and associated access, parking and manoeuvring as a permitted activity.	Earthworks within a Significant Natural Area associated with marae, papakainga and dwellings are not afforded the same permitted status as vegetation clearance and would be a restricted discretionary activity. There seems little point in providing for a permitted indigenous clearance for these activities but then requiring resource consent for earthworks. As currently proposed, consent for a restricted discretionary activity would potentially need to be obtained to establish building platforms and access.	Accept in part	20.3
FS1035.36	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support the submission in full.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council needs to partner with Kaitiaki, mana whenua or review strategies with Waikato Tainui to ensure preservation and restoration of the Waikato River. 	Accept in part	20.3
FS1293.17	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	The Director-General considers that earthworks in Significant Natural Areas as a permitted activity would have potentially inappropriate levels of effect without consideration of how effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated. Further clarification on the intent of this point would also be appreciated. The Department of Conservation has a duty to ensure indigenous biodiversity is protected. The requested amendments do not currently contain sufficient linkage with the Waikato-Tainui Iwi Environmental Plan and working towards environmental enhancement.	Accept in part	20.3
286.31	Lorraine Dixon for Waikato-Tainui	Not Stated	Retain the permitted activity provisions for indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the gathering of plants in accordance with Maaori customs and values.	This is supported.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1035.37	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support the submission in full.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council needs to partner with Kaitiaki, mana whenua or review strategies with Waikato Tainui to ensure preservation and restoration of the Waikato River. 	Accept in part	21.1
330.83	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	No reasons provided.	Accept	20.2
330.88	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought; however submission refers to Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a	No reasons provided.	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Significant Natural Area.			
330.89	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.8- Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	No reasons provided.	Reject	22.2
332.11	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Support	Retain Appendix 2.	Support the inclusion of the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept in part	26.3
349.12	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Delete from Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks in Significant Natural Areas, the earthworks controls relating to maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains.	Volume too small and purposes too limited. Cut height is too low and slope is too gradual. Hill country is prone to slips and tracks may need to be repaired/restored. Existing use is protected under section 10 RMA.	Accept	20.2
349.13	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Delete from Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks in Significant Natural Areas, the earthworks controls on cultivation and pasture maintenance.	Volume is too small and purposes too limited. Cut height is too low and slope is too gradual. In hill country tracks may need repair/restoration due to a slip. Managing existing tracks and fences is provided for as an existing use under section 10 of the RMA.	Accept in part	20.2
349.14	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.7DI Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to be a restricted discretionary activity rather than a discretionary activity and read: DI DI.	If indigenous vegetation removal does not comply with the permitted limit it should be a Restricted Discretionary activity, rather than a Discretionary activity.	Reject	21.8
FS1340.45	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 349.14 in that indigenous vegetation clearance should be able to be appropriately addressed by listed matters of discretion. Unlimited discretion should not be required when considering such an activity.	Reject	21.8
FS1377.56	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.8
349.15	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.7P3 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to increase the area for indigenous vegetation clearance in relation to buildings and access/parking.	The rule is too uncertain as to what is an 'alternative development area' is. If the building has been approved, then another assessment should not be required. 250m2 of indigenous	Reject	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				vegetation clearance will not provide enough area for a building and driveway.		
FS1340.46	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 349.15 and agrees that uncertainty exists in the writing of the rule as to what constitutes an 'alternative development area'. The submitter also agrees that 250m2 of indigenous vegetation clearance does not provide enough area for both a building and a driveway.	Reject	21.5
FS1377.57	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.5
349.16	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to remove all controls on indigenous vegetation clearance for pasture maintenance and other existing activities ancillary to farming.	Farming is a permitted activity protected as existing uses under s10 RMA and there should be no limit on the maintenance requirements for pasture, track and drain maintenance and cultivation. There should be no limit if the purpose is for pasture maintenance.	Reject	22.2
349.17	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to increase the permitted indigenous vegetation clearance for new pasture, new fencing and tracks to 2,500m2 per site per year.	The limit on indigenous vegetation removal outside a SNA is too low (only 1000m2 per single consecutive 12 month period).	Accept in part	22.2
349.18	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to increase the limit for permitted indigenous vegetation clearance for new dwellings and buildings and associated access to 2500m2 per site per year.	The limit on indigenous vegetation removal outside a SNA is too low (only 1000m2 per single consecutive 12 month period)	Reject	22.2
349.20	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, to enable any indigenous vegetation clearance for a consented building platform or for clearance that has been considered appropriate at the time of resource or subdivision consent approval to be permitted.	The limit on indigenous vegetation removal outside a Significant Natural Area is too low.	Reject	22.2
349.28	Kim Robinson on behalf of	Not Stated	Review application of Significant Natural Areas mapping on	Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is inaccurate	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Lochiel Farmlands Limited		Lochiel Farmlands Ltd property at 316 Allen and Eyre Road, Onewhero.	on the Lochiel Farmlands Ltd property. The landowner has concerns regarding the accuracy of mapping on the property, which contains multiple Significant Natural Areas.		
FS1293.101	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
349.29	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Ensure that Council funds the investigation of, identification of and robustness of Significant Natural Area mapping throughout the District.	It seems that the mapping is provisional and needs to be tested with data from subsequent field surveys. The obligation is on the Council to identify Significant Natural Areas not the landowner. Needs to be provision for payment to landowners for that assessment if there is any intention for ecological assessments to be required to determine significance of indigenous vegetation as part of any resource consent process.	Accept	32.2
FS1062.25	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 349.29.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All overlays for SNAs need expert analysis. Desktop exercise is not acceptable when this has potential to affect many land owners rights. Ensure council investigation. 	Accept	32.2
349.30	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend the mapping of Significant Natural Areas on the Proposed District Plan maps once ground truthing has been undertaken.	Mapping mainly a desktop exercise and rules do not identify the characteristics being protected. Ground truthing is required to check that the areas identified justify protection.	Accept in part	33.8
349.31	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Delete from Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, the earthworks controls on new fencing.	Fencing is important in protecting Significant Natural Areas from stock. In hill country this can require earthworks to provide a proper building foundation. The earthworks need to be permitted.	Accept	20.2
349.32	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Delete from Rule 22.2.3.3P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, the maximum volume control of 200m3 for imported fill.	A limit of 20m3 imported fill is too low for permitted earthworks in a SNA. If the activity is permitted or an existing activity protected as	Accept	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				existing use rights under section 10 of the RMA, it is not relevant that the fill is imported.		
349.33	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.7P1 (a)(iv) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Maintaining, <u>repairing or reinstating</u> existing tracks and fences; or	Add references to repair and/or restore to allow for tracks that need to be re-routed following slips or natural events.	Accept	21.1
349.34	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.7P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to remove the limitation on manuka/kanuka removal.	Manuka/Kanuka scrub needs to be actively managed to prevent a fire risk and to construct new tracks, fire breaks, fences, etc.	Accept in part	18.3
<i>FS1114.16</i>	<i>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>FENZ supports the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through providing for as a permitted activity the ability for property owners and occupiers to remove flammable vegetation inside a Significant Natural Area. This is particularly important where property is located outside of a reticulated water network.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>18.3</i>
<i>FS1377.58</i>	<i>Havelock Village Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>18.3</i>
349.35	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Oppose	Oppose in Rule 22.2.7P3 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, the requirement that indigenous vegetation removal is only permitted if no alternative development area is identified outside the Significant Natural Area.	The alternative development area has to be a practical site. This limitation will not work if the alternative site is not accessible.	Accept	21.5
<i>FS1377.59</i>	<i>Havelock Village Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>21.5</i>
<i>FS1340.47</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>The submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>21.5</i>
362.10	CYK Limited	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Criteria for Determining significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Support the inclusion of the criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity.	Accept in part	26.3
367.44	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers	Support	Retain Section 3.1 Indigenous Vegetation and Habitats.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Committee					
FS1377.66	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	5.2
367.45	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	8.3
372.13	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Support	Retain Objective 3.2.1 (a) Significant Natural Areas.	Supports the identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	8.3
372.24	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.2 (a) Identify and Recognise as follows: Identify significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in accordance with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and include identified significant ecological areas in the Auckland Unitary Plan which cross the Waikato-Auckland territorial boundary as Significant Natural Areas.	Submitter seeks alignment with the Auckland Unitary Plan - Operative in Part in relation to the identification and protection of Significant Natural Areas in close proximity to the common territorial authority boundary. Ensure areas identified in the Unitary Plan follow through into the Waikato District.	Reject	9.1
394.15	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area, and make indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area permitted in all circumstances. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	No reasons provided.	Reject	22.2
394.23	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area, to make indigenous vegetation clearance outside of a Significant Natural Area permitted in all circumstances. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	Indigenous vegetation clearance outside of Significant Natural Area should be permitted in all circumstances but no reasons have been provided.	Reject	22.2
394.26	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Not Stated	Delete the Significant Natural Area from the property located at 312 Parker Lane, Buckland, except for those	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			parts which have already been protected by covenant. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.			
FS1293.107	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
419.23	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.7PI Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as notified OR Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 22.2.7 PI (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) for the following purposes: ... (vi) <u>removal of vegetation for pest management and biosecurity works</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the provision of indigenous vegetation clearance inside Significant Natural Areas for maintaining existing tracks, fences, farm drains and conservation fencing. It is sought that an additional standard be included here to allow for that response. This is appropriate in the context as there are a number of horticultural cropping sites containing, or adjoining, Significant Natural Areas. It is feasible that should those Significant Natural Areas become infected, then this would pose a risk to the production of fruit and vegetables for human consumption.	Reject	21.1
FS1171.18	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission seeks to enable vegetation removal for pest management and biosecurity works in order to address any risk of infection from Significant Natural areas spreading to areas used for the production of crops including food crops.	Reject	21.1
FS1340.50	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 419.23 as the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.1
FS1345.98	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons presented in the Horticulture NZ	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				submission.		
FS1377.86	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.1
419.98	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the planning maps and rules to clarify the purpose of the Hamilton Basic Ecological Area. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	There are no specific rules relating to the overlay and no clarification is provided in the section 32 reports. The submitter has been informed that the Hamilton Basin Ecological Area overlay is a Environmental Protection Area. However it is noted that the proposed planning maps have a separate key for Environmental Protection Areas, which is a different from the key for the Hamilton Basin Ecological Area. Council staff advised that Rule 22.4.1.6 Conservation lot subdivision relates to the Hamilton Basin Ecological Area and that Rule 22.3.7.6 Building setback - Environmental Protection Area relates to areas identified in the Te Kauwhata Structure Plan.	Accept	28.2
419.140	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Vegetation clearance" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: <u>Indigenous</u> Vegetation clearance Includes the modification, burning, cutting, crushing, spraying and removal by physical, mechanical, chemical or other means of <u>indigenous vegetation</u> , of all forms of vegetation, including indigenous, and may include exotic plants. It does not include vegetation clearance relating to routine cultivation or grazing: clearing: (a) hedges, shelter belts and amenity plants, or (b) vegetation along fences and around dams and ponds, or (c) vegetation around public utility networks, or (d) vegetation that impedes or is likely to impede flood flows (e) vegetation for the maintenance of roads and tracks, or (f) scattered trees, shrubs or regenerating bush amongst pasture or horticultural crops, or (g) vegetation that is infected by an unwanted organism as declared by the Ministry of Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter seeks clarity with the relationship between the use of "indigenous vegetation" and "vegetation clearance" used in the Proposed District Plan. Throughout the Proposed District Plan, the wording in rules relates to "indigenous vegetation clearance". The submitter is unable to locate any rules within the Proposed District Plan that relate to vegetation clearance of non-indigenous species. All relevant rules appear to apply to indigenous vegetation only. The submitter supports the exclusion of vegetation clearance relating to routine cultivation. Productive rural land use requires the ability to manage vegetation species and growth to ensure production activities are not compromised.	Reject	29.2
FS1345.104	Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Accept submission point.	Genesis supports the proposed amendments for the reasons in the submission.	Reject	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
433.20	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a definition for "biodiversity offsets" to Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: Biodiversity offsets are measurable conservation outcomes resulting from actions designed to compensate for significant residual adverse biodiversity impacts arising from project development after appropriate prevention and mitigation measures have been taken. The goal of biodiversity offsets is to achieve no net loss and preferably a net gain of biodiversity on the ground. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	A definition of 'biodiversity offsets' is needed to reflect the 'Guidance for Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand'.	Accept	10.2
FS1198.36	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	Incorporating the definition of "biodiversity offsetting" from the Guidance for Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand is not supported as it is a non-statutory document and there is ongoing dispute over its practical implementation. The proposed definition of "environmental compensation" is too limited and would exclude monetary payments and introduces the concept of "project development." The definition is not needed.	Reject	10.2
FS1340.61	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter is supportive of the principle of including a biodiversity offset definition subject to appropriate wording.	Accept	10.2
FS1345.18	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept in part.	Genesis supports the inclusion of a definition for biodiversity offsets, provided that a similar definition for "Environmental Compensation" also be included in the District Plan and that environmental compensation measures are recognised and provided for in a similar way to offsets.	Accept	10.2
FS1377.91	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	Support amendments to provisions that enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation, subject to drafting.	Accept	10.2
FS1342.120	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 433.20.	FFNZ opposes incorporating the definition of "biodiversity offsetting" from a non-statutory document into the plan.	Reject	10.2
433.21	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a definition for "environmental compensation" to Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: <u>Environmental compensation comprises actions offered as a means to address residual adverse effects on the environment</u>	A definition for "environmental compensation" is needed to reflect the 'Guidance for Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand'.	Accept	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>arising from project development that are not intended to result in no net loss or a net gain of biodiversity on the ground.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.</p>			
FS1223.78	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept	29.2
FS1198.37	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission points be disallowed in full.	<p>Incorporating the definition of "biodiversity offsetting" from the Guidance for Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand is not supported as it is a non-statutory document and there is ongoing dispute over its practical implementation. The proposed definition of "environmental compensation" is too limited and would exclude monetary payments and introduces the concept of "project development." The definition is not needed.</p>	Reject	29.2
FS1345.19	Genesis Energy Limited	Not Stated	Accept in part/ Reject in part.	<p>Genesis supports the inclusion of a definition Environmental Compensation provided that environmental compensation measures are recognised and provided for in a similar way to offsets. Genesis does not support the wording of the definition proposed by Fish and Game.</p>	Accept	29.2
FS1377.92	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	<p>Support amendments to provisions that enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation, subject to drafting.</p>	Accept	29.2
FS1340.62	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	<p>The submitter supports the principle of environmental compensation subject to appropriating wording of the definition.</p>	Accept	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
433.36	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Objective 3.1.1 - Biodiversity and ecosystems, as notified.	This objective ensures the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity and ecosystems and promotes sustainable management.	Accept in part	6.1
433.37	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting as follows: (b) Within a Significant Natural Area, a biodiversity offset will only be considered appropriate where adverse effects have been <u>preferentially</u> avoided, <u>then</u> remedied or mitigated in accordance with the hierarchy established in Policy 3.2.3; and ... (c) <u>Where biodiversity cannot be reasonably achieved as to address environmental effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration of environmental compensation must be made.</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Supports the inclusion of a policy to address biodiversity offsetting. This policy needs to better reflect the management hierarchy in 3.2.2 and environmental compensation should be provided for in cases where it is demonstrated that biodiversity offsetting cannot achieve its no net loss goal.	Accept	11.1
FS1345.20	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis considers that environmental compensation should be recognised as an appropriate response to addressing the adverse effects of an activity, alongside avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects, or providing for a biodiversity offset. Genesis does not support the wording proposed by Fish and Game.	Reject	11.1
FS1258.41	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow in part	Meridian's own submission number 580 requests provision for environmental compensation. However, Meridian does not support the way in which the submission point ties environmental compensation to biodiversity offsetting and the no net loss outcome. Environmental compensation is a separate method that could be volunteered, but should not be constrained by the no net loss outcome.	Reject	11.1
FS1292.26	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	McPherson supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
FS1334.25	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	Fulton Hogan supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
FS1340.65	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports the concept of environmental	Accept	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				compensation to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation, subject to appropriate drafting.		
FS1377.94	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports the concept of environmental compensation to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation, subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept	11.1
FS1342.121	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 433.37.	The amendments are not supported, FFNZ considers the notified policy is appropriate to meet WRPS requirements and help achieve improved biodiversity outcomes across the district.	Accept	11.1
433.38	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.7 (a)(iv) Managing Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (iv) maintaining and restoring natural wetland hydrology which in some cases may require artificial raising of water levels due to the adverse effects of drainage. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Natural wetland hydrology may, in some cases, require artificial raising of water levels due to the adverse effects of drainage.	Reject	14.1
FS1342.116	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 433.38.	FFNZ considers the amendment to be an unnecessary addition. It does not add any benefit to the notified policy direction.	Accept	14.1
FS1083.8	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	The additions sought to the policy appropriately recognise that natural wetland hydrology may, in some cases, require artificial raising of water levels due to the adverse effects of drainage.	Allow the submission point in full	Reject	14.1
433.39	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 3.2.8 - Incentivise subdivision. AND Add new policy 3.2.8 as follows: <u>3.2.8A Policy - Incentivise Protection of Significant Natural Areas by enabling subdivision in the Rural Zone (a) Incentivise the legal and physical protection of Significant Natural Areas by enabling appropriate subdivision in the Rural Zone which is consistent with protecting the rural environment and only occurs where the Significant Natural Areas protected are of a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning ecosystem.</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	The notified Policy 3.2.8 focuses incorrectly on incentivising subdivision rather than legal and physical habitat protection. This contradicts issues which the Proposed Plan seeks to address and the guiding principles of Future Proof.	Reject	15.3
FS1330.40	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission.	The notified policy is preferred.	Reject	15.3
433.52	Mischa Davis for Auckland	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a)(vii) Earthworks - Significant	The notified rule is too restrictive for most of	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Waikato Fish and Game Council		Natural Area AND Add new note to Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Area, as follows: <u>Note: Where earthworks are specifically for ecosystem protection, restoration or enhancement (e.g. conservation covenants, works involved with wetland enhance) then P1, P2 and RD1 do not apply.</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	the maintenance and enhancement activities carried out by Auckland Waikato Fish and Game in wetlands, particularly with the proposal to change most of the wetland areas in Waikato District from Wetland Conservation Area to Significant Natural Area. Earthworks for ecosystem protection, restoration or enhancement need to be exempt from this rule. Furthermore, any change to natural water flows, water bodies or drainage paths is to be considered by Waikato Regional Council and this is not a district council function.		
FS1340.70	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 433.52 as this would enable landowners to carry out ecosystem enhancement, protection and restoration works without the need to obtain resource consent which can often be a barrier to such works.	Accept in part	20.2
FS1083.19	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	The rule as notified fails to recognise maintenance and enhancement activities associated with wetlands.	Allow the submission point in full	Accept in part	20.2
433.56	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as notified.	The submitter supports the list of activities for which rural vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area is permitted.	Accept in part	21.1
433.57	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.8 Vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area, as notified.	The submitter supports the list of activities for which rural vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area is permitted.	Accept in part	22.2
433.63	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 6: Biodiversity Offsetting, as follows: <u>The following sets out a framework for the use of biodiversity offsets. It should be read in conjunction with the New Zealand government Guidance on Good Practice Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand, New Zealand Government et al: August 2014 (or any successor document).</u> ... 2. A proposed biodiversity offset will contain an quantitative assessment of losses and gains commensurate with the scale of effects of the activity, and should demonstrate the manner in which no net loss can be achieved. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Generally supports Appendix 6. Appendix 6 should better reflect the document 'Guidance on Biodiversity Offsetting' as set out in this website link: https://www.doc.govt.nz/about-us/our-policiesand-plans/guidance-on-biodiversity-offsetting/	Accept in part	27.2
FS1342.122	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 433.63.	FFNZ opposes the proposed amendments, Appendix 6 is appropriate as notified.	Accept in part	27.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1340.72	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter considers that referencing external documents does not reflect good planning practice.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1377.96	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL's submission seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. In addition, incorporating non-statutory documents by reference is inappropriate.	Accept in part	27.2
466.16	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks - Significant Natural Area to allow for ground truthing of all Significant Natural Areas prior to inclusion as a property record and on planning maps.	Many of the identified Significant Natural Areas do not meet the criteria set out in section 11A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. Edge effects, fragmentation, cost of management and lack of ecological significance of some of the areas identified raises concerns. Ground truthing should be enabled, for all Significant Natural Areas, prior to inclusion on a property record or planning map. Where Significant Natural Areas have been ground truthed and confirmed as significant then this rule should apply.	Accept in part	20.2
466.18	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to allow for ground truthing of all Significant Natural Areas prior to inclusion as a property record and on planning maps.	The submitter supports this rule, if provision is made for ground truthing of Significant Natural Areas at a property level.	Reject	21.1
FS1340.76	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 466.18 as the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.1
FS1377.112	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. HVL also supports accurate mapping of SNAs.	Reject	21.1
466.66	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Area to remove the 1.5m setback for earthworks, provided all effects be mitigated.	The submitter questions a 1.5m setback for earthworks from all boundaries and consider that the rule should be effects based and therefore the setback is not required where effects can be mitigated.	Accept in part	20.2
466.67	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 16.2.8 PI Indigenous	Vegetation clearance may occur in a Significant	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Group Limited		vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: <u>(vi) removal of vegetation for pest management and biosecurity works.</u>	Natural Area adjoining commercial vegetable production land where the area may contain a known biosecurity risk.		
FS1340.77	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 466.67 as this would enable landowners to carry out ecosystem enhancements, protection, pest management, biosecurity works, and restoration works without the need to obtain a resource consent which can often be a barrier to such works. The rule, as it is currently written, is too restrictive for ecosystem maintenance works within areas identified as an SAL.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1377.113	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. HVL also supports accurate mapping of SNAs.	Reject	21.1
466.68	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks - Significant Natural Area to remove the 1.5m setback for earthworks, provided all effects be mitigated.	The submitter questions a 1.5m setback for earthworks from all boundaries.	Accept in part	20.2
466.69	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 22.2.7 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: <u>(vi) removal of vegetation for pest management and biosecurity works.</u>	Vegetation clearance may occur in a Significant Natural Area adjoining commercial vegetable production land where the area may contain a known biosecurity risk.	Reject	21.1
FS1377.114	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. HVL also supports accurate mapping of SNAs.	Reject	21.1
FS1168.71	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Vegetation clearance may occur in a Significant Natural Area adjoining commercial vegetable production land where the area may contain a known biosecurity risk.	Reject	21.1
466.78	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission considers that significant ecological enhancement (wherever it occurs) should be given a significant weighting, and current rules around environmental and enhancement provisions are too restrictive and provide minimal incentivisation for ecological management.	Submission considers that significant ecological enhancement (wherever it occurs) should be given a significant weighting, and current rules around environmental and enhancement provisions are too restrictive and provide minimal incentivisation for ecological management.	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
481.10	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Not Stated	Delete the proposed limit of 20m3 for fill in Rule 22.2.3.3 P2 Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas.	It may be necessary to bring in fill to repair a fence line or track and there is no reason for a 20m3 limit.	Accept	20.2
481.15	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Not Stated	Delete the limit of 20m3 for fill in Rule 22.2.3.3 P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	There is no reason for a 20m3 limit to bring in fill to repair a fence line or a track.	Accept	20.2
481.16	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Not Stated	Amend the rules relating to Significant Natural Areas and Significant Amenity Landscapes to better enable existing practices for activities which are usual and expected in the Rural Zone.	Such overlays and associated restrictions potentially render land incapable of reasonable use. This has wide ranging impacts on maintenance of health and safety standards, the economics of current farming operations, as well as significant implications on capital land value.	Reject	25.2
493.14	Jackie Colliar	Support	Retain the activity status and clearance thresholds for indigenous vegetation clearance for Marae, dwellings and papakainga on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land in the Proposed District Plan.	The Proposed District Plan provides for the clearance of indigenous vegetation (both within identified significant natural areas and outside of significant natural areas) on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land for the purpose of a Marae complex (1500m2), dwellings (500m2 per dwelling) and a papakainga building (500m2), as a permitted activity. If provisions cannot be compiled with then a resource consent for a discretionary activity (clearance of indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area) or restricted discretionary activity (clearance of indigenous vegetation outside of a significant natural area) is required.	Accept	21.6
FS1035.67	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	• Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan.	Accept	21.6
493.15	Jackie Colliar	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for earthworks in Significant Natural Areas that are for the establishment of Marae, papakainga, dwellings and associated access, parking and manoeuvring as a permitted activity.	It appears however that earthworks within significant natural areas and associated with Marae, papakainga and dwellings are not afforded the same permitted status as vegetation clearance; they would be a restricted discretionary activity. Only the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains are permitted within certain parameters. There seems little	Accept	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				point in providing for a permitted indigenous vegetation clearance for these activities but then requiring a resource consent for any earthworks. As currently drafted a resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity would potentially need to be obtained to establish building platforms and access. The submitter supports the ability to clear indigenous vegetation for the purpose of establishing these activities on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land. However, I seek that provision be made in the earthworks in Significant Natural Areas rules to allow earthworks associated with Marae, papakainga and dwellings as a permitted activity. The Proposed District Plan also provides for indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the gathering of plants in accordance with Maaori customs and values as a permitted activity. This is supported.		
FS1035.68	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan. 	Accept	20.2
493.26	Jackie Colliar	Not Stated	Retain the provisions allowing for indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the gathering of plants in accordance with Maori customs and values as a Permitted Activity.	Submitter supports these provisions.	Accept	21.6
FS1035.79	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan. 	Accept	21.6
493.31	Jackie Colliar	Not Stated	Retain the ability to clear indigenous vegetation for the purposes of establishing a Marae complex, dwellings and papakainga building on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land.	Supports the ability to clear indigenous vegetation for these activities.	Accept	21.6
FS1035.84	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Agree and support the whole submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage with Waikato Tainui and mana whenua to ensure that the Tainui Environmental Plan Tai Tunu, Tai Pari, Tai Ao and marae environmental plans have been included in the Waikato District Plan. 	Accept	21.6
499.25	Adrian Morton	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.2.8 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to reduce the 5m ³ limit to 3m ³ and remove reference to the Coastal Environment.	Manuka and kanuka are important habitat environments and provide visual amenity. Therefore, 3m ³ should be adequate for heating purposes with non-native wood sources available.	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
514.10	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Criteria for determining significance of indigenous biodiversity.	Supports the inclusion of these criteria.	Accept in part	26.3
FS1388.551	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	26.3
529.1	Wilcox Properties Limited		Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Policy 3.2.8(b) Incentivise subdivision, as follows: <u>(b) Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity, legal and physical protection of areas that are of a suitable size and meet the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity</u>	Supports the policy in part. Seeks that Policy 3.2.8 be expanded to include provision for the enhancement/restoration of areas as this is in line with the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River. Supports incentivising the protection of existing biodiversity with subdivision subject to meeting certain criteria. Appendix 2 of the Proposed District Plan Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity could provide the basis for determining eligibility.	Reject	15.1
FS1377.126	Havelock Village Limited		Supports 529.1: HVL supports amendments that allow for greater development potential in rural areas while also maintaining and protecting significant indigenous biodiversity.			15.1
529.10	Wilcox Properties Limited	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity, as notified.	Submission supports the inclusion of Appendix 2 in the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	26.3
535.71	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Delete Rule 22.2.7 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area. AND	Any vegetation clearance from a Significant Natural Area is not appropriate because the protection of significant vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance and this should not be eroded through a harvesting activity.	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1377.131	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	18.1
FS1345.108	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	There are some circumstances where it is appropriate to clear vegetation from an SNA. These circumstances need to be provided for in the plan.	Accept in part	18.1
FS1340.85	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 535.71. Removal of indigenous vegetation is sometimes required, and as such this rule enables this to occur within an SNA where necessary.	Accept in part	18.1
535.76	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area. AND Delete Rule 23.2.8 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Any vegetation clearance from a Significant Natural Area is not appropriate. The protection of significant vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance and therefore such vegetation should not be eroded through a harvesting activity.	Accept in part	18.1
535.79	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area. AND Delete Rule 24.2.8 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter does not consider any vegetation clearance within a Significant Natural Area is not appropriate. The protection of significant vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance and therefore such vegetation should not be eroded through a harvesting activity.	Accept in part	18.1
FS1129.77	Auckland Council	Support	Null		Accept in part	18.1
540.1	Glen Alvon Farms Limited		Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise Subdivision as notified except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new clause (b) to Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise Subdivision as follows: <u>(b) Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity, legal and physical protection of areas that are of a suitable size and meet the Criteria for Determining Significance of</u>	Policy 3.2.8 needs to be expanded to provide for the enhancement and/or restoration of areas that achieve a functioning ecosystem and allow for subdivision on the basis of compliance with Appendix 2 (Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity). Eligible areas would likely be wetlands and waterways which have become degraded due to stock farming and cropping and restoring these would	Reject	15.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>Indigenous Biodiversity.</u>	be in line with the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River. Supports incentivising the protection of existing biodiversity with the ability to subdivide subject to meeting certain criteria. Incentivising restoration is in line with the vision and strategy for the Waikato River.		
FS1062.85	Andrew and Christine Gore		Supports 540.1: • Incentivising subdivision has advantages for conservation and biodiversity. • It spreads responsibility and cost across more people.	• Incentivising subdivision has advantages for conservation and biodiversity. • It spreads responsibility and cost across more people.	Reject	15.1
540.11	Glen Alvon Farms Limited	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Supports the inclusion of the criteria.	Accept in part	26.3
543.13	Fellrock Developments Limited and TTT Products Limited	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The submitter states that all Significant Natural Areas need to be protected.	Accept in part	21.1
553.13	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.6(b) Providing for vegetation clearance.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	13.1
553.17	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.9 P2, P4, P5, and P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
553.20	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.9 P2, P4, P5, and P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	18.1
553.24	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.7 P4, P5 and P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	21.6
553.25	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.8 P1 (vi), P1 (vii), P2, and P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	22.2
553.28	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.8 P3, P4, P5, and P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional	Accept in part	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.		
553.29	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.9 PI (a)(vi), PI (a)(vii), P2, and P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	22.2
553.32	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 24.2.8 PI (a)(v), P4, P5, and P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	21.1
553.34	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 28.2.8 P4, P5, and P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of	Accept in part	21.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata Whenua.		
553.39	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.8 P2, P4 and P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	18.1
559.39	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.7(a) (vii) Managing Significant Natural Areas.	The submitter supports Policy 3.2.7 (a)(vii) as these policies give effect to s6(e) of the Resource Management Act.	Accept	14.1
574.10	3.2 Significant Natural Areas TaTa Valley Limited		Amend Section 3.2 - Significant Natural Areas and related rules, to apply a bespoke approach for the management of indigenous biodiversity on the TaTa Valley site as outlined in the proposed provisions (refer to Appendix A of the submission). AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Opposes the approach (including rules) to the management of Significant Natural Area's on their land and seeks the application of a bespoke approach to the management of indigenous biodiversity and Significant Natural Area's on the TaTa Valley Resort site. Approach recognises that some areas of indigenous biodiversity will be removed to allow for development of the resort but overall biodiversity across the site will be maintained through a combination of ecological mitigation, enhancement, offset, compensation and protection. Submission notes that proposed areas of Significant Natural Areas for removal are identified on the Precinct Plan (Areas A and B), attached to the submission as Appendix A. Submission also notes that this approach is informed by a report from Wildlands Consultants Ltd.	Reject	8.1
FS1369.13	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Opposes		Oppose the Significant Natural Area overlay being removed.	Accept	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1108.88	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Opposes		Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	8.1
FS1301.52	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Supports	Support the submission in its entirety.	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	8.1
FS1303.52	Charlie Harris	Supports	I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.	Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	8.1
FS1139.79	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Opposes		Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	8.1
574.13	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Delete the definition of Significant Natural Area in Chapter 13 Definitions, and replace with a new definition that is more descriptive as to what a Significant Natural Area is. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Significant Natural Areas can be comprised of significant indigenous vegetation, exotic vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. The current definition just directs users back to the planning maps, and as such is insufficient.	Reject	29.2
FS1301.55	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	Support the submission in its entirety.	TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.	Reject	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1303.55	Charlie Harris	Support	<i>I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.</i>	<i>Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.</i>	Reject	29.2
FS1108.91	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	29.2
FS1139.82	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Accept	29.2
574.20	TaTa Valley Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3.2 Significant Natural Areas and associated rules, to provide for greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation or offsetting. AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Considers that objectives and policies (except for 3.2.8) are overly restrictive.	Reject	25.2
FS1301.62	New Zealand Health Food Park Limited	Support	<i>Support the submission in its entirety.</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "TaTa Valley Resort." Health Food Park supports the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, This is turn brings more consumers to the area, showcase New Zealand's rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.</i>	Reject	25.2
FS1303.62	Charlie Harris	Support	<i>I also support the original submission by Ta Ta Valley Limited in its entirety.</i>	<i>Ta Ta Valley Limited controls land in southern Pokeno at 242 Bluff Road, Pokeno. TaTa Valley's submission is to amend the plan to enable the development of its site into a major tourism destination, known as the "Ta Ta Valley Resort". I Support the improved tourism offerings that this will provide for the area, showcase New Zealand rural character and significantly enrich the region socially and economically.</i>	Reject	25.2
FS1369.16	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose	Null	SNA's should not be subject to modification to enable development mitigation offset.	Accept	25.2
575.2	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.2.1 - Significant Natural Areas.	Supports the aim of protection SNAs throughout the district, provided such overlays are used appropriately and without limiting the	Accept in part	8.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				commercial viability of legally established quarries.		
FS1332.23	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	8.3
575.23	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Delete Significant Natural Area from the Tauhei quarry at 1500 Tauhei Road, Tuakau (property 1005650). (A map of the respective area sought for deletion is attached to the original submission as Appendix B). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The Significant Natural Areas areas encroach on a large amount of potential extraction land. The quarry is also subject to the 'Aggregate Extraction Areas' overlay, which is intended to protect lawfully established quarry activities. The overlapping overlays creates unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of these quarries complex and costly.	Accept in part	33.9
FS1293.118	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.9
FS1027.9	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and significant natural area overlays in an area for which these values are of national and regional importance. With regards to this submission, the extractive industry should be treated no differently here as other land-users are treated.	We seek to disallow the whole of this submission including other submissions which seek to remove natural heritage and landscape overlays, as if those values didn't exist.	Accept in part	33.9
575.24	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Delete Significant Natural Area from the Waingarō quarry	The Significant Natural Areas areas encroach on	Accept in part	33.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			land (Waingaro Road, Ngaruawahia - properties 2006029, 1012692, 1012697 and 1012732). (A map of the respective area sought for deletion is attached to the original submission as Appendix B). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	a large amount of potential extraction land. The quarry is also subject to the 'Aggregate Extraction Areas' overlay, which is intended to protect lawfully established quarry activities. The overlapping overlays creates unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of these quarries complex and costly.		
FS1293.119	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.9
576.5	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy, as notified.	Significant Natural Areas are identified on the planning maps and feature widely across the district. Although not defined in the Proposed District Plan, SNA are those areas containing significant habitats of indigenous fauna and flora. The submitter supports the identification of such areas, and the hierarchy approach provided within Policy 3.2.3, and in particular the reference within clause (i) to 'unless specific activities need to be enabled'. The reference is supported as it recognises that there are some activities (for example the National Grid) which in some circumstances may need to be enabled. The policy gives effect to Policy 8 of the NPSET which recognises that within the rural environment, planning and development of the National Grid should seek to avoid adverse effects on outstanding natural landscapes, areas of high natural character and areas of high recreation value and amenity and existing sensitive activities.	Accept in part	10.1
576.6	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance,	The submitter supports the provision of	Accept	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new clause (v) to Policy 3.2.6 (a) Providing for vegetation clearance as follows (or equivalent references to Regionally significant infrastructure or the National Grid): (v) associated with the operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	policy providing for the clearance of indigenous vegetation in Significant Natural Areas for certain circumstances as the policy recognizes there are some activities for which clearance is required. The submitter supports expansion of the policy to recognise vegetation associated with the operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure. Such policy recognition would reflect the permitted activity rule 14.3.1. P5, and the need for vegetation clearance around the National Grid for safety reasons. While the submitter has recommended the policy apply to infrastructure generally, it would support the policy being specific to Regionally Significant Infrastructure (noting that this term is not defined or widely used in the Proposed District Plan), or the National Grid.		
FS1211.2	First Gas Limited on behalf of First Gas	Neutral/Amend	Allow	First Gas supports the above amendment which recognises that in some circumstances it is necessary for the removal of vegetation to protect the integrity of this existing infrastructure.	Accept	13.1
FS1345.21	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Transpower submission (noting that under the Waikato RPS the Huntly Power Station is "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" and also fits within the RPS definition of "Regionally Significant Industry").	Accept	13.1
576.47	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Retain the definition for "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The definition is supported on the basis it applies to the area as identified on the planning maps. Such identification assists plan users and provides clarity on the application of the Proposed District Plan provisions that relate to the definition.	Accept in part	29.2
579.45	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Support	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlays from the lake edge within the Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited property (see map included in submission). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any amendments or consequential changes that are necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	It is considered that the mapping of the Significant Natural Area overlays should be pulled back from the walkway and from the lake edge. The overlapping of the walkway and the overlays may frustrate the consenting process and the works that are required for the stop bank and to keep out the koi carp and alligator	Accept in part	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				weed.		
FS1293.120	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.6
579.89	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission generally supports the objectives and policies relating to the Natural Environment (Chapter 3 Natural Environment).	No reasons provided.	Accept	5.2
FS1087.13	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Support submission point 579.89.	Ports of Auckland Limited considers the objectives and policies of Chapter 3 to be appropriate.	Accept	5.2
580.12	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Amend Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas as follows: (a) Indigenous biodiversity in Significant Natural Areas is protected, and enhanced. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The obligation of section 6(c) of the RMA is protection and does not require enhancement.	Reject	8.1
FS1308.81	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	We oppose the removal of enhancement from Objective 3.2.1. Enhancement, particularly of wetlands and waterways, falls under the umbrella of 'sustainable management' - managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources. Enhancement accord with the WRPS, The Vision and Strategy and relevant NPS.	Accept	8.1
FS1350.3	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	The submission point is supported on the basis that the sought wording reflects the wording of s6(c) of the RMA, with emphasis placed on the protection, as opposed to enhancement, of significant indigenous vegetation. It is also noted that protection is also afforded in Policy 11.2.2 of the Waikato RPS.	Reject	8.1
FS1342.144	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 580.12.	FFNZ support the amendment. It is important to be clear that enhancement goals require a different approach to protection, which can be achieved, in part via regulation. Regulation can control use but not induce the active management required to achieve enhancement.	Reject	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.149	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	8.1
FS1330.43	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission.	Ecological systems are dynamic and enhancement is appropriate to meet the Purpose of the Act.	Accept	8.1
FS1345.49	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Meridian submission.	Reject	8.1
580.13	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management Hierarchy, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.2.3(a)(iv) Management Hierarchy as follows: (iv) after remediation or mitigation has been undertaken, provide for managing residual effects by means of <u>environmental compensation or biodiversity offsets</u> in accordance with Policy 3.2.4. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Environmental compensation is an important method in the toolbox of approaches to managing adverse effects and should be explicitly included in the management hierarchy particularly for the consideration of large infrastructure projects.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1330.44	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Accept Submission.	The proposed methods are appropriate. Particularly where avoidance, remedy and mitigation cannot be achieved.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1345.50	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Meridian submission.	Accept in part	10.1
580.21	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.2.4(a) Biodiversity Offsetting to provide for environmental compensation as follows: (a) Allow for a biodiversity offset <u>or environmental compensation</u> to be offered by a resource consent applicant where an activity will result in significant residual adverse effects on a Significant Natural Area, or on indigenous biodiversity outside such Significant Natural Areas. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Environmental compensation is an important method in the toolbox of approaches to managing adverse effects and should be explicitly included in the management hierarchy, particularly for the consideration of large infrastructure projects.	Accept	11.1
FS1342.145	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 580.21.	FFNZ supports the amendment and agree with the submitter that environmental compensation is an important method in the toolbox of approaches to managing adverse effects and should be explicitly included in the plan.	Accept	11.1
FS1198.15	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	Biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation should be available tools where there	Accept	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				are adverse effects.		
FS1330.45	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Accept Submission.	The proposed methods are appropriate, particularly where avoidance, remedy and mitigation cannot be achieved.	Accept	11.1
FS1334.26	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	Fulton Hogan support the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
FS1292.27	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	McPherson support the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
FS1377.150	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. Environmental compensation is a valid mechanism for managing effects in certain scenarios and should be included in Policy 3.2.4.	Accept	11.1
FS1223.111	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	11.1
581.17	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Support	Retain the definition of "Significant Natural Areas" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	The definition provides appropriate interpretation in administration of the District Plan.	Accept in part	29.2
FS1341.34	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	• This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and	Accept in part	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>proposal for residential re-zoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.</i>		
585.1	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Delete policy 3.2.6(a)(iv) Providing for vegetation clearance.	The policy is too permissive for vegetation clearance in Significant Natural Areas.	Reject	13.1
<i>FS1345.4</i>	<i>Genesis Energy Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject submission point.</i>	<i>Genesis supports the retention of this policy, subject to the amendments set out in Genesis primary submission.</i>	Accept	13.1
<i>FS1330.66</i>	<i>Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject relief sought.</i>	<i>Proposed rules or a variation to them are appropriate.</i>	Accept	13.1
<i>FS1340.89</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes submission point 585.1 as some vegetation clearance needs to be able to occur within SNAs. The submitter disagrees that this policy makes vegetation clearance within an SNA too permissive.</i>	Accept	13.1
585.2	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.2.6(b) Providing for vegetation clearance.	This policy is too permissive for vegetation clearance within a Significant Natural Area.	Reject	13.1
<i>FS1345.5</i>	<i>Genesis Energy Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject submission point.</i>	<i>Genesis supports the retention of this policy, subject to the amendments set out in Genesis primary submission.</i>	Accept	13.1
<i>FS1340.90</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes submission point 585.2 as some vegetation clearance needs to be able to occur within SNAs. The submitter disagrees that this policy makes vegetation clearance within an SNA too permissive.</i>	Accept	13.1
<i>FS1342.149</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 585.2.</i>	<i>FFNZ opposes the deletion sought and largely supports the notified version of Policy 3.2.6 which, in part, is designed to acknowledge existing use right activities. This is an appropriate planning approach that provides certainty for plan users.</i>	Accept	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.157	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	No reasons provided.	Accept	13.1
585.14	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Not Stated	Retain Appendix 6 Biodiversity offsetting, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Appendix 6 Biodiversity offsetting as follows: Introduction.... <u>The following sets out a framework for the use of biodiversity offsets. It should be read in conjunction with the New Zealand government Guidance on Good Practice Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand, New Zealand Government et al., August 2014 (or any successor document).</u> 2 Biodiversity offsetting framework ... 2. A proposed biodiversity offset will contain an qualitative assessment of losses and gains commensurate with the scale of effects of the activity, and should demonstrate the manner in which no net loss can be achieved. AND Amend bullet 8 of Appendix 6 Biodiversity Offsetting to ensure that any offset not replacing biodiversity on a like for like basis should not 'trade up' from already threatened or at risk biodiversity.	Generally support appendix 6, however requests amendment to better reflect guidance on Biodiversity Offsetting.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1330.56	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Support subject to final wording. Grant the relief sought.	It is appropriate to refer to the guidance.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1340.93	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter considers that referencing external documents does not reflect good planning practice.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1223.139	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports policy changes to achieve better biodiversity outcomes in the lower Waikato River Catchment. It supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1258.70	Meridian Energy Limited	Not Stated	Allow in part, to the extent consistent with submission number 580	The Appendix 6 framework for Biodiversity Offsetting is potentially relevant for proposals involving the use, development and upgrading of renewable electricity resources in the Waikato District. Meridian therefore has an interest in any amendments to Appendix 6 and request that it be included in any meetings or discussions about amendments to Appendix 6.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1345.8	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Accept in part/ Reject in part.	For the reasons presented in Genesis' primary submission, any framework for offsetting should also include environmental compensation alongside.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1377.160	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. Also it is inappropriate	Accept in part	27.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>to incorporate non-statutory documents by reference.</i>		
<i>FS1342.154</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 585.14.</i>	<i>FFNZ opposes the amendments to Appendix 6.</i>	Accept in part	27.2
585.15	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of Manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.	Reject	21.1
<i>FS1377.161</i>	<i>Havelock Village Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose.</i>	<i>HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	Accept	21.1
585.16	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of Manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.	Accept in part	21.1
585.17	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 20.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				volume of Manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.		
FS1345.11	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The Department of Conservation requests that various rules associated with vegetation clearance within an SNA be amended. However, the specifics of those amendments are unclear and therefore the effect of the amendments proposed is uncertain.	Accept on part	21.1
585.18	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 21.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1345.12	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The Department of Conservation requests that various rules associated with vegetation clearance within an SNA be amended. However, the specifics of those amendments are unclear and therefore the effect of the amendments proposed is uncertain.	Accept in part	21.1
585.19	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.		
FS1315.9	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Oppose	Null	The submission is opposed for the reasons set out in the LFL submission.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1345.13	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The Department of Conservation requests that various rules associated with vegetation clearance within an SNA be amended. However, the specifics of those amendments are unclear and therefore the effect of the amendments proposed is uncertain.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1340.94	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 585.19 in that, whilst the matters raised in the submission are valid, no set volumes have been suggested as part of the proposed amendments.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1342.156	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.19.	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be; we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Accept in part	21.1
585.20	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; AND Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.	Accept in part	21.1
585.21	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.		
585.22	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 25.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.	Accept in part	21.1
585.23	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Rule 28.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Change P2 to a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. P2 describes a maximum volume of manuka and kanuka that may be removed per 12 months outside of the coastal environment. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an area of a few 5m ² , where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.	Accept in part	21.1
585.24	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Add rules for Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area in all Zones as follows: Include a maximum vegetation clearance permitted activity rule for all purposes; and Include a minimum setback distance from water bodies for all purposes; and Include a maximum area of clearance rather than a maximum volume; and Any other relevant amendments.	The current rules for vegetation clearance within Significant Natural Areas fails to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. A volume of timber is dependent on the size of trees and their density where 5m ³ may be clearance of an	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				area of a few 5m2, where a few large trees have been harvested. An area limit is more suitable to ensure consistency of removal.		
FS1340.95	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 585.24 in that, whilst the matters raised in the submission are valid, no set volumes are suggested as part of the proposed amendment.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1342.155	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.24.	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be; we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1377.162	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	21.1
FS1345.14	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	The Department of Conservation requests that various rules associated with vegetation clearance within an SNA be amended. However, the specifics of those amendments are unclear and therefore the effect of the amendments proposed is uncertain.	Accept in part	21.1
585.25	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
FS1377.163	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.8
585.26	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 17.2.9 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
585.27	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 20.2.9 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
585.28	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 21.2.9 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
585.29	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.7 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
<i>FS1315.10</i>	<i>Lochiel Farmlands Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>If indigenous vegetation removal does not comply with the permitted limit it should go to RD and not D.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>21.8</i>
585.30	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
585.31	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 24.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
585.33	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Add new objectives, policies and rules to address the management of kauri dieback, particularly around earthworks and measures to prevent spread of the disease.	The disease is threatening Kauri with functional extinction and requires collaboration work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of New Zealand Kauri Tree can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site. The provisions of Thames Coromandel District Plan, as they relate to Kauri Dieback, should be adopted into the Proposed District Plan where appropriate.	Accept in part	17.1
<i>FS1342.158</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 585.33.</i>	<i>FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC to implement a planning response over and above what is being undertaken at the national and regional level. Further, it is not appropriate to just shoehorn rules from another district without any local analysis and consideration of other biosecurity responses that may be available. FFNZ understands that vector pests such as wild pigs could create a significant risk and look forward to better understanding how the Department is</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>17.1</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>responding to that.</i>		
585.35	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Retain the mapping of Significant Natural Areas, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the Plan to manage areas that are not mapped, but meet the criteria for Significant Natural Areas stated in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Support the mapping of Significant Natural Areas but also request provisions to ensure unmapped areas that the Significant Natural Area criteria are managed appropriately.	Accept in part	32.2
<i>FS1258.34</i>	<i>Meridian Energy Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow</i>	<i>It is not possible to ascertain from the submission point exactly which natural areas are to be included. neither is it clear precisely which objectives, policies and rules would apply to these unspecified natural areas. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>32.2</i>
<i>FS1330.50</i>	<i>Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Grant relief subject to detailed wording - consider the approach in the Auckland Unitary Plan in Part</i>	<i>SEA mapping will not be full-proof and ecology is dynamic so there should be provisions to recognise, manage, protect, and derive a development benefit, from new areas.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>32.2</i>
585.37	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Add new objectives, policies and rules to recognise and implement measures to address and manage the revised conservation status of Kunzea and Leptospermum taxa.	With the advent of myrtle rust, all Kunzea and Leptospermum taxa are considered threatened. The taxonomy and current threatened status of Manuka and kanuka must be reflected and managed appropriately through objectives, policies and rules in the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	18.1
<i>FS1342.159</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 585.37.</i>	<i>The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be, and as such, we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>18.1</i>
585.38	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Add new maps, objectives, policies and rules recognising and providing for bat zones and tree protection (see submission for an example of a rule from the Draft Timaru District Plan).	Both exotic and native trees provide habitat for native and threatened bats. The removal of such trees on fragmented landscapes will impact on the native species habitat and survival.	Reject	16.1
<i>FS1377.165</i>	<i>Havelock Village Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose.</i>	<i>Existing provisions relating to biodiversity adequately provide for the issues any zone would seek to address.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>16.1</i>
<i>FS1340.97</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes submission 585.38 subject to understanding the potential implications of the proposed provisions.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>16.1</i>
<i>FS1345.9</i>	<i>Genesis Energy Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject in part.</i>	<i>Genesis supports the protection of native species such as the native bat, however there is insufficient information provided in the submission to understand the implications of a (so far) undefined Bat Protection and Tree Protection Zone.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>16.1</i>

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1342.160	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.38.	The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be in the WDC context and as such; we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.	Accept	16.1
585.39	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Objective 3.1.1 Biodiversity and ecosystems as notified.	The objective is consistent with section 6(c) of the RMA.	Accept in part	6.1
585.40	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.1.2(a)(i) Policies as follows: (a) Enable activities that maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity including: (i) planting and reintroducing eco-sourced using indigenous species suitable to the habitat;	Request recognition of potential initiatives to reintroduce fauna as components of habitats. Eco-sourcing refers to plants grown from seeds or propagules collected from the naturally occurring vegetation close to the restoration site. Application of this principle will support species adapting to local conditions. To avoid plant species not native to Waikato District becoming invasive and impacting on the local native vegetation, eco-sourced indigenous plants should be used.	Accept in part	7.1
FS1330.51	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject relief or modify.	Climbing change may mean that eco-sourcing may not always be the best way to future proof indigenous ecology.	Accept in part	7.1
585.41	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Policy 3.1.2 (a)(iii) Policies as follows: Enable activities that maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity including: ... (iii) biosecurity works including management of plant diseases.	Plant diseases such as kauri dieback and myrtle rust present immediate threats to indigenous species. Recognising plant diseases will provide better acknowledgement of the potential risks from these diseases.	Reject	7.1
FS1223.141	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports policy changes to achieve better biodiversity outcomes in the lower Waikato River Catchment. It supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation.	reject	7.1
FS1342.161	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.41.	FFNZ opposes the amendment; the management of plant diseases is enabled within the existing provision.	Accept	7.1
FS1330.52	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Grant relief sought.	Appropriate considering current and future threats.	Reject	7.1
585.42	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.2 (b) Policies except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.1.2(b) as follows: (b) Consider the following when avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity including by considering:	Support the intent of this provision to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, however the current wording of the policy does not allow for consideration of aspects of indigenous biodiversity outside of those listed. Amendment of this policy will give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Reject	7.1
FS1223.142	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports policy changes to achieve better biodiversity outcomes in the lower Waikato River	Reject	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Catchment. It supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation.</i>		
585.43	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.1.2(c) Policies to appropriately recognise and implement measures to address and manage Kunzea and Leptospermum in light of their re-assessed conservation status.	A 2017 assessment identified that all species of Kunzea and Leptospermum are threatened due to the threat of Myrtle Rust.	Reject	18.1
<i>FS1342.162</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 585.43.</i>	<i>The submission is not specific as to what the planning response may be and as such, we are unable to assess the impacts of this proposal on farming activities.</i>	Accept	18.1
585.44	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas as notified.	Director-General supports this objective.	Accept in part	
585.45	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.2 Identify and Recognise as notified.	The Director-General supports this policy.	Accept in part	9.1
585.46	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy as follows: (a) Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity within Significant Natural Areas by: (i) avoiding the significant adverse effects of vegetation clearance and the disturbance of habitats unless specific activities need to be enabled as a preference; ...	Generally supports Policy 3.2.3, however seek amendments to ensure the policy gives effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and is consistent with the Guidance for Biodiversity Offsetting. Avoidance of adverse effects should apply to all activities before other measures are considered.	Accept in part	10.1
<i>FS1198.13</i>	<i>Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submission be disallowed in full.</i>	<i>The application of SNAs should not act to prevent mineral extraction that by its nature needs to take place in areas where minerals are located.</i>	Accept in part	10.1
<i>FS1340.98</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose.</i>	<i>The submitter opposes submission 585.46 as some activities are required to be enabled, and situated, within an SNA.</i>	Accept in part	10.1
<i>FS1345.10</i>	<i>Genesis Energy Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject in part.</i>	<i>Genesis considers that, for a SNA that has been ground-truthed and appropriately classified as an SNA (unlike some of the SNA's mapped over Genesis assets) that avoidance should be a preference. However, this policy should also enable specific activities as notified.</i>	Accept in part	10.1
<i>FS1258.35</i>	<i>Meridian Energy Limited</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>	<i>Allow in part, to the extent consistent with the RPS</i>	<i>The wording should reflect the management hierarchy for identified areas of significant indigenous vegetation and identified significant habitats of indigenous fauna set out in the Waikato Regional</i>	Accept in part	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Policy Statement, including RPS Policy 11.1.		
FS1292.24	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject and ensure that the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per McPherson's original submission (691.4).	McPherson recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS, but are concerned that it may unreasonably hinder their existing quarries. Furthermore the RPS also provides protection for mineral and aggregate extraction activities and therefore the policy should reflect this.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1334.24	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject and ensure that the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per Fulton Hogan's original submission (575.7).	Fulton Hogan recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS, but are concerned that it may unreasonably hinder their existing quarries. Furthermore, the RPS also provides protection for mineral and aggregate extraction activities and therefore the policy should reflect this.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1377.166	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	10.1
585.47	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Retain Policy 3.2.4 (b) Biodiversity Offsetting, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.2.4(b) Biodiversity as follows: (b) Within a Significant Natural Area, a biodiversity offset will only be considered appropriate where adverse effects have been <u>preferentially</u> avoided, <u>then</u> remedied or mitigated in accordance with the hierarchy established in Policy 3.2.3; and...	Supports the inclusion of a policy to address biodiversity offsets, however seeks amendment to reflect the management hierarchy in policy 3.2.3.	Reject	11.1
FS1340.99	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes 585.47 as the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. The additional wording is not considered necessary.	Accept	11.1
FS1292.28	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	McPherson supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
FS1334.27	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	Fulton Hogan supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
FS1258.38	Meridian Energy Limited	Not Stated	Allow in part, to the extent consistent with the RPS.	The wording should reflect the management hierarchy for identified areas of significant indigenous vegetation and identified significant habitats of	Accept	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>indigenous fauna set out in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, including RPS Policy 11.2.2</i>		
FS1377.167	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	11.1
FS1223.143	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Support.	Mercury supports policy changes to achieve better biodiversity outcomes in the lower Waikato River Catchment. It supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation.	Accept	11.1
FS1345.15	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	SNA's need to be properly mapped and ground-truthed before applying a policy of this nature.	Accept	11.1
FS1330.53	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Grant relief sought.	Amendment proposed is appropriate.	Accept	11.1
FS1045.9	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We support the inclusion of a policy to address biodiversity offsets, and seek amendment to reflect the management hierarchy in policy 3.2.3.		Accept	11.1
585.48	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (c) to Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity offsetting that provides for consideration of environmental compensation in cases where biodiversity offsetting cannot be reasonably achieved as to address environmental effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Environmental compensation should be provided for in cases where it is demonstrated that biodiversity offsetting cannot achieve its no net loss goal. This gives effect to s104(ab) of the RMA.	Accept	11.1
FS1223.144	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that these submissions are allowed	Mercury supports policy changes to achieve better biodiversity outcomes in the lower Waikato River Catchment. It supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation.	Accept	11.1
FS1292.29	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	McPherson supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
FS1258.40	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow in part	Meridian's own submission number 580 requests provision for environmental compensation. However, Meridian does not support the way in which the submission point ties environmental compensation to biodiversity offsetting and the not net loss outcome. Environmental compensation is a separate method that could be volunteered, but should not be constrained by the no net loss outcome.	Reject	11.1
FS1377.168	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	11.1
FS1345.16	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis considers that environmental compensation should have equal standing with offsetting.	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1342.163	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 585.48.	FFNZ supports the proposal. Environmental compensation is an important method in the toolbox of approaches to managing adverse effects and should be explicitly included in the plan.	Accept	11.1
FS1340.100	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 585.48 as environmental compensation is sometimes required when biodiversity offsetting is not possible. This clause will result in development being able to occur through providing environmental compensation as an option of last resort.	Accept	11.1
FS1334.28	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing for environmental compensation while also giving recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities.	Fulton Hogan supports the use of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation. However, the policy should also give recognition to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.	Accept	11.1
585.49	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.5 Biodiversity in the coastal environment by moving it to section 3.1 AND Amend Policy 3.2.5 Biodiversity in the coastal environment as follows: (a) Avoid the adverse effects of subdivision use and development within Significant Natural Areas of the coastal environment on:	Amendments to ensure the policy cover all of the coastal environment in the district, not just within Significant Natural Areas. Policy 11 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement requires the protection of indigenous biological diversity in all areas of the coastal environment.	Reject	12.1
FS1258.43	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow in part	The rationale for the proposed amendments summarises Policy 11 of the NZCPS 2010 in a way that expands the scope of the Policy. Any amendments to the proposed District Plan provisions for the coastal environment need to accurately reflect the wording of NZCPS Policy 11.	Accept	12.1
585.5	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities to address the management of kauri dieback and measures to prevent the spread of the disease.	The disease is threatening kauri and any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of a kauri dripline can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site. Seek that the provisions of the final decision of the Thames Coromandel District Plan as appropriate are adopted into the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	17.1
FS1342.150	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.5.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC to implement a planning response over and above what is being undertaken at the national and regional level. Further, it is not appropriate to just shoehorn rules from another district without any local analysis and	Accept in part	17.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				consideration of other biosecurity responses that may be available. FFNZ understands that vector pests such as wild pigs could create a significant risk and look forward to better understanding how the Department is responding to that.		
585.50	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 25.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
585.51	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Support	Retain Rule 28.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, in particular, retain the cascade to discretionary activity upon non-compliance with the permitted activity standards.	The Director-General supports vegetation clearance outside permitted activity standards becoming a discretionary activity.	Accept	21.8
587.10	Bruce Cameron	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to ensure there are no setbacks imposed on farm operations adjacent to a Significant Natural Area.	There should be no setbacks imposed on any farm operation adjacent to an Significant Natural Area.	Reject	14.1
587.11	Bruce Cameron	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to recognise that landowners need the ability to clear bush and prepare building sites within a Significant Natural Areas.	Landowners need the ability to clear bush and soil for building sites within an Significant Natural Area.	Accept in part	14.1
591.13	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Delete the Significant Natural Area overlay in areas where it overlaps with the Aggregate Extraction Area or Aggregate Resource Area at Stevenson's Huntly Quarry at 300 River Road, Huntly.	There is little point in identifying areas of aggregate extraction or future aggregate extraction if it will be prevented by a significant natural area. Alternative is to make a special provision for earthworks and vegetation clearance within the policies and rules for the situation where the Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Area overlaps overlap with the Significant Natural Area. The Significant Natural Area should be removed from the planning maps. This Significant Natural Area is considered to be only of local significance.	Accept in part	33.9
FS1293.121	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties.	Accept in part	33.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.		
FS1027.10	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove significant natural area overlay, in an area for which these values have been identified.	NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove significant natural area overlay, in an area for which these values have been identified.	Accept in part	33.9
FS1146.23	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	One Significant Natural Area is adjacent and encroaches on the potential extraction expansion area. The quarry is also subject to the 'Aggregate Extraction Areas' overlay, which is intended to protect lawfully established quarry activities.	We seek that the whole submission is allowed as the overlapping of the SNA and Aggregate Extraction overlays creates unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of these quarries complex.	Accept in part	33.9
644.10	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.7 Managing Significant Natural Areas, as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	14.1
68.2	William Smeed		Delete the overlays placed over the island in the Waikato		Reject	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			River, such as the Significant Amenity Landscape or the Significant Natural Area.			
646.3	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.1.2-Policies as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas", requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	32.2
646.4	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.	Accept in part	32.2
646.10	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain 3.2.7- Managing Significant Natural Areas as notified.	Policy 6.1.10 in the Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in "Identified Areas," requiring consideration of the values and attributes of these area where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in such areas. Policy 6.1.10 needs to be read in conjunction with the Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in Identified Areas. Natural Environment Provisions as drafted set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure. Submitter	Accept in part	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				wishes to preserve its standing on such provisions should changes be sought by other parties.		
648.4	Chorus New Zealand Limited		Retain Objective 3.2.1- Significant Natural Areas as notified.	<p>Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.</p>	Accept in part	8.3
648.10	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.7 - Managing Significant Natural Areas as notified.	<p>Policy 6.1.10 in Infrastructure section directly addresses infrastructure in 'Identified Areas,' requiring a consideration of the values and attributes of these areas where new infrastructure or significant upgrades are required in these areas. Policy 6.1.10 will need to be read in conjunction with Natural Environment provisions where assessing proposals in these areas. Submitter considers Natural Environment provisions, as drafted, set out a workable framework for assessing telecommunications infrastructure in these areas, particularly where assessed in conjunction with Policy 6.1.10. Submitter wishes to preserve its standing on these provisions should changes be sought by other parties.</p>	Accept in part	14.1
680.27	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	No specific decision sought, but the submission conditionally supports Objective 3.1.1 (a) Biodiversity and ecosystems.	<p>The submitter's support for this objective is conditional on provision of appropriate policy that recognises the role landowners play in protecting and enhancing biodiversity and our relief sought elsewhere in that regard. The submitter understands the intention of this</p>	Accept	6.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				objective is to give effect to the RMA and Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS). It is a goal that many farmers and landowners share and reminds farmers to adopt responsible management and environmental practices. However, the Proposed District Plan's exclusively regulatory approach is outdated and inconsistent with best practice and advice received from the Council's own consultant through this district plan review process (Kessels Ecology Significant Natural Areas Summary of Inputs from the Community Consultation Process Dec 2016). The submitter considers that the planning approach will need significant changes if Council is genuine about engaging in effective consultation and serious about achieving the stated public good outcomes.		
FS1387.161	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D		Opposes	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	6.1
FS1007.5	Phillip John Swann		Supports		Accept	6.1
680.28	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		<p>Add new policy in Section 3.1 Indigenous vegetation and habitats, as follows:</p> <p>(a) <u>The Council recognises landowners' stewardship of the land and it will work with landowners to promote the use of non-regulatory methods; including assistance with the establishment of protective covenants, service delivery, education, and other incentives in protecting and enhancing</u></p>	<p>Enhancement goals require active management on behalf of both Council and landowners if the goals are to be met. Submitter is concerned at the lack of understanding and recognition within the planning framework of the role landowners play with regards to achieving protection and enhanced biodiversity and ecosystem values across the district, regional and country. Active participation of</p>	Accept in part	7.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>ecological sites, geological features, and the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes; and ensure current land management practices help achieve this</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	landowners is practically necessary and essential to the successful protection and enhancement of ecological sites, geological features, and the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes.		
FS1293.41	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Allowed.	The management of physical resources should be a partnership - in many cases over regulation and policies which result in over onerous rules result in poor outcomes and added costs - both in terms of compliance and monitoring. a collaborative approach that incentivises the protection of the listed features will achieve better overall outcomes.	Accept in part	7.1
FS1275.3	Zeala Limited TIA Aztech Buildings	Support		Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	7.1
FS1139.40	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose		Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	7.1
FS1108.49	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Disallow as currently worded	It is accepted that Waikato District Council is attempting to enhance the clarity of the proposed rule. However, the suggested wording creates further potential confusion. The second part of the suggested amendment could be read as applying, either, to a 'large-scale wind farm located within a Rural Zone' and to a 'large-scale wind farm located within an Identified Area'. If the intention is that the non-complying activity rule apply to any 'large-scale wind farm in the Rural Zone that is located within an identified area', the rule should say that. Also, the rule doesn't provide certainty in the absence of a definitions of 'Identified Area'.	Accept in part	7.1
680.30	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 3.2.1 Significant Natural Areas as follows: (a) Indigenous biodiversity in Significant Natural Areas is protected and enhanced <u>through a range of regulatory and non-regulatory methods.</u> AND Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter considers it important for the Objective to provide more direction and context. It is important to be clear that enhancement goals require a different approach to protection which can be achieved, in part via regulation. Regulation can control use but not induce the active management required to achieve enhancement. The submitter recognises that protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of	Accept in part	8.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				indigenous fauna is a RMA Section 6(c) obligation, and that biodiversity is important to all New Zealanders. This does not however justify the one dimensional approach the Proposed District Plan has adopted. Farmers play a fundamental role in the on-going active management and protection of biodiversity on private land in the district and invest hundreds and thousands of dollars in weed and pest control on their own land, every single year. It more appropriate to provide support, advice and encouragement through contestable funds to landowners when it comes to protection of ecosystems supporting significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. It is through such non-regulatory methods that Council can ensure the greatest landowner buy-in and ultimately the best environmental gains.		
FS1007.7	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	8.1
FS1387.162	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	8.1
680.31	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.2 (a) Identify and Recognise, as follows: (a) Identify significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna in accordance with the Waikato Regional Policy Statement and identify as Significant Natural Areas on a Schedule in the plan and planning maps. (i) <u>The sites currently identified on the planning maps are for information purposes only and have no legal effect until a robust identification process, including ground-truthing, has been undertaken.</u> (b) Recognise and protect	FFNZ understand the intent of this policy and the link to the significance criteria in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (VWRPS) FFNZ support the principle of a policy that seeks to identify areas of national importance and consider that a targeted planning response is more appropriate than general catch all rules which elevate all areas of biodiversity to a significance status until proven otherwise.	Accept in part	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Significant Natural Areas by ensuring the characteristics that contribute to their significance are not adversely affected. (i) <u>Ensure landowners are informed of the characteristics relating to their specific site and the activities which may adversely affect them.</u> (c) <u>Where a proposed activity requires a resource consent solely as a result of an area being identified as a significant natural area (SNA) and the site has not been ground-truthed, Council will meet the costs of the ground-truthing assessment to confirm the status and boundaries of the significant natural area. The assessment will be carried out by a Council approved suitably qualified and experienced ecologist prior to an application for resource consent being lodged.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>However, this position increases the importance of the process used to identify the sites, as with significance comes protection and acceptance that extra land use controls may be required to meet RMA obligations. It would be very rare to find a landowner who would not want to look after an area which is truly significant, but frustrations and resentment will result from a flawed identification process. In this regard we are unsure what the method or process which will be used to implement the identification assessment required of Policy 3.2.2(a) and as such cannot assess the merits or otherwise of the process going forward. With regards to SNA sites which have been included in the PDP, FFNZ seek that these be withdrawn until a robust identification process has been undertaken. Many sites have been mapped as SNAs which didn't categorically meet the WRPS significance criterion. It is our submission that identification of sites using aerial photography and desktop analysis with only a very small percentage of sites visited to ground-truth information, means the level of confidence in the process is not sufficiently high enough to incorporate these sites into the plan with the degree of regulation proposed to be applied over these areas. There are many potential deficiencies in relying only on desktop studies, including outdated information, not understanding the purpose or origins of features that may be identified (such as 'wetland areas' for example - which may have been deliberately constructed for water storage purposes) and not being able to properly evaluate and understand the values of a feature, or ground slope. FFNZ also urge WDC to be strategic and practical in its approach and focus limited resources on working first with those landowners who are engaged and keen to be involved in the first instance. There is little to be gained by backing reluctant landowners into an expensive and protracted litigious battle using public money that would be better spent achieving good outcomes on the ground not on paper.</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1198.9	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed to the extent that SNAs are of no legal effect until a robust identification process (including challenge) has been undertaken.	Given the implications of Significant Natural Areas designation in the proposed plan the criteria for SNAs should be capable of challenge and be "ground truthed" based on clear and objective criteria before being applied to any land. It should not be solely up to the Council to identify what land meets the high level criteria listed in Appendix 2.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1334.20	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Reject and ensure that the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per Fulton Hogan's original submission (575.6).	Fulton Hogan recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS. However, it also acknowledges the importance of ensuring that such areas are correctly identified.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1292.20	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Reject and ensure that the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per McPherson's original submission (691.3).	McPherson recognises the important of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS. However, the RPS also provides protection for mineral and aggregate extraction activities and therefore the policy should reflect this.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1340.107	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports in part submission point 680.31 in that identified SALs often do not accurately reflect what is present at the subject site and should be contestable if this is in fact the case. The submitter is of the opinion that, a researched and ground truthed method (which can be contestable on qualitative matters) should occur.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1377.190	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1315.1	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	As consistent with Lochiel Farmlands Limited ("LFL") submission that more clarity is required with identification of SNAs and ground-truthing processes need to be undertaken.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1108.50	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1139.41	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	9.1
FS1333.5	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	For the reasons stated in the submission.	Accept in part	9.1
680.32	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy as notified.	The submission conditionally supports this policy, which submitter understands is drafted to give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports a planning response which is focused on more robust and ground-truthed Significant Natural Area identification and which may impact on and require amendments to rules.	Accept in part	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
680.33	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting as notified.	Conditional support is extended to this policy, which the submitter understands is drafted to give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. Support is conditional on a more robust Significant Natural Area identification process being undertaken.	Accept in part	11.1
680.34	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.5 Biodiversity in the coastal environment as notified.	Conditional support is extended to this policy, which submitter understands is drafted to give effect to the NZ Coastal Policy Statement and Waikato Regional Policy Statement. Support is conditional on a more robust Significant Natural Area identification process being undertaken.	Accept in part	12.1
680.35	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Policy 3.2.6(b) Providing for vegetation clearance, as follows:</p> <p>(b) Provide for the clearance of indigenous vegetation in Significant Natural Areas for the construction of building platforms, services, access, vehicle parking and on-site manoeuvring and the development of Maaori Freehold Land by: ...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>Conditional support is extended to this policy which FFNZ understand is drafted to give effect to the WRPS. Support is conditional on a more robust SNA identification process being undertaken. Furthermore, FFNZ seek a better balance being struck between environmental, social and economic wellbeing. Farmers typically need to undertake a variety of types of vegetation clearance as part of day-to-day farming activity for the purpose of matters including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Vegetation clearance around farm buildings, airstrips and helipads, farm access tracks, waterway crossings, culverts and bridges, farm infrastructure such as telecommunications facilities, water supply pipelines, dams and troughs, fertiliser storage areas, hazardous substance storage and handling areas, silage pits, stock mustering areas for dairy sheds, shearing sheds and marshalling yards. -Pest plant/weed control, including invasive weed clearance from riparian margins -Pasture maintenance -Maintenance of rural fire breaks <p>These types of minor vegetation clearance include clearance of all types of vegetation, including indigenous vegetation. These activities are undertaken in the context of the relatively wide open spaces and low population and development densities that characterise rural areas. Enabling these types of routine minor vegetation clearance is important for efficient resource management in</p>	Reject	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				order to support the economic, social and cultural well-being of communities in the district. Farmers should not be subject to undue delays and costs from triggering resource consent requirements for minor clearance of indigenous vegetation where there is little or no environmental benefit. FFNZ are also unsure why land tenure is an appropriate trigger to determine different land use controls related to biodiversity outcomes, and seek that reference to particular land tenure be deleted from this policy.		
680.36	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 3.2.7 Managing Significant Natural Areas a new clause (b) as follows: <u>(b) Recognise that management of Significant Natural Areas on private land requires public investment in a range of incentives such as: (i) Rates remissions or rebates for land retired for biodiversity purposes; (ii) Reimbursements or discounts for products and fencing material for stock exclusion; (iii) Resource consent fee discounts and waivers; (iv) Providing native plants seedlings; (v) Pest animal and weed control assistance; (vi) Contestable fund for biodiversity projects; (vii) Transferable development rights; (viii) Education and information on types of vegetation and habitat, and why they are important; (ix) Assistance for landowners going through a QEII process, or applying for Landcare Trust funding.</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	Waikato District Council need to prioritise and ground-truth identification and management of Significant Natural Areas in order to ensure landowners are not unnecessarily subject to onerous costs and time delays. This is the outcome when usual and expected farming activities are subject to resource consent conditions to protect patches of indigenous vegetation. Submitter has concerns that the district's ratepayers will not be able to afford to adequately protect areas of indigenous vegetation which accurately meet the significance criteria let alone the 'wish list' which has currently been created by the inadequate identification process. Waikato District Council also need to acknowledge the role landowners play in managing Significant Natural Areas where these are found on private land, and to have policy which incentivises a range of management tools to enable the appropriate management of Significant Natural Areas.	Accept in part	14.1
FS1045.1	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We agree that the Waikato District Council need to prioritise and ground-truth identification and management of Significant Natural Areas in order to ensure landowners are not unnecessarily subject to onerous costs and time delays. Waikato District Council also need to acknowledge the role landowners play in managing Significant Natural Areas where these are found on private land, and to have policy which incentivises a range of management tools to enable the appropriate management of Significant Natural Areas.		Accept in part	14.1
FS1138.6	Glenn Michael Soroka and Louise Claire Mered as Trustees of the Pakau Trust	Support	3.2.7(b)(vii) amendment for transferable development rights.	In part.	Accept in part	14.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
680.37	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, as notified.	The submitter supports the intention of the incentive.	Accept	15.1
FS1315.4	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	Consistent with LFL supporting the intent of the policy. However, LFL would like to see the policy extended to further protect SNAs even if only part of the SNA is to be protected as a conservation	Accept	15.1
680.271	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Vegetation clearance" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Includes the modification, burning, cutting, crushing, spraying and removal by physical, mechanical, chemical or other means, of all forms of vegetation, including indigenous, and may include exotic plants. It does not include vegetation clearance relating to routine cultivation or grazing, which is ancillary to Farming, such as: (a) clearance for the purpose of maintaining rural fire breaks, (b) pasture maintenance (c) clearance of airstrips, helipads, vehicle entranceways, accessways and driveways, farm tracks and stock crossings of waterways, (d) clearance around farm buildings and farm infrastructure, water supply dams, pipelines and troughs, (e) pest plant/weed management, including clearance of pest plants including: thistles, ring ferns, carpet ferns, rushes, ink weed, briar rose, barberry, introduced pampas grass (other than toetoe), mingimingi, wilding pinus species, etc (f) cultivation, (g) forestry harvesting, pruning and thinning, (h) clearance or disturbance by animals including grazing, (i) activities undertaken for the purpose of establishing a fence line, (j) maintaining shelterbelts (including cutting of shelterbelt roots, (k) activities associated with fruit tree or fruit vine plantations, (l) clearance of vegetation that is fallen or dead, AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	This definition should be amended to specifically exclude vegetation clearance undertaken in association with day-to-day farming. The submitter has concerns 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. 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	29.2
FS1171.97	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission seeks to amend the definition of vegetation clearance. This submission is supported to the extent that the amendment clarifies that vegetation removal related to cultivation and horticultural activities should be excluded from the definition of vegetation clearance.	Reject	29.2
FS1168.132	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Accept submission.	The submitter seeks to amend the definition of vegetation clearance to clarify that certain activities are ancillary to farming. This is supported.	Reject	29.2
FS1277.144	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain definition of vegetation clearance as notified.	The proposed changes go beyond the scope of activities that have minor adverse effects as per Method 11.1.4. Inconsistent with Chapter 11 of the WRPS.	Accept	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
686.1	Reid Crawford Farms Limited		<p>Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, except for the amendments sought below:</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new clause (b) to Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, to include the following:</p> <p><u>(b)Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity, legal and physical protection of areas that are of a suitable size and meet the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.</u></p>		Reject	15.3
FS1342.171	Federated Farms of New Zealand	Support			Reject	15.3
686.11	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Support	Retain Appendix 2 Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Supports inclusion of Appendix 2 Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept in part	26.3
691.16	McPherson Resources Limited	Not Stated	<p>Delete the Significant Natural Areas from the Planning Maps for the following titles: CT NA2D/412 (comprising Allot 22 PSH of Mangatawhiri, Allot 139 and 140 PSH of Mangatawhiri, Allot 161 and 163 PSH of Mangatawhiri) CT NA2D/497 (comprising Allot 162 PSH) CT NA2D/961 (Allot 164 PSH)</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>The submitter requests that the Significant Natural Area overlay be removed in its entirety insofar as it affects any land owned by the McPherson family. The land has been owned by the McPherson family for 140 years and have made good use of the available resource. The Significant Natural Area overlay placed over large parts of McPherson's property would severely limit the ability to expand the quarry footprint over time. This will have significant adverse effects on not only the McPhersons (as the owner and operator of the quarry) but also the mineral and aggregate industry, which relies on the ability of existing operators to continue extracting aggregate to support the anticipated district and regional growth. The Significant Natural Area overlay is inappropriate and unreasonable based on the fact that it directly impacts on the viability of their existing business. It goes against the sustainable management purpose of the Resource Management Act to impose an overlay which will prevent people from providing for their social and economic wellbeing which is what the proposed Significant Natural Overlay will do.</p>	Accept in part	33.8
FS1293.128	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.</i>		
FS1007.16	Phillip John Swann	Support	Null		Accept in part	33.8
701.10	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: P2 Removal of up to 5m³ 1ha of manuka and/or kanuka and/or totara outside of the Coastal Environment per single consecutive 12 month period per property for domestic firewood purposes and arts or crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant. AND Amend Rule 22.2.7 P3 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: P3 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance for building, access, parking and manoeuvring areas in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) There is no alternative development area on the site outside the Significant Natural Area; and (ii) The total indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 250m² 1500m².	This rule is overly prescriptive; especially given most sites have not been ground-truthed.	Accept in part	18.3
FS1340.137	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	<i>The submitter supports submission 701.10 in that it seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>	Accept in part	18.3
724.16	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission wants to confirm that that Proposed District Plan protects the significant stands of Kahikatea in the District AND Further investigative work regarding the stands of kahikatea on the Montgomerie property at 70 Duncan Road and the Hatrill property on Pencarrow Road.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	33.1
724.18	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Support	Retain the rules regarding Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, which applies to gullies	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			identified as Significant Natural Areas.			
FS1387.808	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	21.1
731.10	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Amend the extent of Significant Natural Area, Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape on Lot 3 DP 62084 located at Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri, as shown on the Planning Maps, to areas of high quality indigenous vegetation.	The mapped area of Significant Natural Area etc. on this lot is excessive as it contains exotic plantings and wilding pines. The planning maps need to be amended to clearly indicate access to a legal road. More acreage is needed to provide for a plant nursery, private orchard, buildings and sustainable off the grid living.	Accept in part	33.8
FS1180.10	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	No reduction of areas SNA, ONF and ONL are required.	Accept in part	33.8
731.13	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Delete the map annotations of Significant Natural Area, Outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature affecting the submitter's properties at Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri, being Lots 3, 4, and 5 DP 62084.	The submitter's three properties at Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri are unique. They were set up in the 1920s as a sustainable source of native timber and no felling has occurred since the 1960s. No monetary return has been recognised from these properties for over 50 years despite costs relating to rates, insurance, pest control and maintenance. Other milling statements can be issued to mill indigenous timber such as windblown trees, naturally dead trees and trees removed for the construction or maintenance of an accessway where they are not subject to a registered plan or permit. Refer to these documents attached to original submission for further detail: The Waipoua Argument: Letters to the NZ Herald, Rudolf Hohneck aka Ron Hohneck Tane's Tree Trust, Newsletter No. 2 November - Guest	Accept in part	33.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Editorial by Lindsay Poole Paper presented to The Seventh Conference of the Australian Forestry History Society, Christchurch 29 January-2 February 2007 - The Legacy of Rudolf Hohneck "A Lover of Trees: A Forester Unique" by Ian Barton A page from another article by Ian Barton A few poems written by the submitter's late mother (Ina Trump aka Ina Johnson, neeHohneck Obituary - Mr R Hohneck		
FS1293.135	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	A number of submitters have requested a removal of Significant Natural Areas from their properties. Mapping of Significant Natural Areas is based on criteria in Section 11A of the WRPS. Removal of these Significant Natural Areas would not provide an adequate level of protection for areas with significant value for indigenous biodiversity. The Director-General does not object to removal or amendment to Significant Natural Areas where there is a mapping error. It is also noted that the identification of Significant Natural Areas was a desktop exercise and accuracy would be increased by ground truthing.	Accept in part	33.8
746.22	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend the definition of "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: Means an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area on the planning maps <u>or has been assessed as meeting one or more of the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity (Appendix 2) by a suitably qualified Ecologist.</u>	The submitter supports the inclusion of Significant Natural Area's definition. The submitter would like to see it expanded to also include areas that have been assessed by a suitably qualified ecologist as meeting one more of the criteria in Appendix 2 of the Proposed Plan - Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity. This would align with the wording of the Conservation Lot Subdivision provisions which allow for subdivision where an identified Significant Natural Area is being protected or an area meeting the Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.	Accept in part	29.2
FS1293.54	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	Occasionally restored or enhanced vegetation may meet the threshold level to be considered an SNA. The suggested changes will allow for protection on indigenous vegetation that may not be mapped as a Significant Natural Area but do meet SNA criteria.	Accept in part	29.2
747.10	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to ensure the link from the term "Indigenous vegetation clearance" does not go to the more generally defined "vegetation clearance" and that the rule only limits the clearance of indigenous vegetation.	The online version of Rule 22.2.7 links the term "Indigenous vegetation clearance" to a more general definition of "vegetation clearance", which includes for example cutting of all forms or vegetation, indigenous or	Accept in part	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Add an additional definition of "Indigenous vegetation clearance" if necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	otherwise. This is not the intent of the rule and a link to a more specifically defined "Indigenous vegetation clearance" should be made in the rule.		
757.14	Karen White	Oppose	Amend Rule 24.2.8- Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to reduce the removal of Manuka and Kanuka from 5m ³ to 3m ³ . AND Delete reference to "Coastal Environment" from Rule 24.2.8- Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	Manuka and Kanuka are important habitat environments. Manuka and Kanuka provide visual amenity. 3m ³ should be adequate for heating purposes with non-native wood sources available.	Accept in part	18.1
780.33	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.9 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Removing of up to 53m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per single consecutive 12 month period per property for domestic firewood purposes or arts and craft, provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage to any other tree, bush or plant.	Manuka/Kanuka are important environments and 3m ³ is adequate for heating a well-insulated house.	Accept in part	18.1
<i>FS1007.19</i>	<i>Phillip John Swann</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>3m cu is insufficient for heating a house especially if the dwelling is old and/or the dwelling has an outdoor fire or pizza oven</i>	<i>How did John Lawson work out the amount of wood required to heat a house?</i>	Accept in part	18.1
780.48	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that all resource consents for vegetation clearance are publicly notified, including informing adjoining authorities and the regional council. The submission makes reference to Section 1.5.7 Natural Environment, Chapter 3 and Maps.	As per Section 1.5.7 which ensures Council will inform adjoining authorities and the regional council are informed of all resource consent applications received for vegetation clearance, this requirement should be extended to public notification of all such applications.	Reject	5.2
<i>FS1269.75</i>	<i>Housing New Zealand Corporation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.</i>	Accept	5.2
780.49	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental	Oppose	Add to the planning maps areas such as Hauroto Bay and other sites of indigenous vegetation, as recorded in Estuarine vegetation survey - Raglan (Whaingaroa) Harbour.	No reasons provided.	Reject	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Defence Incorporated Society					
FS1293.59	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	DOC supports the inclusion of sites of indigenous vegetation where they meet the RPS identification criteria.	Reject	32.2
780.51	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission states that it is not clear that the policies and rules sufficiently identify and protect Significant Natural Areas. The submission refers to section 1.5.7 Natural Environment, Chapter 3 Natural Environment and Maps.	The 2005 WDC State of Environment Report states that over 50% of remaining indigenous cover is classified as threatened and much of this land is not legally protected. An average of 2 consents for vegetation clearance are issued each year. The NZ Biodiversity Strategy set a 2020 goal of "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats (such as lowland forests and grasslands, wetlands and dune lands) have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."	Reject	5.2
785.72	Z Energy Limited, BP Oil NZ Limited and Mobil Oil NZ Limited for 'Oil Companies'	Oppose	Delete the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area Overlay from the Planning Maps. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to give effect to the submission.	The submitter opposes the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area Overlay on the basis that no policy or regulatory framework has been included within the proposed District Plan to address this specific overlay. There is no definition for "Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area" and the overlay is not considered to fall under the definition of "Significant Natural Area" The submitter cannot find any specific section 32 report which addresses the mapping overlays and is unable to establish the rationale for the inclusion and purpose of the overlay. Without any justification for its inclusion in the plan nor a proposed policy or regulatory framework to support the overlay, the submitter considers the removal of this overlay appropriate.	Reject	28.3
794.10	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision as follows: (a) Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the legal and physical protection of Significant Natural Areas, provided the areas are of a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning ecosystem. (b) Incentivises in situ	Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest	Reject	15.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>subdivision in the Rural Zone where there are significant ecological benefits.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils were practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.		
FS1387.1242	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	15.3
FS1308.129	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<i>We support this submission as it relates to incentivized environmental subdivision for the reasons provided in submission point 794.5.</i>	Reject	15.3
794.29	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan maps to include the riparian areas on the property at 95 Jericho Road, Pukekohe shown in Appendix 2 of the submission as an Ecological Corridor or a similar layer. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.	The site was granted subdivision consent for the protection of some streams and ecological enhancement. The submitter would like to extend the planting over the rest of the property to exclude stock from accessing the waterways. Fencing and planting around streams is expensive. Submitter believes that a subdivision incentive mechanism is appropriate and necessary to afford the degraded stream protection.	Accept in part	33.8
797.26	Fonterra Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.3.3 Earthworks in Significant Natural Areas except for the amendments sought below. AND	Supports the rule subject to deletion of reference to volume limit. Adverse effects of earthworks are appropriately addressed through	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Delete Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a)(i) Earthworks in Significant Natural Areas. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	controls over the area, cut and fill heights, revegetation requirements and erosion and sediment control measures.		
FS1108.32	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate wording change.	Accept in part	20.2
FS1139.31	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate wording change.	Accept in part	20.2
797.28	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous Vegetation Clearance within a Significant Natural Area as notified.	Rule provides appropriate flexibility to enable maintenance of farm tracks, drains and fences as part of rural production activity.	Accept in part	21.1
797.29	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous Vegetation Clearance outside of a Significant Natural Area as notified.	The rule provides appropriate flexibility to enable maintenance of farm tracks, drains and fences as part of rural production activity.	Accept in part	22.2
81.101	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain identification of Significant Natural Area's on planning maps.	The submitter supports the approach of identification and mapping of SNAs. This approach provides landowners with greater certainty and assists with achieving Policy 11.2 of WRPS.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1334.85	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow with the exception of removing the Significant Natural Area overlay as it applies to Tauhaei and Waingaro Quarry and the areas identified within the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay as per submission points 575.23 and 24.	In principle, Fulton Hogan supports the identification and protection of Significant Natural Area's across the district. However, in the case of Tauhaei and Waingaro Quarry, Fulton Hogan oppose the application of the Significant Natural Area to these sites as they overlay encroaches on a large amount of potential extraction land. More importantly, both of these quarries are also subject to the Aggregate Extraction Areas overlay, which is intended to protect lawfully established quarry activities. The overlapping overlays create unnecessary confusion as to what takes priority and will make any future expansion of these quarries complex and costly.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1292.82	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow with the exception of removing the Significant Natural Area overlay as it applies to McPherson Quarry as per submission point 691.9.	In principle, McPherson supports the identification and protection of Significant Natural Area's across the District. However, in the case of the McPherson Quarry, McPherson oppose the application of the Significant Natural Area to this site as the overlay encroaches on a large amount of potential extraction land. The McPherson Quarry has been operational for over 60 years and therefore is an established feature of the area. The	Accept in part	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>application of the SNA overlay to the site unreasonably impacts on the vitality of the existing business.</i>		
FS1198.54	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	<i>The submission point be disallowed in full.</i>	<i>The desktop approach to identifying SNAs is flawed. Without objective criteria applied by experts rigorously to areas of land with input from the respective landowners it is inappropriate to identify any areas of land as SNAs. The implications of having land identified as an SNA is significant and affects property rights without redress and necessary effects based justification.</i>	Accept in part	32.2
FS1198.62	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	<i>The submission point be disallowed in full.</i>	<i>The desktop exercise used to identify the SNAs on the land covered by BT Mining's submission is inadequate.</i>	Accept in part	32.2
81.102	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy as follows: (a) Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity within Significant Natural Areas by: (i) avoiding the significant adverse effects of vegetation clearance and the disturbance of habitats unless specific activities need to be enabled ; (ii) remedying any effects that cannot be avoided; then (iii) mitigating any effects that cannot be remedied; and (iv) after remediation or mitigation has been undertaken, offset any significant residual more than minor adverse effects in accordance with Policy 3.2.4.	Policy 3.2.3 is generally supported; however, some amendments are required to ensure that the Policy gives effect to Implementation Method 11.2.2 of the WRPS. Policy 3.2.3(a)(i) states that significant adverse effects will be avoided unless specific activities need to be enabled. Firstly, the policy sets the bar at 'significant adverse effects' being avoided. Implementation Method 11.2.2(b) of the WRPS requires that all adverse effects are avoided. Secondly, no further guidance is provided on what the specific activities that need to be enabled are. This is potentially referring to those circumstances covered by Policy 3.2.1 of the Proposed Plan, however it is not clear. Implementation Method 11.1.4 of the WRPS recognises that some activities with minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity may be permitted. In addition, Policy 3.2.3(a)(iv) requires that any significant residual adverse effects be offset. WRPS Method 11.2.2(d) requires offsets where more than minor residual adverse effects remain. 'Significant' is a much higher threshold than 'more than minor' and may result in residual adverse effects not being addressed.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1258.9	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	<i>The submission point does not detail the wording of the proposed mitigation hierarchy. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.</i>	Accept in part	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1345.91	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis opposes the amendments to the policy.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1377.18	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes the changes sought by submission 81.102. Overall, the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1292.23	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject and ensure the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per McPherson's original submission (691.4).	McPherson recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS, but are concerned that it may unreasonably hinder their existing quarries.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1198.63	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	It is appropriate that the Policy is direct at addressing "significant" adverse effects as the relief sought would require a nil effect outcome which does not represent sustainable management.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1334.23	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject and ensure that the policy provides protection of mineral and aggregate extraction as per Fulton Hogan's original submission (575.7).	Fulton Hogan recognises the importance of protecting SNAs in accordance with the RPS, but are concerned that it may unreasonable hinder their existing quarries.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1340.21	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes the changes sought by submission 81.102. Overall, the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1272.1	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Null	KiwiRail supports the management of effects of SNAs. In particular, KiwiRail supports the recognition provided in Policy 3.2.3 as notified that some activities are required to be located within SNAs, and the adverse effects of these activities on SNAs can be appropriately managed through a hierarchy of options including avoidance, remediation, mitigation and offsetting. KiwiRail has a functional and operational need for parts of its rail network to be located in or near SNAs, as the rail network is linear infrastructure that cannot be easily relocated. KiwiRail is therefore opposed to any amendments to Policy 3.2.3 that seek to reduce the ability for KiwiRail to utilise the measures identified to manage any adverse effects on SNAs associated with its rail activities.	Accept in part	10.1
81.103	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting to address biodiversity offsets in relation to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas.	As currently worded, Policy 3.2.4(a) addresses biodiversity offsets in both SNA's and indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs. The rest of the Policy only addresses offsets in relation to SNAs.	Accept	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				It is important that offsetting in relation to indigenous biodiversity outside of SNA's is also subject to a robust assessment framework. Outside of SNA's, WRPS Implementation Method 11.1.3(a)(ii) promotes biodiversity offsets where significant residual adverse effects remain. Within SNA's, WRPS Method 11.2.2(d) requires offsets where more than minor residual adverse effects remain. Policy 3.2.4 is intended to apply to both SNA and indigenous biodiversity outside of SNA. However it comes under section 3.2 SNAs.		
FS1340.22	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 81.103 as the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	11.1
FS1345.92	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis considers that amendments are not required, given that section 104 of the RMA enables an applicant to offer an offset or compensatory measure.	Reject	11.1
FS1342.18	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.103.	Policy 3.2.4 does address biodiversity offsets in relation to indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas.	Reject	11.1
FS1258.10	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	Policy 3.2.4 already expresses the proposed District Plan's approach for biodiversity offsetting outside identified Significant Natural Areas. The submission point does not detail the wording intended to address the issue raised in the submission point. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.	Reject	11.1
FS1315.2	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	As consistent with LFL's submission that further rules and assessment criteria be included providing for biodiversity offsetting where an activity might cause effects on a SNA or on indigenous biodiversity outside a SNA.	Accept	11.1
FS1292.84	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject.	McPherson supports the use of biodiversity offsetting. The submission by WRC do not provide suggested wording to amend Policy 3.2.4 and therefore McPherson are unable to review the policy to determine their position.	Reject	11.1
FS1334.91	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject.	Fulton Hogan supports the use of biodiversity offsetting. The submissions by WRC do not provide suggested wording to amend Policy 3.2.4 and therefore Fulton Hogan are unable to review the	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>policy to determine their position.</i>		
81.187	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 6 (2) (1) Biodiversity Offsetting as follows: Restoration, enhancement and protection actions <u>offered by an applicant</u> will only be considered a biodiversity offset where they are used to <u>offset</u> <u>compensate</u> for the <u>anticipated</u> reasonably-measurable residual effects of activities <u>that are anticipated will remain</u> after appropriate avoidance, remediation and mitigation <u>measures</u> actions have been <u>applied</u> - occurred in accordance with Policy 3.2.3.	Appendix 6 (2) (1) is difficult to follow. A resource consent applicant is not required to propose or agree to biodiversity offset measures, but may choose to do so if they are unable to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of the activity they propose. A biodiversity offset is not mitigation. Mitigation is action to reduce the severity of an adverse effect. A biodiversity offset, in contrast, is designed to compensate for residual adverse biodiversity effects that remain after appropriate measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects have been applied. Submitter supports Biodiversity Offsetting Framework outlined in Appendix 6 but seeks the amendments in this submission point.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1340.26	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports submission point 81.187 in principle and subject to appropriate wording.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1345.93	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject in part.	Given that some submitters are seeking environmental compensation be provided for (which Genesis supports) the use of "compensate" in the Appendix may cause confusion between and offset and environmental compensation measure.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1198.64	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Not Stated	This submission point be allowed in part and disallowed in part.	Oppose: Use of the word "compensate" as it may cause confusion with Environmental Compensation which should be available to address residual effects of offsetting in accordance with Environment Court authority. Otherwise support.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1258.11	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow in part	The proposed District Plan should clearly define the mitigation hierarchy intended. Appendix 6 should clearly define when biodiversity offsetting is able to be offered and how it will be assessed (with a view to achieving no net loss at a regional scale). The proposed District Plan should also, separately, allow for projects to volunteer compensation for unavoidable residual adverse effects (acknowledging that this outcome may result, particularly for large infrastructure projects). The wording proposed doesn't entirely achieve this.	Accept in part	27.2
81.188	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 6 Biodiversity Offsetting to take into account the forthcoming national guidance for local government on biodiversity offsetting, Biodiversity	It is recommended to amend the detail relating to offsetting in order to give effect to Policy 11.1 of the WRPS.	Accept in part	27.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Offsetting under the Resource Management Act; A guidance document.			
FS1198.65	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full. In addition: Delete 2.2 Delete reference to no net loss Clarify confusion between offsetting and environmental compensation Delete 2.3 Replace "residual adverse effects" with "significant residual adverse effects" in paragraph 2.7	The guidance is a non-statutory document and it is not appropriate for it to be referenced in a District Plan. It may be superseded by a national policy statement which is being drafted on the basis of the Report of the Biodiversity Collaborative Group (2018). Appendix 6 that the submission point relates to is inconsistent with judicial authority regarding offsetting and is unnecessarily complex and restrictive. The Coastal Policy Statement does not relate to much of the land covered by the District Plan.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1198.68	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full. In addition: Delete 2.2. Delete reference to no net loss Clarify confusion between offsetting and environmental compensation Delete 2.3 Replace "residual adverse effects" with "significant residual adverse effects" in para 2.7.	The guidance is a non-statutory documents and it is not appropriate for it to be referenced in a District Plan. It may be superseded by a national policy statement which is being drafted on the basis of the Report of the Biodiversity Collaborative Group. Appendix 6 that the submission point relates to is inconsistent with the judicial authority regarding offsetting and is unnecessarily complex and restrictive. The Coastal Policy Statement does not relate to much of the land covered by the District Plan.	Accept in part	27.2
FS1258.12	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point lacks the detail necessary to enable other submitters to evaluate the likely impact of the requested relief from their own land interests.	Accept in part	27.2
81.196	Waikato Regional Council	Not Stated	Retain Rule 24.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 24.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to exclude clearance of Manuka and Kanuka in wetlands and the coastal environment from this rule.	The submitter supports the provision for sustainable clearance of regenerating Manuka or Kanuka for domestic firewood purposes or for arts or crafts in P2. However, the submitter does not support the removal of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands or vegetation that is naturally short in stature. It is important to ensure that vegetation that is naturally short does not get included in the rules intended to provide for clearance of Manuka and Kanuka colonising pasture. Manuka, in particular, can be a permanent and important component of some types of ecosystems. These are generally wetlands, dunes and other coastal vegetation, but can be gumland vegetation that remains in the leached soils following kauri forest removal. These persistent shrublands are important habitats for lizards, orchids,	Accept in part	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				mistletoes and a range of threatened species. Exclusion of permitted clearance of Manuka or Kanuka from wetlands and from the Coastal Environment is likely to prevent clearance of these ecosystems of concern. The exclusion of Manuka and/or Kanuka clearance in the Coastal Environment from this rule would give effect to the 'avoid' direction in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) and Policy 11.4 of the WRPS. Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).		
81.197	Waikato Regional Council	Not Stated	Amend Rule 24.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area to ensure that weeds are controlled in the cleared area and native vegetation is allowed to regenerate.	Vegetation clearance within an SNA needs to be remedied to give effect to Policy 3.2.3(a)(ii).	Reject	18.1
81.198	Waikato Regional Council	Not Stated	Delete P6 of Rule 24.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	P6 duplicates P2.	Accept	18.1
81.239	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Chapter 13 a new definition for "Biodiversity offset" as follows: Biodiversity offset A measureable conservation outcome resulting from actions designed to compensate for residual, adverse biodiversity effects arising from activities after appropriate avoidance, remediation, and mitigation measures have been applied. The goal of a biodiversity offset is to achieve a no-net-loss, and preferably a net-gain, of indigenous biodiversity values.	Biodiversity offsetting and its relationship to avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects of an activity is poorly understood. A new definition is recommended to be added to clarify what this is, and the expectations around it.	Accept	29.2
FSI 198.66	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	An alternative definition, for example: A biodiversity offset is a measure proposed or agreed to by the applicant of a resource consent for the purpose of ensuring like-for-like positive effects on the environment to balance any adverse effects on the environment that will or may result from allowing the activity. We would also proposed the insertion of a definition for compensation, being: Compensation in a biological diversity context is a like-for-unlike measure proposed or agreed to by an applicant of a resource consent for the purpose of ensuring like-or-unlike positive effects on the environment to balance any	Oppose the definition as a whole, in particular: The definition requires compensation outcomes but the relevant section 104(1)(ab) RMA test requires ensuring positive effects on the environment; The definition's use of the word compensation confuses the concepts of offsetting and environmental compensation; An individual offset or environmental compensation does not require no net loss and preferable net gain of itself- that may be a goal of a planning document (under objectives,	Reject	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>adverse effects on the environment that will or may result from allowing the activity.</i>	<i>policies, methods or rules); The RMA is not a nil effects statute as the definition suggests it is; and The definition is too prescriptive given it applies beyond just SNAs.</i>		
FS1258.13	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow in part	The proposed definition confuses 'biodiversity offsetting' with 'environmental compensation' but use of the word 'compensate'. Meridian agrees that a definition of 'biodiversity offset' would be useful but suggests the wording proposed should be amended to better reflect the mitigation hierarchy intended by the Waikato RPS.	Reject	29.2
FS1340.27	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission point 81.230 as, overall, the submitter seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and mitigation.	Reject	29.2
FS1342.52	Federated Farmers	Support	Support in part submission point 81.239. With inclusion of regional scale i.e. The goal of a biodiversity offset is to achieve a no-net-loss, and preferably a net-gain, of indigenous biodiversity values at a regional scale.	Support for reasons provided by the submitter.	Accept	29.2
81.249	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting to require offsetting of more than minor residual adverse effects on Significant Natural Areas.	As currently worded, Policy 3.2.4(a) addresses biodiversity offsets in both SNA's and indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs. The rest of the Policy only addresses offsets in relation to SNAs. It is important that offsetting in relation to indigenous biodiversity outside of SNA's is also subject to a robust assessment framework. Outside of SNA's, WRPS Implementation Method 11.1.3(a)(ii) promotes biodiversity offsets where significant residual adverse effects remain. Within SNA's, WRPS Method 11.2.2(d) requires offsets where more than minor residual adverse effects remain.	Accept	11.1
FS1342.19	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow the submission point 81.249.	Policy 3.2.4 does require offsetting of more than minor residual adverse effects on Significant Natural Areas through reference to Policy 3.2.3.	Reject	11.1
FS1334.92	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject.	Fulton Hogan supports the use of biodiversity offsetting. The submissions by WRC do not provide suggested wording to amend Policy 3.2.4 and therefore Fulton Hogan are unable to review the policy to determine their position.	Reject	11.1
FS1292.85	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject.	McPherson supports the use of biodiversity offsetting. The submission by WRC do not provide suggested wording to amend Policy 3.2.4 and therefore McPherson are unable to review the policy to determine their position.	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1315.3	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	As consistent with LFL's submission that further rules and assessment criteria be included providing for biodiversity offsetting where an activity might cause effects on a SNA or on indigenous biodiversity outside a SNA.	Accept	11.1
FS1345.94	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept in part.	Genesis supports the intent of the submission in that it is only more than minor / significant residual effects that are required to be offset. However, any amendments of this nature should include environmental compensation alongside offsetting.	Accept	11.1
FS1258.17	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not clarify the spatial extent of the additional areas to which the biodiversity offsetting requirements would apply. In the absence of this detail, it is not possible to determine the relevance of the offsetting requirement or the specific implications for land in which Meridian may have an interest.	Reject	11.1
81.250	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.5 Biodiversity in the coastal environment.	This Policy gives effect to Policy 11.4(a) of the WRPS.	Accept in part	12.1
81.251	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance to recognise that only clearance with minor adverse effects in relation to the maintenance or protection of indigenous biodiversity will be enabled as a permitted activity.	Policy 3.2.6 gives effect to Implementation Method 11.1.4 of the WRPS. However, for clarity and consistency with the WRPS it is suggested that the opening statement be amended to refer to minor adverse effects, as this is the basis for the activities listed in the WRPS Implementation Method.	Reject	13.1
FS1342.20	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.251.	FFNZ opposes the amendment. The policy does not need to repeat the WRPS verbatim. The notified policy, using the direction from the WRPS, has identified the activities which have minor adverse effects and enabled them accordingly. This is an appropriate planning approach that provides certainty for plan users and good biodiversity outcomes for the district.	Accept	13.1
81.252	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend or Relocate Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance so that it is clear that it applies to both SNA's and indigenous biodiversity outside of Significant Natural Areas.	The activities in Policy 3.2.6 are provided for as permitted activities in the rules (just as they are for SNA, but different thresholds apply). However, this Policy falls under the heading 3.2 SNAs.	Reject	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1340.29	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports point 81.252 in regard to indigenous vegetation clearance outside SNAs, this is reflected in the proposed provisions of the Resort Zone. The submitter agrees that for clarity the policy should be amended or relocated.	Reject	13.1
FS1342.21	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 81.252.	FFNZ supports the amendment for reasons outlined by the submitter.	Reject	13.1
81.253	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision.	The submitter is supportive of mechanisms that incentivise the protection and enhancement of SNA's. This is consistent with Implementation Method 11.1.8 of the WRPS.	Accept	15.1
825.33	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend Rule 17.2.9 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Removing of up to 53m3 of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per single consecutive 12 month period per property for domestic firewood purposes or arts and craft, provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage to any other tree, bush or plant.	Manuka/Kanuka are important environments and 3m3 is adequate for heating a well-insulated house.	Accept in part	18.1
FS1007.20	Phillip John Swann	Oppose	3m cu is insufficient to heat a house	Households with fires require wood for heating	Accept in part	
825.48	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend the Proposed District Plan so that all resource consents for vegetation clearance are publicly notified, including informing adjoining authorities and the regional council. The submission makes reference to section 1.5.7 Natural Environment, Chapter 3 and Maps.	As per Section 1.5.7 which ensures Council will inform adjoining authorities and the regional council are informed of all resource consent applications received for vegetation clearance, this requirement should be extended to public notification of all such applications.	Reject	5.2
825.49	John Lawson	Oppose	Add to the planning maps areas such as Hauroto Bay and other sites of indigenous vegetation, as recorded in Estuarine vegetation survey - Raglan (Whaingaroa) Harbour.	No reasons provided.	Reject	32.2
825.52	John Lawson	Not Stated	Add areas of Significant Indigenous vegetation or habitat by use of LENZ and in consolidation with conservation and environment groups.	The 2005 Waikato District Council State of the Environment Report stated "Since 1992 the Waikato District experienced a of approximately 1,346ha (which could be as high as 1,508ha) of indigenous forest and 1,388ha (which could be as high as 1,706ha) of indigenous scrub." The 2013 report said, "There is evidence to indicate that over 50% of remaining indigenous cover is	Reject	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				classified as threatened and much of this land is not legally protected." It also said an average of 2 consents for vegetation clearance are issued each year. The NZ Biodiversity Strategy (page 33) set the 2020 goal as "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats (such as lowland forests and grasslands, wetlands and dune lands) have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored.		
831.1	Raglan Naturally		Add areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitats and rules in consultation with LENZ and environmental groups.		Reject	25.2
FS1342.235	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		<i>Oppose</i>		Accept	25.2
831.44	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend Chapter 3 Natural Character, to recognise that new development should not encroach on nature and that all natural character areas (not just those of higher value) be protected through tools such as cat free covenants and similar rules imposed by the Palmerston North District Plan.	The Natural Character has been lost in most of the district, so it is important that any new development shows environmental awareness and does not encroach on nature. Cats are major predators of native wildlife, so new developments close to natural character areas should be cat free.	Reject	5.2
FS1342.237	Federated Farmers	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 831.44.</i>	<i>FFNZ opposes the submission. It is important to provide for development in appropriate circumstances. WDC is charged with striking the right balance across all the wellbeings; cultural, environmental, social and economic.</i>	Accept	5.2
831.47	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	No specific decision is sought, however the submitter seeks that the Council publicly notifies and informs adjoining authorities and the Regional Council of all resource consent applications for vegetation clearance.	The 2013 Waikato District Council Statement of the Environment report said "there is evidence to indicate that over 50 per cent of remaining indigenous cover is classified as threatened and much of this land is not legally protected." The New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy set the 2020 goal as "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."	Reject	5.2
FS1276.142	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	<i>Support</i>	<i>WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.</i>	<i>WED supports all activities that do not comply with the District Plan being publicly notified in order to</i>	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>protect the character of Raglan.</i>		
FS1342.238	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 831.47.	FFNZ opposes the blunt planning approach being sought in this submission. Notification principles are well settled in the RMA and case law, and will provide for any application to be notified if it is appropriate to do so.	Accept	5.2
831.48	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Add new rules that read as follows: <u>In a significant indigenous vegetation or habitat area the following are discretionary activities: Cultivation Spreading soil or other material (including fertilizer or lime) in excess of existing routine application rates Drainage works, apart from routine maintenance Land reclamation from estuary or other wetlands Modifications to watercourses apart from routine maintenance Flood defences Infilling ditches, ponds, pits, pools, marshes or historic earthwork features Clearing vegetation or land (by physical removal, burning, application of herbicides, or deliberate overgrazing, tramping, or rooting by livestock) in preparation for cultivation Introducing livestock (including poultry) at intensive stocking rates, or increasing stocking rates to intensive levels.</u>	The 2013 Waikato District Council Statement of the Environment report said "there is evidence to indicate that over 50 per cent of remaining indigenous cover is classified as threatened and much of this land is not legally protected." The New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy set the 2020 goal as "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."	Reject	24.2
FS1342.240	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 831.48.	FFNZ opposes the submission. It is important to provide for vegetation clearance in appropriate circumstances. WDC is charged with striking the right balance across all the wellbeings; cultural, environmental, social and economic.	Accept	24.2
FS1345.121	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis does not consider that an additional rule in relation to significant indigenous vegetation / habitat areas is required.	Accept	24.2
831.49	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Add sites of indigenous vegetation such as Hauroto Bay and other sites of indigenous vegetation to the planning maps, as recorded in the estuarine vegetation survey - Raglan (Whaingaroa) Harbour.	The 2013 Waikato District Council Statement of the Environment report said "there is evidence to indicate that over 50 per cent of remaining indigenous cover is classified as threatened and much of this land is not legally protected." The New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy set the 2020 goal as "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."	Reject	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
831.56	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.2.6 Providing for vegetation clearance AND Add policies that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	13.1
FS1342.239	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 831.56.	FFNZ opposes the submission. It is important to provide for vegetation clearance in appropriate circumstances. WDC is charged with striking the right balance across all the wellbeings; cultural, environmental, social and economic.	Accept	13.1
FS1377.278	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	13.1
831.57	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	21.1
FS1377.279	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	21.1
831.58	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of	Oppose	Delete Rule 17.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Raglan Naturally		a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.		
831.59	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 20.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	21.1
<i>FS1345.122</i>	<i>Genesis Energy Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject submission point.</i>	<i>There are some circumstances where vegetation clearance within an SNA should be provided for.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>21.1</i>
831.60	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.		
FS1340.147	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 831.60 because some indigenous vegetation clearance may be required to occur within SNA for a number of reasons. Deleting the rules associated with indigenous vegetation clearance within an SNA will result in an overly restrictive planning approach to the matter.	Accept	21.1
FS1377.280	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	21.1
831.61	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	21.1
831.62	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 24.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.		
831.63	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 25.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	21.1
831.64	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 28.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	21.1
831.71	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	No specific decision is sought, but the submitter considers that it is not clear that the policies sufficiently identify and protect significant natural areas.	The 2013 Waikato District Council Statement of the Environment report said "there is evidence to indicate that over 50 per cent of remaining indigenous cover is classified as threatened and much of this land is not legally protected." The	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy set the 2020 goal as "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."		
831.72	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	No specific decision is sought, but the submitter considers it is not clear that the rules sufficiently identify and protect significant natural areas.	The 2013 Waikato District Council Statement of the Environment report said "there is evidence to indicate that over 50 per cent of remaining indigenous cover is classified as threatened and much of this land is not legally protected." The New Zealand Biodiversity Strategy set the 2020 goal as "A net gain has been made in the extent and condition of natural habitats and ecosystems important for indigenous biodiversity. Scarce and fragmented habitats have increased in area and are in better ecological health due to improved connections and the sustainable management of surrounding areas. Some modified habitats are restored."	Reject	5.2
831.87	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision AND Add policies that will increase habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	15.1
FS1342.241	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 831.87.	FFNZ opposes the relief sought. Policy 3.2.8 is one of a range of options available to WDC to encourage habitat protection.	Accept	15.1
831.88	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such	Reject	22.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Raglan Naturally		outside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.		
FS1345.123	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	There are circumstance were vegetation clearance should be provided for.	Accept	22.2
831.89	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area AND Add provisions that will increase natural habitats.	The submitter supports bush regeneration, such as that at Wainui Bush Reserve. The Proposed District Plan makes no attempt to indicate how much bush has been lost, or will be lost by these and other provisions in the Proposed District Plan. Screening with trees should be applied to improve and protect views from Raglan and its beaches. Much of the attraction of Raglan derives from its beaches and the north shore of the harbour having rural aspects. New subdivisions could diminish that attraction and an active policy of tree planting to establish belts of trees screening those views would help to protect the rural image. Alternatively, the Proposed District Plan could ban development which would detract from those views.	Reject	22.2
924.10	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add clause (v) to Policy 3.2.6-Providing for Vegetation Clearance by including the following (or wording to similar effect): (v) The vegetation is impinging on adjacent existing <u>activities</u> .	The submitter considers that there should be a provision of vegetation clearance within SNAs that includes clearance of vegetation that is impinging on adjacent existing activities. It is inappropriate to identify SNAs on land used for the Huntly Power Station and at Scott Farm.	Reject	13.1
FS1342.249	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 924.10.	There are times when clearing vegetation may be appropriate to enable normal day-to-day operation of permitted farming activities, such a maintaining clearance within firebreaks, or next to boundary fences, water supply line, and farm access tracks.	Reject	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>This further criterion would capture any such activity not already itemised in other clauses of the policy.</i>		
FS1293.66	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	The Director-General opposes the addition of this clause as it would be too permissive for vegetation clearance in Significant Natural Areas.	Accept	13.1
924.40	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission is neutral in terms of Rule 21.2.5.2-Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas as this rule has implications for the requested deletion of the Significant Natural Areas on the Huntly Power Station and Scott Farm.	Part of the Huntly Power Station that is zoned Heavy Industrial has been identified as a SNA. This identification is inappropriate for such a site.	Accept	20.2
942.13	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Support	Retain the objectives and policies in Chapter 3 Natural Environment that protect and enhance the natural environment.	The submitter supports the objectives and policies.	Accept in part	5.2
942.40	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Support	Retain the objectives and policies in Chapter 3 Natural Environment.	The coastal montane area between Bryant Home and Pauake stream is largely owned by tangata whenua and remained natural until the incursions of the public in the mid-1950s brought a road, subdivisions, walling tracks and development. This destroyed habitats and impacted negatively on the biodiversity within the Karioi Native Reserve. The submitter supports the objectives and policies in Chapter 3 drafted to protect and enhance the natural environment outlined.	Accept in part	5.2
942.79	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.2.3 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas to limit the extent of earthworks and vegetation clearance to minimise the negative impacts to the environment and to ensure the values of the site are protected.	Lands have been cleared of 100m2 per year for several years eventually ending with enough space to build 5 houses in areas that were once coastal montane forest. Recently 2500m2 of original kanuka and manuka was inadvertently cleared for one house site which was in excess of the earthworks allowed. The submitter supports rules that protect significant areas from unnecessary destruction.	Reject	20.2
942.81	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to incorporate a policy of environmental offset promoting the establishment of woodlots to replace trees cut and provide for future needs, using the principle of reciprocity to give back to	Manuka and kanuka are an important part of the forest and wetland ecosystem. They provide for numerous purposes including food, homes and traditional uses. As most rural land in the	Accept in part	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			the land.	district has been cleared for pastoral grazing, supplies have diminished. If Council is going to allow 5m3 of these timbers to be cut and burnt every 12 months the supply will eventually disappear, putting more pressure on Maori land which is largely covered in manuka and other native species.		
984.13	Glenda Raumati on behalf of Trustee Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Retain the activity status and clearance thresholds for indigenous vegetation clearance for marae, dwellings and papakaainga on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land.	Turangawaewae Trust Board supports the ability to clear indigenous vegetation for the purpose of establishing these activities on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land.	Accept	21.6
<i>FS1387.1624</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>21.6</i>
<i>FS1108.183</i>	<i>Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Supports the ability to clear indigenous vegetation for the purpose of establishing these activities.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>21.6</i>
984.14	Glenda Raumati on behalf of Trustee Turangawaewae Trust Board	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for earthworks in Significant Natural Areas that are for the establishment of marae, papakaainga, dwellings and associated access, parking and manoeuvring as a permitted activity.	Earthworks within a Significant Natural Area associated with marae, papakaainga and dwellings are not afforded the same permitted status as vegetation clearance and would be a restricted discretionary activity. There seems little point in providing for a permitted indigenous clearance for these activities but then requiring resource consent for earthworks. As currently proposed, consent for a restricted discretionary activity would potentially need to be obtained to establish building platforms and access.	Accept in part	20.2
984.15	Glenda Raumati on behalf of Trustee Turangawaewae Trust	Not Stated	Retain the permitted activity provisions for indigenous vegetation clearance associated with the gathering of	This is supported.	Accept	21.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Board		plants in accordance with Maaori customs and values.			
330.103	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	No reasons provided.	Reject	21.1
330.104	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	No reasons provided.	Reject	22.2
419.137	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Delete the acronym "SNA" in Chapter 13 Definitions AND Add a glossary of abbreviations in the Proposed District Plan. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The definition of "SNA" refers to the definition of Significant Natural Area which is unnecessarily repetitive. The submitter considers that abbreviations could be placed in a separate glossary.	Accept in part	29.2
680.205	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 PI Earthworks-Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area must meet all of the following conditions: (a) Earthworks for farming within an identified Significant Natural Area. Activity-specific conditions: Nil (b) Earthworks, other than for farming, within an identified Significant Natural Area must meet all of the following conditions: (i) The earthworks must not exceed a volume of 50m ³ in a single consecutive 12 month period; and (ii) The earthworks must not exceed an area of 250m ² in a single consecutive 12 month period; (iii) The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (iv) Earthworks are setback 1.5m from all boundaries; (v) Areas exposed by earthworks are revegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vi) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (vii) Do not divert or change the	The submitter understands that areas which meet Significant Natural Area identification criteria can be subject to land use controls for the purposes of managing adverse effects on the biodiversity values of the site. The District Plan should provide for or enable activities that can support in maintaining or enhancing these areas. This includes maintenance of everyday farming activities like farm tracks, which are necessary for the safe and efficient movement of stock and farm vehicles. If there were a disruption to the functioning of any track, then farmers need the ability to form alternative safe access to parts of their farm that needs access, including for the purpose of moving stock. A farmer cannot afford to wait four or more weeks to have to obtain resource consent to move stock that are trapped in a part of the farm where existing access has become disrupted or blocked. The welfare of the stock and the economic well-being of the farmers are at stake.	Accept in part	20.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.			
FS1108.68	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	20.3
FS1139.59	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	20.3
FS1315.8	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	Where farming is occurring within an identified Significant Natural Area it has existing use rights. The maintenance of existing tracks, fences and drains is an essential element of that farming activity and can continue as of right. It is inappropriate to introduce a rule that conflicts with rights of farmers to maintain essential infrastructure. Failure to maintain existing infrastructure would give rise to adverse effects on the environment and on the permitted farming activity carried on beyond the SNA. There should be no control on the earthworks needed to undertake those (farming) activities. Other controls can apply to non-farming activities.	Accept in part	20.3
680.206	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 RD1 (b) (ii) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (b) Councils discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) The location of earthworks taking into account waterways, significant indigenous vegetation or habitat (ii) <u>The effects on the values and integrity of the Significant Natural Area.</u> AND Add a new clause to Rule 22.2.3.3 RD1 (b) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas (iii) <u>The purpose and functional need of the earthworks</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter considers there to be unnecessary duplication between (i) and (ii). It is the effects of earthworks on the values and integrity of the Significant Natural Area and purpose of the activity which should be Council's key priorities.	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1139.60	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Accept in part	Accept in part	20.2
FS1108.69	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Accept in part	Accept in part	20.2
680.211	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 PI Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) for the following purposes: (i) Removing vegetation that endangers human life or existing buildings or structures or to manage fire risk; (ii) Construction of conservation fencing to exclude stock and tracks for pest management; (iii) Maintaining existing farm drains; (iv) Maintaining existing tracks and fences; or (v) Gathering plants in accordance with Maaori customs and values. (vi) The removal of broken branches, deadwood or diseased vegetation; (vii) To give effect to a Sustainable Forest Management Plan or Permit as approved under the Forests Act 1949 prior to 16 September 2010; (viii) Activities are carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements entered into with the District Council, or Waikato Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust; AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Additional uses must be provided for as permitted activities. The submitter considers that the proposed additions are practical, provide more certainty and ensure Council continues to meet RMA obligations.	Reject	21.1
FS1114.23	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Null	FENZ supports the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through providing for as a permitted activity the ability for property owners and occupiers to remove flammable vegetation. This is particularly important where property is located outside of a reticulated water network.	Reject	21.1
FS1377.191	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.1
FS1340.109	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 680.211 in that these are typical activities that should be able to occur within an area identified as an SNA. These	Reject	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>activities would not prove detrimental to the values of the SNA.</i>		
680.212	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 205m3 of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per single consecutive 12-month period per property for domestic firewood purposes and arts or crafts. provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of the rule, however the 5m3 threshold is far too restrictive and the requirement for the removal to not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant is nonsense. The literal interpretation of this provision extends this protection to both indigenous and exotic vegetation, including pest plants.	Accept in part	20.3
680.213	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P3 (a) (ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (ii) The total indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 250m2 500m2 per building, including areas associated with access, parking and manoeuvring AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Support is extended to the enabling intent of this rule however; the submitter is unsure why land title is a factor in determining the permitted clearance thresholds for building and associated access purposes. This issue is about adverse effects and if Council accepts that 500m2 can be cleared per dwelling on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary land then that level of effects should also be accepted on fee simple land.	Reject	21.5
FS1108.71	<i>Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Inappropriate addition.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	21.5
FS1139.62	<i>Turangawaewae Trust Board</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Inappropriate addition.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	21.5
FS1340.110	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>The submitter supports submission 680.213 in that it seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. The submitter supports provisions that will allow for an appropriate level of developable areas within SNAs.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	21.5
FS1377.192	<i>Havelock Village Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support in part.</i>	<i>HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. In particular, HVL supports clearance to provide an appropriate level of</i>	<i>Reject</i>	21.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>developable area.</i>		
FS1315.11	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	For the reasons set out in the LFL submission.	Reject	21.5
680.214	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 50m3 of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per single consecutive 12-month period per property for domestic firewood purposes and arts or crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of the rule, however the 5m3 threshold is far too restrictive and is unsure why a distinction is made between vegetation which may be inside or outside the Coastal Environment (P2 v P6) when the clearance threshold is the same. Further the requirement for the removal to not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant is a nonsense. The literal interpretation of this provision extends this protection to both indigenous and exotic vegetation, including pest plants.	Accept in part	18.3
FS1139.63	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	<i>Inappropriate addition.</i>	Accept in part	18.3
FS1108.72	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null		Accept in part	18.3
680.215	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.7 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: D1-RD1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) that does not comply with one or more conditions in Rule 22.2.7 P1, P2, P3, P4, P5 or P6. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) The measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects to the significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, including species relocation, offset and restorative planting; (ii) Any cumulative effects arising from the proposed activity; AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter considers the leap from permitted activity status with standards to discretionary is inappropriate for a consenting pathway in this context. A restricted discretionary activity status is more consistent with the Proposed District Plan rules framework and the matters which Council should focus on are easily defined.	Reject	21.8
FS1340.111	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 680.215 in that it seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to	Reject	21.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.</i>		
FS1377.193	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Reject	21.8
FS1315.12	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	Consistent with LFL's position that if the indigenous vegetation removal does not comply with the permitted limit it should go to RD and not D.	Reject	21.8
680.216	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 (P1) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) must be for the following purposes: (i) Removing vegetation that endangers human life or existing buildings or structures; (ii) Maintaining or reinstating productive pasture through the removal of up to 1000m ² per single consecutive 12-month period of manuka and/or kanuka that is more than 10m from a waterbody, and less than 4m in height; (iii) Constructing and maintaining existing tracks and fences; (iv) Constructing and maintaining existing farm drains; (v) Conservation Activities to fencing to exclude manage stock or pests such as installing a bait station network or undertaking plant pest management activities. (vi) Gathering of plants in accordance with Maaori custom and values; or (vii) A building platform and associated access, parking and manoeuvring up to a total of 1,000m ² 500m ² clearance of indigenous vegetation. (viii) To create and maintain firebreaks (ix) The clearance or modification of indigenous vegetation that has been planted and managed specifically for commercial production forestry, horticulture or agriculture purposes. (x) To give effect to a Sustainable Forest Management Plan or Permit as approved under the Forests Act 1949 prior to 16 September 2010; (xi) Activities are carried out subject to and in accordance with any specific covenants or other legal agreements entered into with the District Council, or Waikato Regional Council, or Department of Conservation, or QEII Trust; AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND	Additional uses must be provided for as permitted activities. The proposed amendments are practical, provide more certainty, avoid duplication and ensure the Council continues to meet RMA obligations. The thresholds will have a limiting effect on farming practice. It will potentially prevent further development of useful rural resources and trigger the need for resource consent for anticipated and expected activities within the rural zone which is contradictory to a number of objectives and policies within the Plan. The restriction on all indigenous vegetation clearance within 10 metres of a waterbody is problematic and potentially unduly onerous given the term 'waterbody' is not defined within the plan. This also makes it difficult to understand how the rule will be accurately monitored. Clearance for activities such as formation of fences, firebreaks, crossings, tracks and pest management should be expected to occur on farms and rural areas, and the submitter would like to see provision for those activities within the permitted activity framework.	Accept in part	18.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.			
FS1315.16	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	This submission is consistent with LFL's view that the proposed rule is overly restrictive.	Accept in part	18.3
FS1139.64	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	18.3
FS1114.24	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Null	FENZ supports the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through providing for as a permitted activity the ability for property owners and occupiers to remove flammable vegetation and create fire breaks. This is particularly important where property is located outside of a reticulated water network.	Accept in part	18.3
FS1108.73	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept in part	18.3
680.217	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 RDI (b) (iv) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (iv) the extent to which the clearance on Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land affects Tangata Whenua relationships with indigenous biodiversity on the site; AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of this rule is to give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The matters of discretion are broadly accepted with the exception of RDI (b)(iv) which they do not consider is appropriate to apply to land which is in private ownership.	Reject	22.4
FS1139.65	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	22.4
FS1108.74	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	22.4
680.250	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Appendix 6: Biodiversity Offsetting, as notified.	The submitter understands the purpose and intent of Appendix 6.	Accept in part	27.2
680.252	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of 'Indigenous vegetation' in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Means vegetation that occurs naturally in New Zealand or arrived in New Zealand without human assistance. For the purposes of this plan, domestic or ornamental / landscaping planting, or planted shelter belts comprising indigenous species are not included. or forestry undergrowth, or planted indigenous forestry are excluded from the definition of 'indigenous vegetation'.	The definition of indigenous vegetation needs to include more exemptions. This will ensure it is reasonable and practical in the context of the proposed rules framework.	Accept in part	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.			
680.268	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Significant Natural Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an area of significant indigenous biodiversity that is identified as a Significant Natural Area on the planning maps and listed in <u>Appendix XX and described in the individual assessment sheet</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	Conditional support is extended to this definition. The submitter supports the principle of identifying these areas, listing them on a schedule, which summaries the associated values, and including the overlay on planning maps.	Accept in part	29.2
<i>FS1333.23</i>	<i>Fonterra Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow the relief.</i>	<i>Fonterra supports the verification of the boundaries of the identified SNA's and identification of their specific values.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>29.2</i>
695.109	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.3 P1 (a)(i) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, to change the suffix from 50m2 to 50m3.	This is to denote volume and not area.	Accept in part	20.2
695.206	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 and P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas so that earthworks are based on the site area i.e. a 1:1 ratio so a 450m2 site would provide 450m3 of earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalizes bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together	Accept in part	20.2
695.207	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain a maximum area of earthworks in Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	20.2
697.109	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.3 P1(a) Earthworks-Significant Natural Areas to read as follows: (a) Earthworks are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area and must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Maximum <u>Do not exceed</u> a volume of 50m3 in a single consecutive 12 month period; (ii) Maximum <u>Do not exceed an</u> area of 250m2 in a single consecutive 12 month period; and (iii) <u>Do Not</u> include the importation of any fill material. (iv) <u>The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed</u>	Wording provides clarity to the rule and consistency with other zone chapters.	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>1.5m above or below ground level with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (v) Earthworks are setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (vi) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (viii) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</u>			
FS1340.116	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 697.109 as the submitter seeks amendments to provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	20.2
FS1377.205	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	20.2
FS1291.4	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	20.2
697.110	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.3 RDI Earthworks-Significant Natural Areas to read as follows: (a) Earthworks that do not comply with Rule 16.2.4.3 P1. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) The location of earthworks in relation <u>taking into account</u> to waterways, significant indigenous vegetation or habitat; (ii) The protection of adverse effects on the Significant Natural Area values.	Wording provides clarity to the rule and consistency with other zone chapters.	Accept	20.2
FS1377.206	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. Council should also take into account mitigation, offsetting and compensation as part of its discretion.	Accept	20.2
FS1340.117	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports submission 697.110 subject to the inclusion of additional appropriate criteria including (but not limited to) mitigation and offsetting.	Accept	20.2
697.111	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.4.3 DI Earthworks- Significant Natural Areas.	Not required as activity falls to Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Accept	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.207	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. It agrees that earthworks in SNAs should have an activity status no worse than restricted discretionary.	Accept	20.2
FS1291.6	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. It agrees that earthworks in SNAs should have an activity status no worse than restricted discretionary.	Accept	20.2
FS1340.118	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 697.111 as the rule is in fact not required as activity falls to Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Accept	20.2
697.123	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area heading to read as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance inside <u>within</u> a Significant Natural Area	Wording provides clarity.	Accept	21.1
697.124	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add Rule 16.2.8 P1(a) (vi) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: <u>Removing vegetation for conservation activities.</u>	This new rule ensures indigenous vegetation can be cleared for conservation activities.	Accept	21.1
FS1377.208	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports increased flexibility for conservation based activities.	Accept	21.1
FS1340.120	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 697.124 as removing vegetation for conservation activities should be encouraged. Removing the burden of obtaining resource consent for these activities will result in a better environmental outcome.	Accept	21.1
FS1291.7	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports increased flexibility for conservation based activities.	Accept	21.1
697.125	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: Removal of up to 5m3 of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property <u>site</u> for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant.	Additional clarity that the rule is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property" which is not a defined term.	Accept in part	18.1
697.126	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.8 P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance	Rule P5 duplicates P1 with the only difference	Accept	21.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			inside a Significant Natural Area AND Make consequential change to D1 as follows: "... or P4, P5 or P6."	being that P5 captures Maaori Freehold land or Maaori Customary land, which is already captured by P1.		
697.127	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.8 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area AND Make consequential change to D1 as follows: "... or P4, P5 or P6."	The activity is a repeat of P2.	Accept	18.1
697.183	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.5.3 P1 Earthworks - within Significant Natural Areas, as follows: P1 (a) Earthworks <u>are</u> for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area <u>and</u> must meet all of the following conditions.... AND Delete Rule 17.2.5.3 D1 Earthworks - within Significant Natural Area.	Minor amendments to improve clarity. Deletion of a rule that is duplicating another rule.	Accept	20.2
697.196	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: 17.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance <u>inside</u> <u>within</u> a Significant Natural Area	Amend the title for additional clarity.	Accept	21.1
697.197	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.9 P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, to add new rule (vi) to read as follows: (vi) <u>Removing vegetation for conservation activities.</u>	This new rule ensures indigenous vegetation can be cleared for conservation activities.	Accept	21.1
697.198	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 17.2.9 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural, Area as follows: Removal of up to 5m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property site for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant.	Additional clarity that the rule is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property" which is not a defined term.	Accept	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.199	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.2.9 P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	Remove duplication. P5 duplicates P1 with the only difference being that P5 captures Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land, which is captured by P1 anyway.	Accept	21.7
697.200	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 17.2.9 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area.	Delete Rule P6 as it duplicates P2.	Accept	18.1
697.309	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a rule that will allow for the trimming of Significant Natural Areas across all of the zone chapters.	A rule for trimming Significant Natural Areas with appropriate conditions will enable tree trimming as permitted activities. Currently there is only a rule for removal.	Accept in part	21.1
697.360	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete the word "firewood" from Policy 3.2.6 (b)(vi) Providing for vegetation clearance.	Removing duplication.	Accept	13.1
697.402	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance in <u>within</u> a Significant Natural Area.	Amend the title for additional clarity.	Accept	21.1
697.403	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) for the following purposes: (i) Removing vegetation that endangers human life or existing buildings or structures; (ii) Conservation fencing to exclude stock or pests; (iii) Maintaining existing farm drains; (iv) Maintaining existing tracks and fences; (v) Gathering plants in accordance with Maaori customs and values. (vi) <u>Removing vegetation for conservation activities</u>	Amend rule for consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Accept	21.1
697.404	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.8 DI Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Indigenous	Amending an omission in the rule.	Accept	21.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) that does not comply with one or more conditions Rule 25.2.8 P1 or P2.			
697.424	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 28.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 5m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property <u>site</u> for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant	Additional clarity that the rule is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property" which is not a defined term.	Accept	18.1
697.507	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition for "Significant Natural Area" as follows: Significant Natural Area or SNA	Amend definition so that Significant Natural Area and significant amenity area are interchangeable.	Accept	29.2
697.626	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.5.2 P1 Earthworks - within Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (i) Earthworks are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area and must meet all of the following conditions: (ii) Maximum volume of 50m ³ in a single consecutive 12 month period; (iii) Maximum area of 250m ² in a single consecutive 12 month period; and (iv) Not include importing any fill material. (v) <u>The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal);</u> (vi) Earthworks are setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (vii) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (viii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (ix) <u>Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</u>	Wording provides clarity and consistency with other chapters.	Accept in part	20.2
697.635	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance inside <u>within</u> a Significant Natural	Wording provides clarity.	Accept	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Area			
697.636	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 20.2.9 P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: <u>(vi)</u> Removing vegetation for conservation activities.	This new rule ensures indigenous vegetation can be cleared for conservation activities.	Accept	21.1
697.637	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 20.2.9 (P2) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 5m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property <u>site</u> for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant.	Additional clarity that the rule is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property" which is not a defined term.	Accept	18.1
697.638	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.2.9 Rule P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Make consequential change to Rule 20.2.9 Discretionary Activities Rule D1 as follows: ... P4, P5 or P6.	Rule P5 duplicates P1 with the only difference being that P5 captures Maaori Freehold land or Maaori Customary land, which is captured by P1 anyway.	Accept	21.7
697.639	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 20.2.9 Rule P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Make consequential change to Rule 20.2.9 Discretionary Activities Rule D1 as follows: "...P4 <u>or</u> P5 or P6."	The activity is a repeat of P2.	Accept	18.1
697.699	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5.2 Earthworks - Significant Natural areas heading, as follows; Earthworks - <u>within</u> Significant Natural Areas	Amendment to align with intent of rule.	Accept in part	20.2
697.700	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.5.2 P1 (a) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks <u>are</u> for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area and must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Maximum volume of 50m ³ in a single consecutive 12 month period; (ii) Maximum area	Wording provides clarity and consistency with other chapters.	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			of 250m2 in a single consecutive 12 month period; and (iii) Not include importing any fill material. (iv) <u>The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (v) Earthworks are setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (vi) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (viii) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</u>			
697.701	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.5.2 DI Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	The activity falls to be a Restricted Discretionary Activity if PI is not met.	Accept	20.2
697.711	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance inside within a Significant Natural Area	Wording provides additional clarity.	Accept	21.1
FS1345.81	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission insofar as the outdoor storage rules are amended.	Genesis, via its primary submission, seeks amendments to the outdoor storage rules to enable coal stockpiling at the HPS (as per the operative District Plan).	Accept	21.1
697.712	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 21.2.9 P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (vi) <u>Removing vegetation for conservation activities.</u>	This new rule ensures indigenous vegetation can be cleared for conservation activities.	Accept	21.1
697.713	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 21.2.9 (P2) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 5m3 of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property site for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant.	Additional clarity that the rule is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property" which is not a defined term.	Accept	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.714	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.9 P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Make consequential changes to Rule 21.2.9 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: ...P4, P5 or P6.	Rule P5 duplicates P1 with the only difference being that P5 captures Maaori Freehold land or Maaori Customary land, which is captured by P1 anyway.	Accept	21.7
697.715	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 21.2.9 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Make consequential changes to Rule 21.2.9 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: ...P4, or P5 or P6.	The activity is a repeat of P2.	Accept	18.1
697.773	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 P1(a) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks <u>are</u> for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area must meet all of the following conditions: (i) The earthworks must do not exceed a volume of 50m ³ in a single consecutive 12 month period; and (ii) The earthworks must do not exceed an area of 250m ² in a single consecutive 12 month period;	The word "are" provides clarity to the rule.	Accept in part	20.2
697.774	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 P1(a)(iv) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (iv) Earthworks are setback <u>at least</u> 1.5m from all boundaries;	The words "at least" provide clarity to the rule.	Accept in part	20.2
697.775	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 P2 Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: Filling <u>within a significant natural area</u> using imported fill must not exceed a volume of 20m ³ and a depth of 1.5m.	The words "within a significant natural area" provide clarity to the rule.	Accept in part	20.2
697.786	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance <u>inside within</u> a Significant Natural Area	This wording provides additional clarity.	Accept	21.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.787	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 Indigenous vegetation inside an Significant Natural Area, as follows: P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) for the following purposes... P3 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance for building, access, parking and manoeuvring areas in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) must comply with all of the following conditions.... P4 (a) On Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land, indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) where... P5 (a) On Maaori Freehold Land or Maaori Customary Land, indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) for the following purposes: D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance in a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) that does not comply with one or more conditions in Rule 22.2.7 P1, P2, P3, P4, P5 or P6.	The definition of "urban allotment" is not likely to apply to any sites zoned as Rural Zone.	Accept	21.1
697.788	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new condition (vii) to Rule 22.2.7(a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: <u>(vii) Removing vegetation for conservation activities.</u>	This new rule enables the clearance of indigenous vegetation within significant natural areas for conservation activities.	Accept	21.1
FS1340.133	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 697.788 as removing vegetation for conservation activities should be encouraged. Removing the burden of obtaining resource consent for these activities will result in a better environmental outcome.	Accept	21.1
FS1291.29	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, 57offsetting and compensation.	Accept	21.1
FS1377.230	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept	21.1
697.789	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance	This is to provide additional clarity that the rule	Accept	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 5m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property site for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant.	is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property", which is not a defined term.		
697.790	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.7 P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area. AND Amend Rule 22.2.7 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: ...P4, P5 or P6.	Rule P5 duplicates P1 with the only difference being that P5 captures Maaori Freehold land or Maaori Customary land, which is captured by P1 anyway. As a consequential amendment to the text.	Accept	21.7
697.791	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.7 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Amend Rule 22.2.7 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area as follows: ...P4, or P5 or P6.	The activity is a repeat of P2. As a consequential amendment.	Accept	18.1
697.792	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area - General	The heading "outside a Significant Natural Area" is confusing, as the provision relates to all areas of the rural zone that is not covered by a Significant Natural Area.	Reject	22.2
697.793	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 P1 (a)(ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (ii) Maintaining productive pasture through the removal of up to 1000m ² per single consecutive 12 month period of manuka and/or kanuka that is <u>at least</u> more than 10m from a waterbody, and <u>is</u> less than 4m in height;	Additional words in this rule provide clarity.	Accept in part	4.2.1
FS1340.134	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 697.793 in that it provides further clarification as to where this vegetation removal is able to occur.	Accept in part	4.2.1
697.794	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 P1(a)(vii) Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (vii) A building platform and associated access, parking and	Including an exemption for Maaori Freehold or Maaori Customary land into this rule means that P2 can be deleted, as P2 essentially repeats P1.	Accept in part	22.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			manoeuvring up to a total of 500m ² clearance of indigenous vegetation <u>except on Maaori Freehold or Maaori Customary land.</u>			
FSI 108.26	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	Appropriate wording change.	Accept in part	22.2
FSI 139.25	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	Appropriate wording change.	Accept in part	22.2
697.795	Waikato District Council	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area.	P2 is not required, given the change made to rule 22.2.8 P1 (a) (vii).	Accept	22.2
697.796	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.8 RD1 Indigenous vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (a) Indigenous Vegetation clearance outside a Significant Natural Area identified on the planning maps or in Schedule 30.5 (Urban Allotment Significant Natural Areas) that does not comply with one or more conditions of Rule 22.2.8 P1, or P2 or P3. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) the extent to which the clearance will result in the fragmentation and isolation of indigenous ecosystems and habitats, including the loss of corridors or connections that link indigenous ecosystems and habitat and the loss of buffering of indigenous ecosystems; (ii) the extent to which the clearance will result in loss, damage or disruption to ecological processes, functions and ecological integrity, including ecosystem services; (iii) the extent to which cumulative effects of the vegetation clearance have been considered and addressed; (iv) the extent to which the clearance affects Tangata Whenua relationships with indigenous biodiversity on the site; (v) the extent to which the indigenous biodiversity contributes to natural character and landscape values, including: in <u>A.</u> areas of outstanding natural character, <u>B.</u> outstanding natural features, <u>C.</u> outstanding natural landscapes; and <u>D.</u> significant amenity landscapes.	Amendments required to wording to ensure intent of the rule is correct and formatting changed in (v) to be clear.	Accept in part	22.4
FSI 340.135	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 697.796 as corridors, or connections, between ecosystems are unclear and it is uncertain as to what is implied by buffering of indigenous ecosystems. The amendments to (iii) also make it clear what cumulative effects are required to be considered by the consent authority.	Accept in part	22.4
697.867	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.3 P1 (a) Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks are for the	Wording provides clarity and consistency with other chapters.	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area that meet all of the following conditions: (i) Maximum volume of 50m³ in any <u>single consecutive</u> 12 month period; (ii) Maximum area of 250m² in any <u>single consecutive</u> 12 month period; and (iii) Not include importing any fill material; and (iv) <u>The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (v) Earthworks are setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (vi) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (viii) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</u></p>			
697.868	Waikato District Council	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.2.3.3 DI Earthworks - Significant Natural Areas.	DI is not necessary as activity becomes restricted discretionary upon non-compliance of a permitted activity condition.	Accept	20.2
697.882	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance <u>inside-within</u> a Significant Natural Area	This wording provides clarity.	Accept	21.1
697.883	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 23.2.8 P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: <u>(vi) Removing vegetation for conservation activities.</u>	This new rule ensures indigenous vegetation can be cleared for conservation activities.	Accept	21.1
697.884	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 5m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property <u>site</u> for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush	This will provide additional clarity that the rule is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property" which is not a defined term.	Accept	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			or plant.			
697.885	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.8 P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Amend Rule 23.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: ...P4, P5 or P6.	Rule P5 duplicates P1 with the only difference being that P5 captures Maaori Freehold land or Maaori Customary land, which is already captured by P1. As a consequential amendment.	Accept	21.7
697.886	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.8 P6 Indigenous vegetation - outside a Significant Natural Area; AND Amend Rule 23.2.8 D1 Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: ...P4, or P5 or P6.	The activity in P6 is a repeat of P2. As a consequential amendment.	Accept	22.2
697.887	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.9 Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area general	The heading "outside a Significant Natural Area" is confusing, as the provision relates to all areas of the Country Living Zone that is not covered by a Significant Natural Area.	Reject	22.2
697.888	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.9 P1(a)(ii) Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (ii) maintaining productive pasture through the removal of up to 1000m ² per <u>single consecutive 12 month period</u> year of manuka and/or kanuka that is <u>at least</u> more than 10m from a waterbody, and less than 4m in height; or	The additional wording in this rule provides clarity.	Accept in part	22.2
697.889	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.9 RD1 (b) (iii) Indigenous vegetation clearance - outside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: (iii) The extent to which cumulative effects of the vegetation clearance have been considered and addressed;	Amendments required to wording to ensure that the intent of the rule is correct and formatting changed in (b)(iii) to be clear.	Accept in part	22.4
697.956	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.3 P1 Earthworks-within Significant Natural Areas, as follows: (a) Earthworks are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an	Additional clarity of the rule and consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			identified Significant Natural Area must not: (i) Exceed a volume of 50m ³ in a single calendar-year consecutive 12 month period; (ii) Exceed an area of 250m ² in a single calendar-year consecutive 12 month period; and (iii) Import any fill material. (iv) The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (v) Earthworks are setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (vi) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (vii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (viii) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.			
697.957	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.4.3 D1 Earthworks-within Significant Natural Areas to be Restricted Discretionary rather than Discretionary.	The activity status becomes a restricted discretionary activity, not a Discretionary activity.	Accept in part	20.2
697.971	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.8 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area heading, as follows: Indigenous vegetation clearance inside <u>within</u> a Significant Natural Area	Wording provides clarity.	Accept	21.1
697.972	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 24.2.8 P1 (a) Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area a new clause (vi), as follows: (vi) Removing vegetation for conservation <u>activities</u> .	This new rule ensures indigenous vegetation can be cleared for conservation activities.	Accept	21.1
697.973	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 24.2.8 P2 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area, as follows: Removal of up to 5m ³ of manuka and/or kanuka outside of the Coastal Environment per year per property <u>site</u> for domestic firewood purposes or arts and crafts provided the removal will not directly result in the death, destruction or irreparable damage of any other tree, bush or plant.	Additional clarity that the rule is intended to apply "per site" rather than "per property" which is not a defined term.	Accept	18.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.974	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.2.8 P5 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Make consequential change to Rule 24.2.8 D1, as follows: ...P4, P5 or P6.	Rule P5 duplicates P1 with the only difference being that P5 captures Maaori Freehold land or Maaori Customary land, which is captured by P1 anyway.	Accept	21.7
697.975	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 24.2.8 P6 Indigenous vegetation clearance inside a Significant Natural Area; AND Make consequential change to Rule 24.2.8 D1 as follows: ...P4, or P5 or P6.	The activity is a repeat of P2.	Accept	18.1
742.185	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain the Significant Natural Area overlay, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend the Significant Natural Area (SNA) overlay by reviewing and removing any such areas from existing New Zealand Transport Agency designations. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The objective of Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) is to protect and enhance indigenous biodiversity. Land transport designation corridors are generally highly modified areas and do not meet the identity and management hierarchy requirements (Policy 3.2.2 and Policy 3.2.3). Placing an SNA overlay over existing land transport corridors does not reflect the designated use and purpose of the corridor or recognise the highly modified nature of these environments.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1293.48	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	SNAs are identified for their biodiversity values (which meet a list of criteria identified in Section 11A of the WRPS). This is not influenced by the existence of a designation. The Director-General opposes reviewing the SNA overlay to remove designations. NZTA designations can be broad and have a large impact on SNAs. However, the Director-General is not opposed to the removal of SNAs where there is a mapping error.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1277.148	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain mapped extents of SNA's on the Planning Maps as notified.	This is inconsistent with Section 6(c) RMA, and does not give effect to Policy 11.2 and associated methods of the WRPS.	Accept in part	32.2
FS1062.99	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 742.185.	• It is important that if a road goes through a SNA that this designation remains in that area. • Roading should not be exempt from considering the environment and mitigating effect of the infrastructure.	Accept in part	32.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.7	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.5(a) Biodiversity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 3.2.5(a) Biodiversity in the coastal environment as follows: Avoid the adverse effects of subdivision use and development within Significant Natural Areas of the coastal environment (except where there is a need for regionally significant infrastructure to be located in the coastal environment) on: ... AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter recognises the need to protect Significant Natural Areas in the coastal environment. However this policy needs to recognise the need for some infrastructure to be located, operated and maintained within this environment. It is important that existing infrastructure located in areas of high value is able to be maintained and upgraded to ensure its continuing safe and efficient operation.	Reject	12.1
FS1381.4	Counties Power Limited	Support	Support.	CPL supports the retention with modifications of Policy 3.2.5(a) in order for the policy to acknowledge the importance of regionally significant infrastructure within Significant Natural Areas within the Coastal Environment.	Reject	12.1
FS1293.46	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	The Director-General considers that this policy would be contrary to Policy 11 of the NZCPS.	Accept	12.1
FS1277.146	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Do not amend provisions as requested.	This approach is inconsistent with Policy 11 of the NZCPS and Policies 6.2, 11.2, 11.4, and associated Methods of the WRPS.	Accept	12.1
742.5	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Policy 3.2.3 Management hierarchy, as notified.	The submitter supports the identification of Significant Natural Areas, with the ability to offset effects. However, the policy of achieving no net loss of indigenous biodiversity is not consistent with the RPS. Policy 11.1 of the Regional Policy Statement states "maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity" and has a particular focus on working towards achieving no net loss of indigenous biodiversity at a regional scale. The proposed "absolute" approach needs to be clarified as to how both positive and negative effects will be weighed up across ecological and other matters, such as (but not limited to) what is required to identify and test the achievement of no net loss and what is the relevant time allocation.	Accept in part	10.1
FS1386.278	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose			Accept in part	10.1
FS1062.93	Andrew & Christine Gore	Support			Accept in part	10.1
742.6	New Zealand Transport Agency		Amend Policy 3.2.4 Biodiversity Offsetting, as follows:	The submitter supports the identification of Significant Natural Areas, with the ability to	Accept in part	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>(a) Allow for a biodiversity offset to be offered by a resource consent applicant where an activity ...</p> <p>(b) (ii) the biodiversity is <u>enhanced or maintained working towards achieving biodiversity</u> offset can <u>strives to</u> achieve no net loss of indigenous biodiversity at a regional scale ...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.</p>	<p>offset effects. However, the policy of achieving no net loss of indigenous biodiversity is not consistent with the RPS. Policy 11.1 of the Regional Policy Statement states "maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity" and has a particular focus on working towards achieving no net loss of indigenous biodiversity at a regional scale. The proposed "absolute" approach needs to be clarified as to how both positive and negative effects will be weighed up across ecological and other matters, such as (but not limited to) what is required to identify and test the achievement of no net loss and what is the relevant time allocation.</p>		
FS1293.45	Department of Conservation	Oppose		<p>The Director-General does not support deletion of "by a resource consent applicant" from the policy. Inclusion of this wording in 3.2.4 (a) clarifies that biodiversity offsets are to be considered at the resource consent for each individual activity. The Director-General requests that the original wording of Policy 3.2.4(b)(ii) is retained. Biodiversity offsets need to be achieved at the resource consent/individual activity level. This offset should preferably occur within the SNA, or if beyond the SNA then within the ecological district, and this is reflected by Policy 3.2.4(b)(ii), as well as the biodiversity offset principles in Appendix 6.</p>	Accept in part	11.1
FS1342.198	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support		<p>FFNZ supports in part, and opposes in part the relief sought. We are concerned that removing the resource consent application link may imply that the policy applies to all land use activities, including those that are permitted. FFNZ supports the amendments to (b).</p>	Accept in part	11.1
FS1292.31	McPherson Resources Limited	Support		<p>McPherson support the use of biodiversity offsetting in line with the direction of the RPS. Recognition must also be given to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.</p>	Accept in part	11.1
FS1334.30	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support		<p>Fulton Hogan support the use of biodiversity offsetting in line with the direction of the RPS.</p>	Accept in part	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Recognition must also be given to mineral and aggregate extraction activities as per the RPS.		
FS1258.42	Meridian Energy Limited	Support		The amendments correctly focus on the Waikato Regional Policy Statement policy that seeks no net loss of indigenous biodiversity at a regional scale	Accept in part	11.1
FS1377.240	Havelock Village Limited	Support		HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	11.1
742.8	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.6(a) Providing for vegetation clearance, except for the amendments sought below AND Add new sub-clauses to Policy 3.2.6(a) Providing for vegetation clearance as follows: <u>(v) operating maintaining or upgrading existing infrastructure (vi) the construction and operation of new regionally significant infrastructure where there is a need for that infrastructure to be located within the Significant Natural Area</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	Some clearance of indigenous vegetation within Significant Natural Areas is appropriate. However, the submitter seeks that this policy recognises the need to operate and maintain regionally significant infrastructure. It is important that existing infrastructure located in areas of high value is able to be maintained and upgraded to ensure its continuing safe and efficient operation. This approach is consistent with Method 11.1.4 of the Regional Policy Statement.	Accept in part	13.1
FS1272.13	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Support		<i>KiwiRail supports the recognition that there can be a need for infrastructure to be located within SNAs. KiwiRail may have a functional and operational need for additions or alterations to the rail network to be located in or near SNAs. The relief sought is also consistent with Policy 3.2.3 (as notified), which provides an exception for activities that need to be enabled to occur within SNAs.</i>	Accept in part	13.1
FS1293.47	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	<i>The Director-General considers that this policy and requested amendments are too permissive for vegetation clearance in Significant Natural Areas.</i>	Accept in part	13.1
FS1345.41	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	<i>For the reasons provided in the NZTA submission.</i>	Accept in part	13.1
FS1277.147	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Do not amend provisions as requested.	<i>Does not give effect to the RPS Chapter 11, in particular Method 11.1.4.</i>	Accept in part	13.1
FS1387.838	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the</i>	Accept in part	13.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
742.189	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Clarify the purpose of the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area in District Plan provisions AND Delete the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area overlay from existing New Zealand Transport Agency designations. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	There are no objectives, policies or rules that specifically relate to the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area. The submitter understands this overlay relates to Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision and Rule 22.4.1.6 Conservation lot subdivision. It is not relevant or appropriate to show this overlay on land designated for land transport purposes.	Accept in part	28.2
<i>FSI 293.52</i>	<i>Department of Conservation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Clarify the purpose of the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area but seek other parts of the submission point are disallowed.</i>	<i>The Director-General agrees that the purpose of the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area should be clarified in the District Plan provisions. However, the Director-General does not support the removal of NZTA designations from the overlay if there are values worth protecting that apply within the designation.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>28.2</i>
746.104	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Objective 3.1.1- Biodiversity and ecosystems as notified.	The submitter supports this objective.	Accept in part	6.1
746.105	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Policy 3.1.2- Policies as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept in part	7.1
746.106	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new clause (b) to Policy 3.2.8- Incentivise subdivision as follows: <u>(b) Incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone when there is the enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity, legal and physical protection of areas that are of a suitable size and meet the Criteria for</u>	The submitter supports incentivising the protection of existing biodiversity with the ability to subdivide subject to meeting certain criteria. The submitter seeks that this policy be expanded to include provision for the enhancement and/or restoration of areas when once restored, would be of a suitable size and quality to achieve a functioning	Reject	15.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity.</u>	ecosystem. Appendix 2 of the Proposed Plan - 'Criteria for Determining Significance of Indigenous Biodiversity' could provide the basis for assessing the eligibility of these areas. Eligible areas would likely be wetlands and waterways which are degraded in the Waikato District due to farming activities such as stock and cropping. Incentivising restoration is in line with The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River.		
FS1062.103	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 746.106.	• It is important to incentivize rural subdivision with biodiversity or conservation.	Reject	15.1
746.151	The Surveying Company	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but the submission supports the incentivisation of legally and physically protecting Significant Natural Area and other areas of existing biodiversity which offers positive benefits for the Region.	No reasons provided.	Accept	25.2
749.64	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Vegetation clearance" to include exclusions and method of measurements. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally supports the inclusion of the term in the Proposed District Plan: however, seeks the term is quantified with measurements that determine what is included and excluded.	Reject	29.2
FS1293.56	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed in part.	The Director-General believes the current rules for vegetation clearance fail to adequately protect or manage biodiversity values present in these areas. It is important to appropriately protect or manage indigenous vegetation clearance to prevent further fragmentation and loss in the Waikato District. The Director-General supports that a method of measurement would allow the effects of vegetation clearance to be managed more appropriately. This would be appropriate as maximum vegetation permitted activity rule under PI. The Director-General opposes further exclusions in the definition for vegetation clearance. "Exclusions," or where vegetation clearance is appropriate, have been covered by the permitted activity standards.	Accept	29.2
697.1029	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 25.2.4.3 Earthworks - within Significant Natural Areas, as follows: PI (a) Earthworks are for the maintenance of existing tracks, fences or drains within an identified Significant Natural Area and must not meet all of the following conditions: (i) Do not exceed a volume of 50m3 in a single consecutive 12 month period; (ii) Do not	Align with other chapters for consistency and additional controls on earthworks within significant natural areas.	Accept in part	20.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			exceed an area of 250m ² in a single consecutive 12 month period; (iii) <u>Do not</u> include the importation of any fill material; (iv) <u>The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level, with a maximum slope of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal);</u> (v) <u>Earthworks are set back at least 1.5m from all boundaries;</u> (vi) <u>Area exposed by earthworks are revegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks;</u> (vii) <u>Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained onsite through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls</u> (viii) <u>Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.</u>			
585.7	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.6.7 Earthworks to address the management of kauri dieback and measures to prevent the spread of the disease	The disease is threatening kauri with functional extinction and requires collaborative work to manage the disease and control any further spread. Any land disturbance within three times the radius of the canopy of the dripline of a kauri tree can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site and spread of disease. The Director-General considers that provisions of the Thames Coromandel District Plan as appropriate be adopted into the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	Accept in part	17.1
585.10	Chapter 13: Definitions Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Neutral/Amend	Add a new definition of "Environmental Compensation" Definitions as follows: <u>Environmental compensation comprises actions offered as a meas to address residual adverse effects on the environmental arising from project development that are not intended to result in no net loss or a net gain of biodiversity on the ground.</u>	The addition of a definition for environmental compensation will reflect Guidance on Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand.	Accept	10.2
FS1340.92	TaTa Valley Limited	Supports	Supports 585.10: The submitter supports the submission point in principle subject to drafting.	The submitter supports the submission point in principle subject to drafting.	Accept	10.2
FS1330.55	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Supports	Supports 585.10: A new definition is supported but the last part or the proposed definition is ambiguous.	A new definition is supported but the last part or the proposed definition is ambiguous.	Accept	10.2
FS1258.26	Meridian Energy Limited	Supports	Supports 585.10: Meridian agrees that a new definition of "Environmental Compensation" may be beneficial. However, Meridian suggest the proposed wording needs refinement to avoid confusing 'environmental compensation' with 'biodiversity	Meridian agrees that a new definition of "Environmental Compensation" may be beneficial. However, Meridian suggest the proposed wording needs refinement to avoid confusing 'environmental	Accept	10.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			offsetting' as follows:'Environmental compensation comprises positive biodiversity actions offered as a means to address residual adverse effects on the environment arising from project development. that are not intended to result in no net loss or a not gain of biodiversity on the ground.	compensation' with 'biodiversity offsetting' as follows:'Environmental compensation comprises positive biodiversity actions offered as a means to address residual adverse effects on the environment arising from project development. that are not intended to result in no net loss or a not gain of biodiversity on the ground.		
FS1345.7	Genesis Energy Limited	Supports	Not Stated 585.10: Genesis supports the inclusion of a definition for "Environmental Compensation" provided that environmental compensation measures are recognised and provided for in a similar way to offsets. Genesis does not support the wording of the definition proposed by the Director General of Conservation.	Genesis supports the inclusion of a definition for "Environmental Compensation" provided that environmental compensation measures are recognised and provided for in a similar way to offsets. Genesis does not support the wording of the definition proposed by the Director General of Conservation.	Accept	10.2
FS1223.138	Mercury NZ Limited	Supports	Supports 585.10: Mercury supports policy changes to achieve better biodiversity outcomes in the lower Waikato River Catchment. It supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation.	Mercury supports policy changes to achieve better biodiversity outcomes in the lower Waikato River Catchment. It supports the principle of biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation.	Accept	10.2
FS1377.159	Havelock Village Limited	Supports	Supports 585.10: Support amendments to provisions that enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation, subject to drafting.	Support amendments to provisions that enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation, subject to drafting.	Accept	10.2
FS1342.153	Federated Farmers	Supports	Supports 585.10: FFNZ supports a definition of Environmental Compensation being included into the Plan.	FFNZ supports a definition of Environmental Compensation being included into the Plan.	Accept	10.2
419.125	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Indigenous vegetation" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The exclusion of planted shelter belts comprising indigenous species from the definition of indigenous vegetation is supported.	Accept	29.2
581.19	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Support	Retain the definition of "Vegetation clearance" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	The definition provides appropriate interpretation in administration of the District Plan.	Accept	29.2
FS1341.36	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support		This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential re-zoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to	Accept	29.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p><i>the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.</i></p>		