

| Submitter # | Sub. Point # | Submitter Name | Address for Service (Email) | Support / Oppose | Wish to be heard (Y/N) | Consider Joint Pres. (Y/N) | Decision Sought | Reasons |
|-------------|--------------|--|--|------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 1 | 1.01 | Aislabie, V & B | veronica.aislabie01@gmail.com | S | N | N | Supports not to include their property as SNA [at 52 Dudley Road] that is already covenanted. | The area identified for further protection in your maps predominantly exists across the property boundary at 62 Dudley Road. We agree that providing further protection to these types of areas, which are already protected could cause confusion in the future. |
| 2 | 2.03 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | | Site #153 be included unless identified as not meeting the significance criteria. | Site #153 identified as wetland vegetation - wetlands are covered by National Priority 2 in the Priorities for Protecting Rare and Threatened Biodiversity on Private Land (MfE 2007) and have been reduced to less than 10% of their former extent in the Bay of Plenty Region. Note: Parts of this site were identified in the recent desk top wetland extent mapping carried out by Landcare Research. Site 578 is outside the BOP region however the same information applies here. BOPRC seek that all sites that meet the significance criteria are included as SNAS. This is required under RPS Policies MN 1B (a) & (c) and MN 3B (c). Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. |
| 2 | 2.04 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | | Site #578 be included unless identified as not meeting the significance criteria. | Site #153 identified as wetland vegetation - wetlands are covered by National Priority 2 in the Priorities for Protecting Rare and Threatened Biodiversity on Private Land (MfE 2007) and have been reduced to less than 10% of their former extent in the Bay of Plenty Region. Note: Parts of this site were identified in the recent desk top wetland extent mapping carried out by Landcare Research. Site 578 is outside the BOP region however the same information applies here. BOPRC seek that all sites that meet the significance criteria are included as snaps. This is required under RPS Policies MN 1B (a) & (c) and MN 3B (c). Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. |
| 2 | 2.06 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | | Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Regarding the acknowledgement in section 1.3 of the Section 32 Report that a number of additional amendments to existing SNAs and new SNAs have also been identified in a recent draft report (Wildland Consultants 2018c) but excluded from scope due to the need to progress the sites already under consideration - BOPRC seek that all sites that meet the significance criteria are included as SNAs. This is required under RPS Policies MN 1B (a) & (c) and MN 3B (c). |
| 2 | 2.01 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | | (Regarding new and expanded SNAs) - Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Regarding considering of new and expanded SNAs - BOPRC retain concerns about the exclusion of some sites assessed as meeting the RPS Appendix F Set 3 criteria and/or provided protection under other means. We consider areas covenanted or protected by other mechanisms should still be added where these sites meet SNA assessment criteria. Generally these covenants seek to protect indigenous vegetation/ecological values which aligns with the purpose of SNAs. Our main concern is occasionally covenants are removed to enable subdivision and development inconsistent with the purpose of PC3. Excluding such areas poses a risk that their private protection status may be removed leaving them with no protection |
| 2 | 2.02 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | | (Regarding removed SNAs) - Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Regarding removal of sites that have alternative legal protection - BOPRC seek all sites that meet the significance criteria are included as SNAs. This is required under RPS Policies MN 1B (a) & (c) and MN 3B(c). BOPRC considers covenanted areas or areas with some other level of protection that meet the significance should still be added. Often the intention of these covenants is to protect the native vegetation/ecological value and therefore aligns with the site being made an SNA. It does not change the fact that these sites meet the SNA criteria. Further, occasionally covenants are removed to enable development inconsistent with the purpose of the PC3 (SNAs). Excluding such areas poses a risk that their private protection status may be removed leaving them with no protection under the District Plan. BOPRC seeks to avoid a piecemeal approach to the District Plan SNA layer. Our preference is to ensure that the full extent of the SNAs are mapped across the district, to ensure there is a robust repository of all SNAs allowing for the completeness of the layer. Excluding sites afforded private protection from the SNAs maps and schedule doesn't lend well to future protection of sites under these other mechanisms. |
| 2 | 2.03 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | | Site #153 be included unless identified as not meeting the significance criteria. | Site #153 identified as wetland vegetation - wetlands are covered by National Priority 2 in the Priorities for Protecting Rare and Threatened Biodiversity on Private Land (MfE 2007) and have been reduced to less than 10% of their former extent in the Bay of Plenty Region. Note: Parts of this site were identified in the recent desk top wetland extent mapping carried out |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| 2 | 2.04 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | Site #578 be included unless identified as not meeting the significance criteria. | Site #153 identified as wetland vegetation - wetlands are covered by National Priority 2 in the Priorities for Protecting Rare and Threatened Biodiversity on Private Land (MfE 2007) and have been reduced to less than 10% of their former extent in the Bay of Plenty Region. Note: Parts of this site were identified in the recent desk top wetland extent mapping carried out by Landcare Research. Site 578 is outside the BOP region however the same information applies here. BOPRC seek that all sites that meet the significance criteria are included as NAS. This is required under RPS Policies MN 1B (a) & (c) and MN 3B (c). Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. |
| 2 | 2.06 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Regarding the acknowledgement in section 1.3 of the Section 32 Report that a number of additional amendments to existing SNAs and new SNAs have also been identified in a recent draft report (Wildland Consultants 2018c) but excluded from scope due to the need to progress the sites already under consideration - BOPRC seek that all sites that meet the significance criteria are included as SNAs. This is required under RPS Policies MN 1B (a) & (c) and MN 3B (c). |
| 2 | 2.01 - 2.09 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | | | | Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #2.01 - #2.09 | Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #2.01 - #2.10 |
| 2 | 2.01 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | (Regarding new and expanded SNAs) - Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Regarding considering of new and expanded SNAs - BOPRC retain concerns about the exclusion of some sites assessed as meeting the RPS Appendix F Set 3 criteria and/or provided protection under other means. We consider areas covenanted or protected by other mechanisms should still be added where these sites meet SNA assessment criteria. Generally these covenants seek to protect indigenous vegetation/ecological values which aligns with the purpose of SNAs. Our main |
| 2 | 2.05 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Re exclusion of this site due to ownership - BOPRC seek that all sites that meet the significance criteria are included as SNAs. This is required under RPS Policies MN 1B (a) & (c) and MN 3B (c). |
| 2 | 2.07 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Along with the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna Section 6(a) of the RMA identifies the preservation of wetlands to be another matter of national importance. BORPC have particular interest in ensuring the protection of wetlands identified as #141 Pohaturoa Wetland, #143 Reservoir Road Wetland and #148 Te Ngae Lake Edge Wetland. RLC has assessed the risk of not including these sites in the schedule as 'low'. This area is within Whakarewarewa Forest and these wetlands will be playing a part in the lake nutrient budgets. These wetlands should be included in the SNA schedule. Wildland Consultants (2017) made the recommendation that all existing wetlands in the Rotorua Catchment should be protected from development and drainage now. The protection should be formal and in perpetuity. These wetlands are already functioning to remove N from lake nutrient budgets; further reduction of these wetlands will increase the amount of N that needs to be removed from the lake by 'other' means. Only four lake edge wetlands currently have any legal protection status. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 2 | 2.08 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | O | Y | | Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Along with the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna section 6(a) of the RMA identifies the preservation of wetlands to be another matter of national importance. BORPC have particular interest in ensuring the protection of wetlands identified as #141 Pohaturoa Wetland, #143 Reservoir Road Wetland and #148 Te Ngae Lake Edge Wetland. RLC has assessed the risk of not including these sites in the schedule as 'low'. This area is within Whakarewarewa Forest and these wetlands will be playing a part in the lake nutrient budgets. These wetlands should be included in the SNA schedule. Wildland Consultants (2017) made the recommendation that all existing wetlands in the Rotorua Catchment should be protected from development and drainage now. The protection should be formal and in perpetuity. These wetlands are already functioning to remove N from lake nutrient budgets; further reduction of these wetlands will increase the amount of N that needs to be removed from the lake by 'other' means. Only four lake edge wetlands currently have any legal protection status. |
| 2 | 2.09 | Bay of Plenty Regional Council Toi Moana (BOPRC) | Nassah.Steed@boprc.govt.nz | | Y | | Include all sites that meet significance criteria. Ensure completeness of the SNA layer, District Plan schedule and maps. | Along with the protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna section 6(a) of the RMA identifies the preservation of wetlands to be another matter of national importance. BORPC have particular interest in ensuring the protection of wetlands identified as #141 Pohaturoa Wetland, #143 Reservoir Road Wetland and #148 Te Ngae Lake Edge Wetland. From a water quality perspective, site #148 - Te Ngae Lake Edge wetland should be included in the SNA schedule as a priority. This area plays an important role as a lake edge wetland, filtering nutrients from entering Lake Rotorua. As an existing wetland, its role is already accounted for in lake nutrient budgets. Given the location close to the lake, development pressure on this wetland should be considered high and this wetland complex should be included in the schedule to ensure the nutrient filtering values of the site are protected in the long-term. Wildland Consultants (2017) made the recommendation that all existing wetlands in the Rotorua Catchment should be protected from development and drainage now. The protection should be formal and in perpetuity. These wetlands are already functioning to remove N from lake nutrient budgets; further reduction of these wetlands will increase the amount |
| 3 | 3.01 | Campbell, R | rosspcampbell@gmail.com | O | N | Y | I would like the council to review the current SNA classification [for SNA 8] and remove it from the paddock side of the Waikuta Stream. | Can we please give some consideration to reassessing the current SNA [at 39 Waikuta Road], because as it stands it is only a paddock and therefore is not a SNA. To better understand the real situation rather than relying on aerial photographs please feel free to arrange a visit to the property. |
| 3 | 3.01 | Campbell, R | rosspcampbell@gmail.com | O | N | Y | I would like the council to review the current SNA classification [for SNA 8] and remove it from the paddock side of the Waikuta Stream. | Can we please give some consideration to reassessing the current SNA [at 39 Waikuta Road], because as it stands it is only a paddock and therefore is not a SNA. To better understand the real situation rather than relying on aerial photographs please feel free to arrange a visit to the property. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 4 | 4.01 | Campion, R | rscampion@xtra.co.nz | S | Y | Y | Support SNA 154 with amendment - reduced rates - we would like to see a permanent reduction of our rates maybe based on a per hectare saved into SNA. | While we are happy with revised SNA boundaries on our property, we are still losing the use of a large area of our land. |
| 4 | 4.02 | Campion, R | rscampion@xtra.co.nz | S | Y | Y | Support SNA 154 with amendment - reduced rates - we would like to see a permanent reduction of our rates maybe based on a per hectare saved into SNA. | While we are happy with revised SNA boundaries on our property, we are still losing the use of a large area of our land. |
| 5 | 5.01 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | That the additional area proposed to be included [for SNA 142] is not classified as SNA. | The vegetation does not meet significance criteria in the Bay of Plenty RPS. The additional areas identified are dominated by weeds. The intent of the RPS, objectives 19, 20, and 21, policies MN 1-4B can be given effect to without applying an SNA. The protective status of an SNA does not address the predominant risk to this site - plant and animal pests. Council does not identify how an SNA gives greater protection. The section 32 report states "On private land the main causes of decline are habitat destruction or modification through the removal, fragmentation and degradation of ecosystems, wetland |
| 5 | 5.02 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site is not classified as a SNA. | The area containing significant vegetation is overstated. Many sub-parts are dominated by weeds. Vegetation on at least one landform does not meet the Waikato RPS criteria. The intent of the Waikato RPS, objective 3.19, policy 11.2 and methods 11.2.1 – 3 can be met without an SNA. Most relevant is method 11.2.2. Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in the Waikato RPS method (11.2.2.a), therefore the cascade of avoidance, mitigation and offset (11.2.2.b-d) is not required. The site contains no rare, at risk, threatened or irreplaceable indigenous biodiversity (11.2.2.f); and the activity of plantation |
| 5 | 5.03 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site (SNA 701) is not classified as a SNA. | Vegetation does not all meet the Waikato RPS criteria for significance. Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site (identified in the Waikato RPS method 11.2.2). Regulation under the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) already applies to riparian margins and wetlands. These require setbacks for planting, replanting, crossings, harvesting, mechanical land prep and earthworks near a stream or wetland (see NES-PF regulations 14, 20, 29, 36-49, 54, 68, 74, 78, 93-94, and Schedule 3). Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in District Plan policy 2.3.5.1 as the ecological sustainability or values are not at risk as a result of forest practice. There will be no net loss of biodiversity as a result of forest practice. There will be no building or development setbacks to affect the health and functioning of the site. The forest provides a buffer. The land ownership, as a result of the 2008 CNI Settlement now reflects the Māori, historical and community association with the site. There is a view that an SNA status reduces that association. The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (2018) is a pre consultation draft, thus its weight must be limited. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 5 | 5.04 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 703] is not classified as a SNA. | <p>It is a dry gully system except in periods of heavy rain and not riparian. Thus it does not meet RMA s6(a). Nor is the vegetation significant thus it does not meet RMA s6(c).</p> <p>Forest activities will not have a significant effect in any case, so classifying it as SNA will not provide extra protection from what it already receives under the Forestry Management Plan, The Plantation Forestry NES and the requirements of the FSC Certification. SNA classification would introduce another layer of compliance assessment with no additional benefit.</p> <p>Vegetation does not meet the Waikato RPS criteria for significance.</p> <p>Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site (identified in the Waikato RPS method 11.2.2).</p> <p>Plantation forestry on land adjacent to this unstocked site will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in District Plan policy 2.3.5.1 as the ecological sustainability or values are not at risk as a result of forest practice. There will be no net loss of biodiversity as a result of forest practice. There will be no building or development setbacks to affect the health and functioning of the site. The forest and fence around the forest provides a buffer.</p> <p>The land ownership, as a result of the 2008 CNI Settlement now reflects the Māori, historical and community association with the site. There is a view that an SNA status reduces that association.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (2018) is a pre consultation draft, thus its weight must be limited.</p> |
| 5 | 5.04 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 703] is not classified as a SNA. | <p>It is a dry gully system except in periods of heavy rain and not riparian. Thus it does not meet RMA s6(a). Nor is the vegetation significant thus it does not meet RMA s6(c).</p> <p>Forest activities will not have a significant effect in any case, so classifying it as SNA will not provide extra protection from what it already receives under the Forestry Management Plan, The Plantation Forestry NES and the requirements of the FSC Certification. SNA classification would introduce another layer of compliance assessment with no additional benefit.</p> |
| 5 | 5.02 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site is not classified as a SNA. | <p>The area containing significant vegetation is overstated. Many sub-parts are dominated by weeds. Vegetation on at least one landform does not meet the Waikato RPS criteria.</p> <p>The intent of the Waikato RPS, objective 3.19, policy 11.2 and methods 11.2.1 – 3 can be met without an SNA. Most relevant is method 11.2.2. Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in the Waikato RPS method (11.2.2.a), therefore the cascade of avoidance, mitigation and offset (11.2.2.b-d) is not required. The site contains no rare, at risk, threatened or irreplaceable indigenous biodiversity (11.2.2.f); and the activity of plantation forestry located next to the site (11.2.2.g) if anything performs a protective function, in that the biggest risk appears to be domestic animals, deduced from the regional council seeking to fence all wetlands in this catchment.</p> <p>Regulation under the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) already applies to riparian margins and wetlands. These require setbacks for planting, replanting, crossings, harvesting, mechanical land prep and earthworks near a stream or wetland (see regulations 14, 20, 29, 36-49, 54, 68, 74, 78, 93-94, and Schedule 3). Note: Appendix 9</p> <p>.2.3.3.b of the District Plan identifies that the clearance of indigenous vegetation <i>within SNA</i> shall be: vegetation that is in an area subject to management by entities that have certification under Forest Stewardship Council Certification, which Timberlands holds. However as the NES-PF is more stringent than the District Plan in this regard, the NES-PF provisions prevail.</p> <p>The protective status of an SNA does not address the predominant risk to this site – plant and animal pests. Council does not identify how an SNA gives greater protection. The section 32 report states “On private land the main causes of decline are habitat destruction or modification through the removal, fragmentation and degradation of ecosystems, wetland drainage and the effects of pests and weeds.” The risks either do not apply to this land in the context of FSC certified forest practice, or the SNA status does not address the risks identified (e.g. active pest control).</p> <p>Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in the District Plan’s Policy 2.3.5.1 as the ecological sustainability or values are not at risk as a result of forest practice. There will be no net loss of biodiversity as a result of forest practice. There will be no building or development setbacks to affect the health and functioning of the site. The forest provides a buffer to the site.</p> <p>Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in the District Plan’s Policy 2.3.5.2 which is to Support the integrity of Significant Natural Areas and habitat of indigenous fauna by provision of buffers around SNAs.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 5 | 5.03 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site (SNA 701] is not classified as a SNA. | <p>Vegetation does not all meet the Waikato RPS criteria for significance.</p> <p>Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site (identified in the Waikato RPS method 11.2.2).</p> <p>Regulation under the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) already applies to riparian margins and wetlands. These require setbacks for planting, replanting, crossings, harvesting, mechanical land prep and earthworks near a stream or wetland (see NES-PF regulations 14, 20, 29, 36-49, 54, 68, 74, 78, 93-94, and Schedule 3).</p> <p>Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in District Plan policy 2.3.5.1 as the ecological sustainability or values are not at risk as a result of forest practice. There will be no net loss of biodiversity as a result of forest practice. There will be no building or development setbacks to affect the health and functioning of the site. The forest provides a buffer.</p> <p>The land ownership, as a result of the 2008 CNI Settlement now reflects the Māori, historical and community association with the site. There is a view that an SNA status reduces that association.</p> <p>The National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity (2018) is a pre consultation draft, thus its weight must be limited.</p> |
| 5 | 5.04 | CNI Iwi Land Management Limited (CNIILML) on behalf of CNI Iwi Holdings Limited (CNIHL) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 703] is not classified as a SNA. | <p>It is a dry gully system except in periods of heavy rain and not riparian. Thus it does not meet RMA s6(a). Nor is the vegetation significant thus it does not meet RMA s6(c).</p> <p>Forest activities will not have a significant effect in any case, so classifying it as SNA will not provide extra protection from what it already receives under the Forestry Management Plan, The Plantation Forestry NES and the requirements of the FSC Certification. SNA classification would introduce another layer of compliance assessment with no additional benefit.</p> <p>Vegetation does not meet the Waikato RPS criteria for significance.</p> <p>Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site (identified in the Waikato RPS method 11.2.2).</p> <p>Plantation forestry on land adjacent to this unstocked site will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in District Plan policy 2.3.5.1 as the ecological sustainability or values are not at risk as a result of forest practice. There will be no net loss of biodiversity as a result of forest practice. There will be no building or development setbacks to affect the health and functioning of the site.</p> |
| 7 | 7.01 | Contact Energy Ltd. | daniel.forbes@contactenergy.co.nz 07 376 2179 | S | Y | Y | Support SNA 715 provided the area meets consistent and accepted ecological criteria and that sufficient flexibility is provided to allow the continued operation and development of renewable generation activities on the Ohaaki field and ‘development geothermal fields’. | <p>Proposed SNA 715 is within resource consent boundary 126153 of the Ohaaki Power Station. The Ohaaki East Steamfield is classified as Development Geothermal System by Waikato Regional Council and the operation was subject to a full assessment of effects and the resource consent process in 2013, including in relation to actual and potential effects on significant natural areas and geothermally tolerant vegetation. The consent is subject to conditions and extensive requirements to avoid, remedy and mitigate effects on natural areas such as Torepatutahi Wetland. Generation of renewable electricity is a matter of regional and national importance and key to the government's goal of 100% renewable electricity by 2035. While we support identification of SNAs in the Rotorua District Plan, our interest is in the rules that apply. Strict avoidance policies and rules could be inconsistent with the continued operation and development of renewable geothermal energy. This area would seem already controlled/managed under the SGF provisions of the District Plan (further detail provided in full submission). Contact is open to working with Council to ensure that any impacts of our operations are minimised, and steps taken to maintain, restore and enhance areas such as #715</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 8.59 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 718] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.30 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the two additional sites for SNA 660. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site adjoining conservation land. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.31 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the entire identified area for SNA 679 | The Director-General considers that scheduling of these areas is required as significant forest sites. Although fragmented many are close by or almost contiguous. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.20 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the whole identified area [SNA 154]. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. A lack of landowner consultation should not be considered as the main criteria for exclusion of an SNA. |
| 8 | 8.02 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Retain SNA mapping on legally covenanted areas or areas under other forms of formal protection. | The Director-General opposes the removal of SNA mapping in areas with legally protected covenants, including QEII and considers that all areas that meet the SNA criteria contained in the Waikato RPS and Bay of Plenty RPS should be included in the SNA mapping. The proposed SNA mapping and scheduling is inconsistent with section 11A of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement which requires mapping of SNAs where there is an identified covenant such as QEII and where it meets the criteria. The Bay |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 8 | 8.04 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Council investigate an incentive fund for restoration and protection of SNAs. | The Director-General supports council initiatives to incentivise protection of SNAs including rates remission, removal of resource consent fees for protection and restoration works and direct funding of restoration and protection works. |
| 8 | 8.09 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | | Y | Y | Amend the scheduled identified area [SNA 111] to the extent to the north and east to include manuka scrubland and geothermal areas. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required due to its significant geothermal vegetation and features, however, requires extension to better reflect the actual extent of ecological significance. |
| 8 | 8.31 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the entire identified area for SNA 679 | The Director-General considers that scheduling of these areas is required as significant forest sites. Although fragmented many are close by or almost contiguous. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.33 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 681] subsequent to a field check of site to further ascertain if smaller areas identified are significant. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site, however, the suggested removal of smaller sites has somewhat arbitrary boundaries especially as the site has not been ground truthed. |
| 8 | 8.64 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the entire identified area [do not make the amendments to [SNA 664]. | The Director General considers that scheduling of the entire area with amendments suggested by council is required as it contains significant indigenous vegetation with significant kokako population. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | 8.65 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | | Y | Y | Consider and include these additional SNAs or extensions to SNAs. | <p>The Director-General considers that these areas should be considered and included in the SNA schedule.</p> <p>1) 8 Mile gate wetland in Whakarewarewa Forest</p> <p>2) Vegetation at the eastern end of SNA 657 - this vegetation is similar to that within the SNA</p> <p>3) Rautawiri Stream upstream of Torepatutahi Stream, Broadlands - extensive oxbow wetland vegetation adjoining public conservation land. Also a stronghold for nationally threatened species Urtica Linearifolia</p> <p>4) Rotoma No2 and 3 at Lake Rotoma as SNA - Council GIS layers incorrectly show these as protected by Nga Whenua Rahui kawenata. The sites are indigenous forest between a kawenata and public conservation land.</p> <p>5) Newly discovered geothermal gully at NZTM E1885274 N5770289 near Pohaturoa Whaka forest (as new SNA or part of SNA 177)</p> <p>6) Geothermal fumarole in paddock at NZTM 1880669 N5744668 Te Kopia Geothermal West (as new SNA or part of SNA 712)</p> <p>7) Wetlands east side of SH5 adjoining Lake Ngahewa Wetland (at NZTM 18955179D, 5754662N, 1895314E, 5754445N)</p> <p>8) Wetland east side of SH5 adjoining Earthquake Flat Road realignment at NZTM 1893478E</p> <p>9) Wetland at corner of Springs Road and SH5 near Mihi (NZTM 1888262E, 5736527N)</p> <p>10) Wetland adjoining Hinehopu wetland SH30at NZTM 1906246E, 5784112N (as part of Hinehopu SNA)</p> <p>11) Significant indigenous vegetation kahikatea-swamp maire forest corner Curtis Road SH30 at NZTM 1898348E, 5783270N</p> <p>12) Significant wetland Roy Road Kaharoa at NZTM 1878536E, 5789837N</p> <p>13) Significant wetland on west side of SH5 south of Lake Ngahewa wetland at NZTM 1878536E, 5789837N (add to SNA 572)</p> <p>14) Expand SNA 89 to cover the significant kahikatea forest - Rotoma Recreation Reserve no longer exists so old reserve area needs incorporating into expanded SNA</p> <p>15) Rotoma No 1 geothermal feature (Tikorangi Central) - a geothermal feature heated raw soil field that is not a Nga Whenua Rahui kawenata. Amend as per Landcare Research report for Bay of Plenty Regional Council: An updated assessment of geothermal vegetation in the BOP region based on aerial photography (P154)</p> <p>16) Waitangi Soda Springs Mire - very significant wetland. Incorrectly identified as Nga Whenua Rahui kawenata on RLC GIS layer.</p> <p>17) Large areas of significant indig. veg. adjoining Lake Ohakuri. Shown as DOC public conservation land on Rotorua Lakes</p> |
| 8 | 8.64 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the entire identified area [do not make the amendments to [SNA 664]. | <p>The Director General considers that scheduling of the entire area with amendments suggested by council is required as it contains significant indigenous vegetation with significant kokako population.</p> |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------------------------------|--|----|---|---|---|--|
| 8 | 8.01 - 8.65 | Director-General of Conservation | | | | | Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #8.01 - #8.65 | Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #8.01 - #8.66 |
| 8 | 8.42 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Amend the scheduled identified area for SNA 585 to the West side of Southern most section of the SNA. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation, however, requires amendment to better reflect the actual extent of ecological significance. Some of the SNA is pasture and there is significant secondary vegetation outside of the SNA |
| 8 | 8.65 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | | Y | Y | Consider and include these additional SNAs or extensions to SNAs. | The Director-General considers that these areas should be considered and included in the SNA schedule. 1) 8 Mile gate wetland in Whakarewarewa Forest 2) Vegetation at the eastern end of SNA 657 - this vegetation is similar to that within the SNA 3) Rautawiri Stream upstream of Torepatutahi Stream, Broadlands - extensive oxbow wetland vegetation adjoining public conservation land. Also a stronghold for nationally threatened species Urtica Linearifolia 4) Rotoma No2 and 3 at Lake Rotoma as SNA - Council GIS layers incorrectly show these as protected by Nga Whenua Rahui kawenata. The sites are indigenous forest between a kawenata and public conservation land. |
| 8 | 8.31 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the entire identified area for SNA 679 | The Director-General considers that scheduling of these areas is required as significant forest sites. Although fragmented many are close by or almost contiguous. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.31 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the entire identified area for SNA 679 | The Director-General considers that scheduling of these areas is required as significant forest sites. Although fragmented many are close by or almost contiguous. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.04 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Council investigate an incentive fund for restoration and protection of SNAs. | The Director-General supports council initiatives to incentivise protection of SNAs including rates remission, removal of resource consent fees for protection and restoration works and direct funding of restoration and protection works. |
| 8 | 8.51 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 703] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation. It is also noted that a Land Improvement Agreement does not prevent vegetation clearance and is therefore not considered adequate protection. |
| 8 | 8.01 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Commence review of the Lakes A zone mapping and provisions. | The Lakes A zone of the District Plan is currently overdue for review. A review of this zone would improve coherency of the current plan structure. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|----|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | 8.03 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Update the District Plan maps using the updated DOC public conservation land layer; Show Wildlife Management Reserve on GIS layer planning maps surrounding the SNA for Lake Tutaeinanga as a PNA. | The current GIS layer used in the District Plan maps are not the most up to date version. There have been several changes in land tenures which are not reflected in the layer being used by Rotorua Lakes Council. For example, Waikite valley wetland is now public conservation land. The reserve which surrounds Lake Tutaeinanga should be shown as PNA. Currently the mapping only shows the lake as an SNA on the GIS layer. |
| 8 | 8.06 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 32] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required due to its significance and is at a high risk of disturbance. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.07 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 34] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant wetland site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.08 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 37] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant geothermal site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.10 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 123] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant geothermal and wetland site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.11 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 124] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant geothermal and wetland site and significant fauna habitat. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.12 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 127] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant lake and wetland. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.13 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Amend the scheduled identified area [SNA 139] to extend to the south and east. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required due to its significance as a wetland site, however, requires extension to better reflect the wetland boundaries and extent of ecological significance. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | 8.14 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 141]. | The Director-General considers that all significant unprotected wetlands should be identified as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.15 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Retain existing SNA 142 without amendment. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant wetland site, however, considers that all areas that meet the SNA criteria contained in the RPS should be included in the SNA mapping, regardless of additional covenants. |
| 8 | 8.16 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 143]. | The Director-General considers that all significant unprotected wetlands should be identified as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.17 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 147] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest and wetland. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.18 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 148] subject to amendments to ensure the appropriate area is included. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant wetland site. A lack of landowner consultation should not be considered as the main criteria for exclusion of an SNA. |
| 8 | 8.19 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 151]. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site adjoining public conservation land. All significant unprotected sites should be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure when RPS criteria is met. |
| 8 | 8.20 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the whole identified area [SNA 154]. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. A lack of landowner consultation should not be considered as the main criteria for exclusion of an SNA. |
| 8 | 8.21 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 155] as recommended. | The Director General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|----|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | 8.22 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 156] as recommended. (It is noted that this option refers to SNA155 rather than 156 as stated in the 32A report) | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site adjoining public conservation land. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.23 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 157] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.24 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 158] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.25 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 167] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.26 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 172] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.27 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Amend [SNA 177] as per the Landcare Research report for Bay of Plenty Regional Council: An updated assessment of geothermal vegetation in the BOP region based on aerial photography (p231). | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required due to its significance as a geothermal site, however, considers that the SNA boundaries are incorrect and require extension to better reflect the wetland boundaries and extent of ecological significance. The area of significant geothermal vegetation is larger than currently mapped. |
| 8 | 8.28 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 658] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|----|---|---|---|--|
| 8 | 8.29 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 659] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.30 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the two additional sites for SNA 660. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site adjoining conservation land. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.32 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 680] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.34 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 708] as recommended but with amendments to extend SNA further South East to include the remainder of the wetland and forested area. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant wetland site, however, requires extension to better reflect the actual extent of ecological significance. |
| 8 | 8.35 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 709] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant wetland site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.36 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 415] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 8 | 8.37 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 417] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.38 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 577] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant forest site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.39 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 579] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant secondary vegetation site. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.40 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 582] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation and as a significant wetland site. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.41 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 583] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.43 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 589] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 8 | 8.44 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 590] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.45 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 592] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.46 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 596] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.47 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [as SNA 597] | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant secondary vegetation. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | 8.48 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [as SNA 598]. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant wetland vegetation. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.49 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 700] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant wetland vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.50 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 701] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant wetland vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.52 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 710] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | 8.53 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 712] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.54 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 713] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.55 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 714] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 8 | 8.56 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 715] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.57 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [as SNA 716]. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as a significant geothermal site. All significant unprotected sites that meet the RPS criteria must be scheduled as SNAs regardless of tenure. |
| 8 | 8.58 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 717] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | 8.59 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 718] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.60 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 800] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.61 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area [SNA 801] as recommended. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |
| 8 | 8.62 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Schedule the identified area as recommended for SNA 552, 555, 558, 567, 568, 571, 572, 573, 574. | The Director-General considers that scheduling of this area is required as it contains significant geothermal vegetation. Inclusion of this site is also consistent with the RPS. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|--|----|---|---|--|---|
| 8 | 8.63 | Director-General of Conservation | mburns@doc.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Remove SNAs as recommended for SNA 1, 2, 411, 5, 15, 46, 660, 664 Kapukapu Road. | The removal of these areas provides clarification for landowners that they are not significant. |
| 9 | 9.01 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) | | SA | Y | | Remove specific SNAs from PC3 process if an affected landowner disputes the accuracy of the mapping and/or wishes to have site visits undertaken by an ecologist to identify the site's ecological values. The costs of the onsite assessment are to be met by Council. It is accepted that if the site is confirmed as meeting a significance threshold and is accurately mapped it will be brought back into the PC3 process and become subject to District Plan provisions. | Some areas of vegetation may have been captured as SNAs inappropriately. In some, exotics are the predominant vegetation and/or the value of biodiversity is questioned and in others the mapping seems disconnected with what makes sense on the ground. Inaccuracies can occur with desktop analysis and we ask that for those sites which are disputed and where the affected landowner is keen to resolve the matter with onsite visits, Council accepts that sufficient uncertainty remains for those sites and they should not be included in the PC3 process at this time. This is important as not all landowners provided feedback pre-notification. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------|--|----|---|--|--|
| 9 | 9.01 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) | SA | Y | Remove specific SNAs from PC3 process if an affected landowner disputes the accuracy of the mapping and/or wishes to have site visits undertaken by an ecologist to identify the site's ecological values. The costs of the onsite assessment are to be met by Council. It is accepted that if the site is confirmed as meeting a significance threshold and is accurately mapped it will be brought back into the PC3 process and become subject to District Plan provisions. | Some areas of vegetation may have been captured as SNAs inappropriately. In some, exotics are the predominant vegetation and/or the value of biodiversity is questioned and in others the mapping seems disconnected with what makes sense on the ground. Inaccuracies can occur with desktop analysis and we ask that for those sites which are disputed and where the affected landowner is keen to resolve the matter with onsite visits, Council accepts that sufficient uncertainty remains for those sites and they should not be included in the PC3 process at this time. This is important as not all landowners provided feedback pre-notification. |
| 9 | 9.03 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) | SA | Y | Remove SNA sites subject to alternative legal protection from the planning maps and Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #9.01 - #9.06 | Federated Farmers is always keen to ensure District Plans do not duplicate controls or introduce unnecessary overlapping functions for material benefit. Sites protected by QEII Trust or similar legal mechanisms such as conservation covenants or Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #9.01 - #9.06 |
| 9 | 9.05 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) | SA | Y | Introduce a new paragraph into Part 2 Section 6 Matters 2.2 Key Environmental issues 2.2.4 Significant Indigenous Vegetation (Significant Natural Areas) and Habitat along the lines of: <u>To ensure adequate protection is provided to</u> | Federated Farmers strongly supports the recommendations made in the Section 32 report for Incentives and Support, section 3.5 and summarised section 6.2. However, a strong link between the planning and funding documents is required to inform LGA funding decisions. Without that link these worthy intentions have no certainty and may be difficult to advance. Federated Farmers understands that ultimately it will require changes to the policies and funding sources outlined in the Long Term and Annual Plans to enable this incentivising approach, but District Plan provisions can be used to support, guide |
| 9 | 9.02 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) | S | Y | Retain the amendments proposed for re-assessed SNAs, including the removal of part removal of SNAs as recommended in the Section 32 report. | Federated Farmers supports accurate planning maps and robust identification processes. The PC3 changes which amend boundaries based on the results of field assessments on existing SNAs or pre notification consultation with affected landowners are strongly supported. We understand some boundary amendments were made for practical reasons as well as ecological ones. This shows RLC is focused on the bigger picture and longer term gains. We fully support RLC in this collaborative approach, it will provide landowners some confidence that their issues are understood and addressed where possible. It will help foster a sense of good will required to achieve optimum protection for the remaining areas. |
| 9 | 9.04 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) | SA | Y | Ensure that any sites that are protected by alternative legal mechanisms but not listed on the planning maps or Appendix 2 have access to any of the incentives and support packages introduced to implement the recommendations of the Section 32 Report. This may require the introduction of new provisions into the District Plan and amendment of Table 13.10.1 - Subdivisions in Rural Zones Rule 17 along the lines of: "Subdivision in an additional lifestyle lot | It will be important to ensure access to incentives remains open to those with alternative protection mechanisms. This will not enable double dipping as the different schemes have different funding priorities. |
| 9 | 9.06 | Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Federated Farmers) | SA | Y | Amend A9.2.3(3)(a)(viii) as follows: The continuation of grazing in the rural zone where it does not increase the scale and intensity as stated in the report by an agricultural consultant submitted to Rotorua District Council within six months of the Plan being fully operative , provided that the grazing does not cease for more than 12 months. | A9.2.3(3)(a)(viii) should be amended to provide the same opportunity to newly affected landowners as was given to those affected by the District Plan review. Federated Farmers is aware that key concerns for a number of affected landowners relates to existing use rights and whether they can continue to use an area, now ring-fenced as a SNA, in the same way that they always have. This is an understandable concern and one that was expressed by farmers, who found themselves in similar circumstances during the proposed District Plan review. Performance Standard A9.2.3(3)(a)(viii) was, in part, introduced via the appeals process, to find resolution on issues relating to existing use rights for grazing. Given the issues and context is the same and in the interests of providing equity to landowners who are newly affected as a result of PC3 bringing new areas under the rules framework, the opportunity provided under A9.2.3(3)(a)(viii) should be extended to them. The amendment is required to provide that equity and future proof this process. The six month time frame seems arbitrary. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 10 | 10.01 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 37. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.02 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 123. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.03 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 124. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.04 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 127. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.05 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 157. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.06 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 167. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.07 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 172. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.08 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 708. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.09 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 709. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 10 | 10.10 | Hancock Forest Management New Zealand (HFM NZ) | rhawtree@hnrng.com | S | Y | Y | Adopt notified proposal for SNA 577. | HFM NZ supports the proposed changes to the District Plan for the sites listed as these sites are within forests managed by HFM NZ. All of the forests HFM NZ manages are certified by PEFC and FSC. These areas are already managed as reserves within the plantation forest and are responsibly managed as per the FSC & PEFC standards. |
| 11 | 11.01 | Hartley, G | gdclharley@gmail.com | O | Y | Y | Remove boundaries of SNAs for provision of new exotic planting of scrubland. Reconsider boundary of 664 SNAs, consideration of | Wildlands assessment of boundaries with recommendations to council we challenge these. Concerns: scale of plans maps provided, not equal. Grazed areas historically not been considered. No rebates to rates. |
| 11 | 11.01 | Hartley, G | gdclharley@gmail.com | O | Y | Y | Remove boundaries of SNAs for provision of new exotic planting of scrubland. Reconsider boundary of 664 SNAs, consideration of subdivision? Of land outside of your proposed | Wildlands assessment of boundaries with recommendations to council we challenge these. Concerns: scale of plans maps provided, not equal. Grazed areas historically not been considered. No rebates to rates. |
| 12 | 12.01 | Kaharoa Community Association | chrisjam@xtra.co.nz | S | N | | Adopt the recommendation [to establish an incentive fund]. | KCA supports Council establishing an incentive fund available to those with designated SNA's to help restore sections or parts of established bush that have become degraded for some reason and to establish fencing to further provide protection of that bush. |
| 12 | 12.02 | Kaharoa Community Association | chrisjam@xtra.co.nz | S | N | | Adopt the recommendation [to adopt a uniform rates remission policy for SNAs calculated on the capital value of the land | KCA supports Council adopting a uniform rates remission policy for SNA's calculated on the capital value of the land designated as an SNA. |
| 13 | 13.01 | Loest, Philipp | philipp.loest@tll.co.nz | S | N | N | I want the Council to approve the proposed Plan Change 3 [in regards to SNA 679] | As a directly affected landowner I am pleased that the proposed changes recognize the important role conservation minded landowners play. Scheduling our property as an SNA would add a completely unnecessary layer of rules/bureaucracy without providing any ecological benefit. The many negative impacts would lessen our young families quality of life and undermine our long term financial stability. The proposed change allows us to look into the future with optimism. It |
| 14 | 14.01 | Submitter 14 | | O | N | Y | Council provide clear information that is easy to understand about what an SNA actually means in real terms for landowners. What are | Property boundaries at 5087 State Highway 5 are incorrect and should be shown properly. We are not convinced the intended SNA is even on the property. We cannot be expected to make decisions based on guesswork. Due diligence has |
| 14 | 14.01 | Submitter 14 | | O | N | Y | Council provide clear information that is easy to understand about what an SNA actually means in real terms for landowners. What are rights, obligations, benefits, losses? What is the purpose? | not be done by Council. Communication was ineffective. There is no need for Council to have any control over this private land. Property boundaries at 5087 State Highway 5 are incorrect and should be shown properly. We are not convinced the intended SNA is even on the property. We cannot be expected to make decisions based on guesswork. Due diligence has not be done by Council. Communication was ineffective. There is no need for Council to have any control over this private land. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 15 | 15.01 | McPherson, A | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is extensive. I am concerned that inadequate investigation has been completed to support the identification of the SNA as Wildlands have not visited the site. |
| 15 | 15.01 | McPherson, A | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is extensive. I am concerned that inadequate investigation has been completed to support the identification of the SNA as Wildlands have not visited the site. |
| 16 | 16.01 | McPherson, D | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is |
| 16 | 16.01 | McPherson, D | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is |
| 17 | 17.01 | McPherson, K | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is |
| 17 | 17.01 | McPherson, K | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is |
| 18 | 18.01 | Mercury NZ Ltd. (Mercury) | fraser.graafhuis@mercury.co.nz | S | Y | N | Retain SNA provided Rule 15.5.6 continues to apply. | SNA #583 is located under existing 220kv high voltage National Grid lines which connect Ohakuri to Edgumbe. The national grid lines are located within Ohakuri electricity generation core site, however the lines are owned and operated by Transpower. Correspondence established prior to notification confirms Mercury does not object to the SNA area within the Ohakuri electricity generation core site on the basis that vegetation is able to be pruned and trimmed under infrastructure, as provided for by permitted activity Rule 15.5.6. |
| 18 | 18.02 | Mercury NZ Ltd. (Mercury) | fraser.graafhuis@mercury.co.nz | S | Y | N | Support SNA 585 subject to removal of SNA over Ohakuri diversion tunnel (shown in orange) this is to be excluded as located above diversion tunnel | Mercury generally supports the proposed SNA area (Area 1 in picture), with the exception of the SNA shown in orange located above Ohakuri diversion tunnel, which is anticipated will be removed. Dam safety is paramount. Mercury considers an SNA over hydro electricity generation infrastructure has the potential to constrain future maintenance activities within the Ohakuri electricity generation core site. |
| 19 | 19.01 | Moyle, W & Lane, C | warwick5369@gmail.com | S | N | N | Do not include the area 89, 119 and 119A Kaharoa Road a shared forest remnant that also extends on the road reserve, total c2.3ha in the District Plan as SNA. | The rules are unnecessary for our properties as the areas are physically protected by topography. Furthermore, the vegetation provides value to our small lifestyle properties and is at low risk of disturbance. We have all taken initiatives as our own expense to protect our small sections of bush through fencing, trapping and removing weeds while also entering into a memorandum of understanding to ensure we continue to improve the ecological value of our properties by protecting the natural vegetation. We feel imposition of an SNA is an unnecessary interference with our rights as property owners. We are concerned about how the rules may evolve in the future and area actually counterproductive by creating a sense of uncertainty. Our small remnant located on our small lifestyle properties at 89, 119 and 119A is at no risk of disturbance, as we see it as an amenity that adds significant value to our property. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|-------------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 20 | 20.01 | Northdale Holdings Ltd. & Martin, R | | O | Y | | [Do not proceed with SNA 155] | The Martin family have owned this property since 1972, where we have farmed and been kaitiaki for the land, protecting the native flora and fauna, setting traps for pest control and killing deer, goats and possums. SNA does not have any fencing around it but had a natural geographic barrier that prevented stock entering 80% of the area. The unprotected area was used as winter protection for sheep. With climatic change and very hot summer days the sheep have become sunburnt after shearing and the shade trees are a huge asset to our stock husbandry. We feel we have transformed the property into a Significant Area. There is also concern that this land houses an urupa where our ancestors are buried. Our whanau consists of six generations of farming in the area and if it became an SNA this would be very impactful. The submitter finds it perverse that the area is potentially taken out of the control of the Owner and Custodian. We do not agree with rate compensation, but would consider selling SNA 155 at the value of a Heritage Site. The treasured area of our family land, that you have identified as a potential SNA 155 we are going to retain our land not be open for Public Access under any circumstances, but be the Crown in our Jewel of the Mamaku Scenic Reserve. We are prepared to instigate that the recorded proposed area SNA 155 have covenants placed over the Registered Title over the property so that it is complying to conditions that it cannot be removed, or damaged unless of an Act of God. |
| 20 | 20.02 | Northdale Holdings Ltd. & Martin, R | | O | Y | | Allow the normal three yearly valuation process to take place, the land owner then has the opportunity to oppose or accept the new valuations. Therefore it is independent assessment and does not involve the Council with Administration costs. | I totally disagree with the whole concept of the Rotorua District Council being involved in Rate setting for compensation by way of \$5.00 per hectare. This is a messy and clumsy way of administration. |
| 21 | 21.01 | Pukahukiwi Kaokaoroa Incorporation | shuta@deloitte.co.nz | O | N | N | We would like to explore other options [in regards to the incorporation's property at SH 33] with the Council that will achieve the same outcomes that have been proposed under Plan Change 3. We require further information and time to engage independent advice and to seek financial assistance for this process to occur. The Committee of Management would welcome further | We understand the steps that the Council are undertaking in the protection of wetlands and native fauna and flora but argue that the process undermines the Committee's right to govern its own affairs. We acknowledge attempts to contact the Committee and apologise for the delayed response. |
| 22 | 22.01 | Raukawa Charitable Trust | environment@rauaway.org.nz | S | Y | Y | The Plan Change is supported and the Trust seeks that it be approved by the Council. | The Trust supports aspects of the proposed plan change - The protection of areas of indigenous riparian vegetation, wetlands and significant terrestrial indigenous habitat and vegetation; and the continued provision for cultural harvest in accordance with Māori customs and values. The Trust considers that the plan change will help achieve the restoration and |
| 23 | 23.01 | Rotorua Rural Community Board | Shirley.Trumper@rotorualc.nz | O | Y | | Take the approach outlined to SNAs | The RCB is supportive of the concept and broad objectives of protecting and preserving of genuine SNAs especially where a risk of extinction can be demonstrated. Our support for this concept is conditional as follows: A) that the definitions of |
| 23 | 23.01 | Rotorua Rural Community Board | Shirley.Trumper@rotorualc.nz | O | Y | | Take the approach outlined to SNAs | The RCB is supportive of the concept and broad objectives of protecting and preserving of genuine SNAs especially where a risk of extinction can be demonstrated. Our support for this concept is conditional as follows: A) that the definitions of |
| 24 | 24.01 | Te Kopia Forest Partnership | brett@rfh.co.nz | O | N | Y | Remove or adjust areas identified as SNA 558. | The areas identified do not contain indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as they are planted in pine forest. |
| 24 | 24.02 | Te Kopia Forest Partnership | brett@rfh.co.nz | O | N | Y | Remove or adjust areas identified as SNA 590. | The areas identified do not contain indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as they are planted in pine forest. |
| 24 | 24.03 | Te Kopia Forest Partnership | brett@rfh.co.nz | O | N | Y | Remove or adjust areas identified as SNA 592. | The areas identified do not contain indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as they are planted in pine forest. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|---|
| 24 | 24.01 | Te Kopia Forest Partnership | brett@rfh.co.nz | O | N | Y | Remove or adjust areas identified as SNA 558. | The areas identified do not contain indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, as they are planted in pine forest. |
| 25 | 25.01 | Te Rimu Trust | office@nzsurveys.co.nz | O | Y | Y | The SNA identified on their property [72 Te Manu Road] is removed on the grounds it is only covered by minor scrub not an area of “significant indigenous vegetation”. | The landowners intend to continue to graze the pockets of indigenous vegetation and winter stock under them and the multiple access tracks through them will be continued to be required. We understand [a SNA map] was initially sent to the landowner and they comment about the pasture tracts being included. This was then revised (as a desktop GIS exercise by Wildlands) to the version that was sent with the invitation to submit on the plan change. It is unclear what (if any) fieldwork |
| 26 | 26.01 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 700] is not classified as a SNA. | The area containing significant vegetation is overstated. Many sub-parts are dominated by weeds. Vegetation on at least one landform does not meet the Waikato RPS criteria. |
| 26 | 26.02 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | That the boundary of the proposed SNA 701 site is revised to ensure that it is topographically accurate compared to the vegetation that could be regarded as genuinely significant, in a way that is practical for operational purposes. | The intent of the Waikato RPS, objective 3.19, policy 11.2 and methods 11.2.1 – 3 can be met without an SNA. Most relevant is method 11.2.2. Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site identified in the Waikato RPS method (11.2.2.a), therefore the cascade of avoidance, mitigation and offset (11.2.2.b-d) is not required. The site contains no rare, at risk, threatened or irreplaceable indigenous biodiversity (11.2.2.f); and the activity of plantation Vegetation does not all meet the Waikato RPS criteria for significance. |
| 26 | 26.03 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 703] is not classified as a SNA. | Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site (identified in the Waikato RPS method 11.2.2). |
| 26 | 26.03 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 703] is not classified as a SNA. | Regulation under the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) already applies to riparian margins and wetlands. These require setbacks for planting, replanting, crossings, harvesting, mechanical land prep and earthworks near a stream or wetland (see NES-PF regulations 14, 20, 29, 36-49, 54, 68, 74, 78, 93-94, and Schedule 3). |
| 26 | 26.02 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | That the boundary of the proposed SNA 701 site is revised to ensure that it is topographically accurate compared to the vegetation that could be regarded as | It is a dry gully system except in periods of heavy rain and not riparian. Thus it does not meet RMA s6(a). Nor is the vegetation significant thus it does not meet RMA s6(c). |
| 26 | 26.03 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 703] is not classified as a SNA. | Forest activities will not have a significant effect in any case, so classifying it as SNA will not provide extra protection from It is a dry gully system except in periods of heavy rain and not riparian. Thus it does not meet RMA s6(a). Nor is the vegetation significant thus it does not meet RMA s6(c). |
| 26 | 26.02 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | That the boundary of the proposed SNA 701 site is revised to ensure that it is topographically accurate compared to the vegetation that could be regarded as | Forest activities will not have a significant effect in any case, so classifying it as SNA will not provide extra protection from what it already receives under the Forestry Management Plan, The Plantation Forestry NES and the requirements of the FSC |
| 26 | 26.03 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 703] is not classified as a SNA. | Vegetation does not all meet the Waikato RPS criteria for significance. |
| 26 | 26.01 | Timberlands Ltd. (Timberlands) | bridget@eland.co.nz | O | Y | Y | This site [SNA 700] is not classified as a SNA. | Plantation forestry on adjacent land will not lead to loss of protection of the site (identified in the Waikato RPS method 11.2.2). |
| 27 | 27.01 | Tozer, C and W | tozer@slingshot.co.nz | O | Y | N | Do not schedule/do not include #703 “Short Road Gully” proposed SNA in the District Plan. | Regulation under the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) already applies to riparian margins |
| 27 | 27.01 | Tozer, C and W | tozer@slingshot.co.nz | O | Y | N | Do not schedule/do not include #703 “Short Road Gully” proposed SNA in the District Plan. | It is a dry gully system except in periods of heavy rain and not riparian. Thus it does not meet RMA s6(a). Nor is the vegetation significant thus it does not meet RMA s6(c). |
| 28 | 28.01 | Uttinger, S | ria_uttinger@hotmail.com | O | N | Y | Reverse decision to make the proposed area [at 388 Maleme Road] a significant natural area. | Forest activities will not have a significant effect in any case, so classifying it as SNA will not provide extra protection from what it already receives under the Forestry Management Plan, The Plantation Forestry NES and the requirements of the FSC |
| 28 | 28.01 | Uttinger, S | ria_uttinger@hotmail.com | O | N | Y | Reverse decision to make the proposed area [at 388 Maleme Road] a significant natural area. | The area containing significant vegetation is overstated. Many sub-parts are dominated by weeds. Vegetation on at least one landform does not meet the Waikato RPS criteria. |
| 29 | 29.01 | Vercoe, B | b.vercoe@outlook.com | O | N | | Support SNA 708 with amendment to allow for the Trust to increase the watercress growth and allow controlled access to harvest it. | The intent of the Waikato RPS, objective 3.19, policy 11.2 and methods 11.2.1 – 3 can be met without an SNA. Most |
| 29 | 29.02 | Vercoe, B | b.vercoe@outlook.com | O | N | | Support SNA 709 with amendment to allow for the Trust to increase the watercress growth and allow controlled access to harvest it. | 1. Our property land cover and its management help protect the headwaters of the Torepatutahi Stream. We consider our Short Road Gully and its natural resources are adequately protected without an SNA |
| | | | | | | | | 2. During the past 25 years we have respected, cared for and encouraged the growth of indigenous vegetation. We are |
| | | | | | | | | 1. Our property land cover and its management help protect the headwaters of the Torepatutahi Stream. We consider our Short Road Gully and its natural resources are adequately protected without an SNA |
| | | | | | | | | This farm was previously in Gum trees and this area as shown on map of the SNA has still got gum trees on it and has been fenced off for the last 10 years so stock don't get into it. We want access to this land to use the gum trees for firewood in the future. It is not used for stock but we would prefer to maintain this area ourselves. We are happy to plant flaxes on this |
| | | | | | | | | This farm was previously in Gum trees and this area as shown on map of the SNA has still got gum trees on it and has been fenced off for the last 10 years so stock don't get into it. We want access to this land to use the gum trees for firewood in the future. It is not used for stock but we would prefer to maintain this area ourselves. We are happy to plant flaxes on this |
| | | | | | | | | The two wetlands are very old and have been kept in a protected state and will continue to be under the jurisdiction of the Tokerau A.11 Trust. This is nurtured as an important source of food (watercress growth). We are aware of the unique flora & native trees in both SNA areas. |
| | | | | | | | | The two wetlands are very old and have been kept in a protected state and will continue to be under the jurisdiction of the Tokerau A.11 Trust. This is nurtured as an important source of food (watercress growth). We are aware of the unique flora & native trees in both SNA areas. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 30 | 30.01 | Waerenga East and West Incorporation (Committee of) | nzrotoruaenquiries@deloitte.co.nz | O | | | Request further information and time to consider the proposal and understand what the incorporations options are for alternative means of protecting the true SNAs moving forward. | Further consultation be held as the proposed area includes existing exotic tree plantations and a number of other issues. Also we received insufficient notice to receive the proposed changes, seek professional advice and formulate an informed response. |
| 31 | 31.01 | van Maanen, C | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is |
| 31 | 31.01 | van Maanen, C | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is extensive. I am concerned that inadequate investigation has been completed to support the identification of the SNA as Wildlands have not visited the site. |
| 32 | 32.01 | van Maanen, G | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is extensive. I am concerned that inadequate investigation has been completed to support the identification of the SNA as Wildlands have not visited the site. |
| 32 | 32.01 | van Maanen, G | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is extensive. I am concerned that inadequate investigation has been completed to support the identification of the SNA as Wildlands have not visited the site. |
| 33 | 33.01 | van Maanen, M | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is extensive. I am concerned that inadequate investigation has been completed to support the identification of the SNA as Wildlands have not visited the site. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|--|----|---|---|--|--|
| 33 | 33.01 | van Maanen, M | | O | Y | Y | Remove the 10ha affected at 890 Poutakataka Road from SNA 585 Lake Ohakuri Northwest Riparian Faces. | The first notification of this proposed plan change came on 29/7/19. There has been no opportunity to identify the economic & practical ramifications this will have on farming practice & management. There is little indigenous vegetation in the 10ha identified at 890 Poutakataka Road. Blackberry & wilding pines are rampant & destruction by pigs & possums is extensive. I am concerned that inadequate investigation has been completed to support the identification of the SNA as Wildlands have not visited the site. |
| 34 | 34.15 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Retention of entire site for SNA 559. | (East side of Waikato river only). WRC notes Orakei Conservation Covenants, Section 77 Reserves Act 1977. Removing SNA status from sites due to alternative protection from covenants is inconsistent with the application of significance criteria in the RPS (refer to submission point on alternative legal protection and removal of SNAs). |
| 34 | 34.16 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Retention of entire site for SNA 566. | WRC notes Orakei Korako Conservation Covenants, Section 77 Reserves Act 1977. Removing SNA status from sites due to alternative protection from covenants is inconsistent with the application of significance criteria in the RPS (refer to submission point on alternative legal protection and removal of SNAs). |
| 34 | 34.17 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Retention of entire site for SNA 570. | WRC notes Molloy Conservation Covenant. Removing SNA status from sites due to alternative protection from covenants is inconsistent with the application of significance criteria in the RPS (refer to submission point on alternative legal protection and removal of SNAs). |
| 34 | 34.01 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | That scheduling and subsequent control on activities relies on assessment based on WRPs criteria in Table 11-2 | Removing SNA status from sites due to alternative protection from covenants is inconsistent with the application of significance criteria in the RPS. Covenanting agreements only go so far in meeting the obligations of protection contained in section 6(c) of the RMA. Criteria for determining significance are outlined in Table 11-1 of the WRPS. Criterion 1 identifies indigenous vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna that is currently or recommended to be set aside by statute or |
| 34 | 34.03 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | That all areas of geothermal vegetation that fall within the Council's boundary for RLC be mapped as SNAs. That specific sites be included and scheduling be amended (refer to | WRC's previous submission on matters related to SNAs in the RLC plan sought the inclusion of many geothermal areas in the SNA maps. Several of these were excluded or only partially included. The proposed scheduling and mapping of SNAs excludes areas that have other protection such as reserve status. |
| 34 | 34.04 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | That specific sites be included and scheduling be amended (refer to other submission points). | Appropriate application of WRPS criteria is necessary. Council supports the inclusion of all areas identified in the report and seeks boundary readjustments and further inclusions. |
| 34 | 34.06 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Addition of the entire site for SNA 555. | All areas of geothermal vegetation that fall within the Council's boundary for RLC be mapped as SNA. |
| 34 | 34.07 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Addition of entire site including the stream length for SNA 558. | All areas of geothermal vegetation that fall within the Council's boundary for RLC be mapped as SNA. The notified plan change added the area at the mouth but does not include the stream length. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------|--------------------------------|--|----|---|---|---|--|
| 34 | 34.19 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Add the entire site for SNA 712. | The mapping covers only a very small part of the SNA. The remainder is reserve and is not mapped as an SNA by RLC. All areas of geothermal vegetation that fall within the Council's boundary for RLC be mapped as SNA. |
| 34 | 34.22 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Add the entire site for SNA 715. | The mapping covers only a very small part of the SNA. The remainder is in a QEII covenant and is not mapped as an SNA by RLC. All areas of geothermal vegetation that fall within the Council's boundary for RLC be mapped as SNA. |
| 34 | 34.25 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | SA | Y | Y | Add the entire site for SNA 800. | The mapping covers only apart of the SNA. The remainder is reserve and is not mapped as an SNA by RLC. All areas of geothermal vegetation that fall within the Council's boundary for RLC be mapped as SNA. |
| 34 | 34.27 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | | Y | Y | Add the following sites covered by scenic reserves and conservation areas: (including non-geothermal land) noted in Wildlands 2014 report: Te Kopia, Waikite, Maungaongaonga, Waiotapu North, Maungakakamea (Rainbow Mountain) and Waiotapu South (refer to full submission for | The proposed scheduling and mapping of SNAS should not exclude areas that have other protection such as reserve status. |
| 34 | 34.01 - 34.28 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | | | | | Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #34.01 - #34.28 | Refer to points mentioned above in submission points #34.01 - #34.28 |
| 34 | 34.05 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt proposed amendments to SNA 552. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs |
| 34 | 34.08 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt proposed amendments for SNA 567. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.09 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt proposed amendments for SNA 568. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.10 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt proposed amendments for SNA 571. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| 34 | 34.11 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt proposed amendments for SNA 572. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.12 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt proposed amendments for SNA 573. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.13 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt proposed amendments for SNA 574. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.14 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | O | Y | Y | Addition of entire site for SNA 716. | The area in the southwest should be included as part of the wider geothermal area. The area identified in the northeast is actually in the Bay of Plenty region, not the Waikato region as stated. |
| 34 | 34.18 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt the proposed amendments for SNA 710. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.20 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt the proposed amendments for SNA 713. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.21 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt the proposed amendments for SNA 714. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.23 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt the proposed amendments for SNA 717. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |
| 34 | 34.24 | Waikato Regional Council (WRC) | Alejandro.Cifuentes@waikato.region.govt.nz | S | Y | Y | Adopt the proposed amendments for SNA 718. | WRC supports RLC's effort to update the District Plan and ensure the appropriate level of management of activities within SNAs. |