

Hearing 10: Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity

Questions from the Hearing Panel

Paragraph	Question
8.13	<p>The additional text recommended in response to the submission of H Rennie is somewhat convoluted. Could it be simplified to read something along the lines of:</p> <p>The ecosystems of the <u>District</u> have evolved over time to comprise hybrid ecosystems that combine elements of <u>contain</u> indigenous and exotic characteristics and species. They will continue to evolve and there is no expectation that a return to pre-human or even to pre-European ecosystems and biodiversity is achievable. However, the distinctive contribution New Zealand makes to global biodiversity of both ecosystems and species is founded in its indigenous biodiversity and <u>While</u> the co-evolution of particular ecosystems. These are to <u>should</u> be recognised, however with our particular responsibility to <u>the protection of</u> indigenous biodiversity <u>is</u> desired outcome at the forefront of our consideration.</p>
10.72	<p>The word ‘manage’ would provide no useful guidance to decision-makers in this case. Drawing on text used in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS, would it provide more appropriate guidance to decision-makers to say instead:</p> <p>Protect ... by <u>avoiding significant adverse effects and avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects of activities that would adversely affect on</u> those habitats.</p>
10.131	10.131 and 10.132 appear to be duplicated in part. Can you please correct this if it is a typographical error?
11.18	The recommended restructuring of Rule ECO-R1 is potentially confusing. Can you please provide a Table that lists and compares the notified Rule EIB-R1 provision numbers with the recommended new ECO-RC, RD, RE and RF numbering system?
12.6	Which submission points are recommended to be rejected? Aside from the ESAI submission point at 12.4, paragraph 12.5 states that these submission points were recommended to be accepted?
12.30 12.31	Does ECO-RC 3.i in Appendix 2 provide as a permitted activity for the clearance of indigenous vegetation within areas of improved pasture that have been cultivated within the past five years? Namely, the text in Appendix 2 does not refer to five years (ECO-RC3.o only refers to horticultural cropping)?
12.54	<p>Would it be appropriate for ECO-RC.3 to read:</p> <p>....</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>The clearance is for works are <u>any of</u>:</p> <p>a. the maintenance ..</p>

16.48	In Appendix 2, is all of ECO-R2 supposed to be shown with recommended (underlined) amendments as well as being shown as strikeout? In Appendix 2, should all of recommended ECO-REQG be shown as underlined with no strikeout as it appears to be an entirely new provision that was not in the notified PDP?
23.22	With rules no longer making reference to ECO-SCHED3 and it being treated as a guide how will this assist decision making? Should the matters in ECO-SCHED3 therefore sit out of the Plan or in some way incorporated into ECO-SCHED1?
24.32	Is including a reference to “all new Zealand’s ecosystems” appropriate (or necessary) given that a number of those ecosystems will contain non-indigenous fauna or their habitats?
24.49	Dr Lloyd recommended the inclusion of definitions of ‘over planting’, ‘over grazing / trampling’ and ‘over sowing’ (his paragraph 9.18). Can you explain why you have not incorporated those recommendations into your recommended amendments?
24.57 24.58 24.59	Have you considered whether or not the relevant rules should address these matters?
24.86	Is it appropriate to include (in recommended clause c) a reference to “area occupied” given that a biodiversity offset may entail the relocation of specimens to an alternative site or location? Are clauses b and d capable of practical application by a decision-maker given that they are ‘forward looking’ and would therefore presumably need to be determined by some form of ongoing monitoring regime once a consent application had been granted?
	To assist our consideration of his evidence, could Dr Lloyd please prepare a table that lists any of his recommendations that have not been adopted by Ms Carruthers and include in that table a column stating whether or not he still recommends (with reasons if the reasons are not already in his evidence) amendments to the notified provisions over and above those recommended Ms Carruthers.