

---

# OFFICER'S RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM THE HEARINGS PANEL

---

**DATE:** 28 July 2022

**HEARING:** Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity

**HEARING DATE:** 1 August 2022

**PREPARED BY:** Rachael Carruthers

---

## Introduction

The purpose of this report is to provide a written response to the questions posed by the Hearings Panel on the respective section 42A report for the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter.

Recommended amendments to Plan provisions are shown in a consolidated manner in **Appendix 1**.

## Questions and Answers

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel
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 district have evolved over time to <del>comprise hybrid ecosystems that combine elements of</del> <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. <del>However, the distinctive contribution New Zealand makes to global biodiversity of both ecosystems and species is founded in its indigenous biodiversity and</del> <u>While</u> the co-evolution of particular ecosystems. <del>These are to</del> <u>should</u> be recognised, <del>however with our particular responsibility to the protection of</del> indigenous biodiversity <u>is the desired outcome at the forefront of our consideration.</u></p>
Officer response:	<p>Yes it could, with a slight grammatical alteration to the final sentence, shown <u>blue</u> below, so that the paragraph reads:</p> <p>The ecosystems of the district have evolved over time to <del>comprise hybrid ecosystems that combine elements of</del> <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. <del>However, the distinctive contribution New Zealand makes to global biodiversity of both ecosystems and species is founded in its indigenous biodiversity and</del> <u>While</u> the co-evolution of particular ecosystems. <del>These are to</del> <u>should</u> be recognised, <del>however with our particular responsibility to the protection of</del> indigenous biodiversity <u>is the desired outcome at the forefront of our consideration.</u></p>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel														
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 <del>crested grebe and canterbury mudfish and their habitats, the habitats of specified indigenous fauna that have been identified as being of ecological significance,</del> by <del>managing the</del> <u>avoiding significant adverse effects and avoiding, remedying or mitigating other adverse effects of</u> activities <del>that would adversely affect</del> <u>on</u> those habitats.</p>														
Officer response:	<p><i>I agree that the proposed wording would give better guidance to decision makers in relation to significant adverse effects, and that the proposed wording would be consistent with that used in Policy 11(b) of the NZCPS.</i></p> <p><i>Noting that neither the Crested Grebe Overlay nor the Mudfish Habitat Protection Overlay are located in the coastal environment, the wording of Policy 8 of the draft NPS-IB may also be of assistance, so that ECO-P6 could read (amendments to the policy above shown <u>blue</u>):</i></p> <p><i>Protect <del>crested grebe and canterbury mudfish and their habitats, the habitats of specified indigenous fauna that have been identified as being of ecological significance,</del> by <del>managing the</del> <u>avoiding significant adverse effects and</u> <del>avoiding, remedying or mitigating</del> <u>managing other adverse effects of</u> activities <del>that would adversely affect</del> <u>on</u> those habitats.</i></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?														
Officer response:	<p>10.131 FFNC<sup>1</sup> consider that the protection of suitable natural features can be encouraged through incentives such as additional subdivision rights that can be granted in-situ, or transferred to another location, if the locality where the natural feature or area in question is situated is too sensitive to allow conservation lots in that location. They therefore request a policy to incentivise subdivision in the Rural Zone where SNAs are protected. They also request some form of subdivision right, with a Transferable Development Right option, to create one or more qualifying conservation lots elsewhere, in exchange for the protection of a natural feature.</p> <p>10.132 Deleted</p>														
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?														
Officer response:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Notified provision</th><th>Corresponding recommended provision</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.1.a</td><td>ECO-RC.1</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.1.b</td><td>ECO-RC.11.a</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.1.c</td><td>ECO-RC.11.b</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.1.d</td><td>ECO-RC.8</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.2</td><td>ECO-RD.1 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.a, works within an SNA) ECO-RC.11 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.b, maximum area of clearance in SKIZ) ECO-RC.12 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.c, clearance in SKIZ associated with an earthworks consent under NFL-R2)</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.3</td><td>ECO-RC.9</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Notified provision	Corresponding recommended provision	ECO-R1.1.a	ECO-RC.1	ECO-R1.1.b	ECO-RC.11.a	ECO-R1.1.c	ECO-RC.11.b	ECO-R1.1.d	ECO-RC.8	ECO-R1.2	ECO-RD.1 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.a, works within an SNA) ECO-RC.11 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.b, maximum area of clearance in SKIZ) ECO-RC.12 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.c, clearance in SKIZ associated with an earthworks consent under NFL-R2)	ECO-R1.3	ECO-RC.9
Notified provision	Corresponding recommended provision														
ECO-R1.1.a	ECO-RC.1														
ECO-R1.1.b	ECO-RC.11.a														
ECO-R1.1.c	ECO-RC.11.b														
ECO-R1.1.d	ECO-RC.8														
ECO-R1.2	ECO-RD.1 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.a, works within an SNA) ECO-RC.11 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.b, maximum area of clearance in SKIZ) ECO-RC.12 (for non-compliance with ECO-R1.1.c, clearance in SKIZ associated with an earthworks consent under NFL-R2)														
ECO-R1.3	ECO-RC.9														

<sup>1</sup> DPR-0422.204 FFNC

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel	
	<i>ECO-R1.4.a</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.a</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.b</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.b</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.c</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.c</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.d</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.d</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.e</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.e</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.f</i>	<i>No longer required (relevant EI rules do not require compliance with ECO rules)</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.g</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.g</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.h.i</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.h.i</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.h.ii</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.h.ii</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.h.iii</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.h.iii</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.h.iv</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.h.iv</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.i</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.i</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.j</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3.j</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.k</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.l</i>	<i>ECO-RF.1.b</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.m</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3 (where works are outside any SNA)</i> <i>ECO-RD.3 (where works are within any SNA)</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.4.n</i>	<i>ECO-RC.3 (where works are outside any SNA)</i> <i>ECO-RD.3 (where works are within any SNA)</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.5</i>	<i>No longer required (removal of overlay areas recommended)</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.6.a</i>	<i>ECO-RD.3.a</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.6.b</i>	<i>ECO-RD.3.b</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.6.c</i>	<i>ECO-RD.3.c</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.6.d</i>	<i>ECO-RD.3.d</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.6.e</i>	<i>ECO-RD.3.e</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.6.f</i>	<i>ECO-RD.3.f</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.7</i>	<i>ECO-RD.4</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.8</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.8.a</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.8.b</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.8.c</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5.a</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.9</i>	<i>ECO-RC.6</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.10</i>	<i>ECO-RD.4</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.11</i>	<i>ECO-RC.7</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.12</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.12.a</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.12.b</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.12.c</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5.a</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.13</i>	<i>ECO-RC.6</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.14</i>	<i>ECO-RD.4</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.15</i>	<i>ECO-RC.5</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.16.a</i>	<i>ECO-RF.1.a</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.16.b</i>	<i>ECO-RF.1.c</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.17</i>	<i>No longer required (re-stated as a permitted activity in ECO-RF)</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.18</i>	<i>ECO-REQG.2</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.19</i>	<i>ECO-REQG.3</i>
	<i>ECO-R1.20</i>	<i>ECO-RE.5</i>

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel																
	<table> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.21</td><td>ECO-RE.6</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.22.a</td><td>ECO-RC.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.22.b</td><td>ECO-RC.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.23.a</td><td>ECO-RC.6.a</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.23.b</td><td>ECO-RC.6.b</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.24.a</td><td>ECO-RC.5</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.24.b</td><td>ECO-RC.3.i</td></tr> <tr> <td>ECO-R1.25</td><td>ECO-RD.4</td></tr> </table>	ECO-R1.21	ECO-RE.6	ECO-R1.22.a	ECO-RC.5	ECO-R1.22.b	ECO-RC.5	ECO-R1.23.a	ECO-RC.6.a	ECO-R1.23.b	ECO-RC.6.b	ECO-R1.24.a	ECO-RC.5	ECO-R1.24.b	ECO-RC.3.i	ECO-R1.25	ECO-RD.4
ECO-R1.21	ECO-RE.6																
ECO-R1.22.a	ECO-RC.5																
ECO-R1.22.b	ECO-RC.5																
ECO-R1.23.a	ECO-RC.6.a																
ECO-R1.23.b	ECO-RC.6.b																
ECO-R1.24.a	ECO-RC.5																
ECO-R1.24.b	ECO-RC.3.i																
ECO-R1.25	ECO-RD.4																
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?																
Officer response:	<i>Paragraph 12.6 was included in error and should be deleted.</i>																
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)?																
Officer response:	<i>Yes. As notified, ECO-R1.4.i permits indigenous vegetation clearance within an area of improved pasture, except that on the Canterbury Plains the land must also have been subject to cultivation at some point in the past, with no timeframe (ECO-R1.24.b as notified). The requirement for previous cultivation is recommended for removal,<sup>2</sup> leaving recommended ECO-RC.3.i.</i>																
12.54	<p>Would it be appropriate for ECO-RC.3 to read:</p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p>The <del>clearance is for works are</del> any of:</p> <p>a. the maintenance ..</p>																
Officer response:	<p><i>That would be appropriate, and I recommend that the change be made, subject to a grammatical change to avoid the need to consequentially restructure the wording of the list items, so that the amendment reads:</i></p> <p>....</p> <p><b>Where:</b></p> <p>The <del>clearance is works are</del> any of:</p> <p>a. the maintenance ..</p>																
16.48	<p>In Appendix 2, is all of ECO-R2 supposed to be shown with recommended (underlined) amendments as well as being shown as strikeout?</p> <p>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?</p>																
Officer response:	<p><i>ECO-REQG.1 was notified as ECO-R1.4.i. ECO-REQG.2 was notified as ECO-R1.18 and ECO-REQG.3 was notified as ECO-R1.19. There is no underline or strikeout shown, because no changes to the notified text are recommended – merely the location within the chapter where the provisions sit.</i></p> <p><i>It is recommended that ECO-R2 be deleted and replaced by ECO-REQG.4 and ECO-REQG.5. The amendments shown to ECO-REQG.4 and ECO-REQG.5 are those recommended to ECO-R2.</i></p>																
23.22	With rules no longer making reference to ECO-SCHED3 and it being treated as a guide how will this assist decision making?																

<sup>2</sup> DPR-0260.093 CRC, DPR-0301.043 UWRG

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel
	Should the matters in ECO-SCHED3 therefore sit out of the Plan or in some way incorporated into ECO-SCHED1?
Officer response:	<p><i>Following consultation with Dr Lloyd, I recommend that the retention of ECO-SCHED3 as a guide to potential SNAs would be helpful to assist with interpretation of the plan, similar to the requested threatened and at risk species list, would be helpful for the reasons expressed in para 12.3 of his evidence.</i></p> <p><i>ECO-SCHED1 and ECO-SCHED3 serve different purposes, and so I do not recommend that they be combined into a single schedule.</i></p> <p><i>In light of the change of purpose of ECO-SCHED3, I recommend that it be renamed as follows:</i></p> <p><i>ECO-SCHED3 - <del>Indigenous Species and Area Lists</del> <u>Potential significant natural areas within Selwyn District</u></i></p>
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?
Officer response:	<p><i>I agree that the reference to “all New Zealand’s ecosystems” is not necessary for the intent of the definition to be clear. I therefore recommend that the definition of ‘indigenous biodiversity’ be amended to read (recommended amendments shown blue):</i></p> <p><i>Is biodiversity that is naturally occurring anywhere in New Zealand. It includes <u>all New Zealand’s ecosystems</u>, indigenous vegetation, indigenous fauna and the habitats of indigenous vegetation and fauna. <del>Includes all plants and animals that occur naturally in New Zealand and have evolved or arrived without any assistance from humans. Indigenous species include migratory species visiting New Zealand on a regular or irregular basis.</del><sup>3</sup></i></p>
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?
Officer response:	<p><i>On reflection, I consider that, while the terms are not used themselves within the plan provisions, definitions of these terms would assist in the understanding of the term ‘indigenous vegetation clearance’. I therefore recommend that the definition of indigenous vegetation clearance be amended and following definitions be introduced as recommended by Dr Lloyd, as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Indigenous vegetation clearance: The clearing, <u>modification</u><sup>4</sup> or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including over-grazing/<u>trampling</u>,<sup>5</sup> cutting, crushing, <u>trampling</u><sup>6</sup>, cultivation, spraying, irrigation, chemical application, <u>artificial</u><sup>7</sup> drainage, stop banking, overplanting, over sowing, <del>or</del><sup>8</sup> <u>burning, shading or invasion.</u><sup>9</sup></i></p> <p><i><u>Over-grazing/trampling: the practice of confining farm stock to an area of land</u></i></p>

<sup>3</sup> DPR-0441.017 Manawa

<sup>4</sup> DPR-0260.062 CRC, DPR-0301.008 UWRG, DPR-0372.009 Dairy Holdings, DPR-0388.003 Craigmore, DPR-0390.005 RIL, DPR-0407.005 Forest & Bird, DPR-0427.016 DOC, DPR-0368.001 Beef + Lamb NZ & Deer NZ, DPR-0421.006 R & A Hill, DPR-0474.002 D & K Calder, R Jamison & R Reed, DPR-0353.048, DPR-0353.049 HortNZ, DPR-0422.056 FFNC, DPR-0019.006 S Jarvis, DPR-0422.085 FFNC, DPR-0441.009 Manawa

<sup>5</sup> DPR-0427.016 DOC

<sup>6</sup> DPR-0427.016 DOC

<sup>7</sup> DPR-0372.009 Dairy Holdings, DPR-0388.003 Craigmore, DPR-0390.005 RIL

<sup>8</sup> Consequential to DPR-0407.005 Forest & Bird

<sup>9</sup> DPR-0407.005 Forest & Bird

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel		
	<p><u>resulting in the depletion or destruction of indigenous vegetation by intensive grazing and/or trampling.</u><sup>10</sup></p> <p><u>Overplanting: the planting of exotic plants into an area of indigenous vegetation.</u><sup>11</sup></p> <p><u>Oversowing: the over-sowing of exotic seeds on land that cannot be proven to have been over-sown in the past as part of a farming operation.</u><sup>12</sup></p> <p><i>I also recommend that FFNC submission point DPR-0422.295 and D &amp; K Calder, R Jamison &amp; R Reed submission point DPR-0471.002 each be accepted in part.</i></p>		
24.57 24.58 24.59	Have you considered whether or not the relevant rules should address these matters?		
Officer response:	<i>I consider that recommended rules ECO-RC and ECO-RD provide an appropriate framework for permitting an appropriate level of vegetation clearance. I consider that the requested clearances would not be measurable or enforceable, and so should not be accepted.</i>		
24.86	<p>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?</p> <p>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?</p>		
Officer response:	<p><i>I consider that ‘area occupied’ is appropriately included. Relocation should not prevent the area occupied achieving no net loss, if an equivalent area of occupancy is established at the relocation site. Relocation should be within the natural range of a species. In terms of clauses b and d, the phrase ‘no net loss’ is used within a consenting context, rather than in determining an activity standard. As such, and consistent with other types of effects where the exact outcome may not be known at the outset, a degree of modelling and monitoring would be required to ensure that the intended outcomes were achieved.</i></p>		
	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.		
Officer response:	<b>Reference in Dr Lloyd’s evidence</b>	<b>Recommendation of Dr Lloyd</b>	<b>Comment</b>
	Para 2.8, 10.4-10.5	Requested definition – ancillary rural earthworks: Do not include	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 10.1	Requested definition – edge effects: Do not include	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.4 Section 7	Definition – improved pasture: Should be retained as notified	The s42A report accepts the recommendation

<sup>10</sup> DPR-0471.002 D & K Calder, R Jamison & R Reed<sup>11</sup> DPR-0471.002 D & K Calder, R Jamison & R Reed<sup>12</sup> DPR-0422.295 FFNC, DPR-0471.002 D & K Calder, R Jamison & R Reed



Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel		
	Para 2.3 Section 6	Amend definition – indigenous biodiversity: <i>Indigenous biodiversity is biodiversity that is naturally occurring anywhere in New Zealand. It includes all New Zealand's ecosystems, indigenous vegetation, indigenous fauna, and the habitats of indigenous flora and fauna.</i>	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.5 Section 8	Definition – indigenous fauna: <i>Should be retained as notified</i>	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.3 Section 5	Amend definition – indigenous vegetation: <i>A naturally occurring plant community containing plant species that are native to the area.</i>	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.6 Section 9	Amend definition – indigenous vegetation clearance: <i>The clearing, modification, or removal of indigenous vegetation by any means, including over-grazing, cutting, crushing, cultivation, spraying, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stop banking, overplanting, over sowing, or burning.</i>	The s42A report accepts the recommendation in part. Dr Lloyd supports the amended definition that refers to artificial drainage and adds trampling, shading and invasion as mechanisms of vegetation clearance.
	Para 2.8, 10.6-10.7	Requested definition – native grasslands: <i>Do not include</i>	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.7 Section 9	Include a new definition – over grazing: <i>Over-grazing/trampling means the practice of confining farm stock to an area of land resulting in the depletion or destruction of indigenous vegetation by intensive grazing and/or trampling</i>	This report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.7 Section 9	Include a new definition – over-planting: <i>Over-planting means the planting of exotic plants into an area of indigenous vegetation.</i>	This report recommends that the definition be included
	Para 2.7 Section 9	Include a new definition – over-sowing: <i>Over-sowing means the over-sowing of exotic seeds on land that cannot be proven to have been over-sown in the past as part of a farming operation</i>	This report recommends that the definition be included
	Para 2.8, 10.8-10.9	Requested definition – oversowing and topdressing of native grasslands: <i>Do not include</i>	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.8, 10.2-10.3	Requested definition – regular cycle: <i>Do not include</i>	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.11	Amend definition – significant natural area:	The s42A report accepts the recommendation

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel		
	Para 14.1-14.3	An area identified as meeting the criteria set out in ECO-SCHED1 for determining significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitat of indigenous fauna, or an area listed in ECO-SCHED4 - Significant Natural Areas	
	Para 2.2 Section 4	Overview – braided rivers and limestone outcrops warrant specific consideration	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.2 Section 4	Overview – the role of indigenous vegetation in providing natural solutions to climate change can be added	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.2 Section 4	Overview – the list of protected areas in the high country can be expanded, with this section amended to note intact natural sequences and an almost unbroken sequence of public conservation land from the Main Divide to the eastern foothills	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.1 Para 3.1	Policy ECO-P5 should refer to specified indigenous vegetation, habitats and species above the area thresholds identified in ECO-SCHED3, and to a list of Threatened and At Risk plant species if required	The s42A report recommends that ECO-P5 be deleted. Dr Lloyd agrees that if the amended ECO-P4 includes unscheduled significant areas, ECO-P5 is not required.
	Para 2.9 Section 11	Improve the permitted clearance framework	Dr Lloyd considers that the redrafted rule is much simpler, but would benefit from a few improvements such as detailed elsewhere in this table.
	Para 11.3	ECO-R1.4 as notified does not provide an exemption for vegetation that is regenerating after previous lawful clearance, or regenerating on land previously clear of indigenous vegetation, but this could be considered	Dr Lloyd considers this is still required, and not sufficiently addressed by RC3.1. A new ECO-RC.3.1.p is therefore proposed in this report.
	Para 11.17	In particular, the provision in ECO-R1.6f to clear indigenous vegetation in an SNA to remove a potential fire risk comprises a loophole that could allow considerable clearance of SNA values. This reference to fire risk should be removed. There also needs to be area or other thresholds for vegetation	Dr Lloyd considers that clearance for the safe operation and maintenance of important infrastructure would be inclusive of fire risk, so there is no need to specify it separately.



Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel		
		clearance under EIB-R1.6a-c, so that maintenance, repair, and replacement activities do not result in loss of the significant values of SNAs. Commonly, permitted clearance of SNA vegetation for maintenance of linear features such as fences and farm tracks is restricted to a narrow corridor along the feature.	This report therefore recommends an amendment to ECO-RD.3.f. Dr Lloyd remains concerned about provisions allowing replacement of existing structures, as there is no requirement for replacement to be within the footprint of the existing structure. This report therefore recommends amendments to each of ECO-RC.3 and ECO-RD.3.
	Para 11.18-11.19	An exemption could be provided for vegetation clearance outside SNAs and outside vegetation/habitats listed in SCHED3. A tentative exemption is suggested below: Clearance of indigenous vegetation from areas that within the last ten years, have been cultivated or clear of such vegetation, provided that the clearance is associated with a permitted land use.	Dr Lloyd considers this is still required, and not sufficiently addressed by RC3.1. A new ECO-RC.3.1.p is therefore proposed in this report.
	Para 11.22	Uncultivated land can generally be clearly distinguished, due to the persistence of original braided channel landforms. The proposed ECO-R1.24 is supported.	Dr Lloyd considers that landholders may not perceive uncultivated land to be potentially important, so it is worth including this aspect. An amendment to ECO-SCHED3 is therefore proposed in this report.
	Section 12	Recommended amendments to ECO-SCHED3	Dr Lloyd considers that the retention of ECO-SCHED3 as a guide to potential SNAs, similar to the requested threatened and at-risk species list, would be helpful for the reasons expressed in para 12.3 of his evidence
	Para 2.10	ECO-SCHED3 – Adjustment to the area thresholds for some habitats are warranted	The s42A report accepts the recommendation
	Para 2.10	ECO-SCHED3 – inclusion of new descriptions for the ‘Canterbury plains’ is warranted	Dr Lloyd considers this would still be helpful, and so an amendment to ECO-

Paragraph or Plan reference	Question from the Hearings Panel		
			<i>SCHED3 is proposed in this report</i>
	<i>Para 2.10</i>	<i>ECO-SCHED3 – inclusion of new descriptions for cushion and mat communities is warranted</i>	<i>The s42A report accepts the recommendation</i>
	<i>Para 2.12 Section 14</i>	<i>Amend ECO-SCHED4 to include two new SNAs suggested by CRC</i>	<i>The s42A report accepts the recommendation</i>
	<i>Para 2.10 Section 13</i>	<i>A list of Threatened and At Risk plant species could be scheduled</i>	<i>The s42A report accepts the recommendation</i>