



Notes for:	SDC Ecosystems & Indigenous Biodiversity Working Group –District Plan Review			Date:	1 Nov 2017
Meeting held at:	Darfield Service Centre 1 South Terrace, Darfield				
Time:	3pm-6.15pm			Room:	Meeting Room 1b
Name	Inits	Title/Role	Name	Inits	Title/Role
Members:					
Murray Lemon	ML	Chair (Councillor SDC)	Stephanie Styles	SS	Planning Consultant (Boffa Miskell)
Ben Rhodes	BR	S & P Team Leader SDC	Cathy Begley	CB	Federated Farmers
Andrew Mactier	AM	S & P Planner SDC	Peter Graham	PG	Landowner
Andrew Spanton	AS	Biodiversity Co-ordinator SDC	James Guild	JG	Landowner
Jennifer Miller	JM	Forest & Bird Regional	Jane Doogue	JD	Environment Canterbury
Scott Pearson	SP	Fish & Game NZ	Hilary Riordan	HR	Student Planner SDC
Ken Murray	KM	Department of Conservation	Tina Van der Velde	TV	District Plan Administrator SDC
Jenny Ladley	JL	Landowner (University Canterbury)			
Absent:					
Lizzie Thomson	LT	Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd	Hamish Rennie	HR	Waihora Ellesmere Trust
Sam Leonard	SL	Environment Canterbury	Carol Jensen	CJ	Ecologist
TBC		Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga	TBC		Te Taumutu Rūnanga



Agenda:

Item #	Item	Lead
1.0	Health and safety briefing, Introductions.	AM / All
2.0	A brief summary of the District Plan Review process and timeframes.	AM
3.0	A recap of the Working Group and its purpose etc	AM
4.0	A brief discussion on the Working Group Terms of Reference, and an opportunity to identify errors or areas for enhancement/clarification.	AM
5.0	Discussion on future workshops/meetings and timings etc. (incl. the field trip).	AM
6.0	Finishing up with a presentation on the statutory/planning context.	SS

Notes:

1.0 Health and safety briefing, Introductions:

AM: Explained Darfield Service Centre evacuation procedures and building health and Safety.

Round the table introductions.

2.0 A brief summary of the District Plan Review process and timeframes:

AM: Spoke to his 'Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Working Group' PowerPoint presentation which was circulated to members via e-mail prior to the meeting.

AM: Informed members about District Plan Review Process with timeline & explained planning provisions to notification.

3.0 A recap of the Working Group and its purpose:

AM: Acknowledged receptiveness of members towards working group.

JG: Questioned the role of membership of working group and asked if this is Councils method of 'consulting' all affected?

A.M & SS: Clarified the working group will have the role of working through relevant issues and making recommendations to the DPC on:

- A preferred approach for managing ecosystem and indigenous vegetation issues for inclusion within the proposed District Plan when that is notified.
- Any non-regulatory actions that could assist Selwyn District Council (SDC) meeting its statutory obligations concerning ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity.



AM: Explained membership of District Plan Committee (DPC) & members- elected Councillors, Runanga and Environment Canterbury Councillor. As per Terms of Reference (ToR) A.M will report back to DPC (likely to report back quarterly) to keep DPC informed of progress and issues arising during working group process & any amendments to the ToR.

CB: Questioned statutory authority of working group?

SS: Clarified no statutory authority, everyone in working group still has rights to lodge submissions and appeal decisions through 1st Schedule RMA process.

4.0 A brief discussion on the Working Group Terms of Reference, and an opportunity to identify errors or areas for enhancement/clarification:

Working group is guided by ToR and other statutory documents listed on slide 6 of Presentation.

SS: Working Group approach is based on Timaru District Council working Group that is looking at the same issues. Timaru DC have agreed on very simple package of rules. Working group members were encouraged to learn of this.

Chair: Asked working group whether they have any issues in regards to ToR and composition of working group and reminded group if any amendments to ToR must be put forward to DPC.

CB: Based on her experience with a similar process associated with the Waikato River catchment, suggested information is delivered and recorded in an open and honest way to try and achieve unanimous decision and if not that it is recorded as to why.

Chair / AM / SS: Agreed and ensured all voices will be heard throughout the decision making process and information recorded.

SP: Questioned if any overlapping issues / topics arise that working group members have interests in for example Tourism can members discuss in working group forum?

SS/AM: Responded there will be times where topics overlap as this is a full District Plan Review and during meetings these can briefly be touched on but if it gets beyond main topic we can direct you to Topic lead.

Chair: Suggested every third meeting is a recap and identify links to other District plan review topics

AM: Will try and co-ordinate topics and work-streams.

JM: Questioned if there is a budget available to bring in expertise if required?

AM: Responded can accommodate this if there is something that needs to be followed up by a specialist this.

Chair / AM: Those who have concerns must articulate them. If not comfortable with discussion / composition please e-mail or phone A.M.

Chair: Noted this is not a public meeting but members are welcome to discuss progress and issues with outside parties for example networks and landowners - however do not identify individual working group member's opinions / decisions / issues (Chatham House rules – source of information may not be explicitly identified – leave names out).

CB: The Working Group great mandate to bounce feedback to/from with networks.



JG: Agreed that he would like the opportunity to discuss with his networks to talk about issues without attributing to certain members. Described that the DPR is relatively foreign to people who do not have a background in planning. Is encouraged that Timaru DC rules are two pages long and this is an opportunity to be “ground breaking”.

SS: Reiterated process. Once working group reaches agreement > endorsed by DPC > Notified > Submissions > Hearings > Appeals. The recommendations of this working group will go through a full process so no one member is accountable for ultimate decision.

Chair: Confirmed full process which will not come back to individuals.

5.0 Discussion on future workshops/meetings and timings etc. (incl. the field trip):

AM: Discussion of Future work programme / preference of venue –suggested Rolleston or Darfield?

Group: agreed to meet at Rolleston normally but can review as meetings progress.

AM: Also asked to think about dates/timing.

Chair: Suggested meetings to be held on third Wednesday of every month starting late afternoon.

CB: Expressed her preference of third Wed of every month but agreed dates will need to be circulated then confirmed & also requested at least a week -10days for reading material / documents to be circulated prior to meeting.

Working group members agreed with this statement.

AM: Discussed field trip (Slide 9) and gave a brief of each stop on the map -these are sites that Carol Jensen (Consultant Ecologist involved in Council's SNA assessment programme) has been involved in or is familiar with.

Round the table discussion regarding date: 29th of November is out for two members, but agreed that this date will continue.

JM: In regards to field trip JM discussed her interest in the on-going loss of biodiversity and prevention of this / halt of any loss?

CB: Questioned are we in an area of decline or improvement?

Discussion amongst members about going into high country also.

CB: Suggested two separated field trips one Plains and second high country as there is a lot to fit in. Suggested first field trip in the Plains and meeting at SDC after. Around Te Waihora?

KM: Discussed maybe Iwi issues / waterway issues at Te Waihora

JG: Every second meeting should be out in the field understanding the District and it will help discussion to get out into the districts to see biodiversity first-hand.

SP: Agreed with field trips –opportunity to meet landowners / bring expertise that we represent out on the field trip also?

Chair asked A.M if we can accommodate above suggestion for more than one field trip?

AM: Is possible SS: Part meeting / part field.

AM: Will amend current itinerary

AM: Significant Natural Areas (SNA) assessments Timaru has done all – SDC less than 10%.

JM: Asked about state of environment in SD, would like to see some data.



CB: Requires platform to go by / information that helps provide a picture of where we are today.

PG: Would like to see quantitative details / measurement in hectares.

A.M: Advised data is there just a matter of collating it?

Chair: Parked above discussion as getting too much into the detail would like to stick to high level conversation for this meeting.

4.30pm –Break

Resumed – 5.12pm

AM: Spoke to his presentation of the Definition of Biodiversity.

Clarified indigenous = Native (Slide 10).

6.0 Finishing up with a presentation on the statutory/planning context:

SS: Spoke to her Presentation: Resource Management Act (RMA) –Purpose of what we are doing here today. Section 6 the keyword being Significant.

PG: Questioned Section 7 of RMA why the protection of the habitat of trout and salmon vs other animals? SS: Answered It is part of the Act so we are held to that.

SS: Explained the RMA and section 31 Functions of the District Council Slides 11-15.

JM: Asked whether Council(s) understand what s31 of the Act means and does the SDP address this?

AM: Noted that the District Plan may not necessarily give effect to section 31, but many aspects of Council's work programmes (across various Council departments) are more than just giving effect to section 6(c) matters .

CB: Reiterated the statutory presentation and that there seems to be limited wriggle room.

SS: RPS sets methods for DP's including objectives & policies to identify and protect Significant Natural Areas (SNAs). They may include methods to identify and protect SNAs and must include rules on clearance of indigenous vegetation.

Touched on RPS as a baseline, you have to have an appropriate rule.

Discussed other Local Council DPR progress for South Island and gave examples / comparisons of achieving requirements differently / setting out different rules to meet local requirements for SNAs.

Environment Canterbury will determine if the solution reached fits the RPS.

Current District Plan has criteria that were included before Regional Policy Statement (RPS) were made operative so the Selwyn criteria do not match the RPS.

JD: Advised Regional Biodiversity Strategy is in early stages of review.

SS: Purpose & Constraints. Maintain, restore, enhance - the Council cannot make people do this through the DP.

KM: Suggested there may be incentives in the DP for people to maintain, restore, enhance?

JM: Questioned what monitoring & enforcing does the Council do through DP?

And asked if there was a report available to show stats on previous/ current monitoring and enforcement?

AM: Will look into it.

BR: Agrees that it is important for monitoring and enforcing to take place by Council to adhere to rules DP sets out.



JM: Asked if individual submissions to the Long Term Plan / Annual Plan are fine from working group members? SS & AM: Answered Yes but not from this group.

JM: Questioned GIS capacity can another layer be built on for SNAs or is this available on Canterbury maps?

Chair / B.R / AM: Yes can build onto GIS, can look into this.

SS: SNA Assessment process starting point - SNA identified vs not identifying SNA. Unknown is where general rules come in. Group to make recommendations on the appropriate approach.

SNA information provided on slide is a starting point and provided to members so members have time to think about it.

Chair: Confirmed this is a starting point

SS: Gave an example of proposed rule that may be set in Timaru DP: Habitat being maintained- Bat protection in exotic vegetation in Timaru – cannot cut down trees that provide a roosting site.

AM: Similar example in Selwyn may be man-made water race network

PG: Touched on lesson to be made after Port Hill fires e.g. fences –Fire risk.

Closing:

Chair: A.M to circulate Field Trip itinerary and draft notes for corrections.

Question on what month in the New Year we should aim for first meeting.

Consensus was February as given the time frame the third week of March will be well into the work year.

Chair: Thanked working group.

6.15pm Meeting concluded.

Action Table:

Team Member	Action
AM	Circulate Field Trip Details
AM	Circulate Dates for subsequent meetings
AM / BR	Look into monitoring and enforcement report
Group	Make a decision in regards to SNAs to identify or not?