



Notes for:	SDC Ecosystems & Indigenous Biodiversity Working Group –District Plan Review			Date:	13 December 2018
Meeting held at:	SDC Head Quarters, 2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston				
Time:	2.09pm-3.20pm			Room:	Executive 1
Name	Initials	Title/Role	Name	Initials	Title/Role
Working Group Members present:					
Murray Lemon	Chair	Chair (Councillor SDC)	Sefeti Erasito	SE	Te Taumutu Rūnanga
Ben Rhodes	BR	Strategy & Policy Team Leader SDC	Julia Forsyth	JF	Environment Canterbury
Nicky Snoyink	NS	Forest & Bird	Peter Graham	PG	Landowner
Scott Pearson	SP	Fish & Game NZ	Hamish Rennie	HR	Landowner/ Waihora Ellesmere Trust
Jenny Ladley	JL	Landowner (University Canterbury)	Ken Murray	KM	Department of Conservation
In Attendance					
Stephanie Styles	SS	Planning Consultant (Boffa Miskell Ltd)	Andrew Mactier	AM	Strategy & Policy Planner SDC
Natasha Brown	NB	District Plan Review Administrator	Scott Hooson	SH	Consultant Ecologist (Boffa Miskell Ltd)
Apologies					
Sam Leonard	SL	Environment Canterbury	Elisha Young-Ebert	EYE	Federated Farmers
James Guild	JG	Landowner			

Notes:

The Chair opened the meeting at 2.09pm.

1. Follow up from last meeting



The Chair welcomed the Working Group (WG) and thanked them for attendance and participation and associated outputs.

Apologies received from JG, SL (Environment Canterbury) and EYE (Federated Farmers). JF will represent Environment Canterbury in SL's place this meeting. Outstanding matters discussed. and homework. Feedback on homework was appreciated. No issues raised in relation to the minutes of the last meeting and these were approved.

2. Outstanding matters

AM acknowledged the time and effort particularly from landowners (possibly longer than anticipated). Asked the WG for their thoughts.

Received late feedback from KM in relation to the mudfish and eel maps, which will be circulated to the WG for feedback.

- Resolution of mudfish and eel maps issues, including:
 - Proposed refined rule,
 - Drain/water race management plan template,
 - Whether there is a need for a significance assessment for the Eel sites
 - Buffer distance

SH asked for clarification about significance assessment. A number of water-races and drains have been identified with possible eels present in Council network, is it a case of just identifying or is an ecological assessment required? It is possibly not an issue for mudfish. Data supplied for eels differs, and riparian are subject to other rules.

AM to arrange meeting to finalise rule(s) and associated maps (meeting with interested parties, including DoC, Ecan, Te Taumutu and SDC scheduled for 11/02/2018).

- Crested Grebe willow clearance timeframes

Supplementary feedback from JL whether direct drilling is method rather than digger.

KM suggested any disturbance has an impact on bird nesting. JL commented it impacts on few people.

SS responded land ownership is irrelevant if group considers there is a need to protect crested grebe habitat.

JL and KM said it is needed. Vast majority do not impact on private owners.

BR commented rule looks good.

WG agreed with the approach and the rule as currently worded. Rule 7. Clearance would capture spraying.



SH asked if lakes come under definition of wetland. SS responded it is about specific lakes in the district. No issue about flood protection trees planted.

- Policy 12 terminology (BR/SE)

Policy related to the Rūnanga. Policy 12. Correct terminology is “Nga” Rūnanga.

- Canterbury Plains plant spp. list (and associated rules)

AS and SH discussed this and determined a pragmatic solution. Clearance in improved pastures permitted, except uncultivated areas of plains where clearance is non-compliant.

SS added that a rule would capture this. Rule 2 – sub rule 8 and 10.

Recommended not having a list but favourable to having simple rules. Priority area for Council to engage with landowners.

WG agrees that outstanding matters noted above are now resolved. .

- Other Working Group homework matters
 - Introduction;
 - Appendix 2 (Biodiversity Management Plan)
 - Appendix 4 (spp. Lists A & B);
 - Assessment Matters;
 - Other?

SS noted that the feedback has largely been incorporated into circulated draft, such as JL comments on introduction. Comments that SL provided on BMP included also.

Federated Farmers Feedback

Federated Farmers provided extensive comments and these were circulated to the WG. EYE was not in attendance to discuss these.

It is noted that this has been a complex process, the framework has evolved and is now considerably clearer. There has been scope in the process for items to be re-discussed – if needed during the meetings.

The Chair commented that where decisions has been made, it is noted who has supported/opposed. There is always an opportunity for people to have their views understood and noted. Value of the WG is to understand where any disagreement is. In terms of timing, feedback was not included in the draft.

BR questioned if it will form part of information to go to Council? Suggested the intention of the feedback received should be clearer.

The Chair added, the view of the group will be presented.



KM commented that we need to get something out to the Community for discussion as a broad overview consistent with statutory documentation.

AM commented on further engagement. ToR talk about developing an engagement plan. Key stakeholders are part of the WG, and asked WG was there any other groups the WG feels we need to engage with? Public engagement exercise had varying levels of engagement.

EYE in the feedback suggested there may be other landowners unaware.

BR commented that this group provides a fair representation of community. Notification of this will then provide opportunity for public to submit on it.

The Chair commented that this working group is unique and the only topic type to be going through this process.

HR added people outside of groups (such as Federated Farmers), it might be useful to provide 'forewarning'.

BR suggested recommendation of the group could be clear communications. There are provisions in the Plan now, perhaps in communications leading up to notification might be targeted so it is not a shock in 2020.

HR mentioned landowners with less than 10ha of land (not covered by Farm management plans) in particular.

PG added a comment on the high turnover of people owning 4ha blocks.

AM suggested that further engagement with any small landowners group the Council becomes aware of, along with other landowner groups the Council has become aware of during the course of the Plan Review process (such as Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture) could be included in further engagement post the WG's recommendation being taken to the District Plan Committee (DPC).

- **General discussion on v2.0 draft**

AM noted that a legal review will be completed through the normal course of the Plan Review process.

3. Should the group have another meeting?:

The WG was asked whether an additional Working Group Meeting was needed, prior to Final Draft Chapter going back to DPC in May 2019. Purpose would be to hear back on any matters still subject to debate (such as refinement of mudfish/eel maps and any other outstanding matters). The alternative is the WG does not meet again (in its current format/purpose) but makes recommendations to include various matters in the draft Plan 'in principle', and that Plan drafters continue to work on the issues in the background to give effect to the recommendations.



The WG was asked for their feedback whether an additional meeting was required, and whether they are happy for an executive summary to be distributed in late January.

AM summarised, it is a preferred option for further work. Workshop with the DPC is scheduled for May so that any outstanding matters still subject to final tidying up, or matters that the DPC identify for further work can be reported back on.

PG commented that in most cases a majority view has been held and minority view has been respected. Noted that the feedback received from Federated Farmers was designed for staff and the DPC rather than to relitigate through the WG, the issues have already been discussed. PG wishes this to be the last meeting.

Chair suggested we continue on as 'implementation advisory group'.

JL would like to be kept up with developments but happy for project team to continue.

SE would like a chance to feedback to Taumutu, but happy for project team to lead this.

BR agrees with PG, discussion via email is fine.

SP would like to have another meeting, as new ideas have been introduced by Federated Farmers and commented that it would be good to get a collaborative view on drains.

NS commented it would be good to have a discussion, however, people can feedback via email if needed.

JF also agreed with email feedback.

KM commented on mudfish drains. Would provide feedback also.

HR happy with an ongoing discussion.

The Chair summarised, if everyone is kept in the loop and enough discussion for another meeting then at that point a meeting can be made. The WG agreed.

4. Working Group (Draft) Recommendation to District Plan Committee

The Biodiversity Working Group recommends that the District Plan Committee:

- a) Accept and endorse the recommended chapter presented by the Working Group for further refinement and integration with other District Plan Review topics.***

AM commented on the integration of topics. For example, the water topic has a direct relationship with vegetation and ecosystems. As does ONL. Integration will happen across topics.



There was unanimous agreement from the WG for this recommendation.

- b) *Endorse a parallel process that investigates the feasibility of an alternative to the proposed improved pasture definition to assist in managing and protecting indigenous biodiversity.***

PG asked for clarification in wording, whilst the process is endorsed however it is not an endorsement of the outcome. Parallel process is to go to DPC for approval or non approval, as captured in the minutes.

BR questioned how will the general philosophy be presented.

AM responded that it would likely be a high level summary and presentation of the issues associated with the current definition and implementation of the improved pasture definition, and a summary of the proposed alternative proposal presented by Fish and Game. The presentation at the February DPC Meeting would be to provide a brief understanding of the issue (3-4 slides with maps of issues with improved pasture interpretation).

JL asked about the implications of the WG if the parallel process is endorsed.

The Chair commented it is only an alternative way of protecting vegetation. Recommendations will need to be brought back to Council. The Chair added, it is not the final signoff.

PG asked for clarification.

AM commented on the process. Endorsement is of the process – *to investigate the feasibility of an alternative to the proposed improved pasture definition*, not the outcome. Any subsequent changes/decisions to proceed to an actual variation would have to be taken back to DPC/Council for them to make a decision on.

Unanimous agreement from the WG for this recommendation.

- c) *Subject to the development of amended 'Biodiversity Working Group Terms of Reference', support the continuation of the Biodiversity Working Group to support Council with the implementation of indigenous biodiversity related initiatives.***

The Chair commented there may be a group that wishes to continue and whether there is interest/value in doing this. AS has been successfully lobbying internally at Council for biodiversity resourcing (initiatives and incentives). There could be other avenues to guide Council. A strategy may be necessary to manage biodiversity, which would be good to have stakeholder engagement. The Chair added that we value the biodiversity sphere in a number of ways, by enhancing biodiversity and assisting landowners in doing this.



JF mentioned that Timaru District Council is doing similar and exploring bringing on other private partners/stakeholders. GDC for example has a small contestable fund.

HR mentioned that he would potentially replace his position on the WG with a colleague (Denise).

AM mentioned possibly including LINZ, Te ara Kakariki etc, and asked the WG for suggestions.

SS added it could be conduits for conversations and feedback loops.

The Chair commented that he is keen to keep momentum going and is enthused by what has been achieved by the group.

Unanimous agreement from the WG for this recommendation.

PG commented that there needs to be specific issues to meet about, rather than meeting for meetings sake.

HR agrees with PG.

Meeting closed at 3.20pm.



Action register

Item #	Item	By Who	By When	Status
1.0	Working Group members to provide feedback to SS on elevations and slopes maps for the Selwyn District. (N.B to circulate maps via email).	All	31 October 2018	COMPLETE
2.0	SS to work with HR on riparian permitted activity detail	SS & HR	21 November 2018	COMPLETE
3.0	SS to work with SL on avoidance and overlap with ECAN provisions	SS & SL	21 November 2018	COMPLETE
4.0	SS to discuss farm environment plan alignment with the Zone Committee Facilitator	SS & Zone Committee Facilitator	21 November 2018	COMPLETE
5.0	KM to work with AM in regards to Maps and report back to Working Group whether it will form part of the package	KM & AM	21 November 2018	COMPLETE
6.0	KM to provide further detail (map) on grebes, mudfish and eels to the Working Group	KM	21 November 2018	COMPLETE