



**CENTRAL
HAWKE'S BAY**
DISTRICT COUNCIL

**REPORT OF HEARING
PANEL**

Independent Hearing Commissioners:

Robert Schofield (Chair)
Loretta Lovell
Tim Aitken
Kate Taylor
Pip Burne

TOPIC 6B

Natural Environment – SNA Mapping

REPORT DATED

4 May 2023

DATE OF HEARING

15 and 17 November 2022

Contents

PART A – PRELIMINARY MATTERS	1
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Scope of this report	1
1.2 Statutory considerations	1
1.3 Submissions	2
1.4 Procedural matters	2
1.5 Hearing	2
1.6 Structure of this report	3
PART B – EVALUATION	4
2 Key Issue 1 – General opposition to SNAs	4
2.1 Proposed plan provisions	4
2.2 Submissions	4
2.3 Reporting planner's recommendations (s42A report)	4
2.4 Evidence to the hearing	11
2.5 Post hearing information	11
2.6 Evaluation and findings	11
3 Key Issue 2 – Requests for SNAs to be deleted	17
3.1 Proposed plan provisions	17
3.2 Submissions	17
3.3 Reporting planner's recommendations (s42A report)	17
3.4 Evidence to the hearing	25
3.5 Post hearing information	25
3.6 Evaluation and findings	25
4 Key Issue 3 – Requests for SNAs to be amended	30
4.1 Proposed plan provisions	30
4.2 Submissions	30
4.3 Reporting planner's recommendations (s42A report)	30
4.4 Evidence to the hearing	33
4.5 Post hearing information	33
4.6 Evaluation and findings	33
PART C – SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	34
5 Summary of recommendations	34

6	Consequential amendments and minor errors	34
	Appendix A – Chapter Maps and Eco Schedule 5 as Amended	1
	Appendix B – Summary of Recommendations on Submissions	3

List of Submitters and Further Submitters addressed in this Report

Submitter Name	Submission Number(s)
AJ & MA Smith Family Trust	S22
Andy & Robbie Hunt	S69
Ben & Libby Tosswill	S113
Ben Anderson	S44
Carlyon Station Limited	S83
Claire Bradley	S47
Claire Murphy	S63
Curt & Tricia Zant	S99
David Severinsen	S133
Ernslaw One Limited	S132
Evan & Linda Potter	S65
GH Williams Trust	S72
Hadley Boyle	S9
IA & PD Waldrom	S6
Jane Davidson	S16
Joanne & Kenneth Scholfield	S60
Kairākau Lands Trust (KLT)	S84
Karl Tipene	S59
Lance de Malmanche	S40
Mark and Lucy Lowry	S35
Matthew von Dadelszen	S96
N. M. Riddell Family Trust Farm	S51
Pairatahi Holdings Ltd	S92
Paul Robottom	S68
Rodney Bremer	S61
Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuaia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd	S86
Sam Bradley	S53
Samuel Bradley	S108
Sandra Phillips	S34
Sandy Hill Farms Limited	S103
Scott Hunter	S21
Senlac Station Ltd	S32
Te Mata Mushrooms Land Company Limited (Te Mata Mushrooms)	S102
The C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm	S52
The Surveying Company (HB) Ltd (The Surveying Company)	S50
Tylee Land Co & Terawini Land Co	S7
Wade Stoddart	S49
Waipuna NZ Ltd	S95
Waipuna NZ Ltd	S111

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Number(s)
Ngā hapu me ngā marae o Tamatea (NHMT)	FS5

PART A – PRELIMINARY MATTERS

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope of this report

- 1.1.1 This document details the evaluation and recommended decisions of the Proposed Central Hawke’s Bay District Plan Hearings Panel on the submissions and evidence considered at the Mapping, Rezoning and Miscellaneous topic hearing, held on 15 and 17 November, at the CHBDC Chambers, Waipawa. Specifically, this report addressed submissions on the mapping of Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) in the PDP.
- 1.1.2 The recommendations in this report, together with all of the other recommendations of the Hearing Panel (“the Panel”) on submissions on the PDP, will all go before the full Council following the end of the hearings, who will make the formal decisions.
- 1.1.3 Our report focuses on the key issues in contention. Where there is no contention, such as submitter support for certain provisions, or minor matters where proposed changes are recommended in response to submissions, we have adopted the s42A report’s recommendations and the underlying evaluation behind such changes.

1.2 Statutory considerations

- 1.2.1 The Panel’s Preliminary Report sets out the statutory framework and requirements for preparing a District Plan, as well as case law guidance for our consideration and recommendations. This framework shall not be repeated in this report, and this report should be read in conjunction with our Preliminary Report
- 1.2.2 This report will refer to the Section 42A report ‘Officers Report: Natural Environment – SNA Mapping’ prepared by Ms Tiffany Gray.
- 1.2.3 As submissions on particular aspects of the PDP are considered through hearing reports, officers are required to consider any alternative provisions put forward in the context of what s 32 requires, and when changes are recommended, a further assessment under s 32AA will be provided if the change is a material departure from what was notified. That same obligation to make a further assessment under s 32AA also applies to the Panel if it decides to recommend changes as a result of submissions which materially depart from the notified version.
- 1.2.4 Through Minute #5, the Panel urged submitters to provide the hearings with a further assessment under s 32AA for any changes to the PDP they were seeking.
- 1.2.5 Where we have made amendments to the PDP that are consistent with the recommendations contained within Council officers’ section 42A and / or right-of-reply reports (and where there are relevant joint witness statements) we have adopted the section 32AA analysis contained within those reports (unless expressly stated otherwise). Those reports are part of the public record and are available on the CHBDC website.
- 1.2.6 Where we have made amendments to the PDP that are not contained within Council officers’ recommendations, we have undertaken the required section 32AA analysis and have incorporated it into the body of our report. We are satisfied that the required substantive assessment has been undertaken.

1.3 Submissions

- 1.3.1 This topic report addresses submission points that relate to the mapping and identification of SNAs.
- 1.3.2 There are 41 submission points to the scheduling and mapping of SNAs, and one further submission received.
- 1.3.3 There were no submission points in complete support of the mapping of SNAs in the PDP.
- 1.3.4 Of the 41 submission points received, 7 submission points request that ECO-SCHED-5 / mapping be amended to more accurately reflect individual boundaries of SNAs. The remaining 34 submitters either oppose the concept of SNAs in the PDP as a whole and /or oppose SNAs on their property being included in ECO-SCHED-5 / and or included on the planning maps.
- 1.3.5 For analysis purposes the 41 submissions and 1 further submission have been divided into the following main groups:
- General opposition to SNAs;
 - Removed specific mapped SNAs; and
 - Amend the mapped boundaries of the identified SNA.
- 1.3.6 This report should be read in conjunction with the Panel Report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity (Report 1B), which addressed the PDP provisions on Significant Natural Areas.

1.4 Procedural matters

- 1.4.1 There were no pre-hearing meetings or meetings undertaken in accordance with clause 8AA of Schedule 1, undertaken on the submissions relating to mapping and rezoning requests prior to the finalisation of the s42A report. No further consultation with any parties regarding these SNA Mapping has been undertaken since circulation of the s42A report.
- 1.4.2 No matters of trade competition were raised.

1.5 Hearing

- 1.5.1 The hearings were held on 15 and 17 November 2022 at the CHBDC Chambers, Waipawa. The hearing was adjourned at the end of 17 November 2022.
- 1.5.2 Submitters who appeared at the hearing, and the topics under which their evidence is discussed, are shown below in Table 1. All evidence can be found on the PDP Hearing Schedule webpage under the relevant Hearing Topic [[Hearing Stream 6 | Central Hawke's Bay District Council \(chbdc.govt.nz\)](https://chbdc.govt.nz)].

Table 1. Submitters who appeared at Hearing Stream 6: Rezoning Requests, ECO-SCHED5 and Mapping of Significant Natural Areas, General Mapping, Part 1 Introduction and General Provisions, and Miscellaneous /Other Matters in relation to Mapping of Significant Natural Areas topics

Submitter (Submitter Number)	Represented by/ experts called	Nature of evidence	Topics under which evidence is discussed
Tylee Land Co & Terawini Land Co (S7.001)	Jane and Matt Tylee	Written statement	Key Issue 2
Pairatahi Holdings Limited (S92), Paul Robottom (S68) and the	Ellen Robotham	Written statement	Key Issue 1, 2

C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm (S52)			
Mark and Lucy Lowry (Taikura Station)	Annabel Beattie	Written statement	Key Issue 2
Jane Davidson (S16)	Jane Davidson	Written statement	Key Issue 3

1.5.3 Ms Tiffany Gray, Reporting Officer, appeared for the CHBDC.

1.5.4 Evidence provided by Ms Gray included:

- Section 42A Report on the SNA Mapping; and
- Opening statement (verbal).

1.5.5 Following the adjournment of the hearing on 17 November 2022, a written right-of-reply from the Council's reporting planner was received and circulated on 9 December 2022.

1.6 Structure of this report

1.6.1 This report is structured in alignment with the structure of the s42A report. Submissions on miscellaneous matters are grouped under the following Key Issue headings as follows:

- Key Issue 1: General Opposition to SNAs;
- Key Issue 2: Requests for SNAs to be deleted; and
- Key Issue 3: Requests for SNAs to be amended.

PART B – EVALUATION

2 Key Issue 1 – General opposition to SNAs

2.1 Proposed plan provisions

2.1.1 This section addresses the submissions in general opposition to SNAs.

2.2 Submissions

2.2.1 There were 19 original submission points addressing this matter, and 1 further submission point (refer to Appendix B for a table of submission points).

2.2.2 Submitters raised concerns regarding SNAs on Māori land, private land, within QEII National Trust covenants, as well as questions relating to fencing, public access and safety, ground-truthing, future development, and the effects of drought.

2.2.3 Several of these issues were addressed in the Hearing on the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter held on 14 March 2022 as part of Hearing Stream 1, and our evaluation and recommendations on those issues are presented in Panel Report 1B.

2.2.4 As submitters' concerns regarding specifically mapped SNAs were often interrelated with broader issues, these broader issues were re-addressed in Hearing Stream 6 as part of the hearing into submissions on SNA mapping where they were directly relevant to the mapping issues. These broader issues were addressed so that the submitters can be reassured that their concerns and questions were fully recognised and answered.

2.3 Reporting planner's recommendations (s42A report)

Māori Land and SNAs

2.3.1 The issue of SNAs on Māori land was addressed in the hearing on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity under Hearing Stream 1. In the s42A report on the matter, the reporting planner stated at paragraphs 6.3.20 – 6.3.21:

However, Council is also required to recognise and provide for other section 6 matters of national importance, which has resulted in the introduction of a number of other layers and associated provisions in the PDP including:

- *the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment, wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development (s6(a)),*
- *the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development (s6(b)), and*
- *the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna (s6(c)).*

In the PDP, the above matters have resulted in identification and mapping of the coastal environment itself (a requirement under the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement), and mapping of areas of High Natural Character, Outstanding Natural Features & Landscapes and SNAs. Each of these is accompanied by their own set of provisions in the PDP contained in the CE

– Coastal Environment chapter, NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, and the ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter, respectively.

Where any development is proposed within these identified sensitive areas, including the development of housing for Māori on residual lands owned by Māori, it is appropriate to consider all relevant matters of national importance under section 6 RMA, including section 6(a), (b), (c), as well as section 6(e).

Thus, with respect to the specific landholdings referenced by Ngāti Kere Hapū Authority (Puketauhinu Trust land at the Pōrangahau River mouth and Blackhead Village site at Parimahu) a case would need to be made through the resource consent process at the time of development that weighed up all the relevant matters, including Council's section 6 and 7 responsibilities. In my view it is appropriate that if development takes place in a sensitive environmental area, it is scrutinised via a resource consent pathway that allows all matters to be considered.

Whilst I do not consider a specific rule is necessary, I do consider inclusion of additional assessment matters in Assessment Matters ECO-AM1 and ECO-AM2 as sought by S125.075 Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea, that take into account this specific situation of development of ancestral land, would provide for this matter to be given due regard when assessing a resource consent of this nature. I note this submitter has not provided any suggested wording, however if the Hearings Panel are of a view to include additional assessment matters, I suggest the following wording (or similar) to achieve the outcome sought by these submitters:

ECO-AM1 Removal of Manuka or Kanuka

1. ...

13. Whether the indigenous vegetation or habitat is on Māori land proposed for development, and the effects of that development on the indigenous vegetation or habitat.

ECO-AM2 Trimming and Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation

1. ...

12. Whether the indigenous vegetation or habitat is on Māori land proposed for development, and the effects of that development on the vegetation or habitat.

With respect to an additional 'Other Method' as sought by S125.076 Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea for this purpose, no wording has been supplied and I am unsure what other methods might be helpful in assisting with addressing this issue in the manner sought. The submitter may wish to expand on this at the Hearing, however in the interim I recommend that this submission be rejected.

With respect to K Tipene's submission, for the reasons outlined in paragraphs 6.3.20 -6.3.25, I do not consider it appropriate to exclude development of Māori owned land from consideration if development is being sought in an area of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna. For this reason, I recommend that the submission from S59.004 K Tipene be rejected.

- 2.3.2 The reporting planner for this part of Hearing Stream 6 agreed with the analysis above and did support removing the SNA on Māori owned land with regard to the requirements of section 6(c) of the RMA. The reporting planner also noted that s6(e) required that Council should recognize and provide for 'the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga'. In the reporting planner's view, s6(e) established a particular obligation to make provision in the PDP for Māori to be able to use their land in ways that supported their relationships, culture and traditions at the same time as ensuring that there was an appropriate level of protection applied to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats.

- 2.3.3 Due to the reasons above and because each situation would be different and would depend on the particular circumstances of the SNA and the proposed activity, the reporting planner considered that some policy direction may be helpful and recommended the following policy:

Proposed new Policy ECO-P10

To enable the use and development of Māori land containing areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, that supports the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua, where such activities minimise adverse effects on any significant values of the vegetation or fauna habitat.

- 2.3.4 The reporting planner considered this policy would achieve the objectives and the anticipated environmental results of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter in addition to the enabling development provisions of the Papakāinga chapter.
- 2.3.5 If this new policy were adopted, the reporting planner recommended that S59.002 be accepted in part, but the reporting planner recommended rejecting the implied request to remove all SNAs from Māori land. The reporting planner also recommended rejecting S84.016 for the same reason, but noted it would be helpful if Mr Tipene, for NHMT, as well as KLT could provide their feedback on the new proposed policy ECO-P10 at the hearing.

SNAs on private land

- 2.3.6 Several submitters oppose SNAs on private land:
- Samuel Bradley S108.001;
 - Curt and Tricia Zant S99.001;
 - Sam Bradley S53.001;
 - Sandy Phillips S43.001;
 - Paul Robottom S68.001;
 - Claire Murphy S63.001;
 - Waipuna NZ Ltd S111.01; and
 - AJ & MA Smith Family Trust S22.001.
- 2.3.7 A number of submitters opposed to SNAs on their land submitted that identification of SNA in the PDP did not recognise their efforts and stewardship of the land, including their voluntary establishment of Queen Elizabeth II covenants (QEII covenants). The broad issue of the interrelationship between SNAs and QEII covenants was addressed in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity at paragraphs 7.3.4 – 7.3.17.
- 2.3.8 The reporting planner advised that the PDP seeks to balance private property rights and the need for rural landowners to farm and use their land efficiently and effectively while also identifying SNA for protection. The PDP accommodates a range of activities within these areas, with appropriate standards, so that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.
- 2.3.9 The reporting planner agreed with the conclusions in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, which, in summary acknowledged the importance of private property rights but considered it would not be appropriate to remove SNAs given the small amount of indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna remaining in the District.

QEII National Trust and other covenants

- 2.3.10 The following submitters opposed SNAs being identified where they are already protected by other covenants:

- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
- Evan & Linda Potter (S65.001); and
- Paul Robottom (S68.001).

2.3.11 Council's ecologist, in Appendix C of the s42A report, stated that "from a scientific point of view, SNA mapping of legally protected areas is required to allow for a complete inventory and understanding of the ecological values of a District; both unprotected and protected. In addition, in my experience, mapping SNAs over existing covenants allows for Council to understand the extent of protected significant natural areas versus unprotected areas. In turn, this allows for policy development based on a more robust scientific footing".

2.3.12 This matter of SNAs coexisting with covenants was addressed in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity. The author of that report stated that, where a landowner has both a covenant and a SNA, the identification of that SNA imposed no additional obligations. The PDP did not impose any additional regulation and removed any conflict through Rule ECO-R3(b)(iii) which allowed for activities to be carried out in accordance with such a Covenant as a permitted activity.

2.3.13 The reporting planner agreed with this analysis and conclusion and did not recommend acceptance that SNAs should not be removed where there was already an existing covenant.

Fencing requirements and track maintenance in SNAs

2.3.14 The following submitters expressed concern about how SNAs impact on fencing requirements and track maintenance:

- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
- Evan & Linda Potter (S65.001); and
- Paul Robottom (S68.001).

2.3.15 The reporting planner advised that the PDP did not require SNAs to be fenced. This issue was addressed in in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, which stated that "*the District Plan cannot compel actions such as fencing*". The reporting planner agreed with the analysis and conclusion in that report. She advised that the rules in the PDP that applied to the management of SNAs did not require any pro-active responses from landowners, and only came into play if somebody wished to undertake trimming or clearance of significant indigenous vegetation and / or significant habitats of indigenous fauna.

2.3.16 Given that SNAs are not required to be fenced and appropriate provisions were in place that allowed for fencing and track maintenance and construction, the reporting planner did not agree with the submitters' requests to remove SNAs on those bases.

Pest control

2.3.17 The following submitters expressed concern about pest control and management in SNAs:

- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
- Andy & Robbie Hunt (S69.001); and
- David Severinsen (S133.001).

- 2.3.18 The reporting planner advised that SNAs did not compel active management. The PDP did not prohibit or require resource consent to undertake pest or weed control of exotic or invasive species, and landowners (and others such as pest management agencies) would be able to continue to manage weeds in these areas. The PDP did not impose any additional requirements on landowners to manage weeds within SNAs, or to regenerate SNAs. For these reasons, the reporting planner did not agree with the submitter's requests to remove SNAs.

Grazing

- 2.3.19 The following submitters expressed concern about not being able to continue grazing in SNAs:
- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahua Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001); and
 - David Severinsen (S133.001).
- 2.3.20 The reporting planner advised that the PDP allowed for stock to continue grazing within SNAs and as stated above did not compel the fencing of these areas. For these reasons, the reporting planner did not agree with the submitters' requests to remove SNAs.

Public safety and access

- 2.3.21 The following submitters were concerned about public access and public safety within SNAs:
- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahua Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
 - Andy & Robbie Hunt (S69.001);
 - Curt and Tricia Zant (S99.001); and
 - Waipuna NZ Ltd (S111.001).
- 2.3.22 Waipuna NZ Ltd (S111.001) were concerned regarding people's safety in SNAs on their property and referenced Rule ECO-R3(1)(b)(iv). The reporting planner considered that this submitter had misinterpreted the rule incorrectly. She advised that this clause of Rule ECO-R3 allows DOC, HBRC or CHBDC to trim or clear indigenous vegetation within an SNA that may be required for pest control as a permitted activity. The rule provided RMA authorization for the activity but did not confer or infer any property rights to access private land. Further, the clause did not specify which bodies were responsible for pest control in SNAs. Proposed pest control operations on private land would be planned in the same manner as they currently were, including consultation with landowners.
- 2.3.23 The reporting planner also advised that the PDP did not allow for public access to SNAs, and access to private land remains within the control of the landowner and other legislation. The SNAs identified in the PDP are existing areas, and did not create new areas of indigenous vegetation. As such, simply mapping such areas in the PDP did not create any new right or expectation of access to private land. For these reasons, the reporting planner did not agree with the submitters' requests to remove SNAs.

Rates Relief and Financial Compensation or Financial Incentives

- 2.3.24 The following submitters questioned whether rates relief or financial compensation would be available for landowners with an SNA:
- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahua Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
 - Carlyon Station Limited (S83.001);

- Claire Bradley (S47.001);
- Andy & Robbie Hunt (S69.001);
- David Severinsen (S133.001);
- The Surveying Company (HB) Ltd (S50.004); and
- Hadley Boyle (S9.001).

2.3.25 The reporting planner advised that, while the PDP did seek to accommodate a wide range of activities within SNAs so that landowners could continue to use their land efficiently and effectively, she recognised that there were some constraints imposed on landowners with SNAs. This matter was addressed in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity in that *“the PDP does identify the possibility that Council may consider rates relief for landowners with SNA on their property as an ‘other method’ for achieving the policies of this chapter of the Plan (Refer ECO-M4(3)). Rates relief is however not determined and actioned through the District Plan, but is an ‘other method’ that can be considered in the future, as part of future rates reviews, should Council decide to do so”*.

2.3.26 The reporting planner also advised that the PDP had sought to provide a balance between its section 6(c) duties and incentivizing protection of these areas by allowing for lifestyle lots in association with the creation of a conservation lot that protects and area of 5000m² of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna. As addressed elsewhere in the s42A report, the reporting planner considered this approach is appropriate and accordingly she did not support the deletion of SNA mapping and associated rule framework in the PDP. The reporting planner therefore recommended this aspect of (S50.004) be rejected.

Methodology

2.3.27 The following submitters identified concerns about the methodology used to identify SNAs, including consultation that was undertaken with landowners and the need for ground-truthing:

- Evan & Linda Potter (S65.001);
- Claire Murphy S63.001; and
- Waipuna NZ Ltd (S111.001).

2.3.28 The reporting planner summarised the consultation process that had occurred, noting that all landowners listed on Council’s rates database with a SNA identified on their property were contacted by letter twice. The first letter was sent out before the draft District Plan was made public in May 2019. It provided information on SNAs, site specific maps, and details for public meetings where landowners could come and talk to Councils’ consultant Planners and the Ecologist reviewing the mapping. There were three specific landowner meetings held for this purpose. Landowners also had the opportunity to talk to Council at the several other more general public meetings.

2.3.29 With respect to ground-truthing of all sites, the reporting planner advised that this was addressed in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Vegetation where it stated at para 7.3.7 that *“- whilst the Natural Heritage Review recognises that ground-truthing is the gold standard to ensure a high level of accuracy for determining SNA this is not always practical in larger districts such as Central Hawke’s Bay. The District Council therefore, early on in the plan review process, adopted a pragmatic approach that involved engaging an ecologist to complete a desktop survey during the Draft District Plan preparation phase, followed up by site visits and ground-truthing at the request of individual landowners during the Draft Plan consultation phase”*.

- 2.3.30 The reporting planner agreed with the above statement. With limited resources and a large district, she considered that assessing all SNAs on a case-by-case basis would have been impractical. She also considered that the impact on landowners should be minimal, given the range of activities able to be undertaken within a SNA as a permitted activity. As such, the potential cost of addressing the limited circumstances where a resource consent might be required was significantly outweighed by the cost to the community of ground-truthing every site. On this basis, she recommended that the identification and mapping of SNAs should remain in the PDP.

Ecotourism and Development

- 2.3.31 The following submitters raised concerns about not being able to develop their land containing an identified SNA:
- Waipuna NZ Ltd (S95.001);
 - Waipuna NZ Ltd (S111.001);
 - David Severinsen (S133.001);
 - Curt and Tricia Zant (S99.001); and
 - Hadley Boyle (S9.001).
- 2.3.32 These submitters expressed concern that identification of SNAs will constrain opportunities for future development such as Eco-tourism, subdivision, providing for future generations and harvesting pine or other trees.
- 2.3.33 In response, the reporting planner advised that the identification and mapping of SNA and the provisions of the ECO-chapter seek to provide for the protection and management of the District's significant indigenous vegetation. She advised that the ECO rules provided for some trimming and clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to continue in association with a limited range of activities, but otherwise required scrutiny via the resource consent process to enable any impacts of trimming and clearance associated with development and other activities to be considered on a case-by-case basis. The reporting planner considered this was appropriate, given protection of these areas is identified in the RMA as a matter of national importance and the relatively small amounts of these areas that are present in CHB. She noted the rules did not prohibit such activities, and that the objectives and policies of the PDP provided direction to ensure that appropriate activities could occur provided those core outcomes around protection were achieved.

Miscellaneous issues

- 2.3.34 Submitters Sam Bradley and Claire Bradley (S53 and S47) raised concerns about how climatic conditions may potentially cause vegetation within SNAs to die off and questioned the point of having SNAs in this scenario. The reporting planner advised that this scenario was not something that was addressed in the PDP. The PDP only addressed human modification of SNAs. She advised that, in the event that an SNA did lose a significant amount of vegetation due to environmental conditions, then the status of the SNA may be removed via a plan change.
- 2.3.35 Sam Bradley stated that the several SNAs identified around and upstream of the Mākāroro Gorge dam site would prevent this water scheme being constructed. The reporting planner understood this referred to the Ruataniwha Water Storage Scheme. She advised that consents for that project were still live and could be exercised, regardless of any subsequent change to the PDP. She also advised that the new objectives, policies and rules associated with SNAs under the PDP would be relevant to any new or amended consent application, or for any application to extend the lapse period for the consent. The reporting planner did not agree that such provisions would necessarily 'prevent' the RWSS being constructed. She advised that the appropriateness of the activity would

be assessed against the full range of statutory considerations, in order to reach a decision as to whether the grant (or amendment or extension) of consent is appropriate, and if so, on what conditions. The SNA rules did not create a 'prohibited' activity, and the granting of consent was not necessarily precluded.

Trimming or clearance done by an arborist

- 2.3.36 Waipuna NZ Ltd (S95 and S111) submitted that "Notes (1) & (2) of ECO-R3 indicated that the Council recommended that trimming or clearance must be carried out by an approved arborist with prescribed qualifications. This added restriction would place more financial strain on the landowner, many of whom live in remote areas with difficult access".
- 2.3.37 The reporting planner noted the advice note the submitter referred to only recommended that clearing or trimming of indigenous vegetation was carried out by a qualified arborist: it was not mandatory. She further noted this note did not form part of the rules and could not be enforced. The reporting planner did note that Rule ECO-R3(1)(b)(ii) did require that, in the instance of deadwood, wind-thrown, or chronically diseased indigenous vegetation, an arborist must certify that it was no longer independently viable or posed a risk, but not that they would be required to undertake the trimming or clearance.
- 2.3.38 The reporting planner was of the opinion that it was appropriate that a qualified arborist undertook such certification in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitat of indigenous fauna. The reporting planner also considered the advice note remained relevant and useful guidance, even if not enforceable. The reporting planner therefore recommended this aspect of this submission be rejected.

2.4 Evidence to the hearing

- 2.4.1 The submission on behalf of Pairatahi Holdings Limited, Paul Robottom and the C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm (S92, S68 and S52) provided a submission in general opposition to SNAs on private land.

2.5 Post hearing information

- 2.5.1 The reporting planner's Right-of Reply provided a map of Māori land affected by SNAs.

2.6 Evaluation and findings

Māori Land and SNAs

- 2.6.1 The issue of SNAs on Māori land was addressed in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity presented in Hearing Stream 1, and our evaluation and recommendations on that topic are contained in Panel Report 1B.
- 2.6.2 In brief, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner, and we do not support removing SNAs on Māori owned land, given the requirements of section 6(c) of the RMA. The Panel also agrees with the reporting planner that s6(e) requires that Council shall recognize and provide for 'the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga'. In the reporting planners view, s6(e) establishes a particular obligation to make provision in the PDP for Māori to be able to use their land in ways that support their relationships, culture and traditions at the same time as ensuring that there is an appropriate level of protection applied to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats.

- 2.6.3 Due to the reasons above and because each situation will be different and will depend on the particular circumstances of the SNA and the proposed activity, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner that some policy direction may be helpful. Accordingly, we recommend the following new policy:

Proposed new Policy ECO-P10

To enable the use and development of Māori land containing areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, that supports the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua, where such activities minimise adverse effects on any significant values of the vegetation or fauna habitat.

- 2.6.4 The Panel considers that this policy would be an effective and appropriate way to address and achieve both the objectives and the anticipated environmental results of the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and the enabling development provisions of the Papakāinga chapter of the PDP.
- 2.6.5 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that S59.002 be accepted in part by including the new policy but not removing all SNAs from Māori land.

SNAs on private land

- 2.6.6 Several submitters opposed SNAs on private land:

- Samuel Bradley S108.001;
- Curt and Tricia Zant S99.001;
- Sam Bradley S53.001;
- Sandy Phillips S43.001;
- Paul Robottom S68.001;
- Claire Murphy S63.001;
- Waipuna NZ Ltd S111.01; and
- AJ & MA Smith Family Trust S22.001.

- 2.6.7 A number of the above submitters who were opposed to SNA on private land submitted that the identification of a SNA on their property does not recognise their efforts and stewardship of the land, including their voluntary establishment of QEII covenants. The relationship between SNAs and QEII covenants was addressed in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity at paragraphs 7.3.4 – 7.3.17.

- 2.6.8 The Panel agrees with the evaluation of the reporting planner, and while we acknowledge the importance of private property rights, we consider it not appropriate to remove SNAs given the small amount of indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna remaining in the District, and the provisions of the PDP in managing land use in a way that would prevent significant adverse effects on SNAs.

QEII National Trust and other covenants

- 2.6.9 The following submitters opposed SNAs being identified where they are already protected by other covenants:
- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
 - Evan & Linda Potter (S65.001); and
 - Paul Robottom (S68.001).

- 2.6.10 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and we do not accept that SNAs should be removed where there is already an existing covenant.
- 2.6.11 The matter of SNAs co-existing with covenants is addressed in Panel Report 1B on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity. In our evaluation, the Panel found that the identification of an SNA upon an existing QEII (or other) covenant imposes no additional obligations on affected landowners. The Panel note that the PDP does not impose any additional regulation on landowners, and removes any conflict through Rule ECO-R3(b)(iii) which allows for activities to be carried out in accordance with such a Covenant as a permitted activity.

Fencing requirements and track maintenance in Significant Natural Areas

- 2.6.12 The following submitters were concerned about how SNAs impact on fencing requirements and track maintenance:
- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahua Station Ltd, & High Borrens Farm Ltd (\$86.001);
 - Evan & Linda Potter (\$65.001); and
 - Paul Robottom (\$68.001).
- 2.6.13 The Panel notes that the PDP does not require SNAs to be fenced, and the PDP cannot compel actions such as fencing. The PDP does, however, have provisions that allow for fencing and track maintenance and construction to occur within SNAs. For these reasons, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends rejecting the submitters' requests to remove SNAs on this basis.

Pest control

- 2.6.14 The following submitters were concerned about pest control and management in SNAs:
- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahua Station Ltd, & High Borrens Farm Ltd (\$86.001);
 - Andy & Robbie Hunt (\$69.001); and
 - David Severinsen (\$133.001).
- 2.6.15 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner that SNAs do not and cannot compel active management. For example, the PDP does not impose any additional requirements on landowners to manage weeds within SNAs, or to regenerate SNAs. The PDP does, however, not prohibit or require resource consent to undertake pest or weed control of exotic or invasive species, and therefore landowners (and others such as pest management agencies) will be able to continue to manage weeds in these areas. For these reasons, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends rejecting submitter's requests to remove Significant Natural Areas for this reason.

Grazing

- 2.6.16 The following submitters were concerned about not being able to continue grazing in SNAs:
- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahua Station Ltd, & High Borrens Farm Ltd (\$86.001); and
 - David Severinsen (\$133.001).
- 2.6.17 The Panel notes that the PDP allows for stock to continue grazing within SNAs and, as stated above, does not compel the fencing of these areas. The Panel therefore does not agree with the submitters' requests to remove SNAs for this reason. However, the Panel does agree further

education is required around the SNA provisions, and have made a general recommendation to the Council to develop and disseminate information on SNAs.

Public safety and access

2.6.18 The following submitters were concerned about public access and public safety within SNAs:

- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
- Andy & Robbie Hunt (S69.001);
- Curt and Tricia Zant (S99.001); and
- Waipuna NZ Ltd (S111.001).

2.6.19 The Panel notes that the PDP does not and cannot allow for public access to SNAs, and access to private land remains within the control of the landowner and other legislation. As such, simply mapping such areas in the PDP does not create any new right or expectation of access to private land. The Panel therefore agrees with the reporting planner and recommends rejecting the submitters' requests to remove SNAs.

Rates relief and financial compensation or financial incentives

2.6.20 The following submitters questioned whether rates relief or financial compensation would be available to landowners with an SNA:

- Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd (S86.001);
- Carlyon Station Limited (S83.001);
- Claire Bradley (S47.001);
- Andy & Robbie Hunt (S69.001);
- David Severinsen (S133.001);
- The Surveying Company (HB) Ltd (S50.004);
- Hadley Boyle (S9.001); and
- Gerard Pain (S28).

2.6.21 The Panel considers that the PDP provides an appropriate balance between its section 6(c) duties while enabling to landowners to continue their ongoing land use activities. The Panel notes that s85 RMA states that "an interest in land shall be deemed not to be taken or injuriously affected by reason of any provision in a plan unless otherwise provided for in this Act". We do not consider that the restrictions are such that they warrant compensation under s85 RMA, but Council may wish to consider some form of rates relief in the future.

SNA methodology

2.6.22 The following submitters have identified concerns about the methodology used to identify SNAs, including the consultation that was undertaken with landowners and the need for ground-truthing:

- Evan & Linda Potter (S65.001);
- Claire Murphy S63.001; and
- Waipuna NZ Ltd (S111.001).

- 2.6.23 The Panel considered in detail whether the methodology used to identify and SNAs was appropriate in Panel Report 1B (sections 4 and 8), in which we accepted the process the District Council has used to map SNAs as being appropriate, recognising the limitations of that mapping process, together with the costs and practicalities of ground-truthing the entire District, including obtaining access to all parts.
- 2.6.24 The Panel acknowledges the degree of consultation undertaken by the District Council on SNAs outlined by the reporting planner and considers this was appropriate and proportionate to the issue and nature of the proposed provisions.
- 2.6.25 The Panel acknowledged that as, part of the initial consultation, there was an error in that some QEII covenant owners did not receive the initial letter. Given the consultation that followed this initial phase, and the general publicity and knowledge about the proposed SNA policies and provisions, the Panel do not consider these parties were significantly disadvantaged by that error. The Panel also took into account the proposed PDP provisions enable activities provided for under a QEII covenant to continue as permitted activities and therefore did not unduly affect those landowners.
- 2.6.26 As such, the Panel was satisfied that the potential cost of addressing the limited circumstances where a resource consent might be required was significantly outweighed by the cost to the community of ground-truthing every site. On this basis, the Panel recommends retaining the identification and mapping of SNAs in the PDP.

Ecotourism and development

- 2.6.27 The following submitters raised concerns about not being able to develop their land:
- Waipuna NZ Ltd (S95.001);
 - Waipuna NZ Ltd (S111.001);
 - David Severinsen (S133.001);
 - Curt and Tricia Zant (S99.001); and
 - Hadley Boyle (S9.001).
- 2.6.28 These submitters expressed concern that identification of SNAs would constrain opportunities for future development such as eco-tourism, subdivision, providing for future generations and harvesting pine or other trees.
- 2.6.29 The Panel notes that the identification and mapping of SNA and the provisions of the ECO-chapter seek to provide for the appropriate protection and management of the District's significant indigenous vegetation. The ECO rules provide for some trimming and clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to continue in association with a limited range of activities, but otherwise require scrutiny via the resource consent process to enable any impacts of trimming and clearance associated with development and other activities to be considered on a case-by-case basis. The Panel agrees with the reporting planner considers this is appropriate, given protection of these areas is identified in the RMA as a matter of national importance and the relatively small extent of these areas present within CHB.

Miscellaneous issues

- 2.6.30 Sam and Claire Bradley both raise concerns about how climatic conditions may potentially cause vegetation within SNAs to die off and question the point of having SNAs in this scenario. The Panel note that this potential issue is not something that is addressed in the PDP, only the human modification of SNAs. In the event that an SNA did lose a significant amount of vegetation due to

environmental conditions, the Panel agree with the reporting planner that the SNA may be amended or removed via a plan change.

- 2.6.31 Sam Bradley states that the several SNAs identified around and upstream of the Mākāroro Gorge dam site would prevent this water scheme being constructed. The Panel agrees with the reporting planner that the provisions would necessarily 'prevent' the RWSS being constructed, should it have to reapply for consents. Any new proposal would be assessed against the full range of statutory considerations, including the SNA provisions of the PDP in order to reach a decision as to whether the grant (or amendment or extension) of consent is appropriate, and if so, on what conditions. The SNA rules do not create a 'prohibited' activity, and the granting of consent is not necessarily precluded. The Panel therefore recommends this aspect of the submission be rejected.

Trimming or clearance done by an arborist

- 2.6.32 Waipuna NZ Ltd submitted that Notes (1) & (2) of ECO-R3 indicate that the Council recommends that trimming or clearance must be carried out by an approved arborist with prescribed qualifications.
- 2.6.33 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner that this is a recommendatory provision. Not enforceable under the PDP. The Panel considers it is appropriate that a qualified arborist undertakes such certification in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitat of indigenous fauna, but it is not a mandatory requirement. The Panel considers the advice notes remains relevant and useful guidance, even if not enforceable. The Panel therefore recommends this aspect of this submission be rejected.

3 Key Issue 2 – Requests for SNAs to be deleted

3.1 Proposed plan provisions

- 3.1.1 This issue addresses the requests for specific SNAs to be deleted.

3.2 Submissions

- 3.2.1 There are 27 original submission points that request specific SNAs to be deleted.

3.3 Reporting planner's recommendations (s42A report)

- 3.3.1 The requests for SNA's to be deleted are outlined below. The amendment maps from Gerry Kessels showing any recommended deletions are shown in Appendix C of the s42A report.

(S6.001) IA & PD Waldrom- SNA 27

- 3.3.2 IA & PD Waldrom submitted that SNA 27 *"is an area covered in willows, blackberry and gorse and only inhabitants are possums and rabbits"*. They requested that the SNA is reclassified.
- 3.3.3 Council's ecologist, in Appendix C, stated "I have reviewed recent aerial photography and existing datasets and am of the view that the area is too degraded to form significant ecological buffering or connectivity values for the braided river values of this larger and extensive SNA and therefore can be removed as a SNA from their property" (paragraph 13.2 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.4 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels analysis and recommended that submission S6.001 be accepted and that Gerry Kessels' recommendation be adopted.

(S7.001) Tylee Land Co & Terawini Land Co – SNA 210, 213, 233

- 3.3.5 Tylee Land Co submitted that SNA 210, 213 and 233 *"are not of high biodiversity value"* and requested that they be removed.
- 3.3.6 Council's ecologist stated that "I have reviewed the photographs supplied in the submission, recent aerial photography and existing datasets and am of the view that the areas in question are too degraded to form significant values and therefore can be removed as SNAs from the submitter's property" (paragraph 14.2 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.7 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels analysis and recommended that submission S7.001 be accepted and Gerry Kessels' recommendation be adopted.

(S9.001) Hadley Boyle - SNAs 27, 44, 62, 80, and 139

- 3.3.8 Hadley Boyle submitted that the mapping completed for SNAs 27, 44, 62, 80, and 139 on his family property should be removed as they are *"wrong and don't meet the criteria of an SNA as in all these areas our family have modified these areas by planting and draining them over the last 4 generations"*.
- 3.3.9 Council's ecologist stated that

The site was visited by Mr John Cheyne (ecologist consulting to Council), and Ms O'Shaughnessy on the 25th of November 2019 with Mr Boyle. A second visit was undertaken by Mr Cheyne in December 2019. The ground-truthing report prepared by Mr Cheyne states that the: "Landowner aware of ecological value of site but would like the small area of redwoods excluded to allow future harvesting. He also does not accept the SNA values for the old riverbed area which he has recently cleared of gorse, blackberry, and willows." On the basis of Mr Cheyne's recommendation, I understand that Council amended the SNA's values, and SNA map boundaries adjusted. I also understand that the site-specific ground-truthing report was supplied to the submitter. The submitters have not supplied any ecological

evidence to support their submission. Therefore, I recommend no change to the SNAs as mapped. (Paragraph 15.2 of Appendix C).

- 3.3.10 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels analysis and recommended that submission S9.001 be rejected.

(S21.001) Scott Hunter – SNA 438

- 3.3.11 Scott Hunter requested that SNA 438 be removed from SCHED5 as it was a man-made dam with a pump. The submitter stated that the request to remove SNA 438 had been considered and approved by the Council's consulting ecologist, Mr. Gerry Kessels but was not included in the PDP in error.

- 3.3.12 Council's ecologist states that –

I have visited the property and ground-truthed it. I agree with the submitter that the boundaries of SNA 438 should be deleted in accordance with their submission, as it is evident that the areas in question have insufficient ecological values to trigger significance in relation to the Ecological Significance Determination Criteria for the Central Hawkes Bay District. In particular it does not trigger Criterion 6 as it is a water storage dam. (Paragraph 16.2 of Appendix C).

- 3.3.13 On the basis of the above technical assessment, the reporting planner recommended that submission S21.001 be accepted.

(S32.001) Senlac Station Ltd – SNA 476

- 3.3.14 Senlac Station Ltd submitted that SNA 476 "is showing as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi Forest which is in the highest LENZ threat class. To the best of our knowledge, it does not contain any of these species and instead is made up predominately of Kanuka scrub". The submitter further stated that it "does not meet the criteria for a Significant Natural Area" and implied that it should be removed.

- 3.3.15 The Council's ecologist stated that he had –

...reviewed recent aerial photography and note that the site does have characteristics of kanuka forest, treeland and scrub, although I do also note elements of broadleaf species and possibly beech trees. The site has been labelled as "Indeterminate" during the review process as the underlying dataset was a predicted vegetation type supplied by the Hawkes Bay Regional Council. I have reviewed the maps in detail and considered the submission and agree it is predominantly kānuka so does not meet the criteria and can be deleted from the planning maps as an SNA. (Paragraphs 17.2 – 17.3 of Appendix C)

- 3.3.16 On the basis of the additional ecological assessment described above, the reporting planner recommended that submission S32.001 be accepted and that Gerry Kessels' recommendation be adopted.

(S35.001) Mark and Lucy Lowry – SNA 434

- 3.3.17 Mark and Lucy Lowry sought that SNA 434 on their Blackhead Road be revised. They submitted that the SNA boundaries were incorrect, and that the area was not inspected correctly when the Councils Ecologist was on site.
- 3.3.18 Council's ecologist provided the following assessment in response to this submission in Appendix C. The key point of his analysis is that a large portion of the Pōrangahau foreshore was mapped in the Operative Plan as ASNCV. The SNA review for the PDP allowed for the ground-truthing and reassessment of this area which had allowed the mapping of this SNA to be more focused on the natural features that met the Ecological Significance Determination Criteria.
- 3.3.19 The reporting planner stated that this site was a regionally outstanding natural feature for its size, complexity and diversity, and that it had a high ecological ranking that warranted a more comprehensive review than other SNAs. The reporting planner noted that, at the inception of the ODP, this area had been identified by DOC as a Recommended Area for Protection.

- 3.3.20 While the property had extensive irregularly shaped freshwater wetland complex, Council's ecologist states:

However, on reflection, I agree with the AgFirst report that some of the pasture dominated ephemeral wetlands do require review and amendment. In some of the wetlands the vegetation largely comprises of pasture and exotic species, and while likely to be classified as 'natural wetlands' under the NPS-FW definition, **are unlikely** to meet the threshold of Criterion 6 of the Ecological Significance Determination Criteria. (Paragraph 21.5 of Appendix C)

- 3.3.21 Mr Kessels also noted that to justify meeting Criterion 4 (Rarity – species) he used historical and anecdotal evidence of the regular usage of the exotic dominated ephemeral wetland by Bittern from DOC and the professional opinion of John Cheyne (local ecologist and consultant for ground-truthing). He also stated that to validate regular usage in the absence of existing data would require site-specific fauna surveys. Mr Kessels stated that it was important to note, as recorded in the ground-truthing report, that this site met several other criteria that lent it to being a SNA, such as Criterion 6 (distinctiveness), criterion 3 (diversity and pattern), and criterion 2 (representativeness). He noted that, to meet the criteria to be considered a SNA, Policy ECO-P1 stated that at least one criterion needed to be met: whether or not the site could meet criterion 4 did not influence the status of this site as a SNA.
- 3.3.22 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels assessment and his recommendation to remove areas of pasture dominated ephemeral wetland as shown in the maps provided in his memo in Appendix C. Therefore, the reporting planner recommended that submission S35.001 be accepted in part. The ground-truthing report for this site can be provided on request.

(S44.001) Ben Anderson – SNA 288

- 3.3.23 Ben Anderson opposed the identification of SNA 288 and stated “the area is dissected by both planted and wilding pinus radiata. Furthermore, the planted pinus radiata is on its second rotation and the establishment of an SNA in this area will require us to apply for a resource consent when it becomes time to mill”.
- 3.3.24 Council's ecologist had ground-truthed the site and recommended that SNA 288 be amended to exclude areas that were dominated by wilding pine or were too open to be considered forest (paragraphs 23.1 – 23.2 of Appendix C). Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.
- 3.3.25 On the basis of the ecological assessment described above the reporting planner recommended that submission S44.001 be accepted in part.

(S51.001) N. M. Riddell Family Trust Farm – SNA 152 and 153

- 3.3.26 N. M. Riddell Family Trust Farm sought that SNAs 152 and 153 be removed from their property. The submitter stated that the SNAs are already protected, monitored and maintained under QEII covenants.
- 3.3.27 Council's ecologist stated “the submission states that the SNA 152 and 153 are in QEII National Trust Open Space covenants. I consider the SNAs to meet the threshold for being significant and thus remain as mapped” (paragraph 40.1 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.28 Mr Kessels considered that mapping all SNAs, even those protected by other regulatory methods, provided Council with a robust understanding of the ecological values in the District in order to better inform policy. As noted by Ms Morgan in her section 42A report on Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, having protected areas mapped as SNAs imposed no additional obligations on the landowner.
- 3.3.29 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S51.001 be rejected.

S72.001 & S72.002 GH Williams Trust - SNAs 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, and 55

- 3.3.30 The submitter requested that SNAs 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, and 55 be deleted because they were already managed by QEII covenants thus already achieving section 6(c) of the RMA. Council's ecologist disagreed for the reasons he sets out for other similar requests, and his response is shown in paragraphs 4.3.25 and 5.3.22 above.
- 3.3.31 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended rejecting submission S72.001.
- 3.3.32 The submitter also stated that SNA 96 had an incorrect boundary and SNA 60 should be removed. Council's ecologist agreed that amendments could be made to SNA 96 and provided maps to this effect, as shown in Appendix C.
- 3.3.33 However, the submitter provided no evidence as to why SNA 60 should be deleted, and Council's ecologist recommended SNA 60 remain as mapped unless evidence demonstrating it was not a significant area was provided (paragraphs 30.1 – 30.3 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.34 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S72.002 be accepted in part and that Gerry Kessels' recommendations to amend SNA 96 be accepted while rejecting the request to delete SNA 60. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.

S52.001 The C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm - SNAs 138, 141, 191 and 199

- 3.3.35 The C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm sought that SNAs 138, 141, 191 and 199 be removed from their property. They stated that land identified as SNAs is "grazing land with no trees, other areas are holding paddocks. These areas should not be included in the Plan".
- 3.3.36 Council's ecologist stated that "I have reviewed the maps supplied as part of this submission. I agree with the submission that the areas shown as "primarily grazing" and "holding pads" in the submission should be removed from the SNA maps as the aerial maps show no obvious biodiversity values in these areas" (paragraph 4.1 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.37 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S52.001 be accepted in part.

S53.001 Sam Bradley - SNAs 39, 40,41, 42, 43 & part of 59

- 3.3.38 Sam Bradley raised concern about extremely dry summers causing the Beech Trees to progressively die resulting in patches of bare land opening up within the SNAs and how this may affect the SNAs on his property [SNAs 39, 40,41, 42, 43 & part of 59].
- 3.3.39 Council's ecologist reviewed the submitters' SNAs and stated that "the SNAs meet the threshold for being significant and thus remain as mapped" (paragraph 37.1 of Appendix C). The reporting planner's conclusion was that the PDP only addressed human modification and that if significant amounts of vegetation die off then the SNA could be removed via a plan change.
- 3.3.40 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S53.001 be rejected.

S59.002 Karl Tipene - SNA 533

- 3.3.41 Karl Tipene sought SNA 533 be deleted. The submitter stated that ECO-SCHED5 "indicates that it has Kahikatea and Matai Forest, which would be nice but it made up from kanuka/flax and Tutu bush".
- 3.3.42 Council's ecologist Gerry Kessels stated that while he agreed that the vegetation type listed was not correct

I have reviewed the aerial maps and concur with the submitter that the site is likely to comprise of manuka and kānuka scrub and as the area is coastal and calcareous cliffs containing small-leaved scrub and flaxland. However, these are an uncommon ecosystem type on this coastal landform. It is also likely the SNA has other values which are of likely high ecological value, such as providing significant habitats for indigenous lizard species¹ and coastal birds². Based on the evidence before me I therefore consider the site to meet the SNA threshold” (paragraph 7.2 of Appendix C).

- 3.3.43 While the submitter did not request it, the reporting planner recommended that the vegetation type be updated in ECO-SCHED5 as per the information provided by Mr Kessels in paragraphs 7.2 – 7.3 of Appendix C.
- 3.3.44 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels’ analysis that SNA-533 should not be deleted and recommended submission S59.002 be rejected.

S60.001 & S60.002 Joanne and Kenneth Scholfield – SNA 194 and 118

- 3.3.45 Joanne and Kenneth Scholfield sought that SNA 194 and 118 be removed from their property. They submitted that these areas had not been ground truthed and did not include any indigenous vegetation or fauna but comprise willow, grass and blackberry (SNA 194) and blackberry and broom (SNA 118).
- 3.3.46 Council’s ecologist stated that –
- I agree with the submitters that the boundaries of SNA 118 and SNA 194 should be adjusted in accordance with the maps in their submission, as based on the information supplied by the submitters it is evident that the areas in question have insufficient ecological values to trigger significance in relation to the Ecological Significance Determination Criteria for the Central Hawkes Bay District. (Paragraph 5.2 of Appendix C)*
- 3.3.47 On the basis of the above, the reporting planner recommended that submissions S60.001 and S60.002 be accepted.

S61.001 Rodney Bremer – SNA 417

- 3.3.48 Rodney Bremer sought that SNA 417 be deleted from their Wilder Road property. In their view SNA 417 “has been incorrectly identified as significant rushland, it’s a swamp area from previous dams that have silted up so would like it taken off the SNA list. ... the dams need cleaning out with a digger and it’s not a natural rushland as you have proposed. It is a man-made area”.
- 3.3.49 Council’s ecologist agreed with this submitter that SNA 417 was a swamp area created by previous dams that had silted up, and recommended it be deleted (paragraph 25.1 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.50 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S61.001 be accepted.

S65.001 Evan and Linda Potter

- 3.3.51 Evan & Linda Potter sought that two SNAs on their property be deleted. The submitter stated “there are two small areas on our farm that are incorrectly identified as SNAs. One is a block of Gorse that is an unwanted seed source and the other is a block of dead Kanuka in our deer paddock, neither is “significant”. Both blocks are at the southern end of the property.”
- 3.3.52 Council’s ecologist agreed with this submitter that there were two small areas of incorrectly identified SNAs, and that these areas could be deleted from the planning maps without the need for ground-truthing (paragraph 26.2 of Appendix C).

¹ Arthur, N.; Thomas, D. and Lees, D. 2021. A baseline survey of the indigenous bird values of the Hawke’s Bay coastline. Client report prepared for Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, Napier.

² McArthur, N.; Thomas, D. and Lees, D. 2021. A baseline survey of the indigenous bird values of the Hawke’s Bay coastline. Client report prepared for Hawke’s Bay Regional Council, Napier.

- 3.3.53 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S65.001 be accepted.

S68.001 Paul Robottom – SNA 151, 123, 34

- 3.3.54 Paul Robottom sought that SNA's on his property be deleted. He submitted "I strongly oppose the SNA that is proposed for my property. There are numerous mistakes in the mapping of our property's. SNA 151 at Pendle Hill Rd contains map of pine trees plantation, grass and willow trees for valuation number 1077004004. Also, SNA map faults at valuation 1077003800 Pendle Hill Stn. Also, incorrect maps at SNA 123 and SNA 34 Ruahine Range, Boundary is incorrect and we have ONL/F on our farm land which is steep pasture grassland."
- 3.3.55 Council's ecologist reviewed the submission and stated that 'I agree with the submitter that the SNA boundaries should be reviewed and adjusted to remove exotic pastureland, exotic treeland and plantation forest from the relevant SNAs, provided there are no records of at risk or threatened indigenous fauna species regularly using these areas' (paragraph 28.2 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.56 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S68.001 be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.
- 3.3.57 The submitter also commented on the ONL on their land submitting that it is 'steep pasture grassland'. It was unclear from the submission what Mr Robottom is seeking; however, it would appear to imply that he is opposed to the ONL but gives no further explanation as to why.
- 3.3.58 Without any further explanation by the submitter, the reporting planner could not fully address this statement other than explaining that within the independent report provided by Hudson Associates is the twelve (12) factors that were considered when assessing a landscape. The ecology and/or naturalness of a landscape were only two factors amongst several others in determining whether a landscape was outstanding.
- 3.3.59 This point of the submission was not addressed in the section 42A report on Natural Features and Landscapes, possibly due to a slight error in how the submission was summarized, and so for completeness, was address in the s42A report
- 3.3.60 Of further note was that Gerry Kessels had recommended amendments to SNA-31 and SNA-85 which were adjacent to the submitter's property. Mr Kessels stated SNA-85 "needed correction due to clearance evident on recent aerial photography and therefore recommend the changes" (paragraph 28.2 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.61 The reporting planner considered that, given there were submissions seeking removal of SNAs altogether, there was scope for any amendments to SNAs that reduced their mapped area. Paragraph 2.2.8 outlines the limitations of the assessment of the ASNCVs (subsequently SNAs). The reporting planner admitted that identifying SNAs was predominantly a desktop exercise, and while the data informing their identification had generally been accepted as accurate, minor errors are possible. In the example of SNA-85, recent aerial imagery has shown that parts of the site had been cleared.

S86.001 Roundaway Station

- 3.3.62 Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd sought that "all the identified SNAs on our property continue to be treated as they currently are and are removed from the long-term district plan".
- 3.3.63 The submitters' SNAs were reviewed by Council's ecologist. He stated that he "considers that the SNAs meet the threshold for being significant and thus should remain as mapped".

- 3.3.64 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S86.001 be rejected.

S92.001 Pairatahi Holdings Ltd

- 3.3.65 Pairatahi Holdings Ltd requested that SNA be deleted from their land. They submitted that “the overlay has not been accurately mapped and the mapped area is not of significance. It adversely effects the rights of the landowner to responsibly continue to farm, plant or otherwise manage and utilise the land”.
- 3.3.66 Council’s ecologist stated that “I agree that boundary changes for the SNAs relating to this submission are required and have recommended amendments” (paragraph 38.1 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.67 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S92.001 be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.

S95.001 & S111.001 Waipuna NZ Ltd

- 3.3.68 Waipuna NZ Ltd sought that SNAs mapped on their property at 664 Kairākau Road be deleted. They submit that “the boundaries of the SNAs outlined on the map that affect our farm, (SNA-234 and parts of SNA-276 and 279) are not absolute or clear”.
- 3.3.69 Council’s ecologist reviewed the mapping of these SNAs and stated that “I agree with the landowners that the ecological values of this portion of SNA 279 unlikely to be high and can be removed from the property. However, SNAs 276 and 234 have a mixture of small-leaved scrub and more mature forest types in incised gully systems. My opinion is that these two areas meet the threshold of an SNA and should remain as mapped” (paragraphs 9.2 – 9.3 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.70 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S95.001 be accepted in part. The reporting planner also agreed with Gerry Kessels’ recommendation to delete and amend the SNAs on the submitter’s property. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.
- 3.3.71 S111.001 Waipuna NZ Ltd also identified SNAS 234, 276, and 279 within its submission. Council’s ecologist’s recommendations are outlined in the above in paragraph 3.3.68. The reporting planner recommended that S111.001 Waipuna NZ Ltd be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.
- 3.3.72 Of further note is that Gerry Kessels recommended amendments to SNA-278 adjacent to the submitter’s property. Mr Kessels stated “*I consider boundary adjustments on the adjacent property are appropriate for SNA 278 due to recent spraying activities evident on aerial mapping*” (paragraph 9.4 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.73 As noted above, the reporting planner considered there was scope to reduce the size of SNAs, and the planner agreed that the mapping should be corrected to remove the SNA annotation from the cleared area.

S96.001 Matthew von Dadelszen – SNA 307

- 3.3.74 Matthew von Dadelszen submitted that SNA 307 does not have any “redeeming features of this SNA other than it being a small native bush block.
- 3.3.75 Councils’ ecologist stated that “I have reviewed the SNA mapping and databases and consider the SNA to meet the threshold for being significant and thus remain as mapped” (paragraph 31.1 of Appendix C).

- 3.3.76 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S96.001 be rejected.

S99.001 Curt and Tricia Zant

- 3.3.77 Curt and Tricia Zant sought that SNAs be deleted from their land. He raises no specific issues regarding the SNA on his property other than that the “*area previously identified has now dramatically multiplied*”.
- 3.3.78 This SNA was one of several SNAs that were ground-truthed. The site was visited on 26 August 2020 by John Cheyne (Ecologist) and Councillor Tim Aitken.
- 3.3.79 Council’s ecologist reviewed the submission and in Appendix C his review stated that:
- I consider the SNAs on this property to meet the threshold for being ecologically significant and thus remain as mapped. Despite the areas of the proposed SNA extending to a larger area than that mapped as a Recommended Area for Protection by the Department of Conservation, the landform and remnant vegetation as mapped is considered a valid representation of an early sequence of native coastal vegetation. It is acknowledged that the proposed SNA is detrimentally influenced by the adverse effects of erosion and goat browsing.*
- 3.3.80 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended submission S99.001 be rejected. The ground-truthing report for this site can be provided upon request.

S108.001 Samuel Bradley – SNA 144

- 3.3.81 Samuel Bradley sought that SNA 144 be deleted.
- 3.3.82 Council’s ecologist has reviewed SNA 144 and is of the opinion that it meets the significance threshold and should remain as mapped (paragraph 35.1 of Appendix C).
- 3.3.83 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended submission S108.001 be rejected.

S113.001 Ben and Libby Tosswill - SNA 385, 414, 454 and 45

- 3.3.84 Ben and Libby Tosswill requested that SNA 385, 414, 454 and 457 be deleted ‘or viewed physically before they are deemed included.
- 3.3.85 Council’s ecologist stated that –
- I agree in part with the landowners and support the remapping of the relevant SNAs as described their submission and shown on the annotated map in their submission. I have made a number of recommended amendments based on further desktop review of the mapping and the information they have supplied as shown on the maps below. I also note SNAs 457 and 456 appear to be a GIS induced errors and should be removed as they are small areas covering pasture with no significant indigenous vegetation or habitats of indigenous fauna apparent. I have recommended removal of SNA 385 and SNA 454 from the property as while it is evident these SNAs consist predominantly of indigenous scrub vegetation types, review of historically aerial mapping indicate these areas are relatively immature. (Paragraph 10.2 of Appendix C)*
- 3.3.86 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S113.001 be accepted in part.

S133.001 David Severinsen

- 3.3.87 David Severinsen sought that the SNA on his property be deleted. He submitted that the wetland mapped on his property was not natural but “*most, if not all of the wetland is not natural, but man made, by me, and some being old dam water storage for livestock*”.

- 3.3.88 This SNA was one of several SNAs that were ground-truthed. The site was visited on 29 January 2020 by John Cheyne (Ecologist).
- 3.3.89 In response to this submission as supplied in Appendix C, Gerry Kessels stated “there is sufficient evidence that the wetlands on the submitter’s property trigger Criterion 4 (Rarity for species) and Criterion 6 (Distinctiveness) – although I note that some areas are described as ‘settling ponds’ so there is justification that some areas may be exempt from Criterion 6. In any case, these areas would still likely trigger Criterion 4 as significant bittern habitat ... I recommend that the SNA remain as mapped” (paragraphs 12.3 – 12.5).
- 3.3.90 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S133.001 be rejected.

3.4 Evidence to the hearing

- 3.4.1 Tylee Land and Co provided a written statement that agreed with the reporting planner’s S42A recommendation to remove the SNA.
- 3.4.2 Pairatahi Holdings Limited, Paul Robottom and the C&H Hardy Family Trust, and Lime Terrace Farm provided a statement of evidence that opposed SNAs identified on their property and sought amendments to SNA overlays.
- 3.4.3 Mark and Lucy Lowry provided an ecological assessment on the SNAs at the property from Annabel Beattie (Terrestrial Ecologist).

3.5 Post hearing information

- 3.5.1 The reporting planner’s Right-of-Reply addressed the following:
- The question whether the evidence of Annabel Beattie for M & L Lowry was authorised and undertaken on behalf of the Hawke’s Bay Regional Council;
 - Whether Mr Robottom’s query regarding the ONL on his property can be appropriately addressed through the Hearing on SNA Mapping and/or whether removal of the ONL is within scope of his submission, and
 - Mr Kessels’ response to Lowry, Hardy, Robottom and Kairakau Lands Trust evidence in respect of SNA Mapping on these submitters’ properties and site visits undertaken.

3.6 Evaluation and findings

(S6.001) IA & PD Waldrom

- 3.6.1 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels’ and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S6.001 be accepted and that Gerry Kessels’ recommendation be adopted, and the SNA deleted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.

(S7.001) Tylee Land Co & Terawini Land Co

- 3.6.2 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels’ and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S7.001 be accepted and Gerry Kessels’ recommendation be adopted, and the SNA deleted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.

(S9.001) Hadley Boyle

- 3.6.3 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S9.001 be rejected. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.

(S21.001) Scott Hunter

- 3.6.4 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S21.001 be accepted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C. Of note, the SNA had already been removed from the schedule, it only needs to be removed from the maps which was not done prior to the notification in error. The ground-truthing report for this SNA can be provided on request.

(S32.001) Senlac Station Ltd

- 3.6.5 On the basis of the additional ecological assessment, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S32.001 be accepted and that Gerry Kessels' recommendation be adopted, and the SNA deleted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this deletion are shown in Appendix C.

(S35.001) Mark and Lucy Lowry

- 3.6.6 Council's ecologist has provided additional assessment in response to this submission in Appendix C. The key point of his analysis is that a large portion of the Pōrangahau foreshore was mapped in the ODP as ASNCV. The SNA review for the PDP allowed for the ground-truthing and reassessment of this area which has allowed the mapping of this SNA to be more focused on the natural features that meet the Ecological Significance Determination Criteria.
- 3.6.7 It is a regionally ONF for its size, complexity and diversity. It has a high ecological ranking that warranted a more comprehensive review than other SNAs. At the inception of the ODP this area had been identified by DOC as a RAP.
- 3.6.8 In terms of the evidence provided by Annabel Beattie the Panel has given weight to this evidence as an expert ecologist, but no additional weight due to her employment with HBRC as the evidence was not submitted on behalf of the HBRC.
- 3.6.9 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends removing areas of pasture dominated ephemeral wetland as shown in the maps provided in his memo in Appendix C. Therefore, the Panel recommends that submission S35.001 be accepted in part.

(S44.001) Ben Anderson

- 3.6.10 Council's ecologist has ground-truthed the site and recommends that SNA 288 be amended to exclude areas that are dominated by wilding pine or are too open to be considered forest (paragraphs 23.1 – 23.2 of Appendix C). Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C. The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S44.001 be accepted in part.

(S51.001) N. M. Riddell Family Trust Farm

- 3.6.11 Mr Kessels considers that mapping all SNAs, even those protected by other regulatory methods, provides Council with a robust understanding of the ecological values in the District in order to better inform policy. As noted by Ms Morgan, in the section 42A report on Ecosystems and

Indigenous Biodiversity, having protected areas mapped as SNAs imposes no additional obligations on landowners.

- 3.6.12 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S51.001 be rejected.

S72.001 & S72.002 GH Williams Trust

- 3.6.13 The submitter requests that SNAs 47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54, and 55 be deleted because they are already managed by QEII covenants thus already achieving section 6(c) of the RMA. Council's ecologist disagreed.
- 3.6.14 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends rejecting submission S72.001.
- 3.6.15 The submitter also states that SNA 96 has an incorrect boundary and SNA 60 should be removed. Council's ecologist agreed that amendments can be made to SNA 96 and has provided maps to this effect, as shown in Appendix C.
- 3.6.16 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S72.002 be accepted in part and that Gerry Kessels' recommendations to amend SNA 96 be accepted while rejecting the request to delete SNA 60. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.

S52.001 The C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm

- 3.6.17 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' that notes:

I have reviewed the maps supplied as part of this submission. I agree with the submission that the areas shown as "primarily grazing" and "holding pads" in the submission should be removed from the SNA maps as the aerial maps show no obvious biodiversity values in these areas" (paragraph 4.1 of Appendix C).

- 3.6.18 Accordingly, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S52.001 be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.

S53.001 Sam Bradley

- 3.6.19 Council's ecologist has reviewed the submitter's SNAs and states that 'the SNAs meet the threshold for being significant and thus remain as mapped' (paragraph 37.1 of Appendix C). The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S53.001 be rejected.

S59.002 Karl Tipene

- 3.6.20 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and with Mr Kessels analysis that SNA-533 should not be deleted and recommends submission S59.002 be rejected.
- 3.6.21 While the submitter has not requested it, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that the vegetation type be updated in ECO-SCHED5 as per the information provided by Mr Kessels. We note again the advice of the reporting planner that the PDP does not prohibit or require resource consent for pest or weed control, nor is there further requirement to manage weeds within an SNA.

S60.001 & S60.002 Joanne and Kenneth Scholfield

- 3.6.22 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submissions S60.001 and S60.002 be accepted and the SNA removed. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.

S61.001 Rodney Bremer

- 3.6.23 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommend that submission S61.001 be accepted and the SNA removed. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this deletion are shown in Appendix C.

S65.001 Evan and Linda Potter

- 3.6.24 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and with Mr Kessels and recommends that submission S65.001 be accepted and the SNA removed. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.

S68.001 Paul Robottom

- 3.6.25 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner, and recommends that submission S68.001 be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.
- 3.6.26 In regard to the submitter's comments on the ONL on their land, the Panel acknowledge the comments from Mr Robottom at the hearing that the boundary of this ONL did not align with the topography of the land. However, we understand, from the hearing on landscapes in Hearing Stream 1 that ONL/ONF boundaries generally sought to align with property boundaries and therefore did not always match the underlying topography.

S86.001 Roundaway Station

- 3.6.27 The submitter's SNAs were reviewed by Council's ecologist. He recommended that he "considers that the SNAs meet the threshold for being significant and thus should remain as mapped".
- 3.6.28 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S86.001 be rejected.

S92.001 Pairatahi Holdings Ltd

- 3.6.29 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S92.001 be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.

S95.001 & S111.001 Waipuna NZ Ltd

- 3.6.30 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and with Mr Kessels and recommends that submission S95.001 be accepted in part. The Panel also agrees with the reporting planner and with Mr Kessels' recommendation to delete and amend the SNAs on the submitter's property as advised. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.
- 3.6.31 S111.001 Waipuna NZ Ltd also identified SNAS 234, 276, and 279 within its submission. The Panel agree with the reporting planner recommend that S111.001 Waipuna NZ Ltd be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.
- 3.6.32 Of further note is that Gerry Kessels has recommended amendments to SNA-278 adjacent to the submitter's property. Mr Kessels states "I consider boundary adjustments on the adjacent property are appropriate for SNA 278 due to recent spraying activities evident on aerial mapping"

(paragraph 9.4 of Appendix C). As noted above, the Panel agrees with the reporting planner and consider there is scope to reduce the size of SNAs, and the Panel agrees that the mapping should be corrected to remove the SNA annotation from the cleared area.

S96.001 Matthew von Dadelszen

- 3.6.33 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S96.001 be rejected.

S99.001 Curt and Tricia Zant

- 3.6.34 This SNA was one of several SNAs that were ground-truthed. The site was visited on 26 August 2020 by John Cheyne (Ecologist) and Councillor Tim Aitken.
- 3.6.35 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and with Mr Kessels and recommends submission S99.001 be rejected. The ground-truthing report for this site can be provided upon request.

S108.001 Samuel Bradley

- 3.6.36 Council's ecologist reviewed SNA 144 and is of the opinion that it meets the significance threshold and should remain as mapped (paragraph 35.1 of Appendix C).
- 3.6.37 The Panel agrees with the reporting planner and Mr Kessels and recommends submission S108.001 be rejected.

S113.001 Ben and Libby Tosswill

- 3.6.38 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S113.001 be accepted in part. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing these amendments are shown in Appendix C.

S133.001 David Severinsen

- 3.6.39 This SNA was one of several SNAs that were ground-truthed. The site was visited on 29 January 2020 by John Cheyne (Ecologist).
- 3.6.40 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner Kessels and recommend that submission S133.001 be rejected.

4 Key Issue 3 – Requests for SNAs to be amended

4.1 Proposed plan provisions

- 4.1.1 This key issue addresses the requests for SNAs to be amended.

4.2 Submissions

- 4.2.1 There were 7 submission points that requested specific amendments to the SNAs.

4.3 Reporting planner's recommendations (s42A report)

(S16.001) Jane Davidson, Te Tohe Station Ltd – SNA 453

- 4.3.1 Jane Davidson sought that SNA 453 be amended to reflect the final recommendations made by Council's Ecologist that were omitted in error on the notified PDP maps.
- 4.3.2 Council's ecologist agreed with the map provided in the submission and recommends that the amendments be made to the SNA as was recommended prior to the public notification of the PDP.
- 4.3.3 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S16.001 be accepted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing the amendments to the SNA are provided in Appendix C.

(S40.001) Lance de Malmanche – SNA 175

- 4.3.4 Lance de Malmanche sought SNA 175 be ground truthed as the area has not been identified correctly.
- 4.3.5 Council's ecologist stated that –

The stream gully is contiguous with Monckton Gully Scenic Reserve. The site remains significant; as even though it is podocarp/beech forest treeland mosaic, with mature totara emergent in this locality, it is an underrepresented vegetation type on land in high LENZ threatened environment classes and likely habitat for at risk and threatened fauna species, such as long-tailed bats. I consider the mapping should remain as per the notified Plan. (Paragraph 22.2 of Appendix C)

- 4.3.6 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S40.001 be rejected.

(S49.001) Wade Stoddart

- 4.3.7 Wade Stoddart sought that SNAs on property owned or leased by the submitter (54 Beach Road, Te Paerahi and 331 Ireland Road, Pōrangahau) be amended to match fencing the submitter had completed and to ensure that there were no restrictions to potential subdivision, particularly in relation to 54 Beach Road. The submitter did not provide mapping or other evidence of the fencing referred to in his submission.
- 4.3.8 Council's ecologist stated "the submitter has not provided any supporting ecological evidence for changes to the SNAs. I have reviewed the datasets and maps and am satisfied the SNAs met threshold for being ecologically significant and thus no changes to them are recommended" (paragraph 6.2 of Appendix C).
- 4.3.9 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S49.001 be rejected.

(S63.001) Claire Murphy

- 4.3.10 Claire Murphy submitted that there were approximately 22 SNAs on her property and that “we oppose these as a lot of the areas are areas made up of sparse scrub. It has been agreed in the past in consultation with the Regional Council and representatives from the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust (“QEII”) that these were not significant and could be cleared for grazing (detailed report and map attached). From this report it was agreed as to what could be protected and the areas which could be sprayed to clear for grazing. Although the spraying did not work as intended if a site visit were undertaken a lot of the smaller SNAs we believe would be removed and boundaries changed.... We believe in the case of our land the SNAs need to be taken in context of the block as a whole, rather than tagging everything, it is clear there are several large areas of significant bush with many smaller areas being less significant that should not be included”.

- 4.3.11 Council’s ecologist states that –

I note that the areas mapped as SNAs on this property have previously been identified as a recommended Area for Protection (RAP-18), by the Department of Conservation in 1993. The areas are also currently mapped in the Operative District Plan as “ASNCV 45 - Motuotaraia”. During the 2018 desktop review of these SNAs it was recommended that changes be made to the boundaries and these are reflected in the Proposed District Plan maps for this area. The detailed description of the SNAs in the report supplied by the submitter indicates that there is scope for this SNA’s classification and boundaries to be further reviewed. I agree with the submitter that amendment of the boundaries is required. (Paragraphs 27.2 of Appendix C)

- 4.3.12 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S63.001 be accepted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.

(S102.003) Te Mata Mushrooms – SNA 264

- 4.3.13 Te Mata Mushrooms sought that Council confirm the edges of the SNA 264 that extend into the adjoining property at 367 Mt Herbert Road were appropriate by ground truthing these and agreeing the values of the river environment were within the property. Retain the extent of the SNA 264 if there were SNA values, amend to the extent required if they were not.

- 4.3.14 Councils’ ecologist stated that –

I have visited this property. On the basis of my visit, I consider that the SNAs should remain as mapped. One area is a stand of indigenous riparian forest fragment, predominantly in mature titoki. It is of high ecological value despite having an understorey and ground cover depauperate of indigenous species. The other area, while dominated by exotic tree and shrub species, is riparian vegetation acting as a corridor and buffer to the Tukituki River. (Paragraphs 8.2 – 8.3 of Appendix C)

- 4.3.15 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S102.003 be accepted in accordance with the submitters request to ground-truth and confirm the ecological values of the area.

- 4.3.16 The reporting planner noted that, in a written statement submitted by the submitter for Hearing Stream 3: Rural Environment, they stated that the submission points identified for Hearing Stream 6 would not be “actively followed up”. However, the ground-truthing was undertaken in April and as such the outcomes had still been considered.

(S103.002) Sandy Hill Farms Limited – SNA 424

- 4.3.17 Sandy Hill Farms Limited sought to have one paddock taken out of the designated SNA 424 area on their farm. They submitted, “this is just a paddock that does not fall under the description of SNA 424 and we would like it removed from the SNA area”.

- 4.3.18 Council's ecologist stated that "on further review of the aerial maps and datasets I agree with the landowners that the ecological values of this portion of SNA 424 is unlikely to be high and can be removed from the property" (paragraph 39.1 of Appendix C). A map from Gerry Kessels showing the amendment is provided in Appendix C.
- 4.3.19 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S103.002 be accepted and that Gerry Kessels' recommendations be adopted.

(S132.006) Ernslaw One Limited - SNA 198, 199, 202, 203, 206 and 207

- 4.3.20 Ernslaw One Limited sought amendments to the boundaries of SNA 198, 199, 202, 203, 206 and 207.
- 4.3.21 Council's ecologist states:

I have visited some of the SNAs on Ernslaw One managed forest in and am largely satisfied with mapping and identification for the areas viewed. However, the extent and complexity of the potential SNAs on the Ernslaw One land means that further ground-truthing may be beneficial. The vegetation type description in Appendix F for all these SNA's is noted as rimu/tawakamahi forest. Ernslaw submits that this description has been incorrectly identified as the dominant indigenous vegetation type is manuka/kanuka and scattered rewarewa. I agree that the underlying data-set on the forest types supplied by Hawkes Bay Regional Council is, in part, incorrect. Regardless of this incorrect vegetation typing in the regional council database, in my opinion the areas mapped as ecological significant are value and meet the SNAS threshold.

.....

In response to point 14 of the submission, there are limitations in the planning maps in terms of the SNA's background information displayed in the planning maps. I have undertaken surveys of the site on two occasions, and while the planning maps show the SNAs being 'rimu/tawa kamahi forest', which was part of the original dataset supplied by Hawkes Bay Regional Council, these areas have a more complex pattern of vegetation communities. The ecological values of the areas have been addressed in my site-specific report for the site, which I understand Council has supplied Ernslaw One a copy. In my report I outline the three broad terrestrial vegetation types I observed at the site as manuka – kanuka/broadleaved scrub and forest; rewarewa/ black beech forest and one stand of podocarp/broadleaved secondary forest, as well as several indigenous wetland areas.

In relation to point 15 of this submission, Ernslaw One did supply a report from a previous ecological survey. However, this report was limited in terms of usability for application to my SNA assessment. For example, it was outdated and did not include any detailed vegetation mapping. As I state in my site report: "This complex, fragmented mosaic of native forest and scrub habitats in different stages of regeneration, blanketed by large pines and contained in steep terrain, makes accurate mapping difficult without undertaking extensive survey, ideally with the assistance of drones. The two afternoon site visits have given an insight to the site but applying a high confidence level as a consequence of the surveys is not possible." In addition, in my site report I note that the site was potentially suitable habitat for several indigenous bird and lizard species, including a range of nationally listed At Risk and Threatened species, which would require extensive and targeted surveys to validate absence or presence and if found, extent of habitat usage.

I recommend that the SNA remain as mapped" (paragraphs 11.2 – 11.5 of Appendix C).

- 4.3.22 The reporting planner agreed with Mr Kessels and recommended that submission S132.006 be rejected.
- 4.3.23 While the submitter did not request it, the reporting planner recommended that the vegetation type be updated in ECO-SCHED5 as per the information provided by Mr Kessels in paragraph 11.4 of Appendix C.

4.4 Evidence to the hearing

- 4.4.1 Jane Davidson provided a written statement regarding the pine plantation and that it should not be included as an SNA.

4.5 Post hearing information

- 4.5.1 The reporting planner's Right-of-Reply did not provide any additional information on this key issue.

4.6 Evaluation and findings

(S16.001) Jane Davidson, Te Tohe Station Ltd

- 4.6.1 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S16.001 be accepted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing the amendments to the SNA are provided in Appendix C.

(S40.001) Lance de Malmanche

- 4.6.2 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S40.001 be rejected.

(S49.001) Wade Stoddart

- 4.6.3 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommend that submission S49.001 be rejected. The panel notes for completeness that upon review of the PDP maps that there are no SNAs on the property 54 Beach Road.

(S63.001) Claire Murphy

- 4.6.4 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S63.001 be accepted. Maps from Gerry Kessels showing this amendment are shown in Appendix C.

(S102.003) Te Mata Mushrooms

- 4.6.5 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S102.003 be accepted in accordance with the submitter's request to ground-truth and confirm the ecological values of the area.

(S103.002) Sandy Hill Farms Limited

- 4.6.6 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S103.002 be accepted and that Gerry Kessels' recommendation be adopted.

(S132.006) Ernslaw One Limited

- 4.6.7 The Panel accepts the expert advice of Mr Kessels' and accordingly agrees with the reporting planner and recommends that submission S132.006 be rejected.
- 4.6.8 While the submitter has not requested it, the Panel agree with the reporting planner and recommend that the vegetation type be updated in ECO-SCHED5.

PART C – SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

5 Summary of recommendations

- 5.1.1 A summary table of recommended decisions against each submission point is included as Appendix B.
- 5.1.2 A tracked changes version of recommended amendments is included as Appendix A.

6 Consequential amendments and minor errors

- 6.1.1 Schedule 1, clause 16(2), allows minor and inconsequential amendments to be made to the Plan.

Appendix A – Chapter and Eco Schedule 5 as Amended

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT VALUES

ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity

Introduction

In achieving the sustainable management purpose of the RMA, the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, is specifically identified as a 'matter of national importance' (section 6(c)).

The RMA also requires particular regard to be given to 'other matters', including kaitiakitanga (s7(a)), and the intrinsic values of ecosystems (s7(d)), amongst other things.

Section 31 of the RMA also requires territorial authorities to control any actual or potential effects of the use, development or protection of land for the purpose of maintaining indigenous biological diversity (s31(1)(b)(iii)).

Subdivision, use and development often results in changes to the natural environment. These changes are not always negative, nor are they always significant, however it is important that an opportunity to consider the impact of these activities on the District's remaining significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is provided for in the District Plan.

At a national level, a National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB) is anticipated to be gazetted and to take effect mid 2021, which is expected to require district plans to:

- undertake a district-wide assessment to identify and map areas of significant indigenous vegetation and / or significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the District; and
- take steps to ensure the protection, maintenance and restoration of indigenous biodiversity.

It is anticipated that the approach in this District Plan will go a long way towards giving effect to the likely requirements of the NPS-IB.

Issues

ECO-11 Loss of Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Significant Habitats of Indigenous Fauna

ECO-12 The desire lack of opportunity of mana whenua to exercise kaitiakitanga in the protection of Significant Indigenous Vegetation and Significant Habitats of Indigenous Fauna.

Commented [A1]: S125.051 Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea
- Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 3

Loss of the District's indigenous vegetation, habitats of indigenous fauna and indigenous biodiversity from threats of modification, damage, or destruction through inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Explanation

There is a relatively small amount of remaining indigenous cover in the plains and coastal areas of Central Hawke's Bay. These remaining habitats are now isolated and fragmented. In addition, plant, and animal pests, as well as diseases contribute to the degradation of these fragile areas. While land use changes, development and subdivision can result in adverse effects on these habitats and the native plants and animals which use them, many landowners have voluntarily protected and managed what is left. Addressing the issue of biodiversity loss and degradation therefore requires an integrated management approach that recognises existing activities and utilises a range of implementation methods.

A study of the natural values of the District shows that remaining habitats of indigenous fauna and flora comprise approximately 10% of the District's total land area. However much of the remaining forest lies in the Ruahine Forest Park and is represented by hill and country forests and habitats which are well represented and protected in the region and nationally. The plains and lowland coastal areas, however, have very little remaining original cover and habitat. While some ecosystem / vegetation types retain much of their original extent (such as the podocarp-beech types in the very steep areas of the Ruahine Ranges), other types (such as kahikatea-pukatea-tawa forest) and freshwater wetlands, have retained very little of their former extent. Some vegetation types, such as podocarp-based vegetation types, have all but disappeared from the District. Under-represented ecosystem types fall largely within nationally threatened and under-protected environment categories, and the lowland, coastal and plains parts of the District have very few natural features left and hence very low biodiversity values for indigenous fauna and flora.

Sites which were found to be significant with respect to section 6(c) of the RMA, have been mapped and shown on the Planning Maps, and recommended for inclusion in the District Plan as 'Significant Natural Areas' (SNAs). Many of the sites are found within the Ruahine Forest Park, already under protection. In the plains and along the coast, sites are generally scattered smaller fragments of remaining bush, regenerating scrub and wetlands. Habitats for nationally 'At-Risk' and 'Threatened' fauna and flora are also located within and alongside much of the shingle braided river corridors as well as coastal cliffs and estuary / river mouth areas of the District. While these latter habitats often comprise exotic trees and shrubs, and even weeds, with little native plant cover, they provide the only habitat left for many native animals and plants, including rare and threatened species. They are also critical in maintaining ecological corridors between the coast, existing native fragments across the plains and the extensive forested and protected habitats for the Ruahine Ranges, as well as providing breeding, roosting and spawning habitat.

Only a small percentage of significant sites in the plains and coastal areas have some form of legal protection, such as Stewardship Areas, Queen Elizabeth II National Trust (QEII) private land covenants, and Ngā Whenua Rāhui kawenata (covenants). Central Hawke's Bay District Council acknowledges the important stewardship role of landowners in protecting and managing these remaining sites. The study of the District's natural values also identified that

there are many sites outside those legally protected natural remnants which have value, that have been assessed as SNAs. Landowners often informally protect and manage these SNAs to enhance their biodiversity values as well.

The Hawke's Bay Regional Policy Statement identifies that water and its relationship with land is a significant issue for the Region, as is the scarcity of indigenous vegetation, natural wetlands, and habitats of indigenous fauna as a result of vegetation modification or clearance. Lake Whatuma, Porangahau River and Estuary, the Ruataniwha Aquifer and Waipawa River have been identified as outstanding water bodies, with Lake Whatuma identified as a regionally significant indigenous wetland.

As part of addressing these issues, Hawke's Bay Regional Council have led development of a Regional Biodiversity Strategy to improve habitats and support native species in the Region. Central Hawke's Bay District Council is a signatory and 'accountable partner' to the Hawke's Bay Biodiversity Accord and is therefore a key regional partner in encouraging and enabling improvement in the Region's biodiversity.

Council recognises there is a need to balance protecting and enhancing the District's indigenous biodiversity while allowing for rural landowners to farm their land effectively and efficiently. Except where very high conservation values exist, a wide range of activities can be accommodated, with appropriate standards to ensure adverse effects of these activities are avoided, remedied, or mitigated.

Council also has responsibilities in relation to the control of activities on the surface of inland waters where effects can cause loss of water quality and impacts on ecological systems and habitats.

Objectives

ECO-01 Protect the District's areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, particularly those within wetlands, braided rivers, and coastal margins, from activities that may adversely affect them.

Commented [A2]: S75.029 Forest and Bird - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 2

ECO-02 Maintain indigenous biodiversity within Central Hawke's Bay District.

ECO-03 The relationship of tangata whenua and their traditions and culture with indigenous vegetation and fauna are recognised and provided for.

Commented [A3]: S120.018 Heretaunga Tamatea Settlement Trust - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 3

Policies

ECO-P1 To identify Significant Natural Areas (being areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna) in the District where they meet one or more of the criteria below and describe these areas in ECO-SCHED5 and show their

location on the Planning Maps [\(except for areas that meet Criterion 1, where at least one of Criterion 2-7 must also be met\).](#)

Commented [A4]: S75.031 Forest & Bird - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 4

<i>Ecological Significance Determination Criteria for the Central Hawke's Bay District</i>	
CRITERION 1 <u>Protection Status:</u>	
It is indigenous vegetation or habitat for indigenous fauna that is currently, or is recommended to be, set aside by Government statute or covenant, or by the Nature Heritage Fund, or Ngā Whenua Rauhi committees, or the Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Board of Directors as an Open Space Covenant, specifically for the protection of biodiversity, and meets at least one of criteria 2-7.	
CRITERION 2 <u>Representativeness:</u>	
•	It is vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna that is highly typical or characteristic of the indigenous biodiversity in the Hawkes Bay Region, or an Ecological District within the Central Hawkes Bay District, or nationally.
OR	
•	It is habitat that forms part of an indigenous ecological sequence, or is an exceptional, representative example of its type at a national level.
OR	
•	It is habitat that supports a typical suite of indigenous fauna and flora and that is characteristic of the habitat type in an Ecological District within the Central Hawkes Bay District.
CRITERION 3 <u>Diversity and Pattern:</u>	
It is an area of indigenous vegetation or habitat of high diversity (for its type) that contains ecotones, gradients, or sequences.	
CRITERION 4 <u>Rarity – Species:</u>	
It is vegetation or habitat (including exotic vegetation or braided riverbed for highly mobile fauna species), that is currently regularly utilised habitat for indigenous flora or fauna species or associations of indigenous flora and fauna species that are:	
•	classed as Nationally Threatened or At Risk by the New Zealand Threat Classification System, or
•	endemic or uncommon to the Hawke's Bay Region, or
•	at the limit of their natural range.
CRITERION 5 <u>Rarity - Ecosystems:</u>	
It is indigenous vegetation or habitat that is, and prior to human settlement was, nationally uncommon.	
CRITERION 6 <u>Distinctiveness:</u>	
•	It is indigenous vegetation or habitat on an ecosystem type that is under-represented (30% or less of its known or likely original extent remaining) in an Ecological District, or Ecological Region, or nationally.
OR	
•	It is wetland, sand dune, braided river or estuarine habitats, or a distinctive assemblage or community of indigenous species habitat for indigenous plant communities and/or indigenous fauna communities (excluding exotic rush/pasture communities) that has <i>not</i> been created and subsequently maintained for or in connection with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ waste treatment; ○ wastewater renovation; ○ hydroelectric power lakes; ○ water storage for irrigation; or ○ water supply storage, including stock water storage and fire ponds.
CRITERION 7 <u>Ecological Context:</u>	
It is an area of indigenous vegetation or naturally occurring habitat that:	
•	is moderate to large, well buffered, or is a compact shape, in the context of the Ecological District it is found in, and which contains all or almost all indigenous species typical of that habitat type.
OR	
•	is critical to the self-sustainability of an indigenous flora or fauna species within a catchment of the Hawke's Bay Region. In this context "critical" means essential for a

Commented [A5]: S85.004 Rayonier Matariki Forest - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 4

	specific component of the life cycle and includes breeding and spawning grounds, juvenile nursery areas, important feeding areas and migratory and dispersal pathways of an indigenous species. This includes areas that maintain connectivity between habitats.
OR	
•	is a site that provides a full or partial buffer to, or link between, other important habitats or significant natural area(s) and/or is important for the natural functioning of a freshwater or coastal/estuarine system.
Refer District Plan ECO-APP1 for Quantifying Thresholds and Attribute Assessment Guidance.	

- ECO-P2** To protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna from the adverse effects of landuse and development, including earthworks and vegetation clearance, whilst providing for limited trimming and clearance opportunities where it is necessary for the economic, social and/or cultural wellbeing of people or their health and safety.
- ECO-P3** To avoid adverse effects of activities on areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna in the coastal environment; and avoid significant adverse effects and remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on the indigenous biological values of other areas and habitats in the coastal environment.
- ECO-P4** To avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, including cumulative adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that would result in a loss of indigenous biodiversity values from:
1. Clearance, modification, damage or destruction of large areas of intact indigenous vegetation or habitats of indigenous fauna;
 2. Clearance of indigenous vegetation in and on the margins of Lake Whātuma, and other natural wetlands, and including braided rivers;
 3. Subdivision of land and location of buildings and works in close proximity to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or habitats of indigenous fauna; or
 4. Increased exposure to invasive introduced plant and animal species that pose a threat to indigenous biodiversity.
- ECO-P5** To give effect to the Principles for Biodiversity Offsets in ECO-APP2 of this Plan where biodiversity offsets are proposed as part of resource consent applications.
- ECO-P6.** To encourage the restoration and creation of ecological linkages between coastal habitats, river and stream margins and inland habitats as the opportunity arises and where it enhances the Districts indigenous biodiversity.
- ECO-P7** To recognise landowners' stewardship and current management practices (including weed management and pest control) associated

Commented [A6]: S121.017 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 2

Commented [A7]: S75.034 Forest & Bird - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 6

with protecting and maintaining areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna.

ECO-P8 To assist landowners with the establishment of protective covenants, education, and other non-regulatory methods and incentives to protect and maintain areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna

ECO-P9 To ensure that new nationally significant infrastructure is not located in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna unless:

1. There is a functional or operational need for the infrastructure to be in that particular location; and
2. The route/site selection process has identified no practicable alternative locations.

Where it is necessary to locate in these areas and where, despite the adoption of the best practicable option, there remain residual adverse effects, biodiversity offsetting measures should be proposed for the purpose of ensuring positive effects on the environment sufficient to offset any residual adverse effects of activities on indigenous biodiversity that will or may result from allowing the activity.

ECO-P10 To enable the use and development of Māori land containing areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, that supports the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of tangata whenua, and takes into account the significant values of the vegetation or fauna habitat.

Commented [A8]: S59.002 Karl Tipene - Report 6B SNA Mapping, Key Issue 1

ECO-P110 To exempt from regulatory controls under the District Plan for Significant Natural Areas, activities carried out in accordance with a registered covenant under either the Reserves Act 1977, Conservation Act 1987 (including Ngā Whenua Rāhui Kawenata created under the Reserves Act 1977 or Conservation Act 1987) or Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977, or are managed under a Reserve Management Plan approved under the Reserves Act 1977.

Commented [A9]: S121.027 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Vegetation, Key Issue 6

Rule Overview Table

Use/activity	Rule Number
Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation within any of the following <u>(excluding where it forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5):</u>	ECO-R1

Commented [A10]: S121.033 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Areas of domestic or ornamental landscape planting; or 2. Planted shelter belts; or 3. Plantation forestry undergrowth; or 4. Planted indigenous forestry. 	
<u>Specified Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation (excluding where it forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5)</u>	<u>ECO-R1A</u>
Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation that has naturally re-grown on land that was cleared within the previous 15 years <u>(excluding where it forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5)</u>	ECO-R2
Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation inside any area <u>of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitat of indigenous fauna identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5</u> (excluding natural wetlands)	<u>ECO-R3</u>
Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation outside any area <u>of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitat of indigenous fauna identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5</u>	ECO-R4
<u>Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation not otherwise provided for</u>	<u>ECO-R5</u>
Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation which forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5	ECO-R6

Commented [A11]: S81.073 Hort NZ - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A12]: S121.033 Federated Farmers – Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A13]: S75.041 Forest & Bird and S64.064 DOC - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A14]: S75.041 Forest & Bird - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A15]: S121.032 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Rules

It is important to note that in addition to the provisions in this chapter, zone chapters and a number of other Part 2: District-Wide Matters chapters also contain provisions that may be relevant for activities involving the trimming or clearance of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna.

Note 1: Plantation Forestry Activities - In the case of conflict with any rule in this Chapter, the provisions of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017, (NES-PF) particularly regulations 93 and 94, apply instead of the rule. This specifically applies to afforestation, and vegetation clearance that occurs during or

after afforestation outside of a significant natural area and 'incidental damage' within or outside a significant natural area. Vegetation clearance of indigenous vegetation that occurs before afforestation, or within a significant natural area (other than incidental damage) is not controlled by the NES-PF, and the rules in this Chapter will apply.

For the avoidance of doubt, the NES-PF does not apply to the following activities, and they are therefore subject to the rules of this chapter:

- Vegetation clearance of indigenous vegetation that occurs before afforestation (see Reg 5 (3)):
- Vegetation clearance of indigenous vegetation within a significant natural area, except that clearance of a forestry track described in Reg 93(2)(d) NES-PF, or incidental damage described in Reg 93(5), are covered by the NES-PF under Reg 93 or 94.

Note 2: These rules do not replace regional rules which control vegetation clearance and soil disturbance to address the loss and degradation of soil. These rules must be complied with prior to the activity proceeding.

ECO-R1 Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation within any of the following (excluding where it forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5):

- Areas of domestic or ornamental landscape planting; or
- Planted shelter belts; or
- Plantation forestry undergrowth; or
- Planted indigenous forestry.

All Indigenous Vegetation Species	1. Activity Status: PER Where the following conditions are met: N/A	2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: N/A
-----------------------------------	---	---

ECO-R1A Specified Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation (excluding where it forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5)

All Indigenous Vegetation Species	1. Activity Status: PER <u>Where the following conditions are met:</u> a. <u>Limited to trimming or clearance that is required for any of the following purposes:</u> i. <u>required to achieve compliance with the requirements of the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003; or</u> ii. <u>required to remove deadwood, wind-thrown trees, or chronically diseased indigenous vegetation, where an</u>	2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: <u>ECO-R2 to ECO-R45 apply</u>
-----------------------------------	--	--

Commented [A16]: S85.008 Rayonier Matariki Forests; S132.002 Ernslaw One Limited ; S132.003 Ernslaw One Limited; S132.004 Ernslaw One Limited – Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 1 and 7

Commented [A17]: S11.037 Hawke's Bay Regional Council - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 2

Commented [A18]: S121.033 Federated Farmers – Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A19]: S121.033 Federated Farmers – Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A20]: S81.073 Hort NZ - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A27]: S81.073 Hort NZ - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A21]: S121.030 Federated Farmers – Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

arborist who has attained the New Zealand Qualifications Authority National Certificate in Arboriculture Level 4 or equivalent qualification has certified in writing that the indigenous vegetation is no longer independently viable or poses a risk;
or

iii. carried out in accordance with a registered protective covenant under the Reserves Act 1977, Conservation Act 1987 or Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977; or a Reserve Management Plan approved under the Reserves Act 1977 (including Ngā Whenua Rāhui Kawenata [covenants] created under either s77A Reserves Act 1977 or s27A Conservation Act 1987); or

iv. required for pest control undertaken by or in conjunction with the Department of Conservation, Hawke's Bay Regional Council or Central Hawke's Bay District Council, or by landowners and personnel working with these organisations for this purpose; or removal of material infected by an unwanted organism under the Biosecurity Act 1993; or

v. necessary to avoid an imminent threat to the safety of persons or of damage to lawfully established buildings or structures; or

vi. necessary to provide for the ongoing safe and efficient operation, and maintenance and upgrading of existing telecommunication, radio communication and other network utilities, but excluding their expansion, where carried out by the respective network utility operator; or

vii. necessary to provide for the maintenance and safe and efficient operation of existing tracks, stock crossing and bridges, drains,

Commented [A22]: Correction under Schedule 1, cl16(2) of the RMA

Commented [A23]: S121.027 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Vegetation, Key Issue 6

Commented [A24]: S121.030 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A25]: S75.040 Forest & Bird - Network Utilities Topic 7A, Key Issue 11

firebreaks, formed public roads, private accesses, driveways, right of ways and walkways; or

viii. necessary to maintain buildings, provided that the trimming or clearance of vegetation is limited to within 3 metres of a wall or roof of a building; or

ix. required to construct new fences (including post holes) to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous vegetation, or to maintain existing fences, provided that the trimming or clearance does not exceed 2 metres in width either side of the fence line; or

x. for use by tangata whenua for cultural purposes (e.g. for Rongoā, Waka, traditional buildings and marae-based activities) and does not result in the removal of more than 25m³ of timber per site per 10-year period.

Note (1): The Council recommends that trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation is carried out by an arborist who has attained the New Zealand Qualifications Authority National Certificate in Arboriculture Level 4 or equivalent qualification.

Note (2): Any trimming or clearance work within the vicinity of a network utility should be undertaken by a network utility approved arborist.

Commented [A26]: S121.030 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

ECO-R2 Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation that has naturally re-grown on land that was cleared within the previous 15 years (excluding where it forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5)

Manuka and Kanuka Species Only

1. Activity Status: PER

Where the following conditions are met:

- a. Limited to:
 - i. trees no more than 30cm in diameter measured at 1.4m from the highest

2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS

Matters over which discretion is restricted:

Commented [A28]: S121.033 Federated Farmers – Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

	<p>point of ground level at the base of the tree.</p> <p><i>Note: If the requirements of this rule are complied with then there is no limit on the area of vegetation that can be trimmed or cleared.</i></p>	a. ECO-AM1.
All Other Indigenous Vegetation Species	<p>3. Activity Status: PER</p> <p>Where the following conditions are met:</p> <p>a. Limited to:</p> <p>i. trees no more than 30cm in diameter measured at 1.4m from the highest point of ground level at the base of the tree.</p> <p><i>Note: If the requirements of this rule are complied with then there is no limit on the area of vegetation that can be trimmed or cleared.</i></p>	<p>4. Activity status where compliance not achieved: ECO-R3 to ECO-R6 apply</p>

ECO-R3 Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation inside any areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitat of indigenous fauna identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5 (excluding natural wetlands)

All Indigenous Vegetation Species	<p>1. Activity Status: PER</p> <p>Where the following conditions are met:</p> <p>a. Limited to (whichever is the lesser):</p> <p>i. clearance of no more than 500m² of indigenous vegetation per Significant Natural Area identified in ECO-SCHED5 site per calendar year; or</p> <p>ii. clearance of no more than 1% of the area of a Significant Natural Area identified in ECO-SCHED5 per calendar year.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>b. Limited to trimming or clearance that is:</p> <p>i. required to achieve compliance with the requirements of the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003; or</p> <p>ii. required to remove deadwood, wind-thrown trees, or chronically diseased indigenous vegetation, where an</p>	<p>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: DIS</p>
--	--	---

Commented [A29]: S75.041 Forest & Bird and S64.064 DOC - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A30]: S11.018 HBRC and S75.040 Forest & Bird - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

arborist who has attained the New Zealand Qualifications Authority National Certificate in Arboriculture Level 4 or equivalent qualification has certified in writing that the indigenous vegetation is no longer independently viable or poses a risk; or

- iii. carried out in accordance with a registered protective covenant under the Reserves Act 1977, Conservation Act 1986 or Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977; or a Reserve Management Plan approved under the Reserves Act 1977; or
- iv. required for pest control undertaken by the Department of Conservation, Hawke's Bay Regional Council or Central Hawke's Bay District Council; and removal of material infected by an unwanted organism under the Biosecurity Act 1993; or
- v. necessary to avoid an imminent threat to the safety of persons or of damage to lawfully established buildings or structures; or
- vi. necessary to provide for the ongoing safe and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrading of telecommunication, radio communication and other network utilities, but excluding their expansion, where carried out by the respective network utility operator; or
- vii. necessary to provide for the maintenance and safe and efficient operation of existing tracks, drains, formed public roads, private accesses, driveways, right of ways and walkways; or
- viii. necessary to maintain buildings, provided that the trimming or clearance of vegetation is limited to within 3 metres of a wall or roof of a building; or

- ix. required to construct new fences (including post holes) to exclude stock and/or pests from the area of indigenous vegetation, or to maintain existing fences, provided that the trimming or clearance does not exceed 2 metres in width either side of the fence line; or
- x. for use by tangata whenua for cultural purposes (e.g. for Rongoā, Waka, traditional buildings and marae-based activities) and does not result in the removal of more than 25m³ of timber per site per 10-year period.

Note (1): The Council recommends that trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation is carried out by an arborist who has attained the New Zealand Qualifications Authority National Certificate in Arboriculture Level 4 or equivalent qualification.

Note (2): Any trimming or clearance work within the vicinity of a network utility should be undertaken by a network utility approved arborist. *Note (3): Afforestation and vegetation clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with plantation forestry, is subject to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017.*

Commented [A31]: S81.073 Hort NZ - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A32]: S85.008 Rayonier Matariki Forests; S132.002 Ernslaw One Limited ; S132.003 Ernslaw One Limited; S132.004 Ernslaw One Limited - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

ECO-R4 Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation outside any area of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitat of indigenous fauna identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5

Manuka and Kanuka Species Only

1. Activity Status: PER

Where the following conditions are met:

- a. Limited to:
 - i. clearance of no more than 40.5 hectare per site per calendar year.
 - ii. Trees to be cleared must behave:
 - a. no more than 15cm in diameter measured 1.4m from

2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: RDIS

Matters over which discretion is restricted:

- a. ECO-AM1.

	<p>the highest point of ground level at the base of the tree an average diameter measured 1.4m from the highest point of ground level at the base of the tree, of no more than 15cm; and</p> <p>b. must have an average canopy height of less than 6 metres.</p>	
All Other Indigenous Vegetation Species	<p>3. Activity Status: PER</p> <p>Where the following conditions are met:</p> <p>a. Limited to:</p> <p>i. clearance of no more than 10.5 hectare per site per calendar year.</p> <p>ii. Trees to be cleared must have be:</p> <p>a. no more than 15cm in diameter measured 1.4m from the highest point of ground level at the base of the tree an average diameter measured 1.4m from the highest point of ground level at the base of the tree, of no more than 15cm; and</p> <p>b. must have an average canopy height of less than 6 metres.</p>	<p>4. Activity status where compliance not achieved: DIS</p>
ECO-R5 Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation not otherwise provided for		
All Indigenous Vegetation Species	<p>1. Activity Status: DIS</p> <p>Where the following conditions are met: N/A</p>	<p>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: N/A</p>
ECO-R6 Trimming or clearance of indigenous vegetation which forms part of any natural wetland identified as a Significant Natural Area in ECO-SCHED5		
All Indigenous Vegetation Species	<p>1. Activity Status: NC</p> <p>Where the following conditions are met: N/A</p> <p><i>Note (1): Wetland restoration work managed by the Department of Conservation, Hawke's Bay Regional Council or Central Hawke's</i></p>	<p>2. Activity status where compliance not achieved: N/A</p>

Commented [A33]: S75.041 Forest & Bird - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A34]: S121.032 Federated Farmers - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

<p><u>Bay District Council is regulated by the Regional Resource Management Plan and the NES Freshwater 2020 and therefore exempt from this rule.</u></p>	
<p><u>Note (2): This rule does not apply to vegetation clearance associated with construction of, and ongoing safe and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrading of a network utility, but is subject to the (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 (NESETA) (refer Regulations 30, 31 and 32), and / or Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations, 2020 (NES-FM), (refer Regulations 46 & 47).</u></p>	
<p><u>Note (3): This does not apply to trimming or clearance of vegetation that requires consent under the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020.</u></p>	

Commented [A35]: S11.019 HBRC - 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A36]: S79.066 Transpower - 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Commented [A37]: S121.033 Federated Farmers - 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 7

Assessment Matters

For Discretionary Activities, Council's assessment is not restricted to these matters, but it may consider them (among other factors).

ECO-AM1 Removal of Manuka or Kanuka

1. The significance of the affected indigenous vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna in terms of ecological, intrinsic, cultural or amenity values.
2. The extent to which an area of affected indigenous vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna and its inter-relationship with other habitats or areas of indigenous vegetation represents or exemplifies the components of the natural diversity of a larger reference area. For example, the representation of the current natural diversity of an ecological district, or representation of the original natural landscape.
3. The sustainability of the habitat or area of vegetation proposed to be modified or damaged or of any adjoining habitat of vegetation to an area proposed to be affected.
4. The degree to which the vegetation or habitat is threatened or is uncommon in the ecological district within which it is located.

5. Whether any affected area contains a vegetation type or species of flora or fauna that is regionally rare or threatened.

6. Whether the area is adjacent to an SNA or part of an ecological corridor for threatened or at risk species and the impact that the clearance may have on these areas.

- 6-7. Location and dimensions of areas to be cleared and vegetation type.

- 7-8. Effects on archaeological, cultural, or historic sites.

- 8-9. Effects on waterbodies and riparian margins.

- 9-10. Clearance methods.

- 10-11. Where biodiversity off-setting is proposed, the application of the principles contained in ECO-APP2 will be considered.

- 11-12. Effects on areas of high natural character identified in CE-SCHED7, or on outstanding natural landscape or feature, or significant amenity feature identified in NFL-SCHED6.

- 12-13. Whether the indigenous vegetation or habitat is on Māori land proposed for development, and the effects of that development on the indigenous vegetation or habitat.

- 13-14. The degree to which the trimming or removal of affected vegetation will provide for the health and safety of people, property, and the environment through the management of fire risk.

Formatted: Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.63 cm + Indent at: 1.27 cm

Commented [A38]: S11.038 HBRC - Report 1B
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 8

Commented [A39]: S125.075 NHMT - Report 1B
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 3

Commented [A40]: S57.064 FENZ – Report 1B
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 8

Note: Any significance assessment must be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist or forester (i.e. B.For.Sc, BSc, B.App.Sc or relevant postgraduate qualification).

ECO-AM2 Trimming and Clearance of Indigenous Vegetation

1. The significance of the affected indigenous vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna in terms of ecological, intrinsic, cultural or amenity values.
2. The extent to which an area of affected indigenous vegetation or habitat of indigenous fauna and its inter-relationship with other habitats or areas of indigenous vegetation represents or exemplifies the components of the natural diversity of a larger reference area. For example, the representation of the current natural diversity of an ecological district, or representation of the original natural landscape.
3. The sustainability of the habitat or area of vegetation proposed to be modified or damaged or of any adjoining habitat of vegetation to an area proposed to be affected.
4. The degree to which the vegetation or habitat is threatened or is uncommon in the ecological district in which it is located.
5. Whether any affected area contains a vegetation type of species of flora or fauna that is regionally rare or threatened.
6. Location and dimensions of areas to be cleared and vegetation type.
7. Effects on archaeological, cultural or historic sites.
8. Effects on waterbodies and riparian margins.
9. Clearance methods.
10. Where biodiversity off-setting is proposed, the application of the principles in ECO-APP2 will be considered.

11. Effects on areas of high natural character identified in CE-SCHED7, or on outstanding natural landscape or feature, or significant amenity feature identified in NFL-SCHED6.
12. [Whether the indigenous vegetation or habitat is on Māori land proposed for development, and the effects of that development on the indigenous vegetation or habitat.](#)
13. [The degree to which the trimming or removal of affected vegetation will provide for the health and safety of people, property, and the environment through the management of fire risk.](#)

Commented [A41]: S125.075 NHMT - Report 1B
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 3

Commented [A42]: S57.065 FENZ - Report 1B
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 8

Note: Any significance assessment must be carried out by a suitably qualified ecologist or forester (i.e. B.For.Sc, BSc, B.App.Sc or relevant postgraduate qualification).

Methods

Methods, other than the above rules, for implementing the policies:

ECO-M1 Identification and Mapping of Significant Natural Areas

Identifying Significant Natural Areas in ECO-SCHED5 in the District Plan and showing them on the relevant Planning Maps.

ECO-M2 Other Provisions in the District Plan

Implementation of objectives and policies of the relevant zones and district-wide activities in the District Plan, including those set out in the following sections of the District Plan:

1. TW – Ngā Tangata Whenua o Tamatea
2. SASM – Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori
3. NFL – Natural Landscapes and Features
4. SUB – Subdivision
5. CE – Coastal Environment
6. EW – Earthworks – rules limit the amount of earthworks in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna

ECO-M3 Biodiversity Offsetting

Applying nationally accepted best practice principles for biodiversity offsetting where biodiversity offsetting or compensation is proposed, to achieve 'no net loss' or a 'net gain' of indigenous biodiversity where adverse effects cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. This includes reference to 'Guidance of Good Practice Biodiversity Offsetting in New Zealand', (Department of Conservation, (2014))' and 'Biodiversity Offsetting Under the Resource Management Act, A Guidance Document' (Maseyk, Ussher, Kessels, Christenson and Brown, (2018)), [and the principles outlined in ECO-APP2](#).

Commented [A43]: S75.047 Forest & Bird - Report 1B
Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 5

ECO-M4 Promotion of Ecological Corridors / Networks

Promoting the protection and maintenance of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, particularly those that contribute to achieving an ecological corridor or network, through for example:

1. taking esplanade reserves or esplanade strips on subdivision as the opportunity arises;
2. providing for additional development rights through the subdivision of Conservation Lots where sites in ECO-SCHED5 or other areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna (including wetlands) are protected in perpetuity; and
3. providing partial rates relief or other financial assistance for landowners.

ECO-M5 Advocacy, Education and Information Sharing

1. Promoting education, advocacy and information sharing to raise community awareness of the attributes and values of the District's areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and the need to have regard to these values when considering applications for subdivision use and development activities.
2. Encouraging, guiding and assisting landowners in the voluntary protection of natural areas, including making the community more aware of the opportunities provided by the Queen Elizabeth II National Trust Act 1977 and Reserves Act 1977 (e.g. Ngā Whenua Rāhui kawenata), particularly landowners of areas identified in ECO-SCHED5 of the District Plan; and through consideration of other mechanisms such as a rates rebates in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1974.

ECO-M6 Hawke's Bay Biodiversity Accord

Council's role in the Hawke's Bay Biodiversity Accord. This will be a key method for enhancing biodiversity in the District and will include maintaining, developing, and enhancing partnerships with landowners who have large and significant ecological areas, Landcare and other community groups and non-governmental organisations', tangata whenua, Hawke's Bay Regional Council, Department of Conservation and other agencies and stakeholders to provide focused and efficient assistance to worthy protection and enhancement projects.

Principal Reasons

The principal reasons for adopting the policies and methods:

Key threats to areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna include inappropriate subdivision, use and development, intensification in land use practices, as well as animal and plant pests and diseases. Control and management of these activities, via rules for earthworks and vegetation clearance, in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna, is therefore appropriate.

There is considerable ecological benefit in restoring and linking SNAs where they can contribute to restoring the biodiversity values of a site, achieving an ecological corridor or

network, or controlling animal and plant pests. Methods to encourage and assist ecological management, restoration and protection measures by landowners is therefore appropriate. Council recognises that many landowners are already being proactive in the protection of areas of significant indigenous habitat including SNAs, and seeks to continue working together with the community, to encourage protection of sites on private land though consideration of other mechanisms such as QEII covenants and rates rebates in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1974.

Council, through its commitment to the Hawkes's Bay Biodiversity Accord will also continue to work with community groups and other organisations to raise awareness about the importance of protecting and enhancing the District's biodiversity and remaining threatened indigenous habitats and fauna.

Anticipated Environmental Results

The environmental results anticipated from the policies and methods:

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| ECO-AER1 | Increasing the biodiversity values of the District by increasing the protection and ecological management of SNAs and other natural areas. |
| ECO-AER2 | Improved integrated management of the District's significant areas of indigenous vegetation and/or significant habitats of indigenous fauna and biodiversity within Central Hawke's Bay District. |
| ECO-AER3 | Improved landowner and public understanding of the protecting biodiversity values in Central Hawke's Bay. |
| ECO-AER4 | Increase in the number of registered sites of QE II Covenants to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and/or significant indigenous habitats of flora and fauna in perpetuity. |
| ECO-AER5 | Avoidance, remediation, and mitigation of potential conflicts between surface water activities and adjoining activities. |
| ECO-AER6 | Maintenance of the natural amenity and intrinsic values of waterbodies. |

Commented [A44]: S75.055 Forest & Bird - Report 1B Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, Key Issue 8

ECO-SCHED5 – Schedule of Significant Natural Areas

Note: refer 'Central Hawke's Bay District Council - District Plan Significant Natural Area Review – May 2020', Bluewattle Ecology.

Schedule of Significant Natural Areas

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-1	Podocarp forest & scrub tussock grassland	Ruahine Forest Park; large natural protected area; contains underrepresented habitats and rare ecosystems; At Risk or Threatened plants and animals.		Heretaunga	1, 4, 9, 14 & 20
SNA-2	Broadleaved - Kanuka treeland	Indigenous dominated vegetation present on land of high Threatened Environment Class.		Ruahine	1 & 2
SNA-3	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Ruahine	1
SNA-4	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2, 4, and 5)		Ruahine	1 & 4
SNA-5	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2 and 5)		Ruahine	1
SNA-6		Braided channels are known and potential habitat for threatened biodiversity throughout CHDC. Mixed exotic and native vegetation dominates riparian margins. Braided rivers are a rare ecosystem type in the North Island.		Heretaunga	1, 2 & 5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-7	Beech-Podocarp-Kanuka-Manuka	Site remains significant due to vegetation types present, and the size of the area. Confidence high, site visit required to determine correct vegetation type.	Unknown	Heretaunga	2 & 5
SNA-8	Podocarp-broadleaved-Beech forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type present and indigenous vegetation on land classed as 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Heretaunga	2
SNA-9	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2, and 5)		Ruahine	2 & 5
SNA-10	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 2)		Ruahine	2 & 5
SNA-11	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	2
SNA-12	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	2
SNA-13	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Ruahine	2
SNA-14	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	2
SNA-15	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	2 & 3
SNA-16	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	2 & 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-17	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	'Acutely threatened' LENZ threat class (<10% remaining). Likely habitat for threatened plants (COPped, PITobc). Nationally critical long-tailed bat recorded on-site (The Conservation Company 2020).	Unprotected	Heretaunga	3
SNA-18	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	3
SNA-19	Predicted Rimu-Miro-Kamahi-Red Beech-Hard Beech	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Ruahine	4
SNA-20	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Ruahine	4
SNA-21	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Ruahine	4 & 5
SNA-22	Predicted Rimu-Miro-Kamahi-Red Beech-Hard Beech	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Ruahine	4
SNA-23	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Ruahine	4
SNA-24	Predicted Rimu-Miro-Kamahi-Red Beech-Hard Beech	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Ruahine	4 & 5
SNA-25	Predicted Rimu-Miro-Kamahi-Red Beech-Hard Beech	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Ruahine	4

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-26	Rushland	Whio recorded on the river due south. Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity		Ruahine	4
SNA-27		Braided channels are known and potential habitat for threatened biodiversity throughout CHDC. Mixed exotic and native vegetation dominate riparian margins. Braided rivers are a rare ecosystem type in the North Island.		Heretaunga	4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 4, 17, 23, 55 & 56
SNA-28	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1 and 5 of the LENZ threatened environment.		Ruahine	4
SNA-29	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1 and 2 of the LENZ threatened environment, At Risk - Declining species present (Longfin eel)		Ruahine	4
SNA-30	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 threatened environment, (if added to SNA no 2. it will be considered a large remnant)		Ruahine	4
SNA-31	<p>Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest</p> <p>Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is land classed as 2 in LENZ threatened environment, riparian buffer for adjacent whio (blue duck) habitat (threatened – nationally vulnerable)</p> <p>Ruahine</p> <p>4</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				

Commented [A1]: S68.001 Paul Robottom SNA Mapping Topic Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-32	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 threatened environment, riparian buffer for adjacent whio (blue duck) habitat (threatened - nationally vulnerable)		Ruahine	4
SNA-33	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1 and 5 of LENZ threatened environment, At Risk - Declining species (longfin eel) further down catchment and likely present in this SNA		Ruahine	4 & 5
SNA-34	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	<p>Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)</p> <p>Ruahine</p> <p>4</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>			
SNA-35	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of classes 1, 2 and 3 LENZ threatened environment		Ruahine	4
SNA-36	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Ruahine	4
SNA-37	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Ruahine	4
SNA-38	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Some of vegetation is in a threatened environment (class 5)		Ruahine	4
SNA-39	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk - Declining species (Longfin eel)		Ruahine	4

Commented [A2]: S68.001 Paul Robottom SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-40	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk - Declining species (Longfin eel)		Ruahine	4
SNA-41	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk - Declining species (Longfin eel)		Ruahine	4
SNA-42	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk - Declining species (Longfin eel)		Ruahine	4
SNA-43	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk - Declining species (Longfin eel)		Ruahine	4
SNA-44	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, and 2)		Heretaunga	5 & 10
SNA-45	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-46	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Ruahine	5
SNA-47	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc), At Risk - Declining Longfin Eel present in catchment	Unprotected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-48	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-49	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc), At Risk - Declining species located downstream (Longfin Eel)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-50	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% indigenous cover left)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-51	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), possible habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc), At Risk - Declining species located downstream (Longfin Eel)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-52	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Ruahine	5
SNA-53	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc), At Risk - Declining Longfin Eel present in catchment	Protected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-54	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-55	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g.	Unprotected	Heretaunga	5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		COPped, PITobc), At Risk - Declining species located downstream (Longfin Eel)			
SNA-56	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahī forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% or 10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-57	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahī forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% indigenous cover left)	Protected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-58	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahī forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), possible habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc), At Risk - Declining species located downstream (Longfin Eel)	Protected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-59	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahī forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Ruahine	5
SNA-60	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahī forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	5
SNA-61	Black Beech forest	Site remains significant due to mature indigenous vegetation on highly threatened environment class of land.		Heretaunga	5
SNA-62	Podocarp-Black Beech forest	Site remains significant (vegetation type described, totara/black beech and rimu/tawa-kamahī, is acutely threatened at the regional and district scale respectively.		Heretaunga	5
SNA-63	Podocarp-Black Beech forest	Site remains significant (vegetation type described, totara/black beech and rimu/tawa-kamahī, is acutely threatened at the regional and district scale respectively.		Heretaunga	5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-64	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and coverage of indigenous vegetation on land with 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Heretaunga	5
SNA-65	Broadleaved-Beech forest-Treeland	Mature and underrepresented indigenous vegetation with some within a Threatened Environment Class of 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Heretaunga	5
SNA-66	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to unrepresented vegetation type and LENZ TEC of the site.		Heretaunga	5
SNA-67	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant; underrepresented vegetation type, and indigenous vegetation cover in highest Threatened Environment Class. Likely habitat for alluvial floodplain threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc, etc)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-68	Broadleaved-Beech forest-Treeland	Site remains significant but could be considered forest / treeland due to presence of grazed areas. Significance due to mature likely underrepresented indigenous vegetation with some within a Threatened Environment Class of 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Heretaunga	5
SNA-69	Broadleaved-Beech forest-Treeland	Site remains significant but could be considered forest / treeland due to presence of grazed areas. Significance due to mature likely underrepresented indigenous vegetation with some within a Threatened Environment Class of 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Heretaunga	5
SNA-70	Rushland	A good sized example for the region. Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Heretaunga	5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-71	Matai-Totara-Black Mountain Beech forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1, and 2 threatened environment, (if added to SNA no 2. it will be considered a large remnant)		Ruahine	5
SNA-72	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is land classed as 2 in LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	5
SNA-73	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is land classed as 2 in LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	5
SNA-74	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				
SNA-75	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-76	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining), At Risk - Declining species nearby (Coprosma pedicullata)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-77	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1, and 2 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	5
SNA-78	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-79	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining), At Risk - Declining species nearby (Coprosma pedicullata)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-80	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining), At Risk - Declining species nearby (Coprosma pedicullata)		Heretaunga	5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-81	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of classes 1 and 2 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	5
SNA-82	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is in land of classes 1 and 5 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	5
SNA-83	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Heretaunga	5
SNA-84	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of classes 1 and 2 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	5
SNA-85	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk species present (longfin eel)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-86	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-87	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-88	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Potentially underrepresented vegetation type		Ruahine	5
SNA-89	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-90	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining), At Risk - Declining species (Longfin eel)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-91	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1, and 2 LENZ threatened environment		Ruahine	5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-92	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Ruahine	5
SNA-93	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1, and 2 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	5
SNA-94	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Ruahine	5
SNA-95	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-96	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 2)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-97	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is land classed as 2 in LENZ threatened environment		Ruahine	5
SNA-98	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 2)		Ruahine	5
SNA-99	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 2)		Ruahine	5
SNA-100	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2, and 5)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-101	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-102	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	5

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-103	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 2)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-104	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied of the highest LENZ threat class		Ruahine	5
SNA-105	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, and 2)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-106	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 2)		Heretaunga	5
SNA-107	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened ecosystem type and underrepresented habitat type		Ruahine	5
SNA-108	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Acutely Threatened LENZ threat class (<10% remaining). Nationally critical long-tailed bat recorded on-site (The Conservation Company 2020).		Heretaunga	6
SNA-109	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				
SNA-110	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				
SNA-111	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Heretaunga	6
SNA-112	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Heretaunga	6
SNA-113	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Heretaunga	5 & 6
SNA-114	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-115		Braided channels are known and potential habitat for threatened biodiversity throughout CHDC. Mixed exotic and native vegetation dominate riparian margins. Braided rivers are a rare ecosystem type in the North Island.		Heretaunga	8, 12, 13, 17 & 23
SNA-116	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% or 10-20% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	9 & 10
SNA-117	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% or 10-20% remaining)	Protected	Heretaunga	9 & 10
SNA-118		Braided channels are known and potential habitat for threatened biodiversity throughout CHDC. Mixed exotic and native vegetation dominate riparian margins. Braided rivers are a rare ecosystem type in the North Island.		Heretaunga	9, 10, 14, 15, 16 & 22
SNA-119	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which in land of class 2 LENZ threatened environment, Whio (Blue duck present in neighbouring SNA) potential for use (buffering activity)		Heretaunga	9, 14 & 15
SNA-120	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk species present (longfin eel)		Heretaunga	9 & 10
SNA-121	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	9
SNA-122	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is in land of classes 1 and 5 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	9 & 10
SNA-123	Rimu-Matai-Miro-Totara-Kamahi forest	New Zealand Falcon (Bush Falcon) observed in close proximity, and central, to proposed SNA polygons		Heretaunga	9

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-124	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining). Nationally critical grey duck observed nearby. Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	10 & 15
SNA-125	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	10
SNA-126	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Heretaunga	10
SNA-127	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining). Nationally critical grey duck observed nearby. Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Heretaunga	10 & 15
SNA-128	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Heretaunga	10
SNA-129	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	10

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-130	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% or 10-20% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	10
SNA-131	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type listed present in Schedule of ASNCV (which are likely more accurate than LCDB3 estimations), and indigenous vegetation cover on land classed as 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Heretaunga	10
SNA-132	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and LENZ TEC of site containing indigenous vegetation.		Heretaunga	10
SNA-133	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and indigenous forest/treeland on LENZ TEC site with >10% indigenous cover left. Likely habitat for alluvial floodplain threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc, etc)		Heretaunga	10
SNA-134		Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and LENZ TEC.		Heretaunga	10
SNA-135		Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and LENZ TEC.		Heretaunga	10
SNA-136	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type present and LENZ TEC coverage.		Heretaunga	10
SNA-137		Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and LENZ TEC.		Heretaunga	10
SNA-138	Podocarp forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and LENZ category with indigenous vegetation cover. Likely habitat		Heretaunga	10 & 15

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		for alluvial floodplain threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc, etc)			
SNA-139	Rush-herb-sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Heretaunga	10
SNA-140	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class, At Risk - Declining species nearby (Coprosma pedicullata)		Heretaunga	10
SNA-141	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in the 'Acutely Threatened' LENZ threat class. Long-tailed bat (nationally critical) recorded on-site by The Conservation Company Ltd (2020).		Heretaunga	10 & 15
SNA-142	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 threatened environment, At Risk - Declining species nearby (Coprosma pedicullata)		Heretaunga	10
SNA-143	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	10
SNA-144	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	10
SNA-145	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Heretaunga	10
SNA-146	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Heretaunga	10

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-147	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk - Declining species nearby (Coprosma pedicullata)		Heretaunga	10
SNA-148	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is in land of classes 1 and 2 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	10
SNA-149	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (class 2 - 10-20% remaining), At Risk - Declining species nearby (Coprosma pedicullata)		Heretaunga	10
SNA-150	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	10
SNA-151	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, At Risk species present (longfin eel)		Heretaunga	10
SNA-152	Predicted as Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	11
SNA-153	Predicted as Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Heretaunga	11
SNA-154	Kanuka treeland	Mature indigenous vegetation type present in LENZ TEC category >10% indigenous cover left. Likely habitat for alluvial floodplain threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc, etc)		Heretaunga	11 & 16
SNA-155	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Heretaunga	11

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-156	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				
SNA-157	Peat willow wetland	Site remains significant as very little peat wetland remains (only 2% of the original extent of wetlands remain in the region: Hawke's Bay biodiversity inventory, 2014).		Heretaunga	12
SNA-158	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation types present (podocarp –broadleaved underrepresented ~3% left) and LENZ TEC of land.		Heretaunga	12
SNA-159	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation types present (podocarp –broadleaved underrepresented ~3% left) and LENZ TEC of land.		Heretaunga	12
SNA-160	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation types present (podocarp –broadleaved underrepresented ~3% left) and LENZ TEC of land.		Heretaunga	12
SNA-161	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class - At Risk species close by (Longfin eel and Pittisporum obcordatum)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	12
SNA-162	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-163	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	13

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-164	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-165	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-166	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-167	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-168	Exotic and native scrubland and willow rush sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-169	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (10-20% remaining)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-170	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	13
SNA-171	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Longfin eel in catchment	Unprotected	Heretaunga	14

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-172	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% or 10-20% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	14
SNA-173	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Longfin eel in catchment	Protected	Heretaunga	14
SNA-174	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% or 10-20% remaining); protected site	Protected	Heretaunga	14
SNA-175	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% or 10-20% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	14
SNA-176		Site remains significant; underrepresented vegetation type on land in high LENZ threatened environment classes.		Heretaunga	14 & 15
SNA-177	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (10-20% remaining)		Heretaunga	14
SNA-178	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1, and 2 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	14
SNA-179	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 and 3 LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	14
SNA-180	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), At Risk - Declining Longfin Eel present in catchment	Unprotected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-181	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-182	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), At Risk - Declining fauna in close proximity (N Island Kaka), Likely habitat for	Unprotected	Heretaunga	15

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)			
SNA-183	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining), At Risk - Declining Longfin Eel present in catchment	Protected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-184	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-185	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-186	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), At Risk - Declining fauna in close proximity (N Island Kaka), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-187	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-188	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-189	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), At Risk - Declining fauna in close proximity (N Island Kaka), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Heretaunga	15

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-190	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), At Risk - Declining fauna in close proximity (N Island Kaka), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	15
SNA-191	Podocarp forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and LENZ category with indigenous vegetation cover. Likely habitat for alluvial floodplain threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc, etc)		Heretaunga	15
SNA-192	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type present and LENZ TEC coverage, presence of threatened plant species (Corybas obscura)		Heretaunga	15
SNA-193	Podocarp-broadleaved-Beech forest and treeland	Predominantly 'Chronically Threatened' LENZ threat class. Nationally critical long-tailed bat recorded on-site (The Conservation Company Ltd 2020)		Heretaunga	15
SNA-194	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Predominantly 'Acutely Threatened' LENZ threat class. Potential habitat for threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc). Nationally critical long-tailed bat recorded by The Conservation Company (2020).		Heretaunga	15
SNA-195	Podocarp forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation types present (podocarp –broadleaved underrepresented ~3% left) and LENZ TEC of land.		Heretaunga	15
SNA-196		Site remains significant; underrepresented vegetation type on land in high LENZ threatened environment classes.		Heretaunga	15

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-197	Podocarp-Beech forest and treeland	Site remains significant; underrepresented vegetation type on land in high LENZ threatened environment classes.		Heretaunga	15
SNA-198	Podocarp forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and LENZ category with indigenous vegetation cover. Likely habitat for alluvial floodplain threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc, etc)		Heretaunga	15
SNA-199	<p>Podocarp forest</p> <p>Site remains significant due to vegetation type and LENZ category with indigenous vegetation cover. Likely habitat for alluvial floodplain threatened plant species (COPped, PITobc, etc)</p> <p>Heretaunga</p> <p>15</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-200	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, likely At Risk species present (longfin eel) as within same catchment upstream and downstream		Heretaunga	15
SNA-201	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, likely At Risk species present (longfin eel) as within same catchment downstream		Heretaunga	15
SNA-202	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Heretaunga	15
SNA-203	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Heretaunga	15

Commented [A3]: S52.001 The C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-204	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in 'Chronically Threatened' LENZ threat class. High likelihood of occurrence of nationally critical long-tailed bat due to local records (The Conservation Company 2020).		Heretaunga	15
SNA-205	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, likely At Risk species present (longfin eel) as within same catchment upstream and downstream		Heretaunga	15
SNA-206	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	17
SNA-207	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	17
SNA-208	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	17
SNA-209	Exotic dominated	Site remains significant due to vegetation type (elements of underrepresented vegetation type) and the presence of indigenous vegetation cover LENZ Threatened Environment Class 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	17
SNA-210	Lake	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	17
SNA-211	Willow	Vegetation/habitat type less than 30% original distribution both in the region and in NZ, classified a threatened environment (wetland), potentially utilised by threatened fish, plants, or birds.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	17 & 23

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-212	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class, At Risk aquatic plant nearby (Myriophyllum robustum)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	17
SNA-213	<p>Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest</p> <p>Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>17</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-214	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-215	Predicted as Podocarp-Tawa-Mahoe forest and Manuka	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-216	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-217	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-218	Predicted as Podocarp-Tawa-Mahoe forest and Manuka	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-219	Predicted as Podocarp-Tawa-Mahoe forest and Manuka	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	18

Commented [A4]: S7.001 Tylee Land Co & Terawini Land Co SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-220	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (10-20% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-221	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type present and TEC coverage.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18 & 49
SNA-222	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type present and TEC coverage.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18 & 49
SNA-223	Coastal vegetation	Underrepresented vegetation type and in land of highest LENZ threat class, calcareous cliffs are an uncommon ecosystem type		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18, 19 & 57
SNA-224	Broadleaved - podocarp forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type (elements of underrepresented vegetation type) and the presence of indigenous vegetation cover LENZ Threatened Environment Class 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-225	Broadleaved - podocarp forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type (elements of underrepresented vegetation type) and the presence of indigenous vegetation cover LENZ Threatened Environment Class 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-226	Broadleaved - podocarp forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type (elements of underrepresented vegetation type) and the presence of indigenous vegetation cover LENZ Threatened Environment Class 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-227	Grazed rushland and willow-Native treeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-228	Willow-manula-sedge-rush	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-229	Rush-herb-sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-230	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (10-20% remaining).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-231	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class, At Risk species present in local catchment (Longfin eel)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-232	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-233	<p>Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest</p> <p>Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>18</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-234	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land considered threatened as per LENZ threat classifications, possible habitat of Kunzea linearis.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-235	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land with highest LENZ threat class		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18

Commented [A5]: S7.001 Tylee Land Co & Terawini Land Co SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-236	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (10-20% remaining)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-237	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened environment class		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-238	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (10-20% remaining)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-239	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (10-20% remaining)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	13 & 18
SNA-240	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	18
SNA-241	Coastal vegetation	Underrepresented vegetation type and in land of highest LENZ threat class, calcareous cliffs are an uncommon ecosystem type		Eastern Hawkes Bay	19
SNA-242	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (class 1, 2 and 3 LENZ), At Risk - Declining species located downstream (Longfin Eel)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	20
SNA-243	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (class 1, 2 and 3 LENZ), At Risk - Declining species located downstream (Longfin Eel)	Protected	Heretaunga	20
SNA-244	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (class 1, 2 and 3 LENZ), At Risk - Declining species located downstream (Longfin Eel)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	20

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-245	Beech-broadleaved-podocarp forest	Site remains significant, contains remnant vegetation on a high LENZ Threatened Environment Class. Description could be changed to indigenous forest and treeland.		Heretaunga	20 & 21
SNA-246	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to mature indigenous of Acutely Threatened (3% left) underrepresented forest type, and the site contains indigenous vegetation cover on land mostly within the second highest Threatened Environment Class.		Heretaunga	20
SNA-247	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Heretaunga	20
SNA-248	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1, 3 and 5 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	20
SNA-249	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1 and 2 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	20
SNA-250	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1, 2 and 3 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	20
SNA-251	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type some of which is in land of class 2 and 3 of LENZ threatened environment		Heretaunga	20
SNA-252	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type		Ruahine	20
SNA-253	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class		Heretaunga	20
SNA-254	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (class 1 and 2 LENZ)	Unprotected	Heretaunga	21

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-255	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (class 1 and 2 LENZ)	Protected	Heretaunga	21
SNA-256	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (class 1 and 2 LENZ)	Protected	Heretaunga	21
SNA-257	Podocarp-broadleaved-Beech forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type (elements underrepresented) and LENZ Threatened Environment Class present.		Heretaunga	21
SNA-258	Podocarp-broadleaved-Beech forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type (elements underrepresented) and LENZ Threatened Environment Class present.		Heretaunga	21
SNA-259	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, likely At Risk species present (longfin eel) as within same catchment downstream		Heretaunga	21
SNA-260	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type of the highest LENZ threat class, likely At Risk species present (longfin eel) as within same catchment downstream		Heretaunga	21
SNA-261	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to vegetation type underrepresentation and LENZ Threatened Environment Class covering the site.		Heretaunga	22
SNA-262	Willow wetland	Site remains significant due to habitat provisions it provides for At Risk and Threatened avifauna. Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland).		Heretaunga	22
SNA-263	Lake	Site remains significant due to provisions for Threatened and At Risk avifauna species. Also, wetlands are an		Heretaunga	22 & 68

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		underrepresented habitat type regionally (<2% remaining). Site is a large waterbody of the district.			
SNA-264		Braided channels are known and potential habitat for threatened biodiversity throughout CHDC. Mixed exotic and native vegetation dominates riparian margins. Braided rivers are a rare ecosystem type in the North Island.		Heretaunga	22, 23, 60, 61 & 62
SNA-265	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-266	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-267	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-268	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-269	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species			
SNA-270	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-271	Wetland scrub-Willow-exotic & rush sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-272	Wetland scrub-Willow-exotic & rush sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-273	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				
SNA-274	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	23
SNA-275	Scrub - rush wetland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	24
SNA-276	Broadleaved- small leaved forest scrub	Site remains significant due to indigenous vegetation cover of a scarce vegetation type on land in the highest Threatened Environment Class. The size of the fragment is very large.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	24
SNA-277	Broadleaved- small leaved forest scrub	Site remains significant due to indigenous vegetation cover within a TEC of 10-20% indigenous cover left.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	24

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-278	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land considered threatened as per LENZ threat classifications		Eastern Hawkes Bay	24
SNA-279	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land with highest LENZ threat class, possible habitat of Kunzea linearis.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	24
SNA-280	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Puketoi	26
SNA-281	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	27
SNA-282	<p>Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub</p> <p>Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>27</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-283	Rush-sedge-willow	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Heretaunga	27
SNA-284	Rush-sedgeland & scattered exotic riparian	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened		Heretaunga	27

Commented [A6]: S63.001 Claire Murphy SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.			
SNA-285	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	27 & 31
SNA-286	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	27 & 31
SNA-287	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-288	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-289	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-290	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-291	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28 & 32
SNA-292	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-293	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-294	Podocarp-broadleaved forest & treeland	Site remains significant, due to vegetation type underrepresentation, and the indigenous cover on land classed as <10% indigenous cover left. Habitat for At Risk plant species		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-295	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Little shag observed in close proximity to the polygon		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-296	Rushland-sedgeland-treeland & Puketea Cabbagetre	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-297	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28 & 29
SNA-298	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land considered threatened as per LENZ threat classifications		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-299	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land considered threatened as per LENZ threat classifications		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-300	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land considered threatened as per LENZ threat classifications		Eastern Hawkes Bay	28
SNA-301	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to indigenous vegetation cover of a sizable nature on a LENZ class of >30% indigenous cover left, also large site.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	29
SNA-302	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to indigenous vegetation cover of a sizable nature on a LENZ class of >30% indigenous cover left, also large site.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	29
SNA-303	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to indigenous vegetation cover on the highest TEC.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	29
SNA-304	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to indigenous vegetation cover of a sizable nature on a LENZ class of >30% indigenous cover left, also large site.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	29
SNA-305	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to indigenous vegetation cover of a sizable nature on a LENZ class of >30% indigenous cover left, also large site.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	29
SNA-306	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	29 & 33

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-307	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Puketoi	30
SNA-308	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 2 and 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	30 & 34
SNA-309	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 2 and 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	30
SNA-310	<p>Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub</p> <p>Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>31</p> <p><u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u></p>				
SNA-311	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-312	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-313	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub				

Commented [A7]: S63.001 Claire Murphy SNA Mapping Topic Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	<p>Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>31</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-314	Podocarp-small leaved-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the highest TEC, At Risk plant species (Teucrium parvifolium), and despite patches of treeland it is a large remnant of lowland forest		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31 & 32
SNA-315	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-316	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-317	<p>Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub</p> <p>Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>31</p>				

Commented [A8]: S63.001 Claire Murphy SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				
SNA-318	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-319	Native wetland scrub	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon. Large continuous expanse of wetland and standing water.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-320	Willow-rushland-manuka scrub	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-321	Willow and rushland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31 & 35
SNA-322	Willow-native scrubland-rushland-sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-323	Scrubland-treeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31

Commented [A9]: S63.001 Claire Murphy SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		biodiversity. Coprosma pedicullata (At Risk -Declining) record close by - a species that colonises oxbow habitat			
SNA-324	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-325	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-326	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class. Potential for swamp maire - threatened - nationally critical		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-327	Kahikatea-Pukatea-Tawa forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of the highest LENZ threat class, potential for swamp maire to be present (threatened - nationally critical)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-328	<p>Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub</p> <p>Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>31</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-329	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31

Commented [A10]: S63.001 Claire Murphy SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-330	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important. Eastern Hawkes Bay 34 <u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u>				
SNA-331	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important. Eastern Hawkes Bay 34 <u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u>				
SNA-332	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important. Eastern Hawkes Bay 34 <u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u>				
SNA-333	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.				

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	Eastern Hawkes Bay	31 <u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u>			
SNA-334	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important. Eastern Hawkes Bay	31 <u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u>			
SNA-335	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important. Eastern Hawkes Bay	31 <u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u>			
SNA-336	Broadleaved – small leaved forest and scrub Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important. Eastern Hawkes Bay	31 <u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u>			

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-337	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-338	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-339	<p>Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub</p> <p>Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>31</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-340	Broadleaved - small leaved forest and scrub	Large site with under-represented vegetation types (manuka scrub is less than 2 % land coverage of district) and threatened environment classes. The successional change of the site into broadleaved forest is also important.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	31
SNA-341	Predicted as Podocarp-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining). Nationally critical grey	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32

Commented [A11]: S63.001 Claire Murphy SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		duck observed nearby. Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)			
SNA-342	Predicted as Podocarp-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining). Nationally critical grey duck observed nearby. Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-343	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-344	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-345	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-346	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (multiple categories)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-347	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-348	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-349	Predicted as Podocarp-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining). Nationally critical grey duck observed nearby. Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-350	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-351	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-352	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-353	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (multiple categories)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-354	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-355	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-356	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-357	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-358	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-359	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-360	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-361	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-362	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-363	Podocarp-small leaved-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the highest TEC, At Risk plant species (Teucrium parvifolium), and despite patches of treeland it is a large remnant of lowland forest		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-364	Podocarp-small leaved-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the highest TEC, At Risk plant species (Teucrium parvifolium), and despite patches of treeland it is a large remnant of lowland forest		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32 & 36
SNA-365	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-366	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-367	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-368	Broadleaved - podocarp forest and treeland	Site remains significant due to vegetation type and the site's TEC coverage		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-369	Native scrub - willow	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-370	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32 & 36

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.			
SNA-371	Rush-sedgeland & Manuka in native exotic mosaic	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-372	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-373	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type (possibly), in land of highest LENZ threat class, Criteria 3 may apply if Kunzea linearis is present		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-374	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-375	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-376	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	32
SNA-377	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	33
SNA-378	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	33
SNA-379	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	33

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-380	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in threatened environment (20-30% remaining).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	33
SNA-381	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	33 & 72
SNA-382	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34 & 35
SNA-383	<u>Indigenous broadleaf remnant and regeneration with scattered podocarp</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class <u>41</u> , and <u>2</u>)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-384	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-385	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class <u>2</u> and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34 & 35
SNA-386	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Indigenous vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-387	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34

Commented [A12]: S132.006 Ernslaw One Limited SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Commented [A13]: S132.006 Ernslaw One Limited SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Commented [A14]: S132.006 Ernslaw One Limited SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest				
SNA-388	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 2 and 3 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-389	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of class 1 and 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-390	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	In land of class 1, 2 and 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-391	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 1 and 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-392	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4) Eastern Hawkes Bay <div>34</div> <div>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</div>				
SNA-393	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Indigenous vegetation in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-394	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Indigenous vegetation in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34

Commented [A15]: S113.001 Ben & Libby Tosswill
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-395	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-396	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-397	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-398	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-399	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-400	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-401	Manuka-Kanuka	In land of class 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-402	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-403	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34

Commented [A16]: S132.006 Ernslaw One Limited
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	<u>wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest				
SNA-404	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class <u>1</u> and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-405	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class <u>1</u> and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-406	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class <u>1</u> and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-407	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class <u>1</u> and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	<u>broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest				
SNA-408	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1 and 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-409	<u>Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 2 and 4)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-410	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream margins</u> Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-411	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	stream marginsRimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest				
SNA-412	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream marginsRimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34
SNA-413	<u>Manuka/kanuka scrub, patches of broadleaf/podocarp forest and indigenous wetlands in valley's and stream marginsRimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	34 & 38
SNA-414	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4). Tui, bellbird, kereru, piwakawaka, and skinks recorded by landowner.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	34, 38 & 39
SNA-415	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	35
SNA-416	Predicted as Kahikatea-Puketa-Tawa forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining), Likely habitat for	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	35

Commented [A17]: S132.006 Ernslaw One Limited
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		threatened plants associated with alluvial plains (e.g. COPped, PITobc)			
SNA-417	<p>Rushland</p> <p>Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>35</p> <p>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</p>				
SNA-418	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented ecosystem type and in land of highest LENZ threat class		Eastern Hawkes Bay	35
SNA-419	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-420	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-421	Podocarp-small leaved-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the highest TEC, At Risk plant species (Teucrium parvifolium), and despite patches of treeland it is a large remnant of lowland forest		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-422	Podocarp-small leaved-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the highest TEC, At Risk plant species (Teucrium parvifolium), and despite patches of treeland it is a large remnant of lowland forest		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36

Commented [A18]: S61.001 Rodney Bremer SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-423	Broadleaved-small leaved forest and treeland-scrub	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the second highest TEC		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-424	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36 & 40
SNA-425	Broadleaved-small leaved forest and treeland-scrub	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the second highest TEC		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-426	Broadleaved-small leaved forest and treeland-scrub	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the second highest TEC		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-427	Broadleaved-small leaved forest and treeland-scrub	Site remains significant due to indigenous cover on land of the second highest TEC		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-428	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-429	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-430	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36 & 37

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
		biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.			
SNA-431	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36 & 37
SNA-432	Rush-sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-433		Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. North island fernbird observed in within similar habitat 4km north.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-434	Rush-sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. North Island fernbird and Australasian bittern.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-435	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-436	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36 & 37
SNA-437	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-438	THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-439	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-440	Rush-sedgeland	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	36
SNA-441	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	37
SNA-442	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	37
SNA-443	Herbacious-rush-sedge	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity. Threatened bird species observed in close proximity to polygon.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	37
SNA-444	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type and in land of highest LENZ threat class, calcerous cliffs are an uncommon ecosystem type		Eastern Hawkes Bay	37
SNA-445	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	37 & 74
SNA-446	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	38

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-447	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-448	Small leaved-broadleaved-Beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38 & 39
SNA-449	Small leaved-broadleaved-Beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-450	Small leaved-broadleaved-Beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-451	Small leaved-broadleaved-Beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38 & 39
SNA-452	Small leaved-broadleaved-Beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-453	Small leaved-broadleaved-Beech forest-scrub	<p>Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.</p> <p><u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u></p>		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38, 39 & 41
SNA-454	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest				

Commented [Au19]: S113.001 Ben & Libby Tosswill
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
	<p>Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4). Tui, bellbird, kereru, piwakawaka, and skinks recorded by landowner.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>38 & 39</p> <p><u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u></p>				
SNA-455	<u>Small-leaved – Broadleaved – scrub and beech forest</u> <u>Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest</u>	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)	<u>Not Protected</u>	Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-456	<p>Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest</p> <p>Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4). Tui, bellbird, kereru, piwakawaka, and skinks recorded by landowner.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>38</p> <p><u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u></p>				
SNA-457	<p><u>Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest</u></p> <p>Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4). Tui, bellbird, kereru, piwakawaka, and skinks recorded by landowner.</p> <p>Eastern Hawkes Bay</p> <p>38</p> <p><u>THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED</u></p>				

Commented [A20]: S113.001 Ben & Libby Tosswill
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Commented [A21]: S132.006 Ernslaw One Limited
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Commented [A22]: S113.001 Ben & Libby Tosswill
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-458	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4). Tui, bellbird, kereru, piwakawaka, and skinks recorded by landowner.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-459	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in varied LENZ threatened land (threat class 1, 2 and 4). Tui, bellbird, kereru, piwakawaka, and skinks recorded by landowner.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-460	Small-leaved – broadleaved – scrub and beech forest Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)	Not Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-461	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (threat class 4)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	38
SNA-462	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Unprotected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-463	Predicted as Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (<10% remaining)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-464	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39 & 42
SNA-465	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39

Commented [A23]: S132.006 Ernslaw One Limited
SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 3

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-466	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-467	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-468	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-469	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-470	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-471	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-472	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-473	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-474	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-475		Site is a wetland with good indigenous vegetation cover (criteria 4)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-476	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest Highest LENZ threat class. Eastern Hawkes Bay 39 THIS UNIQUE IDENTIFIER IS NO LONGER ALLOCATED				
SNA-477	Small leaved - broadleaved-beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-478	Small leaved - broadleaved-beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-479	Small leaved - broadleaved-beech forest-scrub	Site remains significant due to the large size of indigenous vegetation area, which contains elements of significantly underrepresented vegetation types known to the district.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39
SNA-480	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	40
SNA-481	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	40 & 76

Commented [A24]: S32.001 Senlac Station SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-482	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	In land of class 1, 2 and 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	40
SNA-483	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	In land of class 1, 2 and 4 LENZ threatened environment		Eastern Hawkes Bay	40
SNA-484	Coastal vegetation and estuary river mouth	Site remains significant due to habitat for at risk and threatened indigenous birds, and fish.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	40 & 76
SNA-485	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land considered threatened as per LENZ threat classifications		Eastern Hawkes Bay	40
SNA-486	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-487	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-488	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-489	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-490	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-491	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-492	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-493	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-494	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (>30% left <10% protected)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-495	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41 & 42
SNA-496	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-497	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Indigenous dominated vegetation on land of acutely Threatened Environment Class		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-498	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-499	Predicted as Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Acutely threatened vegetation type and threatened environment (>30% remaining <10% protected)	Protected	Eastern Hawkes Bay	41
SNA-500	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-501	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-502	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39 & 42

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-503	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-504	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-505	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-506	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-507	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-508	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-509	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-510	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-511	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-512	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-513	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-514	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-515	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-516	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-517	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in LENZ threatened land (>30% left <10% protected)		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-518	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-519	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-520	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-521	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-522	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-523	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-524	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-525	Rush-sedge-willow	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-526	Rush-sedge-willow	Under-represented habitat in region and NZ, threatened environment (wetland), potential habitat for threatened biodiversity.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-527	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	39 & 42
SNA-528	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-529	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-530	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-531	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42
SNA-532	Small leaved scrub and flaxland	Remains significant due to Threat class of land dominated by indigenous regeneration as well as the large site area of indigenous vegetation		Eastern Hawkes Bay	43
SNA-533	<u>Small-leaved scrub and flaxland</u> Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type and in land of highest LENZ threat class, calcerous cliffs are an uncommon ecosystem type		Eastern Hawkes Bay	40 & 43
SNA-534	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42 & 45
SNA-535	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42 & 45
SNA-536	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	42 & 45
SNA-537	Kahikatea-Matai-Tawa-Mahoe forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	45

Commented [A25]: S59.002 Karl Tipene SNA Mapping Topic 6B Key Issue 2

Unique Identifier	Site Identifier (Vegetation Type)	Site Type (Threatened Classification)	Protection Status	Ecological District	Map Reference
SNA-538	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	45
SNA-539	Rimu-Tawa-Kamahi forest	Underrepresented vegetation type in land of highest LENZ threat class.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	45
SNA-540	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	45
SNA-541	Black Beech-Podocarp-Broadleaved Forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type and mosaic of <10% indigenous cover of a Threatened Environment Class (part site).		Eastern Hawkes Bay	45
SNA-542	Podocarp-broadleaved forest	Site remains significant due to underrepresented vegetation type, indigenous vegetation cover on highest TEC, and large site.		Eastern Hawkes Bay	45

Appendix B – Summary of Recommendations on Submissions

Table: Summary of Recommended Decisions on Submissions and Further Submissions

Submission Point	Submitter/ Further Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Key Issue Reference	Officer Recommendation (as per s42A unless otherwise specified)	Panel Recommendation	Amendments to Proposed Plan?
S6.001	IA & PD Waldrom	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNA [SNA-27 on land at 307 Tikokino Rd].	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S7.001	Tylee Land Co & Terawini Land Co	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNAs [SNA-210, SNA-213 & SNA-233 on submitter's land].	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S9.001	Hadley Boyle	ECO-SCHED5	[Remove SNA-27, SNA-44, SNA-62, SNA-80, SNA-102 & SNA-139 on land at 1407 Makaroro Road]. Scrap the mapping done. Work with farmers instead of hindering them. Help to create plans for sustainable harvest.	Key Issue 1, 2	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S16.001	Jane Davidson	MAPS	Amend SNA-453 [on land at 1555 Te Uri Road, Porangahau] to reflect Ecologist recommendations.	Key Issue 3	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S21.001	Scott Hunter	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNA-438 at 639 Hunter Road.	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S22.001	AJ & MA Smith Family Trust	ECO-SCHED5	No change in current laws (oppose Schedule of SNAs).	Key Issue 1	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S32.001	Senlac Station Ltd	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNA-476 [on land at 780 Te Uri Road].	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S34.001	Sandra Phillips	ECO-SCHED5	General opposition to SNAs on private property In relation to SNA-231 and SNA-232 - we would prefer to be trusted to manage them ourselves.	Key Issue 1	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S35.001	Mark and Lucy Lowry	ECO-SCHED5	Revise SNA-434 on our property [1376 Blackhead Road].	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept i	Yes

Submission Point	Submitter/ Further Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Key Issue Reference	Officer Recommendation (as per s42A unless otherwise specified)	Panel Recommendation	Amendments to Proposed Plan?
.							
S40.001	Lance de Malmanche	ECO-SCHED5	SNA-176 has not been identified correctly and should be seen in person before classifying as SNA.	Key Issue 3	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S44.001	Ben Anderson	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNA-288.	Key Issue 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S47.001	Claire Bradley	ECO-SCHED5	General opposition to SNAs Remove SNA-39, SNA-40, SNA-41, SNA-42, SNA-43 and part of SNA-59 over 288 North Block Road, Wakarara. Remove SNA-144 over 1589 Wakarara Road.	Key Issue 1	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S49.001	Wade Stoddart	MAPS	Amend SNAs on 54 Beach Road [SNA-533] and 331 Ireland Road - mainly changing the shape to match fencing already done.	Key Issue 3	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S50.004	The Surveying Company (HB) Ltd	ECO-SCHED5	Removal of SNAs from the District Plan.	Key Issue 1	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S51.001	N. M. Riddell Family Trust Farm	MAPS	Remove SNA-152 and SNA-153 from our property [Argyll Road, Lot 1 DP 12239].	Key Issue 2	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S52.001	The C&H Hardy Family Trust and Lime Terrace Farm	MAPS	Remove SNAs on my land [SNA-138, SNA-141, SNA-191 & SNA-199 on land at 73 Tukituki-Makaretu Road].	Key Issue 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S53.001	Sam Bradley	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNAs from District Plan. Opposition to SNAs 39, 40,41, 42, 43 & part of 59, and 2, 5, 9,10,98 and 99.	Key Issue 1, 2	Reject	Reject	No
.							

Submission Point	Submitter/ Further Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Key Issue Reference	Officer Recommendation (as per s42A unless otherwise specified)	Panel Recommendation	Amendments to Proposed Plan?
S59.002	Karl Tipene	ECO-SCHED5	Oppose SNA-533. Oppose all SNA on Māori land.	Key Issue 1, 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
FS5.065	Ngā hapū me ngā marae o Tamatea		Oppose	Key Issue 1	Allow	Allow	No
S60.001	Joanne & Kenneth Scholfield	MAPS	Re-assess the mapping and remove SNA-118 from Waituki Farm (Lot 1 DP 10934).	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S60.002	Joanne & Kenneth Scholfield	MAPS	Re-assess the mapping and remove SNA-194 from Waituki Farm (Lot 1 DP 10934).	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S61.001	Rodney Bremer	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNA-417 from 624 Wilder Road, Porangahau.	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S63.001	Claire Murphy	ECO-SCHED5	Strongly oppose 'Significant Natural Areas' in the Proposed Plan. If a site visit were undertaken a lot of smaller SNAs [on our property] would be removed and boundaries changed.	Key Issue 1, 3	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S65.001	Evan & Linda Potter	ECO-SCHED5	Remove two areas classified as SNAs on our property. And recognise that QEII covenants are equal to SNAs.	Key Issue 1, 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S68.001	Paul Robottom	ECO-SCHED5	Strongly oppose the SNA that is proposed for my property [SNA-1, SNA-27, SNA-34 & SNA-36 on land at Hinerua Road]. Do not proceed with any SNA on private farm land.	Key Issue 1, 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S69.001	Andy & Robbie Hunt	ECO-SCHED5	Pause or remove all SNAs in the Proposed Plan. Concerns about SNA-192	Key Issue 1	Reject	Reject	No
.							

Submission Point	Submitter/ Further Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Key Issue Reference	Officer Recommendation (as per s42A unless otherwise specified)	Panel Recommendation	Amendments to Proposed Plan?
S72.001	GH Williams Trust	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNA-47, 48, 49, 51, 53, 54 & 55 [on land at 764 Matheson Road, Tikokino].	Key Issue 2	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S72.002	GH Williams Trust	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNA-60, and alter the boundary of SNA-96 [on land at 764 Matheson Road, Tikokino].	Key Issue 2	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S83.001	Carlyon Station Limited	ECO-SCHED5	Do not adopt SNAs in the District Plan.	Key Issue 1	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S84.016	Kairākau Lands Trust	MAPS	Remove ONFs [ONF-7], SNAs [SNA-214, SNA-217, SNA-220, SNA-223 & SNA-229], and HNCAs [HNC-2] on Kairākau Lands Trust land.	Key Issue 1	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S86.001	Roundaway Station Ltd, Oueroa Station Ltd, Ngahuaia Station Ltd, & High Borrans Farm Ltd	ECO-SCHED5	General concern about SNAs. Continue to treat all the identified SNAs on our property as they currently are and remove them from the District Plan [SNA-301, SNA-302, SNA-304, SNA-305 & SNA-306 on land at 2862 Pourerere Road; SNA-27 & SNA-122 on land at Lookout Road, Ongaonga; SNA-291, SNA-344, SNA-351, SNA-359, SNA-366 & SNA-367 on land at 1824 Farm Road, Waipukurau; and SNA-362, SNA-366, SNA-368 & SNA-376 on land at 352 Farm Road, Waipukurau].	Key Issue 1, 2	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S92.001	Pairatahi Holdings Ltd	MAPS	Amend the new SNA overlay.	Key Issue 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S95.001	Waipuna NZ Ltd	MAPS	Remove the SNA mapping from the Proposed District Plan. Objections to SNA-234, SNA-276 and SNA-279.	Key Issue 1, 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S96.001	Matthew von Dadszen	ECO - Ecosystems and	Delete SNA-307 [on land at 842 Tourere Road]. Amend the rules around the SNAs and deletion of some, to give landowners back the rights over	Key Issue 2	Reject	Reject	No

Submission Point	Submitter/ Further Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Key Issue Reference	Officer Recommendation (as per s42A unless otherwise specified)	Panel Recommendation	Amendments to Proposed Plan?
		Indigenous Biodiversity	control of their own land and how it will be managed in the future.				
.							
S99.001	Curt & Tricia Zant	ECO-SCHED5	General opposition to SNAs on private property Remove SNA from my freehold land [SNA-241 on land at Te Apiti Road].	Key Issue 1, 2	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S102.003	Te Mata Mushrooms Land Company Limited	MAPS	Ground-truth and review the edges of SNA-264. Retain the extent of SNA-264 if there are SNA values confirmed - amend the extent if not.	Key Issue 3	Accept	Accept	No
.							
S103.002	Sandy Hill Farms Limited	MAPS	Amend SNA-424 to remove the paddock identified on the map accompanying the full submission.	Key Issue 3	Accept	Accept	Yes
.							
S108.001	Samuel Bradley	ECO-SCHED5	Remove SNAs on private land [SNA-144 on land at 1589 Wakarara Road].	Key Issue 1, 2	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S111.001	Waipuna NZ Ltd	MAPS	Remove SNA-234, SNA-276 and SNA-279. Remove SNA mapping from the Proposed Plan.	Key Issue 1, 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S113.001	Ben & Libby Tosswill	MAPS	Remove SNA-385, SNA-414, SNA-454, and SNA-457 [on land at Wilder Road, Porangahau?], or view them physically before they are deemed included as SNAs.	Key Issue 2	Accept in part	Accept in part	Yes
.							
S132.006	Ernslaw One Limited	MAPS	Work with CHBDC to further rationalise SNA boundaries within Ernslaw forest estate through exchange of monitoring data and ground-truthing.	Key Issue 3	Reject	Reject	No
.							
S133.001	David Severinsen	MAPS	General concern about SNAs Make some amendments to the Proposed Plan [mapping of SNA-424 and SNA-434 on the Planning Maps?], and would like questions answered.	Key Issue 1, 2	Reject	Reject	No

