

Proposed District Plan submission form



Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 199.

Feel free to add more pages to your submission to provide a fuller response.

To: Central Hawke's Bay District Council			
1. Submitter details			
Full Name	Last Potter	First Evie + Linda	
Company/Organisation (if applicable)			
Contact Person (if different)			
Email Address	waipapak@gmail.com		
Address			Postcode
Phone	Mobile	Home (06) 835 0094	Work (06) 835 0094
2. This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan for Central Hawke's Bay			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> I could <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I could not – gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (Please tick relevant box)			
If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete point 4 below:			
4. <input type="checkbox"/> I am <input type="checkbox"/> I am not – directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:			
(a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition. (Please tick relevant box if applicable)			
Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.			
5. <input type="checkbox"/> I wish <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I do not wish – to be heard in support of my submission in person (Please tick relevant box)			
6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I will <input type="checkbox"/> I will not – consider presenting a joint case with other submitters, who make a similar submission, at a hearing. (Please tick relevant box)			
7. Do you wish to present your submission via Zoom? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
8. Please complete section below (insert additional boxes per provision you are submitting on):			
The specific provision of the plan that my submission relates to:			
Identification of SNAs,			
Do you: <input type="checkbox"/> Support <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Amend (Please tick relevant box)			
What decision are you seeking from Council? To remove 2 areas classified as			
Reasons: SNAs on our property, To Recognise that QE2 covenants are equal to SNAs, refer attached submission			
Please note: All submissions will be treated as public documents and will be made available on Council's website. However, you may request that your contact details (but not your name) be withheld. If you want your contact details withheld, please let us know by ticking this box. <input type="checkbox"/>			

03 August 2021

CHB District Council

To whom it may concern

We are writing in response to your letter dated 6 November 2020 regarding the identification of proposed SNA's on our property (valuation number: 1092018300 1092018300A)

We would like to clarify that no notification of potential SNAs was given in May 2019 as suggested regarding our property; this was verified by Helen O'Shaughnessy in a phone conversation in November 2020. Further conversations with Helen and information she supplied have gone some way to alleviate some of our concerns. However we remain concerned with a couple of issues.

1. Our existing QE2 covenants and covenant requirements will achieve better ecological and indigenous biodiversity benefits than a desktop SNA classification. Your proposed SNAs covering land protected by existing QE2 covenants, are unnecessary and is a doubling up of bureaucracy adding another layer of unneeded rules and regulations for no additional gain. The existing covenants will in perpetuity, achieve what you are proposing by putting in SNA's. In our case we have stock access and bridge infrastructure along with water infrastructure in the proposed SNAs that need maintenance, which can involve vegetation removal and earth works. These are tasks easily achieved under our covenant document, or through national QE2 board approval for requests out of the ordinary.

Our QE2 covenant was established over six years in 1999 and covers about 20% of our total area. It's ecological health is considerably better than it was before it was covenanted and has been a significant factor in our being awarded environmental recognition by the New Zealand deer industry (2019 Premier Award – The Elworthy Environmental Award, NZ Landcare Trust Award; 2020 East Coast Supreme Winer for the Balance Farm Environment Awards; 2021 National Ambassadors for Sustainable Farming and Growing and Gordon Stephenson Trophy recipients)

2. Desktop classification of proposed SNAs should be followed up by a physical site inspection to determine actual significance or naturalness. 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. These should be ground proofed if you are in doubt or we can identify these on a map. We attach photographs to give you an indication of the blocks limited ecological value. As these blocks have been in gorse or grazed for many years, we struggle to understand what beneficial outcome would be achieved if designated as SNAs?

While we understand the intent of your proposed SNAs on our property and your obligations under the NPSIB, we consider QE2 covenants to be already meeting your obligations under the biodiversity policy. We are aware Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) in the Proposed District Plan (PDP) are managed primarily by the 'Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity' chapter, which recognises that the protection of areas of significant

indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna is a matter of national importance under s 6(c) Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**). Section 74(1)(b) RMA requires the Council to prepare its district plan in accordance with the provisions of Part 2, which includes s 6. We note the PDP is also required to give effect to the Hawke's Bay Regional Policy Statement, which at Objective 15 requires "*The preservation and enhancement of remaining areas of significant indigenous vegetation, significant habitats of indigenous fauna and ecologically significant wetlands*", this is the exact purpose of a covenant. During discussions with Helen, she acknowledged that CHBDC recognises covenant rules as superseding SNA rules and CHBDC has made provision in the PDP to this effect. If so, the final step of recognising an existing legally binding agreement between two parties in perpetuity for a shared goal as the equivalent wouldn't appear to be that much of a stretch.

We look forward to your response

Yours faithfully

Evan and Linda Potter



