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BUSINESS

1. APOLOGIES

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Conflicts of interest (if any) to be reported for minuting.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 16 October 2018

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 16 October 2018.

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

5. DEPUTATION
6. REPORTS

6.1 District Plan Review – Plan Making Process Options under the RMA – Neil Sheerin (Senior Policy Planner) and Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) Receives report No. 181204142198.
(b) Notes the three plan making process options outlined in Section 4 below.
(c) Approves the District Plan Review to proceed using the ‘Standard’ plan making process under Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA.
(d) Authorises the formal public notification of the intention to review the District Plan under Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA.

6.2 Improving Council’s approach to biodiversity – Shelley Milosavljevic (Intermediate Policy Planner)

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 181029126064.
(b) Endorses the approach of continuing to protect Significant Natural Areas as part of the District Plan Review.
(c) Endorses staff to further consider regulatory approaches to protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity (within and outside of Significant Natural areas) as part of the District Plan Review.
(d) Notes that national and regional policy in relation to indigenous biodiversity is likely subject to significant change and the Council’s role and resourcing in this area will likely be subject to external direction in coming years.
(e) Notes that the full impact of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) has yet to be assessed and will require consideration beyond Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan preparation in January 2019.
(f) Notes that subject to consideration and direction from the Committee on the non-regulatory tools it wishes to be investigated further, staff will bring another report in January 2019 for Annual Plan budgetary purposes.
7. PORTFOLIO UPDATES

7.1 District Planning Development - Councillor Neville Atkinson
7.2 Regulation and Civil Defence – Councillor John Meyer
7.3 Business, Promotion and Town Centres – Councillor Dan Gordon

8. QUESTIONS

9. URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS

Briefing

- At the conclusion of the meeting there will be a briefing

‘District Plan Review – Summary of briefings for consultation purposes’.
MINUTES OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING AND REGULATION COMMITTEE MEETING
HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 215 HIGH STREET, RANGIORA ON TUESDAY
16 OCTOBER 2018 1.00PM.

PRESENT
Councillor D Gordon (Chair), Mayor D Ayers (from 1.30pm), Councillors N Atkinson, W Doody and S Stewart.

IN ATTENDANCE
Councillors A Blackie, P Williams and K Felstead.
J Palmer (Chief Executive), N Harrison (Manager Regulation), M Bacon (Team Leader Resource Consents), W Taylor (Building Unit Manager), T Ellis (Development Planning Manager), M Johnston (Environmental Services Manager), Neil Sheerin (Senior Policy Planner), Shelley Milosavljevic (Intermediate Policy Planner), Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner) Lynley Beckingsale (Policy Analyst) and E Stubbs (Minute Secretary).

1. APOLOGIES

Moved Councillor Gordon second Councillor Doody

An apology was received and sustained from Councillor Meyer for absence and Mayor Ayers for lateness.

CARRIED

Acknowledgement of Les Pester Retirement
Les Pester was invited to the meeting to provide an opportunity for the Committee to thank L Pester for his many years of work in Civil Defence in the Waimakariri District. He had retired from his role of Civil Defence Controller. He had lead the Civil Defence team and played a vital role in building up the Waimakariri community team. Prior to that he was at the Ministry of Civil Defence as Deputy Commissioner in a role involving training, mentoring and caching. N Harrison noted in particular his role with the building assessment team following the Canterbury earthquakes. His relationship skills and calm manner would be missed.

D Gordon thanked L Pester on behalf of the Council and community for his work and wished him and Margaret well for retirement.

N Atkinson thanked L Pester on behalf of the Kaiapoi community for his role following the earthquakes in particular his calm, collected and organised approach at an extremely difficult time.

W Doody concurred with the sentiments.

J Palmer acknowledged L Pester’s work on behalf of the Canterbury group to which he had made a huge contribution. He had generously provided support to other local authorities including the South and mid Canterbury snow of 2006. He had been a part of forming policy and strategy for wider Canterbury. He echoed the sentiments of those around the table regarding L Pester’s calmness under pressure and valuable advice. He also thanked Margaret for her support.

L Pester was humbled and appreciated the sentiments. He acknowledged the support of Council Management including J Palmer to Civil Defence in Waimakariri and also the good working relationships with the community. He
commented that Waimakariri District Council had always been a leader in Civil Defence and it was held in high esteem by others for that reason.

On behalf of the District Planning and Regulation Committee, the Chair presented L Pester a small gift in appreciation for his service in the role of Civil Defence Controller.

2. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

3. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

3.1 Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 21 August 2018

Moved Councillor Atkinson second Councillor Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Confirms as a true and correct record the minutes of a meeting of the District Planning and Regulation Committee held on 21 August 2018.

CARRIED

4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

There were no matters arising.

Item 6.1 was taken at this time. Note that the minutes have been recorded in accordance with the order of the agenda as circulated.

5. DEPUTATION

Gillian Giller spoke to a Powerpoint presentation (Trim 181031127785) titled Waimakariri District – Protecting our Flora and Fauna Heritage. G Giller explained that she had grown up on a dairy farm where she had learned to value and protect vegetation remnants which had gone hand in hand with farm operations.

G Giller showed images of forest cover in Canterbury pre human times compared to modern times noting that there was a fraction of forest cover left. Much of the Waimakariri District was in the ‘redzone’ meaning there was less than 10% of indigenous cover left.

G Giller explained that the Waimakariri District had a range of different ecosystems including:

- Inland basin frost-flat vegetation
- Inland basin wetland vegetation
- Inland hill country beech forest
- Induced (secondary) vegetation
- Foothills and high plains podocarp forest
- Plains drylands
- Plains wetlands
- Lowland swamp forest
- Coastal vegetation

There was little remaining of these ecosystems with many species declining and vulnerable. Some ecosystems were the only known habitat for species. The
lowland swamp and costal forests were gone and were now limited to re-creation attempts.

G Giller advised that Waimakariri District had the best dryland kanuka remnants on the Canterbury Plains however these were highly threatened and were undervalued and under protected. Aerial images from 2005 and 2015 were compared to show the effect of changing land use. In that time Kanuka remnants had reduced from 95ha to 35ha.

G Giller outlined some strategies that could assist with looking after the ecosystems including;

- Addressing knowledge gaps – Council, landowners and the community
- Monitoring trends
- Physical protection – fencing
- Weed control
- Pest control

G Giller recommended the Committee read the Canterbury Regional Biodiversity Strategy to which Waimakariri District Council was a signatory. It outlined guiding principles including protection, restoration and re-creation. Protecting remnant vegetation was the best option as it provided the best available representativeness rather than superficial re-creation. It was also the most cost efficient at $0.5-1k/ha compared to $50k-100k/ha.

G Giller looked at management issues noting that much of the biodiversity was on private land. Protection required awareness, understanding and engagement as well as costing money. The Council had statutory responsibilities and could also provide non-statutory leadership.

In practical terms G Giller suggested that Waimakariri District Council could conduct a survey of all indigenous flora and fauna in the District, employ a biodiversity officer to coordinate actions and adequately fund a Resource Management Programme for indigenous flora and fauna. She noted that the fund had not increased since 2005. In the District Plan there was the option for a ‘carrot or stick’ approach. She suggested it was better to encourage and help people protect biodiversity.

D Ayers asked if areas were set aside adjacent to remnant areas was there an increased chance of ecosystem development in the new area and G Giller replied there was, over time associated micro-horizons could move.

D Ayers asked if there was any usefulness to replacing pine plantations with kanuka plantations, for example in a shingle pit reserve. G Giller replied if it was on the basis that there was remnant kanuka in that location it was. Complete re-creation could never be like the original, however in some cases it was the only option. Kanukas were only one part of the ecosystem and the total was extremely difficult to recreate.

Mayor Ayers asked in the case of climate change would the climate be similar enough for original vegetation cover to re-establish. G Giller explained that it would not be that different that plants could not adapt. They could handle a degree of disturbance, what they could not handle was to be completely wiped out.

D Gordon asked in a question to staff whether it was worthwhile having a workshop or report on the issue to consider the points raised. T Ellis commented there had been one or two workshops on biodiversity options and obligations under the Resource Management Act. There was a broad goal of ‘doing better’. He was happy to come back to the issue in due course. T Ellis noted the biodiversity strategy was not 10 years old and had never had much ownership, it required an action plan to make it happen. From a District Plan point of view ecologists were looking at certain sites to see if they were significant. G Giller suggested that the whole area needed surveying rather than isolated sites as
even within broad categories there were subsets and it was important to understand the entirety.

T Ellis commented that biodiversity in the District Plan was a hot topic. G Giller commented that in the community it was a fear of the unknown, for that reason a biodiversity officer with ecological as well as excellent communication skills was important.

S Stewart commented it was a timely presentation. She asked G Giller if she had seen a local authority in New Zealand that had been successful in enhancing biodiversity – was there a model? G Giller replied that the only place she know that had a biodiversity officer was Selwyn District Council and that initiative was in early days. There was a cumulative effect of neighbours taking to neighbours. She gave the example of QEII clusters of covenants where that discussion occurred. It was important to start the process and have someone available to speak to landowners. With financial assistance there was often goodwill of landowners to spend their own money on a project.

S Stewart asked if G Giller believed financial assistance was a successful method and G Giller believed the ‘carrot’ option was better.

Mayor Ayers asked M Bacon how much was in the contestable fund. M Bacon replied there was $147,000. It was covered heritage buildings and notable trees. M Bacon was happy to workshop that fund with the Committee.

6. REPORTS

6.1 Waimakariri District Plan Review – Possible Council Designations – Neil Sheerin (Senior Policy Planner) and Trevor Ellis (Development Planning Manager)

N Sheerin spoke to the report noting it related to the technical intricacies of designations. There are no Council designations in the current District Plan, prior to that there had been. By 2020 the current District Plan will be nearing 25 years old and the district had changed a lot in that time.

N Sheerin outlined the advantages of designations. Firstly it provided the holder of the designation certainty in regard to project delivery. Secondly it allowed strategic sites or routes were protected into the future and thirdly it provided a useful advance notice to the general public of what may happen where. For example, looking at the District Plan, land acquisitions and resource consents would not show up by designations would thus assisting with decision making.

As the Council had no designations at the moment, if designations were included in the new plan it would mean all new designations would need to be publically notified and subject to submissions. Staff believed potential advantages outweighed the disadvantages. It was a statutory power that Council’s could use to make projects happen that was not currently being used.

Questions

W Doody asked if it would assist with current issues regarding the consent process and N Harrison replied that was the direction of a more Activities Based plan approach.

A Blackie noted at the recent Kaiapoi Town Centre Hearing, Mainpower had referred to a designation umbrella for the mixed use business area and asked for a comment on why Mainpower would want that. T Ellis replied that may be in reference to zoning. Mainpower had designations in the current plan for assets such as substations. J Palmer commented
that he was unsure whether Mainpower had a designation for their substation next to Ruataniwha and it may be they wanted sites like that designated. A Blackie asked how designations could be made now, when it was not known who or what was going into those areas. 

N Sheerin commented that designations could only be used by the authority that was requiring it, only certain types of authority could have designations. MainPower may have been referring to the use of designations for facilities within the zoned area, it was different to designating a wider area for commercial use which a network utility like MainPower wouldn’t be able to do.

N Atkinson noted asked if designations could be used for something existing that the Council wanted to protect such as Woodford Glen or the Airport or did it have to a new activity and how easy was it to take designations in or out. N Sheerin replied yes, they could be used for existing activities such as wastewater treatment plants. With regard to Woodford Glen it was proposed to include that in a sport and active recreation zone rather than designation. For Council designations it was for Council owned and operated facilities. For Greenfields sites – for example a large facility, a designation could be put on a particular site.

K Felstead referred to the new Multiuse Stadium facility and asked about the advantages of designation rather than Resource Consent. N Sheerin advised that MainPower Oval was a site proposed for sport and active recreation zone in the new plan. There had been preliminary discussions regarding options for facilitating development of the new stadium through designation or Resource Consent. In terms of timing, with possible construction by March 2019, it would be a tight time frame for a designation in the proposed District Plan and in that case it would be potentially a longer process than for a Resource Consent. In the long term, a designation would give the ability to manage the site with less difficulty than a consent in terms of extension or upgrade requirements. Even if the new stadium was constructed under Resource Consent a designation for the stadium could still be included in the new plan. J Palmer commented that a March start was optimistic, early May was current expectation. The option for designation as part of the proposed District Plan was something to consider.

S Stewart referred to issues around drinking water and asked if designations could be applicable for recharge areas as a way of protection. She noted the Waimakariri Zone Committee had provided maps of protection areas. N Sheerin commented he had not heard of designations for that kind of purpose. They were normally for above ground physical infrastructure, for example a wastewater plant and associated with that there may be a large area of land for effluent disposal field. In terms of a recharge area it would depend on the size of the area and may be better facilitated by zoning or overlay rather than designations. T Ellis commented that Council typically used designations for head works or specific purposes. Designations were for a requiring authority to do some works or provide a service within that area rather taking a broader water preservation perspective.

W Doody asked whether the hockey turf at Coldstream road needed designation, N Sheerin advised it was proposed to be zoned for sport and active recreation in the new plan. Designation was an option, but he believed zoning was more appropriate. Zoning allowed for other groups such as a sports club wanting to build clubrooms whereas a designation only applied to the authority. A proposed sport and active recreation zone also applied to the Oxford Speedway.
Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Gordon

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee

(a) **Receives** report No. 181008116926;

(b) **Notes** the information on designations outlined in Sections 3 to 8 and Appendix 1 below;

(c) **Approves** the preparation of notices of requirement for Council designations, and their lodgement once the formal call for designations to be included in the proposed new District Plan is made;

(d) **Notes** draft Council notices of requirement will be provided to Council for review, comment and approval prior to lodgement.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson thanked staff for a full report noting the topic had been addressed in a number of briefings, it would now come out in the proposed District Plan for the public to have a say.

Councillor Gordon agreed with Councillor Atkinson commenting it had been well workshopped.


S Milosavljevic spoke to the report noting that it outlined preparation of a revised Rural Residential Development Strategy to inform the District Plan Review. Within Greater Christchurch, rural residential development was required to be guided by a strategy. A communications plan sat behind the Strategy. She noted the topic had been well workshopped.

Moved Mayor Ayers seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

(a) **Receives** report No. 180720081057.

(b) **Approves** the preparation of a District wide Rural Residential Development Strategy.

(c) **Notes** that different approaches to zoning are identified for areas within and outside of the Urban Development Strategy area, as outlined in Paragraph 4.1 of this report.

(d) **Notes** that matters associated with 4ha subdivision will be reported to the Committee as part of the District Plan Review within a separate report.

CARRIED

Mayor Ayers commented that the strategy was important in terms of managing population growth and rural land use. One of the important things was to get an understanding of the difference between lifestyle blocks and rural residential.

6.3 **Structure Planning – Residential East / West Rangiora and East Kaiapoi and linkages with the review of Rangiora Town Centre Plan – Cameron Wood (Senior Policy Planner)**

C Wood would take the report as read noting that it had been well workshopped prior to the meeting.
Questions

Councillor Stewart asked when outline plans were completed were significant features like water courses and spring heads identified. C Wood replied yes.

Councillor Doody referred to greenfields areas and asked if there was an opportunity to grow native vegetation. C Wood replied that structure plans would look at character and what could be done to support urban development including landscaping.

Moved Councillor Atkinson seconded Councillor Doody

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee recommends:

(a) Receives report No. 181003114567.

(b) Approves the preparation of a Structure Plan for East and West Rangiora and for East Kaiapoi as shown on Map 1 of this report.

(c) Notes that the Structure Plans for East and West Rangiora will have linkages with the review of Rangiora Town Centre Plan.

CARRIED

Councillor Atkinson commented the issue had been well traversed. He would like to see it progressed.

7. MATTER REFERRED FROM RANGIORA ASHLEY COMMUNITY BOARD

7.1 Request for Parking Restrictions on Edward Street, Rangiora – Joanne McBride (Roading and Transport Manager)

N Harrison spoke briefly to the report advising that Rangiora Ashley Community Board had chosen the option for 3 time restricted parks outside the car yard on Edward Street. If the Committee agreed the Parking Bylaw 2007 would be amended.

Moved Councillor Doody seconded Councillor Atkinson

THAT the District Planning and Regulation Committee:

(a) Receives report No. 180919108757;

(b) Amends the Parking Bylaw 2007 to include parking on Edward Street as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Item</th>
<th>Rangiora</th>
<th>Edward St</th>
<th>Immediately east of the Blackett St Roundabout</th>
<th>North side</th>
<th>P120</th>
<th>3 Parks, North side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

CARRIED

Councillor Doody supported the Rangiora Ashley Community Board’s decision.

8. PORTFOLIO UPDATES
8.1 **District Planning Development** - Councillor Neville Atkinson

N Atkinson noted the District Planning reports before the Committee in today’s agenda and urged Councillors to attend the workshops where they could as it was beneficial to work through the issues prior to a formal meeting. The process would continue for some time.

8.2 **Regulation and Civil Defence** – Councillor John Meyer

Mayor Ayers noted that National Shakeout Day was 18 October 2018.

8.3 **Business, Promotion and Town Centres** – Councillor Dan Gordon

D Gordon commented there was a lot happening in this space and he was having regular briefings with Simon Hart (Business and Centres Manager). It was heartening to see progress on projects.

Kaiapoi Promotions Association was going well, there was work in progress for the Christmas parade and good feedback from Kaiapoi retailers. There was a joint meeting for the three district promotions associations at the end of November.

9. **QUESTIONS**

10. **URGENT GENERAL BUSINESS**

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 2.18pm

CONFIRMED

________________________
Chairperson

________________________
Date

**Briefing**

- *At the conclusion of the meeting there was a briefing regarding the Rangiora Airfield Plan Change.*
1. SUMMARY

1.1. The purpose of this report is to request the Committee to formally approve the District Plan Review to proceed using the ‘Standard’ plan making process under Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), and to formally publicly notify the intention to review the District Plan under Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA.

1.2. The ‘Standard’ process provides a rigorous analysis and transparent process for the development and change of district plans. Council is involved in the whole process from the outset. There is formal public involvement throughout the process and full appeal rights. It is well understood and there is a lot of ‘best practice’ guidance available. It would allow enough time for staff to undertake a thorough process in regards to plan preparation and engagement. This process is realistic in terms of resources, and does not require Ministerial approval to undertake.

Attachments:

i. Appendix 1: ‘Standard’ Process - Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA
ii. Appendix 2: ‘Collaborative’ Process – Part 4 of Schedule 1 of the RMA
iii. Appendix 3: ‘Streamlined’ Process – Part 5 of Schedule 1 of the RMA

2. RECOMMENDATION

THAT the Committee:

a. Receives report No. 181204142198.

b. Notes the three plan making process options outlined in Section 4 below.

c. Approves the District Plan Review to proceed using the ‘Standard’ plan making process under Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA.

d. Authorises the formal public notification of the intention to review the District Plan under Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1. The Committee received a briefing on 24 October 2017 about plan making process options Council may use to create or review district plans under the RMA. At that time, the Committee expressed a clear preference for the ‘Standard’ process.

4. **PLAN MAKING PROCESS OPTIONS UNDER THE RMA**

   **Introduction**

4.1. The Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 introduced two new plan making process options (‘Streamlined’ and ‘Collaborative’) that councils may use to create or review district plans under the RMA, in addition to the existing ‘Standard’ process. This report provides an overview and comparison of the three options.

   **‘Standard’ Process - Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA**

4.2. Until recently, Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA contained the only process that could be used to create or review a district plan. A simplified flow chart of this process is attached in **Appendix 1**. The process may also be summarised as follows:

   a. Council must formally call for Notices of Requirement for designations and heritage orders at least 30 working days before the formal public notification of a Proposed District Plan;

   b. Because of the complexities in assembling the required technical information it is good practice, and a courtesy, to give requiring authorities an early ‘heads up’ well before this;

   c. A Proposed District Plan must be publicly notified for submissions for at least 40 working days;

   d. A summary must be prepared of decisions requested in submissions;

   e. The summary of decisions requested must be publicly notified for further submissions for at least 10 working days;

   f. Recommended decisions must be prepared and circulated to all submitters at least 10 working days before the start of Hearings;

   g. At least 10 working days’ notice must be provided of the start of Hearings;

   h. The Council must publicly notify decisions on submissions, and recommendations on Notices of Requirement;

   i. Requiring authorities then have 30 working days to make decisions on the Council recommendations on Notices of Requirement;

   j. Appeals to the Environment Court must be lodged within 30 working days of notification of decisions;

   k. The process - from public notification of a Proposed Plan, to the public notification of decisions, but excluding Environment Court appeals - must be completed within 2 years, but can be extended.
4.3. This process provides a rigorous analysis and transparent process for the development and change of district plans. Council is involved in the whole process from the outset. There is formal public involvement throughout the process and full appeal rights. This process has been used since the enactment of the RMA in 1991. It is well understood and there is a lot of ‘best practice’ guidance available. However, it can be lengthy due to a number of process steps and potential appeals.

‘Collaborative’ Process – Part 4 of Schedule 1 of the RMA

4.4. The detailed steps in this new process are contained in Part 4 of Schedule 1 of the RMA. A simplified flow chart of this process is attached in Appendix 2. The process may also be summarised as follows:

a. Under this process, Council must establish a ‘Collaborative Group’ that broadly reflects community interests. The Collaborative Group may include representatives of iwi/runanga, requiring authorities, potentially affected or interested parties – e.g., residents groups, business/industry groups - and elected members (but not Council staff);

b. The Collaborative Group conducts consultation, drafts the plan, publicly notifies it for submissions, holds hearings, and provides recommendations to the Council;

c. Council can accept or reject the recommendations of the Collaborative Group. If the Council rejects the recommendations, the Council must draft alternative provisions;

d. There are limited appeal rights. The only rights of appeal are to the Environment Court for a re-hearing on specific provisions under dispute, or on points of law.

4.5. Before embarking on this process, the Council must first consider a range of matters to determine if this process is the best option, as follows:

a. Whether the resource management issues to be dealt with in the plan would benefit from the use of the Collaborative planning process, having regard to the scale and significance of the relevant resource management issues;

b. The views and preferences expressed by persons who are likely to be affected by those resource management issues or who have an interest in them;

c. Whether the local authority has the capacity to support the Collaborative planning process, having regards to the financial and other costs of the process;

d. Whether requirements for designations or heritage orders could be considered within a Collaborative planning process;

e. Whether there are people in the community able and willing to participate effectively in the Collaborative planning process as members of a Collaborative Group;

f. Whether any matters of national significance are likely to arise and, if so, whether these could be dealt with in the Collaborative planning process; and

g. Whether the relevant provisions of any iwi participation legislation that applies in an area could be accommodated within the Collaborative planning process.

4.6. The ‘Collaborative’ process is designed to encourage greater front-end public participation and engagement to produce plans that potentially better reflect community values and
contain community-designed outcomes. The process is best suited to complex, contentious planning matters requiring balancing of different values.

4.7. However, the Council does not become directly involved until required to make decisions on the recommendations of the Collaborative Group.

4.8. This process is also lengthy. Two years are allowed from notification of the proposed plan to the release of decisions, however there is no time limit on the collaborative phase prior to plan notification.

4.9. This process also requires considerable resources for all involved. A high level of resourcing is required from the Council, iwi/runanga, community members and stakeholders. Members of the Collaborative Group are required to invest significant time in the process.

4.10. Once initiated, the Council cannot withdraw from the Collaborative process, except under specific circumstances, summarised as follows:

   a. Council is unable to appoint a Collaborative Group; or
   b. The Collaborative Group has breached its terms of reference; or
   c. The Council and the Collaborative Group agree there is insufficient consensus on which to proceed with plan preparation.

4.11. The detailed steps in this new process are contained in Part 5 of Schedule 1 of the RMA. A simplified flow chart of this process is attached in Appendix 3.

4.12. The ‘Streamlined’ process is intended to make the plan-making process flexible and fast enough to respond to new or urgent matters (without the need for specific legislation to allow this). For the Auckland Unitary Plan and the Christchurch District Plan review, special legislation was enacted to speed up the planning process; the Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 makes the ‘Streamlined’ process (and the ‘Collaborative’ process) available to other local, regional and unitary authorities.

4.13. For the ‘Streamlined’ process to apply at least one of the following criteria must be met. These are as follows:

   a. The proposed planning instrument will implement a national direction;
   b. As a matter of public policy, the preparation of a planning instrument is urgent;
   c. The proposed planning instrument is required to meet a significant community need;
   d. A plan raises an issue that has resulted in unintended consequences;
   e. The proposed planning instrument will combine several policy statements or plans to develop a combined document;
   f. The expeditious preparation of a planning instrument is required in any circumstances comparable to, or relevant to those set out in paragraphs (a) to (e).

4.14. Approval from the Minister for the Environment is required to use this process and, if the Minister approves its use, the Council must comply with the terms of direction given by the
Minister. This direction includes matters such as consultation to be undertaken, the time period in which the process must be completed, along with any other planning requirements. The Minister may approve or decline the Plan, or refer it back to the Council for reconsideration. Under this process, there are no rights of appeal, except in regards to requirements for designations and heritage orders.

4.15. The ‘Streamlined’ process essentially speeds up plan making by limiting public participation and appeal rights. It should be noted that this process is being considered for use by the Urban Development Strategy Partners for a scope limited change to the Regional Policy Statement in mid-2019 to give effect to the Future Development Strategy, which in turn enables greenfield land to be zoned under the District Plan Review.

5. **ISSUES**

**Community Engagement**

5.1 The ‘Standard’ process provides a rigorous analysis and transparent process for the development and change of district plans. Council is involved in the whole process from the outset. There is formal public involvement throughout the process and full appeal rights.

5.2 The ‘Collaborative’ process is designed to encourage greater front-end public participation and engagement to produce plans that potentially better reflect community values and contain community-designed outcomes. However, the Council also does not become directly involved until required to make decisions on the recommendations of the Collaborative Group. There is also reduced scope for cross-boundary engagement, as Christchurch City and Hurunui District have completed their district plan reviews.

5.3 The Streamlined planning process is intended to make the plan-making process flexible and fast enough to respond to new or urgent matters (without the need for specific legislation to allow this). It can include consultation, submissions, and hearings, depending on the process agreed by the Minister. However, the ‘Streamlined’ process essentially speeds up plan making by limiting public participation and appeal rights.

**Hearings and Appeals**

5.4 Under the ‘Standard’ process, Council is involved in the whole process from the outset including hearing submissions. There is formal public involvement throughout the process and full appeal rights.

5.5 Under the ‘Collaborative’ process, the Council does not become directly involved until required to make decisions on the recommendations of the Collaborative Group. The Collaborative Group conducts consultation, drafts the plan, publicly notifies it for submissions, holds hearings, and provides recommendations to the Council; the Council can then accept or reject the recommendations. The Collaborative Group needs to have knowledge, skills, and experience in relation to the following: the RMA; the subject matter of the hearing; the conduct of hearings; familiarity with the local community and environment; and they must be accredited. It may be difficult to assemble an appropriate group and they may or may not reach a consensus. Rights of appeal are limited to a re-hearing on specific provisions under dispute, or on points of law. A risk from re-hearing is that it may change plan provisions in a way that is inconsistent with the recommendations of the Collaborative Group and could include a matter that was not based on the consensus position of the Collaborative Group.
5.6 Under the ‘Streamlined’ process, there are no rights of appeal, except in regards to requirements for designations and heritage orders. This process essentially speeds up plan making by limiting public participation and appeal rights.

Time

5.7 The ‘Standard’ process - from public notification of a Proposed Plan, to the public notification of decisions, but excluding Environment Court appeals - must be completed within 2 years, but can be extended. It can be lengthy due to a number of process steps and potential appeals. However, it is well understood and there is a lot of ‘best practice’ guidance available.

5.8 The ‘Collaborative’ process is also lengthy. Two years are allowed from notification of the proposed plan to the release of decisions, however there is no time limit on the collaborative phase prior to plan notification. The timeframe to resolve contentious issues by way of group consensus may be lengthy.

5.9 The ‘Streamlined’ process is intended to be faster to respond to urgent issues. The Minister who issues the direction determines the timeline. Reduced hearings and appeals speeds up the process. The full Christchurch District Plan Review, which was accelerated under special legislation, was completed within three years; this review included a formal process of hearings, and appeals on points of law only. However, this process essentially speeds up plan making by limiting public participation and appeal rights, and is subject to Ministerial approval. There could also be less time for research to justify provisions and ensure consistency; shorter timelines can put pressure on evidence preparation, accurate summarising of submissions, and good decisions.

Resources

5.10 Additional staff resources are required for all of these process options in order to have a sufficient amount of the right technical skills to produce the required quality of output that satisfies statutory requirements in as timely a manner as possible.

5.11 The ‘Collaborative’ process in particular requires considerable resources for all involved. A high level of resourcing is required from the Council, iwi/runanga, community members and stakeholders. Members of the Collaborative Group are required to invest significant time in the process. This process could encounter difficulties with sourcing the necessary people within the District to represent a balanced range of interests, and who also have the time and expertise and ability to participate. Importantly, once initiated, the Council cannot withdraw from the collaborative process, except under specific circumstances.

5.12 The Management Team has reviewed this report and supports the recommendations.

6 IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS

6.1 Financial Implications

Preparation and finalisation of the next District Plan will be met by existing Development Planning Unit budget as previously approved through the recent LTP process.

6.2 Community Implications

As outlined above, the community will have opportunities to make submissions on the proposed District Plan when it is notified.
6.3 Risk Management

No risks identified, other than any matters raised in submissions following public notification of the proposed District Plan.

6.4 Health and Safety

Not applicable.

7 CONTEXT

7.1 Policy

The subject of this Council report is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2 Legislation


7.3 Community Outcomes

There are wide ranging opportunities for people to contribute to the decision making that affects our District:

a. The Council makes information about its plans and activities readily available;

b. The Council takes account of the views across the community including mana whenua;

c. The Council makes known its views on significant proposals by others affecting the District's wellbeing.

7.4 Delegations

The District Planning and Regulation Committee has delegated authority for this matter as it relates to resource management.
Appendix 1: ‘Standard’ Process - Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the RMA

Schedule 1, part 1

- Prepare the plan
- Prepare an evaluation report (§32)
- Publicly notify the proposed plan
- Submissions by any person except in regards to trade competition
- Public notice of a summary of submissions
- Further submissions
- Hearings by council
- Give decision on provisions and matters raised in submissions
- Further evaluation (§32AA)
- Notification of decision
- Appeals to the Environment Court
- Hearings by the Environment Court
- Amendments/variation
- Plan approved by council
- Operative on date publicly notified
Appendix 2: ‘Collaborative’ Process – Part 4 of Schedule 1 of the RMA

Collaborative process

1. Appoint collaborative group
2. Set out terms of reference for collaborative group
3. Collaborative group provides Council with a consensus report
4. Council drafts plan giving effect to collaborative group’s recommendations
5. Prepare a s32 evaluation
6. Publicly notify & call for submissions
7. Council reports on submissions and calls for further submissions
8. Council prepares report & provide copy to collaborative group and iwi authorities for comment
9. Establish review panel
10. Review panel holds hearing
11. Review panel provides recommendations report
12. Council accepts or rejects recommendations
13. Publicly notify plan
14. Appeals to Environment Court: Rehearing or POL
15. Operative on date publicly notified
Appendix 3: ‘Streamlined’ Process – Part 5 of Schedule 1 of the RMA

Streamlined process

Request to Minister for the Environment

Minister consults with any relevant Ministers of the Crown; requiring authorities (who have agreed to NOR being included); anyone else considered necessary

Minister requests further info if required

Approve
Decline

Issue direction

Council undertakes planning process set out in the direction

Include:
- The proposed plan
- A summary of written submissions
- A report showing how submissions have been considered and any modification to the proposed plan
- A S32 or S32AA report
- A summary document showing how the statement of expectations has been considered
- A summary document showing how the proposed plan complies with the RMA, any national direction, and any regulations

Submit to Minister for approval

Approve (No appeal rights except for requirements, designations, and heritage orders)

Refer back to council for reconsideration

Make changes

Decline

Give public notice & becomes operative
1. **SUMMARY**

This report: (a) outlines options for how Council could improve its approach to maintaining the Waimakariri District's indigenous biodiversity. It sets out the context for this, the current approach taken by Council, and the various tools that could be used to improve this current approach (including benefits and costs of each) and form a Council biodiversity management programme.

(b) Provides background for the Committee to consider and give direction on the options it would like further investigated (and included in the budgetary considerations as part of the Annual Plan process) in order to improve the Council's approach to biodiversity.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

**THAT** the Committee:

(a) **Receives** report No. 181029126064.

(b) **Endorses** the approach of continuing to protect Significant Natural Areas as part of the District Plan Review.

(c) **Endorses** staff to further consider regulatory approaches to protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity (within and outside of Significant Natural areas) as part of the District Plan Review.

(d) **Notes** that national and regional policy in relation to indigenous biodiversity is likely subject to significant change and the Council’s role and resourcing in this area will likely be subject to external direction in coming years.

(e) **Notes** that the full impact of the Waimakariri Water Zone Committee Zone Implementation Programme Addendum (ZIPA) has yet to be assessed and will require consideration beyond Draft 2019/20 Annual Plan preparation in January 2019.

(f) **Notes** that subject to consideration and direction from the Committee on the non-regulatory tools it wishes to be investigated further, staff will bring another report in January 2019 for Annual Plan budgetary purposes.
3. **BACKGROUND**

3.1 A number of reports\(^1\)\(^2\)\(^3\) have indicated that, similar to the rest of New Zealand, the District’s indigenous vegetation and habitat for fauna has been significantly destroyed or modified over time and what is left is potentially threatened.

3.2 The community showed strong support for protecting and enhancing the Waimakariri District’s biodiversity via during the draft District Development Strategy (DDS) and District Plan Review ‘Issues and Options’ consultation in 2017.

3.3 Section 6(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires the ‘protection of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna’ as a matter of national importance. Section 31(1)(b)(iii) states a function of territorial authorities includes ‘the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity’.

3.4 A proposed National Policy Statement on Indigenous Biodiversity\(^2\) (NPS IB) was released in October 2018 and sets out a policy framework to significantly improve current approaches to maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Consultation is planned for mid to late 2019, with the NPS IB expected to come into effect in March 2020. District Plan’s must give effect to national policy statements. The release of the proposed NPS IB indicates that indigenous biodiversity is a matter of national significance that must be addressed by Councils. The draft NPS IB contains relatively detailed objectives and policies that aim to maintain indigenous biodiversity while recognising the kaitiaki role of Māori with indigenous biodiversity management.

3.5 Environment Canterbury is gearing up as an organisation to improve biodiversity, making it one of its top priorities. The Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy (which WDC is a signatory to) is currently being reviewed, with particular focus on the implementation plan. An updated version is expected in late 2019. Throughout the Waimakariri District, Environment Canterbury has a number of biosecurity projects underway, along with the ‘Immediate Steps’ programme which involves a range of biodiversity projects. Relevant objectives of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS) include halting the decline of Canterbury’s ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity, restoration or enhancement of ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity, and protection of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats. The Waimakariri District Plan must give effect to the CRPS.

3.6 The Waimakariri Water Zone Committee released the draft ZIPA in September 2018. Following consideration of public comments, a final version was released on 8 December 2018. A number of non-regulatory initiatives for protecting and enhancing indigenous biodiversity are included, which WDC will be involved in implementing. Note that this report does not outline the relevant biodiversity initiatives in the final version of the ZIPA as it was released after the agenda for this report was published.

---


2. Report of the Biodiversity Collaborative Group (October 2018), Prepared by New Zealand Biodiversity Collaborative Group. Available at: https://www.biodiversitynz.org/ (Note: This report contains the draft National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity)

4. **ISSUES AND OPTIONS**

4.1. The Management Team have reviewed this report and support the recommendations.

4.2. There are a number of regulatory and non-regulatory mechanisms available to help achieve Council’s function of maintaining indigenous biodiversity. Table 1 below outlines the various mechanisms that form Council’s current approach to maintaining biodiversity.

**Table 1: Council’s current approach to biodiversity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waimakariri District Plan (Regulatory)</td>
<td>There are currently 111 Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) listed in the operative District Plan (called ‘Vegetation &amp; Habitat Sites’). These areas were listed by landowners voluntarily. The District Plan has rules that restrict the reduction of vegetation cover, earthworks, planting, access tracks and the reduction of the health and abundance of certain rare plants within SNAs. There are also general rules regarding the clearance of indigenous vegetation anywhere in the district. A review of the District Plan’s effectiveness in 2016 indicated that most monitoring relating to SNAs was not carried out, primarily due to resourcing constraints. As part of the District Plan Review process, aerial photos were reviewed in early 2018 to identify which SNAs were still present. This exercise showed that four sites had clearly disappeared. Site V117 which was cleared by Netherland Holdings Ltd; whom WDC prosecuted in the Environment Court. The three other sites (V103, V116 and V137) have been passed on to Council Compliance &amp; Enforcement Team to investigate. A total of 62 sites were selected where it was unclear whether the site was still there in its entirety. These 62 sites are being reviewed by ecologists at present. The remaining 45 SNA sites, which aerial photos showed to clearly be still present, will be rolled over into the new District Plan. The District Plan also has rules allowing Council to take (if it wishes) esplanades strips or reserves during subdivision from land adjoining ‘priority waterbodies’ or from created lots less than 4ha adjoining rivers with a width of at least 3m wide. Esplanades can be taken for a range of purposes including the protection of conservation values. A strategic approach to the taking of esplanades and the management of them is needed in order to better provide for the opportunity of ecological corridors and enhanced biodiversity values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Pegasus Bay Bylaw (Regulatory)</td>
<td>Restricts certain activities (e.g. 4WD vehicles) thereby protecting biodiversity values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contestable Fund (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td>Contestable funding of $15,500/year for District Plan listed ‘Vegetation and Habitat’ sites (SNAs), Heritage Items and Notable Plants (protected trees). Current balance of account is $143,679. Changed to discretionary fund in June 2017. Not actively publicised however will be soon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Community partnership planting</td>
<td>• Taranaki Reserve – native stream side plantings ($2k per year). • Kaiapoi Lakes – minor additional native plantings. • Kaiapoi Regeneration area – Honda Forest will commence planting next autumn. Total of 15,400 native seedlings to be planted in Honda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. As shown in Table 1, there are a number of mechanisms in place at Council to maintain biodiversity however given the indications that biodiversity is declining, they are clearly not sufficient to address the biodiversity challenge. These current mechanisms form a good basis for maintaining biodiversity so should be continued, provided they are deemed to be working as effectively as possible. Additional regulatory and non-regulatory tools are recommended to enhance the effectiveness of Council’s approach to maintaining biodiversity and better met statutory obligations.

4.4. Table 2 below outlines additional regulatory and non-regulatory tools for consideration, which could be used to improve Council’s approach to maintaining and enhancing biodiversity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>initiatives (Non-regulatory)</strong></td>
<td>Forest (additional to the retention basin plantings being undertaken by the Council 3 Waters team).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pegasus Bay dune plantings – minor areas planted to encourage dune stabilisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Te Kohaka o Tuhaitara Trust - plantings along Tuhaitara Trail including areas of pines recently harvested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Silverstream - Matariki Tu Rakau (Te Uru Rakau Forestry NZ) 660 kanuka planted in 2018 to have enrichment plantings once established. Also Million Metres Streams Project raised $20k for 1.5ha of riparian planting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Whites Road (ex-quarry) – school planting project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enviro-schools (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td>Involves a sustainability education programme. There are 16 Enviroschools within the Waimakariri District. Council is a funding partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drain management diversity considerations (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td>Incorporating stream/drain bank planting, along with methods for drain cleaning that reduce impact on instream fauna, into Council’s lowland streams and drain maintenance work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Additional regulatory and non-regulatory tools to improve biodiversity for consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Costs &amp; Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. District Plan incentives</strong> <em>(Regulatory)</em></td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide development bonus incentives such as a bonus lot of any size</td>
<td>• Help to switch the perception of SNAs being a burden to being an asset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as a bonus lot of any size (so could be below the zone’s minimum</td>
<td>• Biodiversity gains.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot size for subdivision) with opportunity to build a dwelling on the</td>
<td>• Encourages protection of remnants which is a top priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>created lot for the:</td>
<td>• Bonus lot provisions could help increase property values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protection (legal and physical) of an SNA;</td>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancement and protection (legal and physical) of an SNA;</td>
<td>• Potential for fragmentation of rural areas, and increased density (effects on character, servicing, transport, rural settlement patterns) however this would be on a very small scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhancement of an area within an ‘Ecological Corridor Priority</td>
<td>• Introduction of domestic pets that could predate on native fauna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area’ or other such identified area.</td>
<td>• Monitoring requirements (regularised monitoring would be required e.g. by a Council Biodiversity Officer) and the fact that the biodiversity benefit needs ongoing monitoring while the bonus lot incentive is one-off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological management or enhancement plans would be required.</td>
<td>• Changes in land ownership can bring issues with ongoing management requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**2. Require ecological protection or enhancement as resource</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consent conditions** <em>(Regulatory)</em></td>
<td>• Applicant funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either via direct resource consent conditions, covenants, consent</td>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notices or bonds where possible to do so (conditions must relate to</td>
<td>• Monitoring requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>managing the effects of an activity).</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Council Biodiversity Officer</strong> <em>(Non-regulatory)</em></td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key functions would be:</td>
<td>• Build relationships with landowners and the public by providing advice and support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working with landowners (particularly landowners of SNAs) to</td>
<td>• Coordinated efforts with relevant agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educate them on biodiversity values and management practices.</td>
<td>• Raise profile of biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Coordinating efforts with other agencies (ECAn, DoC, QEII, Forest</td>
<td>• Implement biodiversity initiatives on the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Bird etc)</td>
<td>• Potential to generate more funding (via applications) for protection or enhancement works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing general support and advice to the public regarding</td>
<td>• Active monitoring of SNAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protecting and enhancing biodiversity values.</td>
<td><strong>Costs:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Costs &amp; Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Monitoring SNAs (and any enhanced Ecological Corridor Priority Areas if present).  
• Applying for funding for protection or enhancement works.  
• Undertaking protection works (e.g. fencing) enhancement works (e.g. plantings).  
• Running public biodiversity awareness campaigns. | Costs:  
• Full-time, permanent salaried employee. |

4. **Funding (additional to contestable fund currently available) (Non-regulatory)**

Increasing the amount of funding available, and making it available for protection and enhancement works for both SNAs and non-SNAs would be valuable. Funding or subsidies for protection or enhancement works (e.g. fencing, pest control, buffers, indigenous plantings). Current funding available is $15,500 per year however this is shared between heritage items, protected trees and SNAs. Any funding must be well publicised, with a clear criteria for eligibility, and easy to apply for.

**Benefits:**
• Incentivises protection and enhancement works.
• Encourages good will in the community by rewarding biodiversity efforts.

**Costs:**
• Cost of additional funding.  
• Staff time to administer fund.

5. **Rates rebates for landowners with SNAs (Non-regulatory)**

Landowners with SNAs on their property could be eligible for rates rebates for the area of their property covered by an SNA in order to acknowledge the landowners restrictions on the use of that part of their land.

**Benefits:**
• While the actual rebate may be minimal, it is an effective way of providing an ongoing incentive for protection that provides a more direct linkage.  
• Acknowledges the restrictions landowners face on the use of their land covered by an SNA.

**Costs:**
• Loss of rates on areas of land covered by SNAs.

6. **Biodiversity initiatives on Council land (Non-regulatory)**

Adopt an indigenous planting priority policy for Council reserves (E.g. Auckland Council has a ‘Design Manual Guide for Parks’ with the following motto: ‘Plants are great, natives are better, eco-sourced is best’)

E.g. The coastal strip (administered by Council) between Mean High Water Springs and the Te Kohaka O Tuhaitara Trust land could be actively enhanced with dune

**Benefits:**
• Council takes the lead on showing the importance of indigenous biodiversity on its reserves.

**Costs:**
• Some members of the public prefer exotic plantings (e.g. oak trees).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Costs &amp; Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Council strategy on taking of esplanades in order to prioritise ecological corridor linkages (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Establish a network of esplanade linkages along waterways available for enhancing biodiversity values and/or providing public access for recreation and cultural purposes.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Costs:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Cost of purchasing esplanade reserves (vested in Council).&lt;br&gt;• Cost of maintenance and enhancement of reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Council Urban Forest Strategy and/or District wide canopy cover % goal (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Encourages urban forests.&lt;br&gt;• Encourages enhancing canopy cover throughout the district.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Costs:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Staff time to prepare strategy / canopy cover goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Council nursery with discounted indigenous plants of local provenance (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Encourages public to plant indigenous vegetation of local provenance.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Costs:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Cost of discounting plants.&lt;br&gt;• Cost of establishing and operating a Council nursery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Community biodiversity initiatives - increased involvement and financial contribution to community projects (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Encourages community initiatives.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Costs:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Cost of staff time or Council resources.&lt;br&gt;• Cost of any financial contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provide free ecological assessments to landowners (Non-regulatory)</td>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong>&lt;br&gt;• Encourages landowner interest and knowledge of biodiversity.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Costs:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5. **Recommended approach**

Overall, this report recommends that Council improve its overall approach to maintaining indigenous biodiversity through a formal and coordinated biodiversity management programme. Utilising a combination of regulatory and non-regulatory tools is the best way to achieve this.

Improving the role of regulatory tools, such as the District Plan, is important, however this can come with its own set of challenges. Many other territorial authorities do not go this far, however this will likely change when the NPS IB comes into effect. There are broad range of non-regulatory tools available, as outlined in Table 2. If the recommendations of this report are adopted, staff will consider the relative merits of these tools in more detail in order to develop a recommended tool combination that can form a Council biodiversity management programme.

5. **COMMUNITY VIEWS**

5.1. **Groups and Organisations**

The potential role of a Biodiversity Officer at Council was discussed with Chris Brown, Manager Community & Recreation. It was determined that there would be a wide range of responsibilities for such a position. Possible biodiversity initiatives on Council reserves were also discussed.

The role of regulatory and non-regulatory tools for improving biodiversity was discussed with Chris Keeling, Team Leader Strategy & Planning at Environment Canterbury. Chris emphasised the importance of early engagement with key stakeholders such as Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society and Fish and Game.

5.2. **Wider Community**

As noted above, the community has shown strong support for protecting and enhancing the Waimakariri District's biodiversity via DDS and District Plan Review ‘Issues and Options’ consultation feedback in 2017.

6. **IMPLICATIONS AND RISKS**

6.1. **Financial Implications**
Once direction is given for what approaches the Committee would like to pursue, the budget implications can be estimated and outlined in a report for January 2019 in order to align with Annual Plan requirements.

It should also be noted that $100,000 per annum for the next three years has been included in the Long Term Plan to assist implementation of the ZIPA.

6.2. Community Implications

The potential implications for the community would be a greater level of protection and enhancement of biodiversity values within the Waimakariri District. However there would potentially be rates increases associated with this. As noted above, the extent of any such increase can be estimated once direction is given on the various additional tools Council would like to pursue.

6.3. Risk Management

There are no risks associated with the recommendations of this report which do not in themselves bind the Council to a changed course of action.

6.4. Health and Safety

There are no health and safety implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

7. CONTEXT

7.1. Policy

This matter is not a matter of significance in terms of the Council’s Significance and Engagement Policy.

7.2. Legislation

As noted above, Section 6(c) & Section 31 of the Resource Management Act 1991 are relevant.

7.3. Community Outcomes

The following community outcomes are relevant to this matter:

- There are areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats for indigenous fauna. Conservation and restoration of significant areas of vegetation and/or habitats is encouraged.

7.4. Delegations

The District Planning and Regulation Committee has delegated authority for this matter as it relates to resource management.