

Submission to: Stratford District Council

Submission on: Variation 1 - Proposed Stratford District Plan – Further Submission
Indigenous Vegetation & Biodiversity

Submission by: Taranaki Fish & Game Council
PO Box 662
New Plymouth

Contact: Allen Stancliff, Fish & Game Officer
06 757 9676
fgtar@clear.net.nz

We wish to be heard in support of our further submission.
We may be interested in presenting a joint case at a Hearing.

Original Submitters name	Original Submission No.	Variation Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons for our support/opposition	Decision sought
Taranaki Regional Council	10/01/06	Appendix 9	Support	Further work is needed to identify all wetlands in the District for inclusion in Appendix 9	Periodically update Appendix 9 by adding new sites
	10/01/09	A2.4.2 Appendix 9	Support	Ecological assessments will allow the build-up of information over time and addition of new areas to Appendix 9.	
Ngati Ruanui Group Management Ltd.	10/03/21	Appendix 9	Support	An active programme of assessing new sites for inclusion within Appendix 9 is necessary	Institute active programme of assessing new sites for inclusion in Appendix 9.
Department of Conservation	10/05/32	Part E	Support	Including a definition of an Approved Ecologist will provide more certainty about who can carry out ecological assessments	Amend Part E by including a the proposed definition of an Approved Ecologist
	10/05/34	Policy A2.3.2	Support	The proposed amendment clarifies that indigenous vegetation includes indigenous forest and also that all indigenous forest remnants on the ringplain will be protected, given the significance of the small percentage of original forest cover that remains there.	Amend as requested.
	10/05/36	Method A2.4.3	Support	It is consistent with the Act that the District Plan include a schedule of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as significant habitats of indigenous fauna (and wetlands)	Amend as requested.
	10/05/37	Method A2.4	Support	There is no method in the Plan that provides for regular updates of Appendix 9	Add a new method that provides the opportunity for regular reviews to allow additional areas to be included in Appendix 9.
	10/05/43	Rule B5.5	Support	The proposed amendments provide greater consistency and clarity.	Amend as requested.
	10/05/47	B6.3	Support	Specifying that an assessment is required by an approved ecologist will provide greater clarity.	Amend as requested.
	10/05/48	Appendix 9	Support	The proposed amendment will provide greater consistency and clarity.	Amend as requested.
	10/05/49	Appendix 9	Support	The proposed amendment will provide greater consistency and clarity.	Amend as requested.
Forest & Bird	10/07/53	Policy A2.3.2	Support	The proposed amendment clarifies that indigenous vegetation includes indigenous forest and also that all indigenous forest remnants on the ringplain will be protected, given the significance of the small percentage of original forest cover that remains there.	Amend as requested.
	10/07/54	Method A2.3.2	Support	It is consistent with the Act that the District Plan include a schedule of areas of significant indigenous vegetation as well as significant habitats of indigenous fauna (and wetlands)	Amend as requested.
	10/07/55	Method A2.4	Support	There is no method in the Plan that provides for regular updates of Appendix 9.	Add a new method that provides the opportunity for regular reviews to allow additional areas to be included in Appendix 9.

Original Submitters name	Original Submission No.	Variation Reference	Support/Oppose	Reasons for our support/opposition	Decision sought
Forest & Bird	10/07-58	B6.1.2	Support	Changing “involve” to “include” indicates that the ecological assessment may also address other relevant matters	Amend as requested.
	10/07-60	Appendix 9	Support	The proposed amendment will provide greater consistency and clarity.	Amend as requested.
	10/07-61	Appendix 9	Support	The proposed amendment will provide greater consistency and clarity.	Amend as requested.
NZ Forest Managers Ltd.	10/15-137	B1.2.1.4	Support in part	The 20m buffer distance does appear to be arbitrary and the width required for effective buffering may vary depending on the size and type of wetland and the contour and use of the surrounding land. In some circumstances the buffer may need to be more than 20m to be effective - in others less. The buffer width may be something that could be addressed in the ecological assessment required under Method A2.4.2 and B6.1 - B6.3.	Retain the 20m trigger in Rule B1.2.1.4 but determine the appropriate buffer width through ecological assessment.