

BEFORE THE OTAGO REGIONAL COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act  
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearing of submissions to the  
proposed Otago Regional Policy  
Statement

---

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE

LYNETTE BAISH

---

1. My name is Lynette Baish and I am an Environmental Planner for Ernslaw One Ltd (Ernslaw), a production forestry company, with offices in Tapanui and Naseby for Otago, as well as Marlborough, Bulls, Gisborne, and Auckland. I am based in the Bulls Office and have been with the company since November 2020.
2. I have a Masters in Resource and Environmental Planning from Massey University and I am a member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have worked in the field of consenting and resource management planning for about 15 years, mostly for territorial and regional authorities. I have experience in consenting, policy evaluation and plan development.
3. I am acting for Ernslaw to provide planning evidence in respect of the proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement (pORPS) 2021. I had also prepared submissions on behalf of Ernslaw to the pORPS. Ernslaw was a party to the declaratory proceedings brought by Forest and Bird to the High Court in respect of the pORPS.
4. I confirm that I have read and am familiar with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Consolidated Practice Note (2006). I agree to comply with the Code of Conduct and I am satisfied the matters I address in my evidence are within my expertise.
5. In preparing this evidence, my approach was to:
  - Consider the provisions of the proposed policy statement of consequence to Ernslaw, having regard to the purpose and principles of the RMA and other relevant national policies and environmental standards; and

- Recommend appropriate changes that would give effect to the amendments requested by Ernslaw in a way that is consistent with the RMA and good planning practice.
6. My evidence takes into account the section 42A report recommendations (and submissions and further submissions) in regard to general provisions of the pORPs, and in particular, on the Land and Freshwater, and the Eco-systems and Biodiversity provisions, as they relate to the concerns of Ernslaw.

#### PRIMARY ISSUES FOR ERNSLAW

7. An RPS is a touchstone between higher order documents that set national direction, and the regulatory machinery that delivers on identified social, economic and environmental outcomes in regions and districts.
8. As outlined in its primary submission, Ernslaw generally supports the intent of the pORPS, which seeks to provide a long-term vision for all resource management in Otago and to ensure an integrated approach to the protection, restoration, enhancement, and use of natural and physical resources in the Otago region.
9. The proposed framework sets an expectation for integrated resource management that flows through to all other provisions of pORPS 2021. If multiple provisions are relevant, they must be considered together, as well as alongside Objectives IM01 – IM04. Ernslaw continues to support the integrated approach set out in pORPS.
10. In its initial submission, Ernslaw drew attention to deficiencies in the Section 32 Report with reference to the forestry sector. The National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) 2017 requires plantation forestry activities to meet permitted standards for afforestation, replanting, erosion and sediment control management, and other core operational activities, or failing to meet those conditions, requires a resource consent which would set conditions to ensure any adverse effects would be avoided, remedied or mitigated. However the RPS is silent as to the regulatory role of the NES-PF,
11. There is no evidence presented by ORC that more stringent regulations are necessary to regulate plantation forestry activities that are already regulated by ORC and territorial authorities under the NES-PF. Nor is there recognition of possible benefits of plantation forestry in the RPS, which may be to the detriment of long-term land stability, carbon sequestration, indigenous biodiversity protection and other beneficial ecosystem services that plantation forestry can provide.
12. Unless stated, Ernslaw does not oppose pORPS provisions. Some amendments were sought in the initial submission by Ernslaw, to provide greater clarity or avoid being unnecessarily onerous with respect to the operation of plantation forestry activities. Some of those amendments have been made, however in the evidence below, I seek some further changes to ensure that provisions provide the appropriate recognition of resource activities and uses through a balanced approach to achieving sustainable management.

## SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ISSUES FOR THE REGION (SRMR)

13. It is acknowledged that pORPS 2021 is a build-on of an earlier RPS that ORC has sought to adapt to the changing statutory requirements of higher order legislation, while better identifying the range of significant emerging issues critical for the Otago Region.
14. Ernslaw does not disagree with the breadth of issues identified as significant, however I wish to raise the following points, and/or suggested relief, in respect of a number of provisions within Part 2 of pORPS, SRMR.

### SRMR-I2 - Climate change is likely to impact our economy and environment<sup>1</sup>

15. This section of pORPS identifies the range of potential impacts changing climate will have on the Otago Region, including biodiversity effects, potential land use change and opportunities that may arise as a result of fluctuating temperatures and snow levels.
16. I agree with the request by Forest and Bird and others<sup>2</sup> for an amendment to the title of SRMR-I2 to read "Climate change ~~is likely to~~ will impact our economy and environment" for reasons that should be self-explanatory.
17. I agree with the change of wording requested by Fish and Game<sup>3</sup> to replace 'native' with "terrestrial ecosystems and species". Eco-systems in New Zealand need not be native to warrant recognition that climate change impacts on any type of ecosystem are a significant resource management issue, particularly as the final part of the paragraph relates to 'biodiversity', and not to 'indigenous biodiversity.' Moreover, the reference to terrestrial aligns with the three types of biodiversity – coastal, freshwater and terrestrial, a deliberate policy approach for pORPS 2021<sup>4</sup> that has informed the mapping of ecosystems in the region to date.<sup>5</sup>
18. In recognition of the critical need to adapt to more sustainable forms of energy production, I propose the following additional wording to paragraph 1 under *Regional Industry*.

"Climate change may also result in shifting land use activities, including food and fibre production, to adapt to altered climate conditions, which will incur costs, and potentially enable resources previously unviable to come into production, such as the conversion of biomass into biofuels."

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 42A Report. pp 86-89.

<sup>2</sup> 00230.023a Forest and Bird; 00236.023 Horticulture NZ; 00235.028 OWRUG

<sup>3</sup> 00231.023 Fish & Game

<sup>4</sup> "This topic will address three types of biodiversity instead of only two as per the PORPS. The three biodiversity types will be coastal, freshwater and terrestrial. Acknowledging all three will bring the new RPS in line with the national standards found in the proposed NPSIB, NZCPS, and NPSFM." Otago Regional Council Regional Policy Statement Review: Reference Groups Summary Report. 21 August 2020. p 26.

<sup>5</sup> Lloyd, K. et al. Mapping of significant habitats for indigenous fauna in terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems in Otago Region. Wildlands Consultants for Otago Regional Council. July 2020. p II.

SRMR-I3 Pest species pose an ongoing threat to indigenous biodiversity, economic activities and landscapes<sup>6</sup>

19. I agree with the wording change requested by Port Blakely NZ Ltd<sup>7</sup> in reference to “wilding ~~pin~~es ~~conifers~~.” Other types of conifers are more vigorous than pine and would arguably pose a higher risk of wilding spread if unmanaged.

SRMR-I10 Economic and domestic activities in Otago use natural resources but do not always properly account for the environmental stresses or the future impacts they cause<sup>8</sup>

20. This section traverses the environmental costs and economic benefits of industries in the Otago Region which contribute to GDP but may also impose, and should therefore carry, a degree of environmental liability.

21. The discussion is prefaced with a statement on sources and impacts of sedimentation which I consider to be ‘incomplete’ in its current form, as there are most certainly more than two industries that cause sedimentation in Otago.

22. I understand that the primary sources of sedimentation generation in Otago appear to be located in lowland rural development areas and not in the upper catchments at altitude where forestry is more predominant.

23. I therefore agree with the submission of Rayonier Matariki<sup>9</sup> to amend paragraph 1 to read “Sediment from development and ~~forestry~~ primary production activities ...”

#### LAND AND FRESHWATER CHAPTER (LF)

24. I have considered the Section 42A Report and recommendations by the author Felicity Boyd and provide the following analysis in respect of some of the submissions and requested relief impacting the management of highly productive land and land use change.

#### LF-FW-P13 – Preserving Natural Character

25. I agree with Ms Boyd’s recommendation to accept the submission of Fish and Game<sup>10</sup> proposing to change the title of LF-FW-P13 to “Preserving natural character and in-stream values.”

26. I consider the change to the title more appropriately reflects the scope of the policy which, seated within the freshwater suite of policies within the Land and Freshwater chapter,

---

<sup>6</sup> Section 42A Report. pp 89-82.

<sup>7</sup> 00033.002 Port Blakely NZ Ltd

<sup>8</sup> Section 42A Report. pp 105-107

<sup>9</sup> 00020.005 Rayonier Matariki

<sup>10</sup> 00231.058 Fish and Game

applies to bed and margins, flow and level, as well as form and function and ability to support habitat and biodiversity.

#### LF-FW-P14 – Restoring Natural Character

27. I agree with the same relief as above, applied to LF-FW-P14.

28. I agree with the submission point of Ngai Tahu ki Murihiku<sup>11</sup> in respect of barriers to predatory fish and with the addition to clause (3) “providing for fish passage within river systems and creating fish barriers to prevent predation where necessary” as accepted and recommended by Ms Boyd.

#### LF-LS-P20 – Land Use Change

29. Land use change is inevitable not just given the impact of climate change but additionally due to increasing competition for water and other resources. This policy provides for those changes in land use generally, as well as resulting from the need to adapt and respond to evolving environmental conditions where access to resources may be increasingly limited.

30. New land use and land management practices must not deplete, but must demonstrate a sustainable use, and an efficient use, of those resources. In allowing for land use change, regional and district plan provisions must ‘safeguard or enhance’ the life-supporting capacity of soil resources, and ‘maintain’ soil quality, as guided by Objective LF-LS-O11 and Policy LF-LS-P16 respectively. The implication is that lower order provisions ensure that land uses in effect ‘support and improve’ the quality and availability in particular, of soil and water. I consider that ‘support and improve’ is a practicable approach to the wording in the context of an RPS policy directive for regional and district plans.

31. I therefore agree with the submission point of Ngai Tahu ki Murihiku<sup>12</sup> and with the amendment Ms Boyd has recommended to the chapeau of LF-LS-P20 to state “Promote changes in land use or land management practices that support and improve...”

32. I agree in part with the submission of DCC<sup>13</sup> with regard to inclusion of a reference to climate change mitigation. However, I alternatively consider that inclusion within Clause (2) of a cross reference to IM-P10 would be appropriate to reinforce that the capacity for adaptation, as well as resilience to the effects of climate change, is critical within a policy concerning land use change and should be more strongly supported across the policy framework. I propose the following wording:

“adaptive capacity and resilience to the impacts of climate change in accordance with IM-P10, or...”

---

<sup>11</sup> 00223.088 Ngai Tahu ki Murihiku

<sup>12</sup> 00223.096 Ngai Tahu ki Murihiku

<sup>13</sup> 00139.123 Dunedin City Council

## LF-LS-M12 – District Plans

33. Ernslaw and others<sup>14</sup> oppose Clause (1)(a) of LF-LS-M12 as new plantation forestry activities are already regulated under the NES-PF. Neither the Section 32 Report, nor Ms Boyd's Section 42A Report, refer to any evidence that the NES-PF is not effectively regulating afforestation. I do not disagree that the expansion of carbon farming should also be subject to a regulatory regime given that this expanding land use is not subject to any national direction such as the NES-PF, and therefore falls under the regulatory jurisdiction of regional and district plans.
34. Ms Boyd references research from 2005 regarding the impact of forestry on water yield in the analysis section of the Section 42A Report for LS-LF-M12. I do not agree that a citation of one piece of research is an evidential basis for placing controls on a legitimate land use, although I do acknowledge the prevalence of the issue. I would also add that new research<sup>15</sup> incorporating remote sensing technology is likely to provide an improved understanding on the impact of forestry on underlying hydrology and the complex processes of how water is distributed, used and circulated in forested catchments, for instance the five-year Forest Flows project led by Scion.
35. I agree with Ms Boyd<sup>16</sup> that controlling the use of land for the purpose of maintaining the quantity of water is a function of regional councils and not district councils. I agree that regional as well as district plans will be appropriately informed by outcomes from catchment (FMU) planning, or as Ms Boyd described it, policy direction developed "within the context of the NOF process", that will ultimately identify objectives to achieve the NPSFM.
36. However, I consider the discussion of water yield in reference to catchment hydrology in the Section 42A Report is an issue more appropriately relevant to inform Method LF-LS-M11 Regional Plans. (Please refer to paragraph 55 for further development of this point in the context of a new proposed policy for highly productive land and the management of conifers).
37. Consequently, I assert that Clause (1) (a) in its current form is overly directive and narrowly targeted, and I propose its replacement with the following alternative wording"
- "controlling the establishment of new or any spatial extension of existing land use activities where necessary to give effect to an objective developed under the NPSFM," and..."
38. I agree with a policy direction that seeks to prioritise the use of highly productive land for primary production and I concur with Ms Boyd's acceptance of the submission point of Waitaki DC<sup>17</sup> to include a new clause (4) to cross reference to the requirements of LF-

---

<sup>14</sup> 00412.020 Ernslaw One; 00024.009 City Forests; 00020.016 Rayonier Matariki

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.scionresearch.com/science/sustainable-forest-and-land-management/Forest-flows-research-programme>

<sup>16</sup> LF S42A Report, p 347, para. 1643.

<sup>17</sup> 00140.023 Waitaki DC

LS-P19 which would require district plans to "maintain the availability and productive capacity of highly productive land in accordance with LF-LS-P19."

39. The change I propose to Clause (1)(a), and new Clause (4) ensure the method is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management, and any catchment plans arising from FMU processes, as well as the intent of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.

## ECOSYSTEMS AND BIODIVERSITY (ECO)

40. I have considered the Section 42A Report and consequent recommendations by Melanie Hardiman and provide the below analysis and additional proposed changes to provisions in respect of the mapping and methods of protecting indigenous biodiversity, the management of wilding conifers and regulation under the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry.

ECO-P3 – Protecting significant natural areas and taoka; ECO-P5 – Existing activities in significant natural areas; ECO-P6 – Maintaining indigenous biodiversity

41. I agree with the submission of Ngai Tahu ki Murikiku<sup>18</sup> to amend Clause (1) of ECO-P3 to "First avoiding..." as the amendment provides clarity that the policy is one in a framework, and I concur with Ms Hardiman that its inclusion assists to signal the policies are sequential steps within that framework.
42. I agree with the change suggested by Rayonier Matariki<sup>19</sup> in Clause (3) that prior to SNA's and species and ecosystems that are taoka being "identified and mapped in accordance with ECO-P2", a precautionary approach is adopted in respect to any land use activities in accordance with IM-P6(2)."
43. The mapping, or rather the inclusion of maps in a regional or district plan, is a definitive, presumably conclusive step in the process to delineate those areas and agree their significance, and their values, through a robust (Schedule 1) process with landowners and stakeholders. For forestry operations, mapping provides a higher degree of certainty to support the long-term decision making and harvest planning underpinning forestry rotations.
44. The NES-PF contains provisions, including defined setbacks and specified thresholds, that forestry operations must comply with to protect indigenous vegetation, including specific provisions applying to SNA's.
45. Ms Hardiman has recommended not to accept City Forests<sup>20</sup> request to exempt plantation forestry from the precautionary approach in Clause (3), and not to accept the request by

---

<sup>18</sup> 00223.100 Ngai Tahu ki Murikiku

<sup>19</sup> 00020.018 Rayonier Matariki Forests

<sup>20</sup> 00024.005 City Forests Limited

Rayonier Matariki<sup>21</sup> to include a note to the effect that ECO-P3 is subject to the provisions of the NESPF. I do not disagree with City Forests request as plantation forestry activities are already regulated to ensure that indigenous vegetation is protected; any incidental damage to indigenous vegetation is constrained from exceeding identified thresholds or a resource consent would be needed.

46. Under Regulation 6 of the NES-PF, protection of SNA's may prevail over the NES-PF. However, an evidential basis must exist for the provisions of a district or regional plan to impose rules that are more stringent than a regulation in a national environmental standard. The NES-PF sets out a regulatory framework that provides certainty and consistency for forestry, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on indigenous vegetation and significant natural areas.
47. Although debate as to the effectiveness or efficiency of NES-PF provisions is not the focus of an RPS, such consideration would be made in respect to any proposed provisions in a regional plan or a district plan proposing any regulation more stringent than the NES-PF.
48. I remain of the view that the inclusion of a note would provide clarity for both the forestry industry and regulators alike. However, I consider the appropriate placement of such a note would be where policy direction is provided for the content and substance of regional and district plans based on their respective scope of responsibility in relation to freshwater and indigenous biodiversity, Method ECO-M1 – Statement of responsibilities:

*The applicable provisions of the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) must be applied by regional councils and territorial authorities unless it is determined that a more stringent rule is necessary to achieve a freshwater objective under the NPS-FM, or the protection of SNA's or outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes, pursuant to Regulation 6 of the NES-PF.*

49. I concur with Ms Hardiman in respect to the submission by Forest and Bird<sup>22</sup> that it is appropriate that the exemption for ECO-P4 and ECO-P5 are retained in the chapeau for ECO-P3. As previously highlighted, these policies are part of a framework where ECO-P3 applies in the first instance, before turning to either ECO-P4 or ECO-P5, pertaining to new and existing activities respectively.
50. I agree with the suggested addition to ECO-P5 by Forest and Bird to qualify its application to "existing activities that are lawfully established within significant natural areas." I also consider Ms Hardiman's recommendation to provide for maintenance and minor upgrades in line with the submission by NZ Infrastructure Commission<sup>23</sup> to be appropriate.

---

<sup>21</sup> 00020.019 Rayonier Matariki Forests

<sup>22</sup> 00230.104 Forest and Bird

<sup>23</sup> 00321.024 NZ Infrastructure Commission



51. I agree with Ms Hardiman's acceptance of the relief proposed by Forest and Bird<sup>24</sup> and others, to amend ECO-P6 to read "by applying the following effects management hierarchy (in relation to indigenous biodiversity) in decision-making..." as this necessarily distinguishes from the NPSFM effects management hierarchy which was designed for a different purpose.

#### ECO-P9 – Wilding conifers

52. A number of submitters make the point that wilding spread is an issue concerning a range of tree and plant species and is not specific to coniferous tree species entirely. There is no question that wilding conifers are a significant issue for the Otago region, however it is also important to note that some coniferous species pose a higher risk of spread vigour than others. This is a risk that is factored by the Wilding Tree Risk Calculator,<sup>25</sup> a tool developed to support the implementation of provisions in the NES-PF.

53. Moreover, the unmanaged spread of wilding conifers is an issue for a range of land uses, not just plantation forestry, for instance where these hardy tree species are used as shelterbelts and for erosion protection. Wilding spread is a legacy problem arising from historic catchment board, government or forestry service interventions, compounded by the absence of an effective approach to regulate wilding spread in intervening years.

54. A Regional Policy Statement Review Paper<sup>26</sup> presented to the ORC Strategy and Planning Committee September 2020, identified the main opportunities for the new RPS to explore. These included "more detail in the implementation of provisions across organisations and further clarifying the responsibilities of both the ORC and district councils through methods."<sup>27</sup> In particular the RPS "should give direction about what the pest management plan should do and how that carries through to operational work programmes."<sup>28</sup>

55. Implementation of the requirements of the RMA and the Biosecurity Act has been ad hoc. While the Biosecurity Act 1993 is the relevant statute for agencies with roles and responsibilities for pest management (and ultimately informs the Regional Pest Management Strategy), in my view, the RMA has a bearing on regional policy statements, regional plans and district plans to provide for appropriate regulation, and to support and inform the coordination of a multilateral response to the wilding conifer issue. It is recognised that national coordination and more effective leadership of the issue is critical. The New Zealand Wilding Conifer Management Strategy (2015-2030), while not a statutory document, aims to provide that leadership and coordination.

---

<sup>24</sup> 00230.105 Forest and Bird

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.mpi.govt.nz/dmsdocument/19124-Guidelines-for-the-use-of-the-Decision-Support-System-Calculating-Wilding-Spread-Risk-From-New-Plantings>

<sup>26</sup> Otago Regional Council Regional Policy Statement Review: Reference Groups Summary Report. 21 August 2020.

<sup>27</sup> Ibid. P 20.

<sup>28</sup> Ibid. P 20.

56. Regional and district plan provisions must ensure that the problem is not exacerbated by activities regulated under the RMA.<sup>29</sup> Moreover, inconsistent regulation exaggerates the tension that exists between managing conifers as both a resource and a pest.<sup>30</sup>

57. Pest species, including wilding conifers, are a threat to indigenous biodiversity and habitat and must be managed and controlled. That is the designated purpose of Policy ECO-P9, albeit that the policy directs to “*reduce the impact* of wilding conifers on indigenous biodiversity”. I concur with Ms Hardiman that the scope of ECO-P9 is restricted by Regulation 6 of the NES-PF, rendering proposed relief by other submitters out of scope, for instance the submission by Kai Tahu ki Otago<sup>31</sup> to include the protection of indigenous biodiversity identified as taoka.

58. I consider that an explicit reference to the NES-PF, and to the wilding calculator tool would provide clear guidance and risk management responding to the scale and significance of the issue. I propose additional Clauses (3) and (4) to ECO-P9 as follows:

(3) promoting application of the Wilding Tree Risk Calculator and,

(4) with regard to *plantation forestry*, applying the regulatory framework under the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry.

59. I agree with Ms Hardiman’s assertion that the new policy limb suggested by QLDC<sup>32</sup> for managing wilding species is directive in nature, and that the construction of ECO-P9 is discretely designed to protect indigenous biodiversity rather than manage and control wildings generally across landscapes. However, it would be appropriate for a more widely scoped policy like this to be included in the regional policy statement particularly as the jurisdiction for the regulation of types of forestry other than plantation forestry, lies with regional and district councils.

60. I also agree with the submission by DOC<sup>33</sup> that the LF-LS section of the RPS would be the appropriate place for a wider scoped policy in relation to conifers as it would apply to all land uses and land types. I propose a new policy could be worded as follows:

LF-LS-P23 Management of conifers

The planting and establishment of conifer species, including for the purpose of forestry, landscape/amenity planting, erosion control and shelter-belt planting, is managed by:

(1) Requiring any proposal for the planting of new or any spatial extension of existing conifers listed in APP5 to identify the risk, and minimise the potential spread of wildings, including:

---

<sup>29</sup> Otago Pest Management Plan 2019-2029. Otago Regional Council. September 2019. P 11.

<sup>30</sup> New Zealand Wilding Conifer Strategy 2015-2030. 2014. P 21.

<sup>31</sup> 00226.225 Kai Tahu ki Otago

<sup>32</sup> 00138.038 Queenstown Lakes District Council

<sup>33</sup> 00137.092 Director General of Conservation

- a) The location and its potential for wilding spread;
- b) The surrounding land uses and whether these would reduce the potential for wilding spread;
- c) The outcome of a risk assessment based on a recognised methodology;
- d) A management plan appropriate for the risk identified.

(2) Controlling the establishment of new or any spatial extension of existing *plantation forestry* activities or *permanent forestry* activities where identified as necessary to give effect to a freshwater objective developed under the NPS-FM, and in alignment with LS-LF-M11 (2).

61. I consider it is essential the RPS, as a touchstone between national strategy and lower order plans regulating land use, include a method to increase public understanding, education and awareness of the issue, and to facilitate the coordination of effort across organisations and amongst landowners and land managers to adopt the best practice controls and interventions identified in the New Zealand Wilding Conifer Management Strategy and the Otago Pest Management Plan.

62. To some extent, Method ECO-M8(3) achieves this. However, I suggest additional wording in the method would strengthen connections between the RPS and other strategies at paragraph 63 below.

ECO-M2 – Identification of significant natural areas

63. I agree with the wording change requested by Rayonier Matariki Forests<sup>34</sup> for Clause (2) of ECO-M2, to “map and verify” areas of indigenous biodiversity and their values, and the acceptance of that amendment by Ms Hardiman. To ‘verify’ is to ensure that appropriate effort and resourcing has been undertaken to ground truth, and to engage and communicate with landowners and land managers. This is a fair and reasonable expectation and an appropriate amendment to the method.

64. I concur with the request by DCC<sup>35</sup> for a date by which indigenous biodiversity values must be mapped and verified in regional plans and district plans, and with the date stipulated by MS Hardiman of 31 December 2030, in Clause (2) of ECO- 2.

65. Furthermore, I agree with Ms Hardiman’s recommendation regarding the request by Federated Farmers<sup>36</sup> to delete Clause (4) of ECO-M2. If areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat are subject to applications for land use or development, it is acceptable for an applicant to undertake to assess ecological values (in accordance with APP2), and the potential effects on those values. I agree with Ms Hardiman’s recommendation in Clause (4) to qualify that ecological assessments would be required

---

<sup>34</sup> 00020.018 Rayonier Matariki Forests

<sup>35</sup> 00139.036 Dunedin City Council

<sup>36</sup> 00239.105 Federated Farmers of New Zealand

for resource consents and notices of requirement only “until significant natural areas are identified and mapped in accordance with (1) and (2)”

#### ECO-M8 – Other incentives and mechanisms

66. For the reasons outlined in paragraph 53 above, I propose the following additional wording in Clause (3):

“supporting the management and control of pest plants and animals, including through the coordination across agencies, land owners and land managers to provide provision of advice, ~~and~~ education and promote best management practice and implementing regulatory programmes such as the Regional Pest Management Plan and the New Zealand Wilding Conifer Management Strategy.”

#### CONCLUSION

67. In conclusion, I support the overall intent and approach of the pORPS to provide a workable framework for the integrated management of Otago's natural and physical resources.

68. The focus of this submission on behalf of Ernslaw One Ltd was to ensure that the policy framework provides sufficient certainty for the forestry industry, particularly with regard to the position of the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry. I believe the changes I have proposed assist to achieve that purpose.



Lynette Baish  
Environmental Planner  
On behalf of Ernslaw One Ltd