

# Submission on PDP Presentation to Hearing 2

Paul Botha – 5 November 2021

Submitter number 118

# Background

- I have lived in Plimmerton for 27 years and owned the rural property at 10A The Track for 21 years.
- While the previous owners ran stock on the land, at the time we purchased it there were significant areas of gorse. We have not run stock on the property since owning it.
- Over the 20 years we have put a lot of effort into the control of gorse and weeds to encourage the regeneration of bush.
- Most of the regenerated bush would generally be younger than 20 years.
- There is an area planted in proteas, sold as cut flowers and other areas planted in coppicing eucalyptus and acacia for firewood.

# Submission points/issues

- My submission on the PDP covers a number of topics and my submission points with respect to the SNA's are outlined in Section 2 of my original submission.
- The main points in my original submission are
  - Lack of consultation on SNA's.
  - The methodology used to derive and map the proposed SNA's which I believe was flawed.
  - The financial impact of the SNA on our land and the requirement for rates remission and ecological assessments for resource consents where they are triggered by the SNAs.
- I explain some of these points in the following slides.

# Consultation on the SNA's

- There was little to no consultation on the SNA's up to the point that they were published on the PCC web site as part of the PDP development.
- In 2012 we received a letter from PCC identifying Significant Vegetation on our land which was 0.0142ha or about 0.3% of our 4.5ha property. This is shown in the 4 maps on the next slide.
- The 2012 process seemed to stall as we heard no more from PCC until 2018 when PCC published the proposed SNA's on their web site. That first version of the SNA mapping covered about 3.12ha of our land or 70% of it. That happened with no further consultation since 2012 discussions.
- Subsequent to that initial publication of the SNA boundaries I have had 3 ecological site visits which modified the SNA boundary. The version included in the PDP was the 3<sup>rd</sup> version I was aware of, but still had issues with in relation to its accuracy.
- Subsequent to the publication of the PDP and submissions received by PCC, I had a 4<sup>th</sup> ecological visit by Dr Sarah Herbert on Tuesday 21<sup>st</sup> September 2021.
- A 4<sup>th</sup> version of the SNA's on our property is now included in Nicholas Goldwater's statement of evidence.

## Versions of SNA047

- Four versions of the SNA's shown shaded.
- The original 2012. Significant Vegetation area identified by PCC is shown as the tiny red triangle in each of the images.
- Ver2012: 0.3% of our land area.
- Version 1: 70%
- Version 2: 57%
- Version 3: 54%
- Version 4: 49%
- I still have an issue with the accuracy of the most recent version of the SNA included in Mr Goldwater's evidence.



# Issue with latest SNA revision

- There remains an issue with the latest revision of SNA047 included in Mr Goldwater's evidence.
- The gap created for the existing farm track is incorrect in a couple of places, within red oval.
- As marked up in Mr Goldwater's statement of evidence (Pg 46 SNA047), the mapping suggests that the track is just over 2m wide at two points.
- The track is actually 4m – 5m wide along its length.



Looking NE down the farm track

05/11/2021



Image taken where the farm track is supposedly 2m wide

Paul Botha



Image taken where the farm track is supposedly 2m wide

6

# Restricted use of property with SNA mapping

- The introduction of the SNA's our land will have a financial impact for us. It will remove our ability to use the land for generating revenue through farming activities such as; forestry, firewood, flowers, carbon farming.
- The Section 42A report by Torrey McDonnell at paragraphs 67 & 217 includes: “..SNA provisions do not render any land incapable of reasonable use.” I believe that they will restrict most of the activities I have listed above.
- Given the extensive nature of the SNA's proposed in the Porirua PDP and the number of submissions made on potential rates remission for SNA's, it is surprising that Mr McDonnell has not sought supporting evidence from a valuer on the impact on land use after the introduction of the SNA's.
- I note that while the S42A report references the number of councils in NZ which have introduced SNA's, it makes no mention that a number of those councils have also introduced rates remissions and other financial support where SNA's were introduced.
- Given how contentious the introduction of SNA's has become, I believe that the introduction of rates relief should be introduced by PCC.
- In the S42A report Mr McDonnell states “..I don't believe that the wider base of ratepayers should have to compensate individual landowners through rates remission or direct compensation where Council is undertaking its statutory planning functions to protect the intrinsic values of these areas.” Put differently, why should a selected number of individual ratepayers carry the burden of protecting these values for the entire PCC region and benefit of all PCC ratepayers?

# Selection of Councils offering Rates remission

- I have not reviewed the policy of all councils who have introduced SNA's however a quick search revealed the following councils have introduced supporting policies in the form of rate remission:
  - New Plymouth District Council
  - Waikato Regional Council
  - South Waikato District Council
  - Whangarei District Council
  - Timaru District Council
- I note that included in the LGNZ submission on the NPSIB, they include a number of Case Studies. Case Study 4 is titled "running a successful Significant Natural Areas (SNA) identification and mapping process in the Timaru District." I note that the Timaru District Council has a Biodiversity Policy which includes rates remission for properties containing SNA's.
- Timaru District Council's Biodiversity Policy also includes other supporting mechanisms for landowners with SNA's identified on their land.

# Remedy sought

- Delete the SNA from our property unless:
  - The SNA is correctly mapped and agreed with us as the landowner.
  - PCC provide rates relief for SNA's.
  - Where the SNA's trigger a requirement for an ecological assessment, the cost of such assessment is borne by PCC.
- If PCC cannot provide the remedy sought above, remove SNA's entirely from our land.