

West Coast Proposed Plan Change 1

Identified Errors in Section 42A Staff Recommending Report and Proposed Miscellaneous Changes 2018 document

14 June 2018 (corrections highlighted in yellow)

Proposed Miscellaneous Changes 2018 document Errors

Section	Explanation
Policy 8.3.5 Surface Water Quality Explanation	At the end of the first sentence: "...the Council will consider matters identified in (a) to (d)", clause (d) is incorrect. It should be "(f)" as there is an existing clause (e), and the new clause (f) is being added to the Policy.

Section 42A Report Errors

Section	Explanation
DR 1.41, Page 32	<p>The Reasons under Decision Requested 1.41 are missing some text. It should read:</p> <p>We agree with the points made by the further submitter. The change sought by the submitter is inappropriate for the reasons given in the further submission, and the relief does not directly relate to activities that come under the Plan definition of "vegetation disturbance".</p>
DR 1.35, 1.37, 1.40, 1.43, 1.45, 1.46, 1.47, 1.51, 1.55	<p>We have omitted to show in the Revised Text of the listed Decisions Requested that a reference to Rule 7A needs to be added to Rule 17(ii) of the Land and Water Plan. Rule 17 is the default discretionary rule that will apply if the recommended Rule 7A is not complied with. This is a consequential amendment of the recommended new Rule 7A. The Revised Text should include the following recommended change:</p> <p>Rule 17 Discretionary activities inside a wetland identified in Schedule 2</p> <p>Within a wetland identified in Schedule 2, any:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Humping and hollowing, flipping or v-blading; or (ii) Vegetation disturbance that contravenes Rules 7, <u>7A</u>, 8, 9, or 10; or
Council staff Reasons for: DR 2.2, para 5; 2.3 para 3; 2.4 para 1; 2.5 para 3; 2.7 paras 2 and 3; 2.9 para 5; 2.13 paras 4 and 5; 2.14 para 3; 2.21; 2.23; 2.24; 2.26 para 1, 2 nd sentence; 2.48 para 3, 2 nd sentence; 2.63 para 2; 2.65 para 1; 2.68 para 1; 4.10; 4.11 last sentence	<p>These paragraphs and sentences in the Reasons incorrectly use the term "significant" in relation to assessments of wetland boundaries undertaken as part of the boundary adjustment process. For clarification, it was not the purpose of these assessments to determine whether the wetland values were significant. The purpose of site visits and assessments was to determine whether the boundaries of wetland areas were correct, or needed changing on the planning maps.</p> <p>The word "significant" should be deleted from the following DR's,</p> <p>a) and no further wording changes are needed to these paragraphs: 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.7 (para 2), 2.9, 2.13, 2.14, 2.21, 2.23, 2.24, 2.26 (para 1, 2nd sentence), 2.48 (para 3, 2nd sentence), 2.63, 4.10, 4.11</p>

	<p>b) with additional wording changes to these paragraphs:</p> <p>DR 2.7 para 3: Based on the information provided by the submitter and the information obtained during the site visit, we are unable to recommend removing the designation from the area as we cannot conclusively say that the area in question is not wetland., or is not ecologically significant.</p> <p>DR 2.65 para 1, last sentence: The remaining area the submitter has requested to be removed is made up of native vegetation and so is considered to have wetland values. that are likely to be significant.</p> <p>DR 2.68 para 1: Based on the information available to us, we consider that it is appropriate to remove the scheduled wetland designation. An ecological assessment was undertaken which identified that the site is not a wetland, and does not have significant wetland values. On 8 December 2016 the Council's Wetland Co-ordinator, and Ecologist Vaughan Keesing viewed the area proposed to be removed, which is located on Mr Friend's property. Mr Keesing found that the area is low lying with older drainage channels and ridges. He also found that the area has a number of common wetland facultative species, however, these do not form a wetland community. The soils are not peaty, greyed or acidic and are most likely soils of a forest, and generally there is no surface water. Based on these reasons, Mr Keesing concluded that the site is not currently a "wetland" in terms of the presence of wetland obligate species, surface water, or wetland soils, and the area should not be considered either "wetland"., nor significant.</p>
DR 2.68, Reasons, Page 91	<p>The year "2016" referred to in paragraph 1 for the site visit by Council's Wetland Co-ordinator and Ecologist Vaughan Keesing is incorrect. It should be "2012".</p>