
Monday, 23 May 2022

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga

Hastings District Council

Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting

Kaupapataka

Agenda

Te Rā Hui:
Meeting date: **Monday, 23 May 2022**

Te Wā:
Time: **2.00pm**

Te Wāhi:
Venue: **Council Chamber
Ground Floor
Civic Administration Building
Lyndon Road East
Hastings**

Te Hoapā:
Contact: **Democracy and Governance Services
P: 06 871 5000 | E: democracy@hdc.govt.nz**

Te Āpiha Matua:
Responsible
Officer: **Transportation Manager - Jag Pannu**

**Watch Council meetings
streamed live on our website
www.hastingsdc.govt.nz**

Hastings District Rural Community Board – Terms of Reference

The Community Board is a separate entity to the Council. The role of the Community Board is set out in Section 52 of the Local Government Act 2002. The Council is authorised to delegate powers to the Community Board.

Membership (6 members)

Chair (elected by the Board)

Deputy Chair (elected by the Board)

4 Elected Community Board Members

1 Mohaka Ward Councillor

1 Kahuranaki Ward Councillor

Quorum – 4 members

DELEGATED POWERS

General

1. To maintain an overview of services provided by the Council within the Community Board's area.
2. To represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of the community represented.
3. To consider and report on all matters referred to the Board by the Council, or any matter of interest or concern to the Community Board.
4. To communicate with community organisations and special interest groups within the community;
5. To undertake any other responsibilities that are delegated to it by the Council.
6. To appoint a member of the Community Board to organisations approved by the Council from time to time.

LONG TERM PLAN/ANNUAL PLAN/POLICY ISSUES

7. Authority to make a submission to the Long Term Plan/Annual Plan process on activities, service levels and expenditure (including capital works priorities) within the Board's area or to make a submission in relation to any policy matter which may have an effect within the Board's area.

ROADING AND TRAFFIC

8. Authority to exercise the Council's powers and functions in relation to roads within the Board's area under the following sections of the Local Government Act 1974:
 - Section 335 (vehicle crossings);
 - Section 344 (gates and cattle stops);
 - Section 355 (overhanging trees).
9. Authority to exercise the Council's statutory powers (including any relevant powers conferred by bylaw) over roads within the Board's area in respect of:
 - (i) Road user behaviour at intersections;
 - (ii) Controls on stopping or overtaking
 - (iii) Controls on turning
 - (iv) Pedestrian safety,
 - (v) Footpath maintenance and improvements.
 - (vi) Accident investigation studies, lighting and other safety works
10. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this delegation authorises a Community Board to deal with a matter, in the exercise of delegated authority, in a manner which is conflict with any policy or decision of the Council or any standing committee of the Council in relation to the same matter.

Monday, 23 May 2022

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga

Hastings District Council

Hastings District Rural Community Board Meeting

Kaupapataka

Agenda

Heamana

Chair: Nick Dawson

Mematanga:

Committee Members:

Marcus Buddo, Sue Maxwell and Jonathan Stockley
Councillors Tania Kerr (Deputy Chair) and Sophie Siers

Youth Council appointee: William Duncan

Tokamatua:

Quorum:

4 members

Apiha Matua:

Officer Responsible:

Kaiwhakahaere Rōpū

Transportation Manager: Jag Pannu

Te Rōpū Manapori me te

Kāwanatanga:

Democracy &

Governance Services:

Louise Stettner (Ext 5018)

Te Rārangi Take

Order of Business

Apologies – Ngā Whakapāhatanga

- 1.0** At the close of the agenda no apologies had been received.
At the close of the agenda no requests for leave of absence had been received.
-

2.0 Conflict of Interest – He Ngākau Kōnatunatu

Members need to be vigilant to stand aside from decision-making when a conflict arises between their role as a Member of the Council and any private or other external interest they might have. This note is provided as a reminder to Members to scan the agenda and assess their own private interests and identify where they may have a pecuniary or other conflict of interest, or where there may be perceptions of conflict of interest.

If a Member feels they do have a conflict of interest, they should publicly declare that at the start of the relevant item of business and withdraw from participating in the meeting. If a Member thinks they may have a conflict of interest, they can seek advice from the General Counsel or the Manager: Democracy and Governance (preferably before the meeting).

It is noted that while Members can seek advice and discuss these matters, the final decision as to whether a conflict exists rests with the member.

Confirmation of Minutes – Te Whakamana i Ngā Miniti

- 3.0** Minutes of the Hastings District Rural Community Board held Monday 14 February 2022.
(Previously circulated)
-

- 4.0 Update on Reserve Management Plan Process** **7**
-

- 5.0 Update on Submissions to Draft Annual Plan** **9**
-

- 6.0 Rural Community Recycling Stations Update** **11**
-

- 7.0 Rural Transportation Activity Report** **15**
-

8.0	Rural Community Board Submission to MPI Consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives"	21
------------	---	-----------

9.0	Minor Items – <i>Ngā Take Iti</i>	
------------	--	--

10.0	Urgent Items – <i>Ngā Take Whakahihiri</i>	
-------------	---	--

Monday, 23 May 2022

Item 4

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga

Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board

Te Rārangi Take

Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

Nā:
From: Rachel Stuart, Public Spaces Planning Manager

Te Take:
Subject: Update on Reserve Management Plan Process

1.0 Purpose and summary - Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga

- 1.1 A presentation will be made to the meeting updating the Board on the status and proposed content of the Draft Reserve Management Plans that are being prepared for the following reserves:
 - a) Eskdale Park
 - b) Frimley Park
 - c) Tainui, Tanner, Tauroa, Hikanui and Keith Sands Grove Reserves Management Plan
- 1.2 Particular reference will be made to the proposed content of the Draft Eskdale Park Reserves Management Plan, given its location within the rural area of the District.

2.0 Recommendations - Ngā Tūhonga

That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Update on Reserve Management Plan Process dated 23 May 2022.

Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

Monday, 23 May 2022

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga

Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board

Item 5

Te Rārangi Take

Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

Nā:
From: **Lex Verhoeven, Strategy Manager**

Te Take:
Subject: **Update on Submissions to Draft Annual Plan**

1.0 Purpose and summary - *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 At the time of writing this report, no submissions of relevance to the Rural Community Board had been received. Consultation on the Draft Annual Plan closes on 16 May 2022.
- 1.2 The Strategy Manager, Lex Verhoeven will provide a verbal update to the Meeting on the status of submissions on the Plan.

2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga*

That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Update on Submissions to Draft Annual Plan dated 23 May 2022.

Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

Monday, 23 May 2022

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga
**Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural
Community Board**

Item 6

Te Rārangi Take

Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

Nā:
From: Danny McClure, Solid Waste Operations & Contract Manager

Te Take:
Subject: Rural Community Recycling Stations Update

1.0 Purpose and summary - *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to provide an update on the rural recycling stations including community participation and new initiatives.
- 1.2 This is to ensure the Rural Community Board members are up to date with what is working and what is not in their respective community areas.

2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga*

- A) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Rural Community Recycling Stations Update dated 23 May 2022.
- B) That the Rural Community Board note the initiatives outlined in this report and provide feedback.
- C) That the Rural Community Board note that officers are continuing to work with the rural communities to identify suitable recycling site options and reinforce community education about recycling.
- D) That the Rural Community Board support the option to pause work on future initiatives until the outcome of the Government Transforming Recycling consultation is known.

3.0 Background – *Te Horopaki*

- 3.1 Rural recycling stations provide a drop off service for common recyclables; glass, plastics, cans, paper and cardboard.
- 3.2 There has been no further contact from other communities to the Hastings District Council (HDC) officer on any initiatives.
- 3.3 The Waipātiki Beach Community will have a permanent site established, with construction underway week commencing 9th May 2022.



Progress Update as at 16 May

- 3.4 Active Rural Recycling Stations update:
 - 3.4.1 Maraekākaho – The community are proactively reporting contamination, with very little issues occurring since the last update.
 - 3.4.2 Pukehamoamoā – The rural community are proactively reporting any/all issues, with HDC being in regular contact with the community champion. No significant issue to report.
 - 3.4.3 Poukawa – No issues to report. Shrubbery around the bin has been pruned and general tidy up of the site was completed in early April 2022.
 - 3.4.4 Waimārama – No significant issues to report on this site and it continues to be well used.
 - The site will continue to be reviewed and updates provided at the next Rural Community Board meeting.
 - The Community appears to be engaged and reporting full bins more regularly than previously and taking a more proactive interested in their site.
 - 3.4.5 Blackbridge continues to see increased usage from the Havelock North community and has seen a slight increased levels of contamination which will be monitored.
 - The site will continue to be reviewed and an update provided at the next Rural Community Board meeting.
 - HDC Officers are working with the contractor onsite to have these bins manned and proactively monitored, as currently they are not – an update will be provided at the next Rural Community Board Meeting.
 - 3.4.6 Tūtira site remains very good with no significant issues reported.
 - 3.4.7 Henderson Road recycling station continues to be well used, based on the location within a manned Refuse Transfer Station environment, however some minor contamination was reported. This occurs when the site becomes busy and staff are occupied with other activities.

4.0 Discussion – *Te Matapakitanga*

- 4.1 The Waipātiki Beach Community will have a permanent site fully operational within the next 3 months.

5.0 Options – Ngā Kōwhiringa

Option One - Recommended Option - Te Kōwhiringa Tuatahi – Te Kōwhiringa Tūtohunga

5.1 Pause investigation work until the Government’s Transforming Recycling consultation which includes the proposed Container Return Scheme is finalised.

5.2 Advantages

- Not over-capitalising spending money on establishing a site which may be redundant in 4 years’ time.

5.3 Disadvantages

- The rural communities will not have convenient access to a recycling station.

Option Two – Status Quo - Te Kōwhiringa Tuarua – Te Āhuetanga o nāianeī

5.4 Advantages

- Provides a potential recycling service to residents in rural communities.

5.5 Disadvantages

- Risk of contamination of product within bins with visitors using site/bin as dumping ground for rubbish (as it is unmanned) – A risk at all sites.
- The site may have to be closed if contamination levels become a problem in line with the decision-making framework to temporarily close rural recycling facilities endorsed by the Rural Community Board, 30 November 2020.

Attachments:

There are no attachments for this report.

Summary of Considerations - He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga

Fit with purpose of Local Government - E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

Link to the Council’s Community Outcomes – Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori

This proposal promotes the local public services environmental wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future by supporting a community which wastes less.

Māori Impact Statement - Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori

This initiative will have no direct impact on the Māori community, over and above the wider community.

Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

The establishment of rural recycling facilities aligns with Action 4E of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan 2018 -2024: Expand recycling drop off stations to communities where feasible.

Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

Nil financial considerations at this stage – time involved of council officer to investigate options.

Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

This decision/report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being not of significance.

Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho*

Consultation regarding rural recycling facilities was undertaken as part of the 2014/2015 Annual Plan, no further consultation is required.

Risks

Opportunity: to extend rural recycling services in line with action 4E of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan.

REWARD – <i>Te Utu</i>	RISK – <i>Te Tūraru</i>
Increased accessibility to recycling facilities to support the aims and targets of the Joint Waste Management and Minimisation Plan, to increase recycling by 20%.	<p>There is a risk that the site may be subjected to dumping of rubbish or contamination of recyclable material. There is no higher risk at this site than any other rural recycling site. The community will be responsible for the management and oversight of use on a daily basis.</p> <p>Additional cost to service may exceed existing budget.</p>

Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hāpori*

This request is being presented to the Rural Community Board for consideration.

Monday, 23 May 2022

Item 7

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga

Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board

Te Rārangi Take

Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

Nā:
From: Adam Jackson, Transportation Operations Manager

Te Take:
Subject: Rural Transportation Activity Report

1.0 Executive Summary – *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 This report is to update the Rural Community Board with the Rural Transportation Programmed Project Status and Activities Report.
- 1.2 This report concludes by recommending that the report be received.

2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga*

That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receives the report titled Rural Transportation Activity Report dated 23 May 2022.

3.0 2021/2022 Major Works Programme

- 3.1 The 2021/22 financial year is the first portion of the 2021-24 Long Term Plan programme.
- 3.2 The following is the status of the final Area Wide Pavement Treatment programme for the 2021/22 financial year and beyond.

Road	Section	Status/Impact
Kererū Road	Kererū Road – Section 3	Deferred until 2022/23.
Mt Erin Road	Crystall Road to School Road	Design complete. Construction has commenced with final section to be finished in the 22/23 financial year (School Rd to Te Aute Road).
Kahurānaki Road	Km7 to km9	AWPT project. Survey is complete and design is underway. Build planned for 22/23 depending on available funds.
Kahurānaki Road	Last 3km	Design complete. Construction has commenced with construction due to be completed in May.
Waimārama Road	Before quarry hill	AWPT project. Survey is complete and design is underway. Build planned for 22/23.

3.3 The following is the status of the low cost/low risk (old minor safety) programme for the 2021/22 financial year.

Road	Section	Status/Impact
Taihape Road	Various sites	Three bridges and a number of curves have been identified as requiring guardrail upgrades. Curves will be completed by end of June 2022.
Taihape Road corner improvements	Various	Several sites identified through Crash Reduction Study, or Engineer visits, being improved. Construction commenced in January 2022 and is complete.
Huiarangi Road	Hill section	Upcoming logging activity required road improvements for pavement strengthening and widening. Work completed in January 2022.
Maraekākaho Road	Maraekākaho / Stock Intersection	Design complete. Project issued to maintenance contract and will commence in May.
Kererū Road	Various	Crash reduction study begins in May. Improvements to be programmed following study.
Dartmoor Road	Various	Crash reduction study begins in May. Improvements to be programmed following study.
Kahurānaki Road	Various	Crash reduction study begins in May. Improvements to be programmed following study.
Network wide	various	Delineation improvements following outcome of delineation review and policy update.

4.0 Bridge Update

- 4.1 The recent flood event has caused minor damage to bridge assets but all things considered assets have performed well. Inspections are continuing with most works required following storm damage being debris clearing from abutments and piers.
- 4.2 Tawa Bridge and Heays Gorge Bridge strengthening works are experiencing delays due to lack of subcontractor staff capacity caused by Covid. Offsite works, however, have started and on site works will take place early August with both projects expected to be complete by end of September.
- 4.3 Six bridge strengthening design works of varying complexities are nearing completion. Procurement and subsequent construction will commence next financial year depending on available budget.

- 4.4 Overweight permitting system is currently undergoing testing to check accuracy before being transitioned to be managed by Waka Kotahi (NZTA) in its entirety. This is expected to cause some loss of revenue for Council but is beneficial for the applicants as the fees are reduced by a third. A separate paper will be presented in the coming meeting to discuss this matter further.

5.0 March Storm Event

- 5.1 A major storm event occurred district wide from 23-26 March. A large depression swept through the district causing widespread flooding and damage to road infrastructure.
- 5.2 Eleven crews were on the road network during the storm event and immediately following it to clear slips and make roads safe.
- 5.3 Significant works are still required across the network for the large slip sites, and also clearing debris from bridges. The total estimate of damage to roads is \$1,440,000 which has been submitted to Waka Kotahi for approval.
- 5.4 The Rural Flood and Emergency Reserve fund that is used to fund HDC's share of the cost of repairs of damage from events such as these has \$1,313,794.19 available as at 2 May 2022. This is to fund the local share of any major event. The funding assistance rate is 54% so Waka Kotahi will fund \$777,600 leaving \$662,400 needing to be funded by the Rural Flood and Emergency Reserve fund.
- 5.5 Photos of the event are contained in attachment 1.

6.0 Rural Network Investment

- 6.1 A request was made to update the Rural Community Board on rural road pavement investment and the impacts arising from underfunding from Waka Kotahi.
- 6.2 Current network needs presented to Waka Kotahi were that we have at least 30km of sealed road overdue to rehabilitate, and 350km of sealed roads overdue for resealing.
- 6.3 Council officers adopt the 80/20 rule in that 80% of our roads are very low volume and the key to keeping them in serviceable condition is to keep them waterproof through adopting a robust resealing programme. The rate of deterioration on these roads is very slow as long as they remain waterproof.
- 6.4 Officers' focus is to:
- Reduce the reseal backlog which in turn will prevent the rehabilitation backlog from increasing to a point that is unmanageable.
 - Undertake rehabilitation works on high volume roads that are not cost effective to maintain in their current condition to the required levels of service (i.e. Kahurānaki and Waimārama Roads)
- 6.5 If additional funding became available, officers would recommend to put this money into reduce the resealing backlog sooner. The funds would be used for pre-seal repairs to be done well in advance of the reseals, and to undertake the actual reseal itself.
- 6.6 HDC is experiencing significant cost increases in tendered work and with limited subsidised funding, may require an unsubsidised top-up to enable projects to proceed.

7.0 Works Update

- 7.1 Attachment 1 (to be circulated separately) will provide the Board with a photographic snapshot of activities undertaken between February 2022 and May 2022.

Attachments:

Summary of Considerations - *He Whakarāpopoto Whakaarohanga*

Fit with purpose of Local Government - *E noho hāngai pū ai ki te Rangatōpū-ā-Rohe*

The Council is required to give effect to the purpose of local government as set out in section 10 of the Local Government Act 2002. That purpose is to enable democratic local decision-making and action by (and on behalf of) communities, and to promote the social, economic, environmental, and cultural wellbeing of communities in the present and for the future.

Link to the Council's Community Outcomes – *Ngā Hononga ki Ngā Putanga ā-Hapori*

This report promotes the performance of regulatory functions for the purpose of providing safe, reliable and efficient transport networks.

Māori Impact Statement - *Te Tauākī Kaupapa Māori*

No known impacts for tangata whenua over and above the impact on the rural district as a whole.

Sustainability - *Te Toitūtanga*

This is a progress report and sustainability issues are not addressed.

Financial considerations - *Ngā Whakaarohanga Ahumoni*

The works identified within this report are within existing budgets.

Significance and Engagement - *Te Hiranga me te Tūhonotanga*

This report has been assessed under the Council's Significance and Engagement Policy as being of minor significance. Individual projects will have been addressed under the significance and engagement policy during the planning and decision making phase of those projects.

Consultation – internal and/or external - *Whakawhiti Whakaaro-ā-roto / ā-waho*

No consultation is required as part of this report.

Risks

Risk management and mitigation issues have been addressed in project planning and organisational health and safety policies.

Rural Community Board – *Te Poari Tuawhenua-ā-Hapori*

The Rural Community Board will have an interest in the operations and transportation activities within the DRA2 rating area.

Monday, 23 May 2022

Te Hui o Te Kaunihera ā-Rohe o Heretaunga

Hastings District Council: Hastings District Rural Community Board

Item 8

Te Rārangi Take

Report to Hastings District Rural Community Board

Nā:
From: Louise Stettner, Manager, Democracy & Governance Services

Te Take:
Subject: Rural Community Board Submission to MPI Consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives"

1.0 Purpose and summary - *Te Kaupapa Me Te Whakarāpopototanga*

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to seek endorsement of the Rural Community Board on the submission made on the Board's behalf to the Government's consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives".
- 1.2 The Government is seeking feedback on proposals to achieve better outcomes from afforestation. This includes:
 - excluding exotic forests from the permanent post-1989 category in the New Zealand Emissions Trading Scheme (NZ ETS)
 - whether to adjust how carbon accounting applies to forests on remote and marginal to harvest land
 - opportunities for improving incentives for indigenous afforestation.Submissions opened on 14 March and closed at 5pm on 22 April 2022.
- 1.3 The Board's submission on the MPI consultation was based on an informal submission the Board had previously made to Local Government NZ.

2.0 Recommendations - *Ngā Tūtohunga*

- A) That the Hastings District Rural Community Board receive the report titled Rural Community Board Submission to MPI Consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives" dated 23 May 2022.
- B) That the Rural Community Board endorse the attached submission (CG-16-7-00091) made on behalf of the Board to Government's "Managing exotic afforestation initiatives" consultation.

Attachments:

- 1  Hastings District Rural Community Board submission to MPI Consultation on Exotic Forestry CG-16-7-00091

Response ID:289 Data

1. Introduction

1. Check the boxes for the sections you are interested in answering (only the sections you select will display in your submission form)

- Section A - Defining the problem
Section B - Objectives and assessment criteria
Section C - Your preferred option
Section D - Designing exemptions if we exclude exotic forests
Section E - Timeframes for changes
Section F - Options for how we could introduce exceptions
Section G - Defining an indigenous and exotic forest
Section H - Penalties in the permanent forest category
Section I - Existing PFSI covenants
Section J - Averaging accounting for remote and marginal to harvest land
Section K - Biodiverse indigenous forests

2. Section A: What is the Problem?

2. Do you agree with our description of the problem?

Yes

3. Why/Why not?

4. Do you have evidence you can share that supports or contradicts this problem definition? Or that demonstrates other problems?

No

If yes, please detail below. You can also send us supporting documentation by email at mpi.forestry@mpi.govt.nz

3. Section B: Objectives and assessment criteria

5. Do you agree with our criteria for managing permanent exotic afforestation?

Yes

If not, what would you change and why?

4. Section C: What is your preferred option?

6. Of these options: what is your preferred approach?

Option 3 - Exclude exotic forests from the permanent category with some exceptions

7. Why?

More flexibility would be welcomed, and blanket policies with no respect to local conditions have a history of being unhelpful. The exclusion of exotics is based on sound evidence, which is that carbon farming would run rampant, and we would be left with large "plant and leave" forests. Therefore, any exception cannot be so broad an exception as to make the rule change to no

Item 8 Rural Community Board Submission to MPI Consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives"

Hastings District Rural Community Board submission to MPI Consultation on Exotic

Attachment 1

For

exotics in permanent forest pointless.

Perhaps the exclusion of pinus radiata should be kept, but other species such as redwoods could be explored.

Ensuring that erosion planting by farmers is encouraged is an exception to be considered, for example by allowing low-density plantings of willows/poplars.

Iwi do make some very valid points around their ability to develop their land, and their lack of ability to borrow money against collectively owned land. Supporting iwi groups' ability to make this improvement to their (often) marginal would be a step in the right direction.

Using pinus radiata as a cover crop for native forest regeneration is an interesting idea, that may work in some local areas, and may not work in others. For example, in the Wharerata Range north of Wairoa, I (Marcus Buddo) have personal experience in our pine forest of 28 years that native under-canopy species are regenerating. Whether this will translate to larger canopy species colonising the area is unknown. On the other hand, there is a 40-year-old forest near our farm in Poukawa, that has nothing but pines needles (and the occasional mushroom) under the pines. I believe this is due to environmental conditions (wet in Wairoa, dry in Poukawa), and the availability of remnant native stands to provide seeds (many stands in Wairoa, very few in Poukawa).

There needs to be a better understanding of the factors that enable pines to be a good cover crop, so that we are not left with "plant and leave" forests by stealth. However, there is enough evidence that this style could work in some locations. Perhaps a consenting regime through the regional/local council would be needed to assess on a case-by-case basis?

Claims of jobs generated by exotic carbon forests need to be backed up by hard evidence. The general argument made for planting exotic carbon forests is that the land cannot be used for other, more productive uses (e.g., production forestry or farming). This will mean that the land is often very marginal (steep, prone to slips), and/or very difficult to access (distance to port/processing facility/population centre). Both factors are not conducive to easy/plentiful employment. Further, the conditions for jobs in forests that are not related to production forestry (pest control, fibre harvesting, pet-food recovery from wild animals, possum fur trade, tourism) are there now in production forests and are not well taken up. Why would these jobs be more attractive in more marginal land, and offer more employment than currently occurs?

Arguments made by other groups that it should be their private right to do what they like with their land, are less persuasive. There are already many restrictions to private land rights for the public good (including consents, and increasingly farm plans etc.). The lack of jobs provided by exotic carbon farms, the fire risk, pest risk, and ecological/storm risk, all point to significant risk to the public good. Therefore, private land rights should not take precedence in this instance.

8. Are there other options you prefer, that we haven't considered?

Perhaps through some kind of consenting process. Local authorities are generally better placed to either know or research local conditions and engage with stakeholder about the appropriateness of carbon forestry. In particular, the permanent kind. It is also local communities that would be greatest impacted any land-use change, resulting in threats to their long term sustainability.

It has been mooted that the National Environmental Standard on Production Forestry could be amended to allow Councils to introduce consent requirements. Another option is the development of a National Environmental Standard on Carbon Forestry, as the cost to Councils in introducing changes to their district plans can be significant both in terms of financial terms and also in staff resource. This is especially so if the plan changes are challenged and decisions appealed to the Environment Court.

Production forestry could also benefit from this kind of land use controls approach, for example allowing consideration to be given to how the damage that trucks do to roading could be prevented with better planning. When it comes to roading, having a better mechanism than rates to cover costs from forestry-related roading activity would be hugely appreciated, and much fairer.

5. Section D: Designing exceptions

9. Should we provide for exceptions allowing exotic species to register in the permanent forest category under certain conditions?

Item 8 Rural Community Board Submission to MPI Consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives"

Hastings District Rural Community Board submission to MPI Consultation on Exotic

Attachment 1

For

Yes

10. Are there particular circumstances that you support introducing exceptions for (for example, exceptions for certain species of exotics)? Why?

land may not easily establish natives.
owners may wish to sparsely plant poplars for erosion control, ETS income and allow grazing underneath
exotics may be a nurse crop in wetter areas -if local evidence supports this function

11. What are the likely impacts, risks and costs of allowing exemptions in these circumstances?

if exemption is too broad, there is no point in banning exotic permanent forest in the first place

12. If we allow exceptions for exotic species under certain conditions, should we place additional conditions on the granting of this exception? What could these be?

these exemptions MUST be assessed and decided on an evidence base at Regional level.
consideration of benefits to community (such as jobs for past control) environment (does it improve biodiversity)

13. Are there any alternative ways we can recognise and encourage these forests, either within, or outside, the NZ ETS?

Pricing, rates rebates, funding similar to 1BT

6. Section E: Timeframes for bringing in changes

14. Do you agree with our preferred approach (acting before 1 January 2023)?

Yes

15. Why/Why not?

reduces uncertainty

If not, what is your preference?

7. Section F: Options for introducing exceptions

16. Do you support exceptions by regulations (option 3A) or exceptions after a moratorium (option 3B)?

Secondary legislation/Regulations

17. Why?

delaying decision making /regulations does not help, creates uncertainty

18. If we choose to introduce exceptions by regulations, what conditions or criteria should be placed on the Minister in choosing to pursue these?

Inappropriate/uneconomic for land to be either production forestry or productive farmland. Ensuring mature trees will not damage environment or infrastructure.
Must have an active approved management plan in place managing risk of fire, pest. (to control pests will require an access route.)

19. If we choose a moratorium (Option 3B) - how long should it be?

Short (1-2 years)

20. Why?

For uncertainty.

21. Do you think a different type of moratorium (whether it requires a decision to be ended/continued) would have different impacts? Or do you prefer a different approach?

8. Section G: Defining an indigenous and exotic forest

22. Currently the NZ ETS defines forests based on the predominant species in a hectare. However, forests change makeup over time. Do you think this definition of exotic and/or indigenous forests is appropriate for the permanent post-1989 category in the NZ ETS?

No

23. What level of exotic species in a forest would be acceptable for the forest to still be classified as an indigenous forest, and registered in the permanent post-1989 category in the NZ ETS?

if more than the majority (70%) of forest is indigenous (measured by canopy cover) = indigenous

24. If forest changes from indigenous to exotic while registered in the permanent category, do you think it should be removed from the category (option 1) or be treated as indigenous (option 2)?

It should be removed from the category

25. Why?

discouraging transition from native to exotic
helps protect native permanent forests
and achieve goal of encouraging improved
biodiversity

26. Are there other options we haven't considered?

27. If we choose to remove forests which have become predominately exotic over time from the category, how do you think we should do this?

Provide a time-period for the participant to become compliant again (Option 1C)

28. Why?

wilding pines may invade, land owner may need support to clear them.

9. Section H: Penalties for clear-felling forests in the permanent category

29. If exotic forests are removed from the permanent category, do you think the current penalty needs updating?

Yes

30. If yes, what would an appropriate penalty be for clearing the forest before the end of the permanent period?

as a minimum, return carbon credits and add a penalty based on a per hectare rate, as a punitive rate to prevent this occurring. fire is a risk, and would need to be replanted

10. Section I: Existing PFSI covenants

31. Are you a PFSI covenant holder?

No

Item 8 Rural Community Board Submission to MPI Consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives"

Hastings District Rural Community Board submission to MPI Consultation on Exotic

Attachment 1

For 32. Do you agree with the proposal to allow exotic forest land in the PFSI to transition into the permanent post-1989 forestry activity?

If no, would another approach be more suitable?

11. Section J: Averaging accounting for remote and marginal land

33. Should the Government create a long rotation category under averaging accounting for *Pinus radiata* forests which are not profitable to harvest at age 28, recognising the additional carbon which is likely to be stored by these long rotation forests?

No

34. What do you think the impacts of introducing a long rotation category as proposed would be?

Same as permanent exotic forest, locking up potentially productive land for a long period of time, no obvious plan to transition to natives.

Oversized trees too costly to harvest, increase infrastructure needs, increase risk of environmental damage.

Averaging tables mean a slow growing pine tree (uneconomic to harvest at age 28) will have been well funded for the carbon sequestration which is very likely to be well below the actual true biological sequestration (of this slow growing tree.)

If timber markets have collapsed, this is a market risk, and the ETS should not need to factor this risk into the calculations.

35. Do you think forests in this category are likely to be harvested?

No

36. Are measures needed to prevent forests in a long rotation category being left permanently and never harvested, or to mitigate potential adverse effects of these forests being left permanently?

YES, ETS pricing is the only measure

ETS should reflect actual growth of forest, ie only in first 30 years of pine tree growth

Unable to mitigate huge trees causing damage to environment or infrastructure

37. What criteria should be in place to restrict the category to *Pinus radiata* forests which are not profitable to harvest at age 28?

No further ETS returns OR if request for further ETS the consideration of an insurance scheme - (needs further thought) to cover the risk of 'plant and walkaway'

38. Do you think a long rotation category aligns with the proposed changes to the permanent activity and supports the Government's wider forestry objectives? (For a reminder of our forestry objectives please refer back to page 16 of the Discussion Document)

NO, not supported unless for another species such as Redwoods, which are recognised as long lived species

39. Are there alternative options to a long-rotation forest category that could be more effective at addressing the concerns raised by stakeholders about remote and marginal land and that align with the Government's forestry objectives? (For a reminder of our forestry objectives please refer back to page 16 of the Discussion Document)

Ensure strong regional decision making.

These are biological systems.

Change species

Right Tree Right Place.

Item 8 Rural Community Board Submission to MPI Consultation on "Managing exotic afforestation incentives"

Hastings District Rural Community Board submission to MPI Consultation on Exotic

Attachment 1

For

Decisions need be location specific, i.e. if greater than 100km from port or processing most likely becomes a permanent forest decision. And hot dry environments are very different from cool wet areas.

12. Section K: Biodiverse permanent indigenous forests

40. Do you have any further feedback on how the Government can reduce barriers and incentivise permanent indigenous afforestation to ensure we deliver long-term resilient, biodiverse forests?

Support change BUT biodiversity should not be included in ETS calculations (which is science based) rather it should be supported by a separate fund to meet additional cost and risks of native establishment (i.e. 1BT).
i.e. Govt support of; native seedling nurseries, predator control (deer), fencing etc

13. Your Information

41. Name:

Tania Kerr

42. Title (if applicable)

Deputy Chair

43. Are you submitting on behalf of your organisation?

Yes

44. Organisation (if applicable)

Hastings District Rural Community Board

45. Do you represent Māori land and forest owners (either solely, or as part of your membership)?

No

46. Please provide one of the following:

Address

Email address

Contact phone number

councillor.kerr@hdc.govt.nz

47. If you would like to have any or all of your submission or personal details withheld, please set out your reasons below