

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
FOR THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES
PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management
Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Hearing Stream 13 ó
Queenstown Mapping

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF GLENN DAVIS

Dated 9 of June 2017

MACALISTER TODD PHILLIPS
Barristers, Solicitors, Notaries
3rd Floor, 11-17 Church Street
Queenstown 9300
P O Box 653, DX ZP95001, Queenstown 9348
Telephone: (03) 441 0125 Fax: (03) 442 8116
Solicitor Acting: Jayne Elizabeth Macdonald

Qualifications and Experience

1. My full name is Glenn Alister Davis. I am a Principal Environmental Scientist and Director of e3 Scientific Limited (formerly Davis Consulting Group Limited) and have been since 2007.
2. I have 20 years' postgraduate work experience in environmental management. I have a BSc in Ecology and MSc in Geography. I have worked as a professional ecologist in the Queenstown Lakes District (**District**) for the last 10 years. During this time, I have worked on a wide range of projects for the agricultural and land development sectors, as well as the Queenstown Lakes District Council (**Council**). In addition, I have also held a contract with Land Information New Zealand to support the assessment of discretionary activities on high country pastoral leases under the Crown Pastoral Lease Act. I therefore have a sound working knowledge of the ecological values of the Queenstown Lakes District.
3. I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2014 and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

Scope of Evidence

4. The Coneburn Group (**Submitter 361**) have requested the re-zone of an area of land adjacent to Kingston Road (SH6) at the base of the Remarkables Range from rural to industrial. The proposed area to be rezoned is shown in Figure 2 of the original Ecological Assessment completed for The Coneburn Group and provided as Annexure H as part of The Coneburn Group's original submission to Council.
5. The original Ecological Assessment summarised that the existing ecological values within the Coneburn study area are limited to the native grey shrubland habitat bordering ephemeral drainage lines and associated gullies located within Zone 4. This habitat lies within an

acutely threatened environment and provides prey for the threatened eastern falcon, and is likely a food and habitat source for native invertebrates and lizards. Any native vegetation outside the grey shrubland is highly degraded, isolated and small in scale.

6. The assessment concluded that the proposed re-zoning of the study area is highly unlikely to degrade the indigenous ecology of the property, provided the areas of grey shrubland identified in Figure 4 (#5 and #8 areas) are retained, including within activity areas. And that for the remaining ecological values to be retained, and restoration opportunities stated within the assessment to be implemented, that provisions provide for the retention of the areas of grey shrubland and the preparation of an Ecological Management Plan to provide specific detail on the implementation of the restoration of the grey shrubland areas.
7. I have been asked by The Coneburn Group to prepare evidence in relation to Dr Kelvin Lloyd's evidence filed on behalf of the Council (24 May 2017) with regards to the proposed rezone.

Consideration Dr Lloyd's evidence filed on behalf of the Council

8. Dr Lloyd does not oppose the requested zone change provided the objectives, policies and rules that relate to the proposed zone have four amendments/additions made (as outlined in 8.4 of Mr Lloyd's evidence).
9. I address each of Dr Lloyd's four conditions below.
10. Condition (a) in Paragraph 8.4 requires the replacement of native species or native planting with ecologically appropriate indigenous plant species in terms of visually screening within the proposed zone. I do not oppose this change.
11. Condition (b) in Paragraph 8.4 requires the wording native species unless they are wilding be replaced with existing indigenous plant species with regards to retaining vegetation within the zone. I do not oppose this change.

12. Condition (c) in Paragraph 8.4 requires reference to "restoring ecologically appropriate indigenous forest in areas currently vegetated in grey shrub". Dr Lloyd states that "grey shrubland does not represent the original vegetation cover" and that it is a "placeholder" that would facilitate restoration of more valuable indigenous vegetation on the site. However, the original vegetation was a mixture of native grasslands and grey shrubland (e.g. Coprosma species, Olearia species, kowhai) and it would be at higher elevations on the Remarkables Range that native forest species (e.g. beech) would have been present (Leathwick *et al.*, 2003; Leathwick 2001; LRIS Portal layer: "Potential Vegetation of New Zealand"). Consequently, for restoration areas within the proposed zone, I do not oppose the reference to restoring with ecologically appropriate species, however, the terminology should be "restoring ecologically appropriate indigenous plant species".
13. Condition (d) in Paragraph 8.4 requires reference to "controlling exotic woody weeds, particularly sycamore, elder, and hawthorn". I do not oppose this, and note that our original assessment stated a restoration opportunity of "control of exotic species, particularly wilding pines, hawthorn and briar, to allow native species to dominant the grey shrubland areas".

Consideration of original ecological assessment

14. The submission by The Coneburn Group proposes "An Ecological Management Plan shall be submitted to Council detailing the retention of the areas of grey shrubland within the Open Space Areas and specific detail on the implementation of the restoration of the grey shrubland areas." This is not fully aligned with the original ecological assessment, that stated all grey shrubland (areas #5 and #8) identified in Figure 4 of our report are to be retained, including within activity areas.

Conclusion

15. I do not oppose Dr Lloyd's four amendments/additions for the objectives, policies, and rules relevant to the proposed zone provided condition (c) is modified as explained in paragraph 12 above.
16. I support the adjustment of the objectives, policies, and rules relevant to the proposed zone to be consistent with the original ecological

assessment conclusion that all grey shrubland (i.e. areas #5 and #8 identified in Figure 4) should be retained, including within activity areas.

Glenn Davis
9 June 2017

