

Before Queenstown Lakes District Council

In the matter of The Resource Management Act 1991

And The Queenstown Lakes District proposed District Plan –
Rezoning Hearing Topic 12 – Upper Clutha mapping

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF JUDITH ROPER-LINDSAY FOR

Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited (#583)

Dated 1 June 2017

Solicitors:

Maree Baker-Galloway | Rosie Hill
Anderson Lloyd
Level 2, 13 Camp Street, Queenstown 9300
PO Box 201, Queenstown 9348
DX Box ZP95010 Queenstown
p + 64 3 450 0700 | f + 64 3 450 0799
maree.baker-galloway@al.nz | rosie.hill@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Introduction

- 1 My name is Dr Judith Roper-Lindsay.
- 2 My evidence in chief dated 4 April 2017 outlines my experience and qualifications relevant to this evidence in respect of the Upper Clutha mapping hearings.

Summary

- 3 My evidence focussed on the ecological aspects of the proposed Glendhu Station Zone. In particular I considered the extent to which the Revegetation Strategy and provisions of the proposed Zone address potential effects on ecological values and management of impacts (including mitigation). The land over which the Zone is proposed has low ecological values due to a history of farming and recreation land uses. However, there are pockets of indigenous vegetation cover, and small waterways which provide nodes suitable for revegetation, regeneration and enhancement of those existing values.
- 4 The Plan provisions incorporate the complex and detailed requirements of the Environment Court decision in relation to revegetation in a wider, landscape context. The features of higher ecological value are protected within what are now termed Farm and Vegetation Management Areas; by waterways setbacks and development controls; and by use of "activity areas" which restrict the location of specific activities to areas of lower ecological value.
- 5 This allows for an integrated approach to ecological management and biodiversity enhancement across the proposed Zone. I note that in some cases (for example, where the Revegetation Strategy would apply over what is now Rural Zone) there is a stronger requirement for protection and enhancement than currently provided through the Operative District Plan and the Proposed District Plan.
- 6 Over 22,000 plants have already been planted on the consented land area, and intensive weed and pest control undertaken. These plants represent the first steps in active biodiversity enhancement on the site.

Golf Course at Fern Burn

- 7 The Revegetation Strategy (2016) has a "Golf Course Revegetation" Objective which provides for natural regeneration of the golf course rough areas, supported by pest and weed control. This would apply to the proposed extension of the golf course across Fern Burn. In this area, stock (which are allowed to graze there currently under Rural Zone provisions) would be considered "pests" and should be excluded from the waterway area.

- 8 Management under the Golf Course Activity Area and Revegetation Strategy regimes will enable regeneration and active enhancement of the Fern Burn's ecological values. Currently there is no indigenous vegetation of note in this area. For example, indigenous species could replace the exotic trees such as willows and poplars that currently grow there.

Extension of Revegetation Strategy

- 9 I understand that Mr Davis accepts that the Revegetation Strategy (as it applies to the consented activities and area and its extension to any new activities for which consent would be needed in the proposed extended R Activity Area) provides both a strategic framework and operational guidance for enhancing biodiversity values there. However, he seeks to extend the Strategy across the whole Zone; in particular to require a Revegetation Strategy be prepared when a consent application is made within the Camping as (C) and Farm Homestead as (FH) Activity Areas.
- 10 The Revegetation Strategy 2016 was drawn up to address very specific, consented activities in areas with specific environmental values and management objectives. The areas over which as (C) and as (FH) Activity Area status is proposed are very different in character and purpose. As set out in my evidence in chief, activity areas GS(FH) and GS(C) have very low ecological values, given their historic and existing land uses.
- 11 A range of possible activities is provided for within each of these Activity Areas through the proposed Zone provisions, making it more difficult to prescribe "revegetation" for them in their entirety. Potential ecological effects on waterways are addressed through proposed Zone provisions which will protect the adjacent waterways through setbacks.
- 12 The more detailed definition of planting areas and programming that were required for the consented development in the Revegetation Strategy are not required in terms of effects associated with GS(FH) and GS(C).
- 13 Rules (44.5.5 and 44.5.6) give Council discretion over enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values and planting, through which benefits in respect of revegetation could be secured. I consider this an appropriate way to address Mr Davis' concerns.

Farm and Vegetation Management Area

- 14 There is some confusion about the rationale behind the naming and purpose of the Farm and Vegetation Management Area.

- 15 The Farm and Vegetation Management Areas were initially identified by the Environment Court as areas that should be protected from development and actively managed. They are wetlands and gullies running along the southern edge of the development area, and the moraine slope above Fern Burn to the east. The Court decision is not explicit on the matter, but the conditions explicitly require the areas be fenced off and revegetated. The gully and wetland areas lie within Covenant Area G and the moraine slope area sits partly in G and partly in Covenant Area F.
- 16 The Environment Court conditions require indigenous revegetation and other activities to enhance biodiversity in these areas. The boundary of the moraine slope Farm and Vegetation Management Area follows the top and bottom of the moraine slope, identifying an area that would be suitable for indigenous vegetation, including totara as specified in the Environment Court conditions.

Dated this 1st day of June 2017

Judith Roper-Lindsay