

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS APPOINTED BY THE  
WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

The Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**  
or **the Act**)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

Hearing of Submissions and Further  
Submissions on the Proposed Waimakariri  
District Plan (**PWDP** or **the Proposed Plan**)

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

Hearing of Submissions and Further  
Submissions on Variations 1 and 2 to the  
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

Submissions and Further Submissions on the  
Proposed Waimakariri District Plan by **Mark**  
**and Melissa Prosser**

---

**SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE OF ROLAND KAHURANGI PAYNE  
IN RESPONSE TO OFFICER'S REPORT  
ON BEHALF OF MARK AND MELISSA PROSSER  
REGARDING HEARING STREAM 12C**

DATED: 8 July 2024

---

Presented for filing by:  
Chris Fowler  
Saunders & Co  
PO Box 18, Christchurch  
T 021 311 784  
chris.fowler@saunders.co.nz

## INTRODUCTION

- 1 My name is Roland Kahurangi Payne.
- 2 I have prepared a statement of evidence regarding Hearing Stream 12C in support of Mark and Melissa Prosser's submission on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (**PWDP**) to rezone approximately 73 ha at Mandeville from Rural Lifestyle Zone (**RLZ**) to Large Lot Residential Zone (**LLRZ**).
- 3 My qualifications and experience are set out in that statement. I confirm that this supplementary statement of evidence is also prepared in accordance with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct.
- 4 On 23 May 2024 the Waimakariri District Council (**Council**) released an Officer's Report for Hearing Stream 12C prepared under section 42A of the RMA containing an analysis of submissions seeking Large Lot Residential Zone and recommendations in response to those submissions (**Officer's Report**).
- 5 The Officer's Report recommends that the Prosser rezoning submission be rejected. My supplementary evidence is filed in response to that Report.

## SCOPE OF SUPPLEMENTARY EVIDENCE

- 6 In my supplementary evidence I address the following matters:
  - (a) My supplementary evidence responds to those parts of the Officer's Report that address matters within scope of my expertise, with particular emphasis on matters where there is a difference of view between myself and the Officer's Report.
- 7 In preparing my supplementary evidence I have:
  - (a) Reviewed the Officer's Report and the Appendices to that Report relevant to my area of expertise;
  - (b) Reviewed my evidence in chief filed earlier on behalf of the Submitters;
  - (c) Reviewed other materials specifically mentioned in my supplementary evidence discussed below.

## **CONTEXT AND APPROACH**

- 8 As mentioned, the Officer's Report recommends decline of the Prosser rezoning submission. A range of reasons are given for this recommendation, some of which relate to my area of expertise.
- 9 The approach I have adopted in this supplementary statement of evidence is to identify those parts of the Officer's Report (including Appendices attached to that Report) where I disagree with the Officer's Report and to explain my reasons for disagreement, as well as identify parts of the Officer's Report where I agree with the Officer's Report, and explain my reasons for agreement.

## **RESPONSE TO OFFICER'S REPORT – ECOLOGY**

### **Riparian buffer along the eastern boundary – paragraph 149.**

- 10 I agree with the view of the Council's ecologist that a wider 10 metre riparian buffer and no build setback along the eastern boundary from the Stormwater Management Area (SMA) to Ashworths Road, should be included in the ODP. A wider area of indigenous planting in this area would enhance the ecological buffering.
- 11 The wider strip would also allow more room for naturalizing the springs (waipuna) and waterway, and correspond with recommendations in the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan, for better protections of waipuna.
- 12 The wider space could provide for a public accessway linking the SMA to Ashworths Road, but this is considered an amenity feature and does not enhance ecological values (and could potentially diminish the ecological buffering and protections to fauna).
- 13 The Council's suggestion for a crossing on the Ashworths Road stream, is also an amenity feature, but it is not considered an issue from an ecological perspective.

### **Freshwater fauna survey – paragraph 150.**

- 14 A freshwater fauna survey is recommended prior to development works (i.e. once plans are finalised). This could be done in conjunction with the naturalisation of the waterway on the eastern boundary (and preparation of a Fish Management Plan, if required). The current ODP does not impact waterways and therefore, freshwater surveys are not necessary at this stage.

### **Retention of existing hedgerows – paragraph 150.**

- 15 The existing hedgerows within the site are not going to be retained, and those within the property provide limited roosting habitat for birds. The areas beneath these hedgerows many provide habitat to indigenous lizards and it is recommended that surveys (for lizards and nesting birds), are undertaken prior to their removal. These hedgerows are all exotic, of low ecological value. The hedgerows also contain tree species listed in the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Plan (2018-2038), including tree lucerne (*Chamaecytisus palmensis*), as well as other species known to spread and become invasive (e.g. pampas (*Cortaderia selloana*) and wilding conifers). The loss of any carbon, from the trees or soil, would be likely be offset by the large amount of planting proposed, in the development.
- 16 There are some hedgerows on the eastern boundary (outside the site) that should be retained initially (if possible), as they are providing shade to the waterway and improving the instream fauna habitat values. However, this would be at the adjoining landowner's discretion.

### **Integrating southern reserve into landscaping planting– paragraph 150.**

- 17 The Councils suggestion of integrating the southern local purpose reserve into the landscaping planting is already part of the design, opportunities for walkways are again an amenity feature, but not considered an issue from an ecological perspective. However, the buffer planting along the southern boundary should be extended out to 10 metres.

### **REPLY TO RESPONSE DOCUMENT**

- 18 I have read the S42A report writer's preliminary response to the panel's written questions and the contents to not appear to be of relevance to my expertise.

### **CONCLUSION**

- 19 I agree with the Officer's Report recommendation to increase the buffering setbacks along boundaries and waterways. A wider indigenous strip would enhance the ecological values and protections for waterways and waipuna, and allow more room for naturalisation of the waterway.
- 20 A freshwater fauna survey (as well as, lizard and nesting bird survey), is recommended prior to development works and once plans are finalised. This

should also be done in conjunction with waterway naturalisation and any required fish management. Lizard and nesting bird surveys, should be undertaken prior to any development works. Nesting bird surveys would only need to occur if developments works are during the breeding season of birds likely to use the habitats.

- 21 Hedgerows on the site are of low ecological value from a both a vegetation and fauna perspective and do not need to be retained for ecological purposes. Any potential loss of habitat (or carbon) would be more than offset by the proposed indigenous planting.
- 22 Walkways within riparian and buffer strips are not considered an issue, as long as they are created in a manner that maintains the ecological values of these areas.

Roland Payne  
8 July 2024