

| Recommendation | Comments |
|---|---|
| <p>It is recommended that the conditions on the resource consent are prescriptive in relation to when the northern corridor is delivered. It is recommended that the conditions stipulate that the applicant starts planting the northern corridor a year prior to vegetation removal taking place. The condition should also stipulate that the planting of the corridor (4.16 ha) cannot take more than three consecutive planting seasons.</p> | <p>The applicant objects to this for the reasons outlined in our email of 14 February 2020. However, the applicant is happy to accept a condition stipulating that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planting commences in the next planting season from when consent is given; and • The northern corridor is planted in no more than three planting seasons. <p><i>Note: Your last bullet point is addressed below.</i></p> |
| <p>The conditions should stipulate that the applicant would need to make contact with QEII at the start of the planting and that the northern corridor must be placed under a covenant prior to planting being completed. The responsibility for the maintenance of the planting will remain with the applicant until 75% canopy closure and 90% survival rate has been achieved. The responsibility for pest control will remain with the applicant for the lifespan of the quarry as stipulated in the EMP.</p> | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed.</p> |
| <p>It is recommended that it is stipulated that the applicant must use plant guards to protect the plantings (northern corridor and riparian restoration) as it is not considered appropriate that indigenous bird species (pukeko) should be killed when there is an alternative management approach.</p> | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition stipulating that plant guards be required should indigenous bird species be found to be a risk to newly planted seedlings within the northern corridor.</p> |
| <p>It is recommended that the planting mix for the terrestrial habitat is developed further than that presented in the EMP in Table 8. It is understood that the mix is focused on those species that will ensure rapid canopy closure and there is available seed source in the local area. However, the mix should include a greater diversity of tree species. The mix is focused on low growing species that are generally not long living species. The conditions should state that the planting mix will require prior approval from WRC.</p> | <p>The applicant has already proffered that:</p> <p>“It is recommended that experienced professional ecological restoration contractors undertake this planting work and be afforded the opportunity to make appropriate changes to species selection, site preparation and timing based on site specific conditions, when deemed necessary.”</p> <p>In other words, the applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed.</p> |
| <p>The EMP indicated that the northern corridor should be fenced. The conditions should stipulate that the planting must (will) be fenced in accordance with the guidelines stipulated in the EMP prior to any plantings commencing on site.</p> | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed.</p> |
| <p>The EMP indicates two areas of SEA which have been avoided by Project. During the walkover completed by AECOM it was observed that these habitats have been degraded as they are</p> | <p>The applicant partially accepts this recommendation. As noted in our email of 14 February 2020, the applicant is happy to accept a condition that stipulates fencing and restoration</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>unfenced and stock have been grazing through these areas. It is recommended that the conditions require that these areas are fenced and restored. The approach to restoration in these areas should require approval from WRC prior to works commencing. The restoration of these habitats should start one year prior to vegetation removal within the SEA and should take no longer than three years to complete.</p> | <p>of the two areas no longer included in Stage 3, on the premise that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size and exact location of the areas are to be defined and agreed by both parties; • The level of restoration be defined by a SQEP and agreed by both parties; • Removal of the requirement of a 12 month 'hold' period between the SEA removal for Stage 1 and the proposed restoration. |
| <p>It is recommended that the conditions stipulate that the riparian planting is to be a minimum of 10m either side of the stream (total width 20 m)1. This is the minimum width required to ensure that stream function is restored. This is particularly relevant to the eastern bank of the stream, where it is proposed that material / overburden will be stored.</p> | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition stipulating that when Tributary 1 has been diverted, riparian margin planting along the lines of that proposed be completed.</p> |
| <p>It is recommended that the planting mix for the riparian margins is developed further than that presented in the EMP in Table 10. It is understood that the mix is focused on those species that will ensure rapid canopy closure. However, the objective of the planting is to provide instream shade in the long term, therefore, the species mix at the top of the embankment needs to be developed to include more tall tree species. The conditions should state that the planting mix will require prior approval from WRC.</p> | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed.</p> |
| <p>The EMP indicates that there is a section of stream where bank collapse means that plants will be set back from the stream. It is recommended that the conditions state that in areas of erosion or bank collapse the bank should be reprofiled to ensure that the streams natural function is restored on completion of the planting.</p> | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed on the premise that the eroded areas be identified, defined and agreed by both parties.</p> |
| <p>However, it is recommended that the conditions stipulate that there will be additional buffer planting around these features, compared to that specified in the EMP. The buffer (>5m) should include taller tree species and be placed between the wetland and the working area. The objective of the plantings would be to increase the potential for species such as New Zealand dabchick to visit them. It is considered that without this screening it is unlikely that these species would be visit.</p> | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed on the premise that the areas be identified, defined and agreed by both parties.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>It is recommended that the conditions also specify the inclusion of the following habitat enhancement measures for bats and lizards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The installation of 25 Kent style bat boxes with predator exclusion bands. To be installed at least 5 m above the ground and on trees located at the forest edge or on a linear feature. If bats are found to be present, then the Bat Management Plan (BMP) will need to be updated to ensure that suitable mitigation is provided. • Installation of lizard log piles within the northern corridor (minimum of 5). | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed before commencing on either of Stages 2 and 3 (bat mitigation for Stage 1 has already been completed).</p> |
| <p>The following management plans will be produced by the applicant and approved by WRC;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bat Management Plan | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that already proffered, namely:</p> <p>“Additional acoustic bat monitoring surveys should be undertaken before the commencement of clearance at Stage 2 and 3 respectively. If bat activity is detected, then bat management will be recommended at the discrepancy of a competent bat ecologist. This may require the preparation and implementation of a bat management plan.”</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fish Management Plan | <p>The applicant has already proffered a condition requiring a Fish Management Plan.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lizard Management Plan | <p>The applicant is happy to accept a condition along the lines of that proposed.</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erosion and Sediment Control Plan | <p>The applicant has already prepared and lodged an ESCP for Stage 1, which has been accepted by WRC and is being implemented by the applicant. Further, the applicant has already proffered conditions requiring ESCPs to be prepared for Stages 2 and 3 respectively.</p> |