

File Note 20 March 2019

Meeting between Charlotte Phelps (CP) for the West Coast Regional Council and Jane Marshall (JM) for the Department of Conservation in relation to eight of the properties identified in the Land and Water Plan.

Summary

After further discussion, reference to file notes and desktop views of properties some progress has been made on reaching full and partial agreement at three sites. No progress was made about three sites. The potential to resolve the differences in assessment is high. A quantitative assessment using the Landcare Research guideline, conducted by both CP and JM would take approx 6 - 8 hours per site to complete and resolve the issues permanently for the landowners.

Site assessments

- In three cases no further agreement was reached however both CP and JM agree that resolving these properties is possible with a combined field trip should the owners allow that.
- In two cases JM has agreed that the areas are not part of the functioning wetland because of the suite of plants (composition and abundance).
- In two cases agreement was reached for changes to the current proposal based on vegetation association.
- In one case CP has agreed the property fits the wetland definition on over 95% of the property.

BULP050 Oweka

CP was unable to produce further evidence that the ground was consistently dry, as on the day of her visit. We discussed the presence of beech species but CP was unable to confidently recall which species of beech is present. This is important as an indicator of a site not being wetland. JM was unable to assess the forest composition and abundance of wetland (obligate or facultative) species on site from photos and reports.

PUNP001 Punakiaki

JM was unable to assess wetland species abundance in photos and unable to see clear difference in the forest associations on either side of the wetland boundary. The ground appears very wet underfoot and many of the individual *Carex* in the photos appear to be the wetland obligate species *Carex virgata*.

HOCP004 Candlelight

JM agreed after further conversation with CP that the photos looked like those areas were well developed and lacked dominance by native wetland species, but JM did not agree that the photos were representative of the whole wetland and therefore does still not agree with CP's recommendation.

KAGP008 Kini

JM agreed that the northern area areas assessed by CP sounded like a coastal forest association that was not indicative of wetland nor did the developed southern area identified by CP. The removal of these areas is unlikely to affect the functioning of the adjacent wetland due to the directional flow of ground water at the sites.

HOKP119 Lake Mudgie

After reference to other photos and file notes JM agreed that two small areas of the part assessed by CP did not support wetland forest species, but rather a mix of common forest species not indicative of wetlands. CP will draw up an amended map of the area.

HARP021 Lake Ianthe

Based on further discussion and photography from other reports JM has agreed that the area identified by CP as not supporting wetland species is no longer a functioning part of the wetland and that its removal from the shapefile, will not alter the hydrology of the greater wetland in large part because of the large drain which runs between the cleared area and the wetland and lake beyond. Whilst the small forest block is dominated by kahikatea, unless it is fenced it is too small to persist in the long term and any change of land use around it will also reduce its viability.

HOKP099 Houhou

CP and JM agreed the driveway is not wetland but the rest of Mr Lowes land is wetland based on ground water hydrology and vegetation.

HOKP086

After further discussion and assessment of further information that was provided, JM and CP agreed to recommend the removal of the area eastern area which was originally recommended to be removed (shaded in red). It is recommended by both JM and CP that the remainder of the designation is retained as Scheduled Wetland.