

**BEFORE THE HEARING PANEL
APPOINTED BY KAPITI COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER OF | I TE TAKE O the Resource Management Act 1991
AND | ME

IN THE MATTER OF | I TE TAKE O Proposed Plan Change 5 (Private):
100 and 110 Te Moana Road,
Waikanae, Kāpiti Coast District

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DR GRAHAM USSHER
ON BEHALF OF ERIC, VINCE AND RAECHEL OSBORNE**

Dated 21 September 2026

Introduction

1. My full name is Graham Thomas Ussher.
2. I have prepared a Statement of Evidence regarding Private Plan Change 5 (**PC5**) to the Kapiti Coast District Plan, in relation to ecology matters. My qualifications, experience and a summary of the work completed are as set out in that statement.

Summary of opinion

3. The site is located at 100 & 110 Te Moana Road and is around 5.497 ha in area. It has an extensive history of farming and pine plantation forestry (recently harvested). The site is still occasionally grazed and maintained as pasture.
4. **Streams:** No natural streams are present. One 'highly modified stream' runs through the eastern and northern part of the site through to the northern boundary. It was originally dug in the 1950s to drain the wetland for pasture conversion. Its state is poor-moderate, and may support native fish (eel, bully, kōkopu, etc., based on Waimeha Stream records). The creation of this watercourse has likely lowered local groundwater, contributing to conversion of the historic wetland flats to non-wetland pasture.
5. **Wetland:** A ca. 0.54 ha coastal ephemeral dune hollow wetland is part of the northern/north-western part of the site that is already protected under QEII covenant K068. The low-lying grazed areas that comprise most of the remainder of the Application Site do not qualify as a 'natural inland wetland' under the NPS-FM¹ as they function as pasture for most of the year. I consider that the pond, vegetated island and margins should be not classified as natural inland wetland, as the pond was artificially created/dug out for recreational amenity use (i.e. was 'deliberately constructed'). I do however consider the pond and wetland form the same management unit under the QEII covenant.
6. **Pond:** ~0.4 ha artificial pond, pre-1990, protected under the same QEII covenant as the wetland; excluded from natural inland wetland classification due to artificial origin.
7. **Terrestrial vegetation:** The site supports mostly exotic/modified vegetation (grazed pasture, mown grass, scrambling weedland, mixed exotic/native plantings). It was assessed against Regional Policy Statement significance criteria and was found not to meet thresholds for ecological significance (representativeness, rarity, diversity, or connectivity).
8. **Lizards:** No lizards or sign were observed during site surveys; potential habitat for northern grass skink and copper skink (being an area of rank weedland and mixed

¹ National Policy Statement- Fresh Water Management, refer definition at clause 3.21.

exotic /native shrubland on the northern side of the pond) was present, but has since been removed via recent clearing/planting works.

9. **Birds:** Only common, "Not Threatened" native and exotic species were recorded. Targeted playback surveys for bittern, fernbird, spotless/marsh crake, and banded rail within the wetland area returned no detections.
10. **Bats:** There are no records of bat activity at or near site and it is considered highly unlikely that bats use the site.

Effects and management

11. Any future development would be required to avoid the wetland/pond (with a 10 m setback maintained) under the NES-F², with potential watercourse realignment and restoration proposed along the northern boundary.
12. Key potential effects identified for future development include sediment discharge, dewatering of the wetland/effects on wetland hydrology through on-site earthworks /flood risk management, disturbance to wetland birds, and lizard injury/habitat loss.
13. Mitigation to avoid or manage potential adverse effects includes the implementation of standard erosion and sediment controls, stormwater management (hydraulic neutrality, mimicking natural hydrology), and wildlife management plans (fish relocation, lizard management).
14. The overall conclusion from the Ecological Effects Assessment Report is that no additional protection layers need to be added as part of PC5, and that with the NES-F and other regulatory requirements and recommended mitigations, residual adverse effects are expected to be no more than minor, with no anticipated need for biodiversity offsetting or compensation.

Conclusion

15. The Application Site has an extensive history of farming and pine plantation forestry. Most of the site is still occasionally grazed and is maintained as pasture.
16. The ecological values of the Application Site are mainly concentrated around the QEII covenant area (K068) which includes pond and wetland areas, and the highly modified northern watercourse. NZ pipit and native lizards may use the site, although habitat is sparse and is of poor quality.
17. Through the ecological assessment and subsequent RFI and further information response process, key issues have been identified, which include the delineation of wetland across the site, the provision of a planted buffer to the wetland and pond, the

² National Environmental Standards for Freshwater.

classification of the modified watercourse, and the amount and quality of habitat for native lizards and birds.

18. Mr Pickett and the S42A Report author conclude that most of the above issues are matters that can be appropriately dealt with at a future resource consent stage.
19. The S42A Report recommends that a 10 m wide planted buffer to the QEII wetland and pond be added to the Structure Plan map, and a provision be added referring to this. In my opinion, I support a 10 m setback to earthworks/ development from the QEII wetland and pond, and I also support that such a buffer is planted to provide a visual screen and people movement constraint to the QEII wetland and pond. However, I consider that the need for a planted buffer should be left to a future resource consent application, when details of housing density and the proximity of human activity to the wetland are confirmed.
20. Overall, the proposed Plan Change will result in potential adverse effects that are expected to be no more than minor. Potential adverse effects of a future resource consent application for subdivision can be managed using the standard suite of ecological tools, including pre-development surveys, wildlife salvage and relocation, stream restoration, and buffer planting using native plant species.



Dr Graham Thomas Ussher

21 September 2026