

RC14513 / COASTAL PROTECTION STRUCTURE AND ASSOCIATED ACTIVITIES SUMMARY STATEMENT OF TERRESTRIAL ECOLOGY

This summary highlights the key matters addressed in my statement of evidence dated 25 July 2025.

Key Matters

1. The site into which the wall is to be installed is predominantly exotic coastal vegetation despite the Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan labelling it 'Indigenous Biological Diversity Area B (IBDA; B1 Central Waihi Beach)'.
2. Most of the site does not meet NZCPS policy 11 a or b, but the southern narrow portion (some 70m in length) is sufficiently indigenous in vegetation cover that that area does meet Policy 11(b)(ii)
3. The most valuable indigenous representative area of the site (the spinifex foredune) has purposefully been avoided.
4. There are two possible wall alignments and the level of adverse effect with either alignment option is very low. The effect to the southern (pohuehue) section is allowable under the NZCPS policy 11(b) and the proposed remedy / mitigation measures.
5. Which ever wall alignment is preferred, the remedial revegetation of the buried wall by indigenous coastal appropriate vegetation causes a better than current condition and ecological value to occur.
6. There is a low risk of the presence of native skink or any invertebrate listed by the Wildlife Act. At clearance processes will need to be in place to manage lizards (salvage) and that process, in the absence of survey to prove absence, will require a wildlife act permit.
7. The remedial actions should have management proposed condition 10.5 (d) states a 2 year maintenance period or when there is a 80% cover of indigenous species.
8. No submitter, including the DOC, raised issues or provided new data that changed my opinion.
9. The reporting officer agrees that the ecological matters can be managed through resource consent conditions.

10. A small range of management plans are required to which I agree.
11. The two points of disagreement are firstly the length of time that the management of the site by the applicant should be required and secondly the area of revegetation south of the wall installation. In my opinion the applicant's responsibility is over once the revegetation is established as the site will have had the effects of the application neutralised (in fact ecological gains) and the area will then be as prone to change as it is currently. Also, if the DOC reserve under storm conditions erodes near the southern end of the wall such that vegetation is lost, it is largely exotic and will regrow by itself and I fail to see why the applicant should be responsible for the revegetation of that area, certainly not in a better native assemblage.