

**From:** [Margo Perpick | SAUNDERS & CO](#)  
**To:** [Alison Cooper](#)  
**Cc:** Woodstock - Commissioners Minute 18  
**Subject:** Wednesday, 6 December 2023 2:19:28 pm  
**Date:** [image002.wmz](#)  
**Attachments:** [Figure 3 Greer evidence 24 November 2023.pdf](#)

---

**Caution:** This is an email from an external party. Please take care when clicking links or opening attachments.

Hello Alison

Thank you for providing us with the Commissioners' Minute 18.

Before responding substantively to that Minute, I write in relation to several matters which have arisen as a result of that Minute.

Figure 3 of Dr Greer's Reply Evidence – Lower Wetland / Narbey Wetland

-

1. I have just noticed that, in the version of Dr Greer's Reply evidence of 24 November 2023 which is posted on the ECan website, Figure 3 is just showing as a blank rectangle. At the time the evidence was finalised, Figure 3 showed as the above document "Layout 1" (which I have also printed out, scanned, and attached as a PDF). Apparently the image in Dr Greer's evidence contained a link to a database, and that link has been disrupted at some point, resulting in the image going blank. Could you please post the attached PDF Figure 3 to the ECan website along with Dr Greer's reply evidence, and draw it to the attention of the other parties.
2. It may be because of the lack of Figure 3, and/or a difference in our use of terminology, but it seems that some confusion has arisen about the "Lower Wetland" and the "Narbey Wetland". The term "Lower Wetland" was adopted in the most recent version of the conditions, in order to distinguish it from the "Upper Wetland" (which has been created through stormwater discharge from a track swale). However, Dr Greer used the term "Narbey Wetland" in his evidence, referring to the wetland which is referred to as the "Lower Wetland" in the conditions. The Lower Wetland and the Narbey Wetland are the same wetland, which surrounds Woodstock Stream, and is shown as the pink area on the attached Figure 3. It is Dr Greer's understanding that this Lower/Narbey wetland is entirely or predominantly located on the Narbeys' property, and not (or only a very small amount) on the Applicant's property. So, the Applicant will need the Narbeys' permission to carry out tests and monitoring within this Lower/Narbey wetland. Given the Narbeys' past co-operation and interest, it is hoped that their permission will be given.
3. The Applicant is willing to provide the information requested at paragraph 7 of Minute 18, but clarifies that any presence/absence survey undertaken in the Lower Wetland will be undertaken on the Narbey property (in the event that the Narbeys provide their permission).
4. It is Dr Greer's understanding that the Lower/Narbey wetland is the only wetland where it has been suggested that mudfish may be present. He asks that the Commissioners confirm that this is also their understanding and that their request for a presence/absence survey relates to the Lower/Narbey wetland, as shown in pink on Figure 3 to his Reply evidence. If that is the case, then paragraph 7 of the Minute would read:

*It is common ground that the Canterbury Mudfish (Neochanna burrowsius) is a Threatened (Nationally Critical) species. It would assist our deliberations to have a*

*presence/absence survey undertaken, in accordance with a methodology to be agreed between Dr Greer and Ms Hayward, with at least 2 locations selected in the Lower Wetland area (but only if the Narbey submitters consent to this), and Woodstock Stream.*

5. Dr Greer notes that he and Ms Hayward have consulted and agreed a mudfishing approach, which means that the Woodstock Stream will be surveyed as part of the Lower/Narbey wetland survey, as the stream is part of the wetland complex. There will not be a separate mudfish survey conducted for the Woodstock Stream, but it will be surveyed.

Schedule for Filing Track Changes Version of Conditions and Response to RFI

-

6. The Commissioners have requested a further track changes version of the conditions. I note that, to the extent that there are further changes to proposed consent conditions contained in the Applicant's reply evidence, that has arisen in response to suggestions by submitters and/or s42A report writers,
7. The Applicant is happy to provide a further consolidated version of consent conditions in track-changes format, identifying all changes made since the version issued on 29 August 2023. However, given the time of year and people's current commitments, that cannot be provided until 15 December. We trust that will be acceptable.
8. The Applicant also seeks that the Commissioners' orders be amended to allow until 15 December 2023 for the Applicant to confirm its agreement (or disagreement) as set out in paragraph 19(a) and (b) of the Minute.

Kind regards  
Margo