

Kānuka Row 2018

Project Images



Image on left kānuka in sward of exotic grass. Image on right cultivated paddock on northern boundary.

Project Summary

Planting of ~200 plants. Control of weeds in previous scraped sites. Scrape new disturbance sites.

Project Details

| | |
|---|---|
| Project CWMS Zone | Waimakariri |
| Project Location | |
| Nature of Project | Creation, Enhancement |
| Habitat Type | |
| Project Aim (objectives and overall vision) | Kickstart recruitment of native plant species. Protect existing plants from competition. Reduce ingress of nutrients from neighbouring property. |
| Project Outcomes (what the project will achieve) | A resilient dry plains remnant. |
| Actions proposed to achieve outcomes | Excavate scrapes for kānuka and other species recruitment. Control of weeds in previous scrapes to protect kānuka, mānuka, <i>Dichondra sp.</i> , <i>Carex breviculmis</i> , etc. Plant dry tolerant species with weedmat and mulch to assist with establishment. |
| Supporting Organisation/Community Group | Woods Simon |

Funding Requested

| From ECAN | From Other Sources | Estimated Total (Applicant) |
|------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| \$8,000.00 | \$4,000.00 | \$12,000.00 |

Funding Detail

| Task / Resource | Type | Paid for by | Units | Unit Type | Cost Per Unit * | Total Costs * |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------|-----------|--------------------------------|-----------------|
| Earthworks | Excavator | Immediate Steps | 1 | Each | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| Planting | Boundary planting | Immediate Steps | 1 | Each | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| Weed control | Cut and paint | Other | 1 | Each | \$4,000.00 | \$4,000 |
| * All costs exclude GST | | | | | Council Contribution | \$8,000 |
| | | | | | All Other Contributions | \$4,000 |
| | | | | | Total Project Funding | \$12,000 |

Project Map



Ecological Assessment

Fundamental Project Criteria

1. Reflects the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy's Guiding Principles

| | |
|---|--|
| Y | Focuses on protecting and maintaining what remains |
| Y | Focuses on restoring what has been lost |

2. Contributes to the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy's Goals (1-6)

| | |
|---|--|
| Y | Protects or maintains the health of significant habitats and ecosystems |
| Y | Restores the natural character of degraded indigenous habitats and ecosystems |
| Y | Increases the integration and sustainable use of indigenous species in modified environments (e.g. farm, urban, lifestyle blocks). |
| | Enhances the public's awareness, understanding and support of biodiversity |
| | Encourages, celebrates and supports action by landowners and communities to protect, maintain and restore biodiversity |
| | Improves the range and quality of knowledge and information about Canterbury's biodiversity for its sustainable management |

3. Project Viability

| | |
|---|--|
| Y | Project is feasible, cost-effective and an efficient use of funds. |
| Y | Project will realistically achieve outcomes/gains it is aiming to. |
| Y | Project is sustainable (e.g. any ongoing or future management requirements are identified and affordable). |
| Y | No other potential costs (e.g. consent costs) that may make the project less viable and/or affordable |

4. Landowner Support

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Y | Project has landowner support |
|---|-------------------------------|

5. Eco-sourced Plants

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Y | Eco-sourced plants being used |
| Y | Not applicable |

6. Is some or all of the work required under the Regional Pest Management Strategy?

| | |
|--|------|
| | RPMS |
|--|------|

7. Is some or all of the work required under a District/Regional Council Plan?

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| | District/Regional Council Plan |
|--|--------------------------------|

8. Proportion of cost

| | |
|----|-------------|
| 0 | Protection |
| 50 | Restoration |
| 50 | Creation |
| 0 | Monitoring |

| Existing Ecological Values | | |
|---|---------------|--|
| Criteria | Score (0 - 3) | Comments |
| Representativeness | 3 | A large example of kānuka for the Low Plains ED. |
| Rarity or Distinctiveness | 3 | Kānuka woodland in Low Plains ED. |
| Diversity and Pattern | 1 | Mostly kānuka woodland with some rank exotic grass. |
| Ecological Context | 2 | Common bush birds often seen or heard at the site. |
| Project Protects a Threatened Environment | 1 | |
| Sub-total | 10 | While the site has no know plant species with a threat ranking it does have manuka which whilst once common in the area is now rare both locally and in the wider Low Plains ED. |

| Potential Ecological Values (in 10-15 years time – based on likely change) | | |
|--|---------------|--|
| Criteria | Score (0 - 5) | Comments |
| Project Design is Effective/Addresses Key Threats | 3 | Key threats are weeds and nutrients. Exotic grasses are preventing recruitment of native species and nutrients will encourage an exotic grass sward. |
| Project Potential/Positive Impact Ecologically | 3 | Gains are starting to be made with recruitment of native species. |
| Value for Money or Cost-benefit | 3 | Using natural processes to establish new plants is excellent value for money. |
| Sub-total | 9 | |

| Other Criteria (non ecological or cultural) | | |
|---|---------------|----------|
| Criteria | Score (0 - 3) | Comments |
| Legally Protected | 0 | |
| Educational or Partnership Value | 0 | |

| Immediate Steps Criteria | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Criteria | Score (L, M, H) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| Overall Assessment Scores | | |
|--|--------------|-----------------|
| Criteria | Score | Comments |
| Ecological Assessment Score (Existing and Potential) /39 | 19 | |
| Cultural | Unknown | |
| Other Criteria Overall Rating | Low | |
| Immediate Steps Rating | | |