

BEFORE THE FAST-TRACK EXPERT PANEL

IN THE MATTER of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (“FTAA”)

AND

IN THE MATTER of Waikanae North (FTAA-2603-1194)

JOINT STATEMENT OF EXPERT WITNESSES:

ECOLOGY

11 September 2026

INTRODUCTION

1. Expert conferencing on the topic of stormwater took place online via Microsoft Teams from 9am-12pm on 11 September 2026.
2. The conference was attended by the following members of the Expert Panel:
 - a. Sue Simons (“SS”) (Chair)
 - b. Nigel Mark-Brown (“NMB”) (Panel Member)
 - c. James Whetu (“JW”) (Panel Member)
 - d. Carolyn Wratt (“CW”) (Panel Member)
3. The conference was attended by the following experts
 - a. Susannah Tait (“ST”) (appointed by the Expert Panel)
 - b. Mitch Lewandowski (“ML”) (Applicant)
 - c. Ray O’Callaghan (“RO”) (Applicant)
 - d. Andrew Beatson (“AB”) (Applicant)
 - e. Dr Graham Ussher (“GU”) (Applicant)
 - f. Dr Sarah Flynn (“SF”) (KCDC)
 - g. Monique Leith (MLe) (KCDC)
 - h. Melanie Dixon (“MD”) (GWRC)
 - i. Katherine Greenaway (“KG”) (GWRC)
 - j. Dr Gareth Taylor (“GT”) (GWRC)
 - k. James Blyth (“JB”) (GWRC)
 - l. Joshua Knowles (“JK”) (GWRC)
 - m. Greg Carlyon (“GC”) (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust)
 - n. Dr Fleur Maseyk (“FM”) (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust)
 - o. Dr Liam McAuliffe (“LM”) (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust)
 - p. Helena Gerretzen Parata (“HGP”) (Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust)
 - q. Melanie McCormick (“MM”) (Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki)
 - r. Tayla Hooker (“TH”) (DOC)
 - s. DrAidan Mora-Teddy (“AMT”) (DOC)
 - t. Annabel Averill (“AA”) (DOC)
 - u. Tertia Thurley (“TT”) (DOC)
4. Kerry Andrews (Planz) assisted the experts to draft the Joint Witness Statement (“JWS”). Ashley Jamieson and Alex Mickleson provided meeting support.

CODE OF CONDUCT

5. The experts confirm that they have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and referred to in the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024: Panel Conveners’ Practice and Procedure Guidance 25 July 2025, and agree to comply with it. The experts confirm that the issues addressed in this JWS are within their area of expertise, unless stated otherwise.

SCOPE OF JWS

6. In response to Minute 7 issued by the Expert Panel, a number of outstanding points were identified in relation to this topic. Those outstanding issues form the basis for the structure of this JWS. The Expert Panel took the opportunity to ask questions of the experts to clarify matters in relation to the ecology matters of the project.
7. In this JWS, we report the outcome of our discussions in relation to each item (below), including by reference to points of agreement, disagreement, and unresolved matters or

uncertainties. Where we are not agreed in relation to any issue, we have set out the nature and basis of that disagreement.

AGENDA ITEMS

The appropriateness of the WEV model and water levels in Te Harekeke Swamp

8. AMT expressed concern that the WEV model is a relatively new approach and would prefer to see it compared to a more “tried and tested” approach. TH advised that the model parameters (value attributes) are provided but the specific measures are unclear and therefore DOCs ability to comment on the assessment is limited. TH considers that a 1:1 replacement of wetlands is a minimum requirement and that plant communities do not sufficiently represent the entirety of wetland values. MD agreed that it would be valuable to have a model that was published and peer reviewed but the WEV model is accepted elsewhere in the country. FM agreed with MD and noted as with all models, limitations must be acknowledged and accounted for in the consent conditions.
9. GU advised that the model was developed in 2019 and was designed to fill a gap providing for wetland offset modeling. It has been used in Auckland, Wellington and Waikato since its development. The attributes in the model are drawn from national wetland guidance. GU considers that the BOAM is not appropriate to apply to this project. Using BOAM would require much less offsetting than proposed by the applicant. The project provides for more than a 1:1 replacement but the restoration of wetland is well in excess of a 1:1 ratio. GU is able to compare models if the panel is minded.
10. TH acknowledges the limitations of BOAM but there are still outstanding issues specifically in relation to its lack of published information. SF noted that BOAM, the WEV model (and the SEV model) use the same underlying logic (exchange of area for condition) and simple mathematical formula to calculate offset ratios.

Water levels in Te Harekeke Swamp

11. AMT confirmed that there is a brown mudfish (At Risk Declining) and shortfin eel populations in Te Harakeke Swamp. Shortfin eel predate on mudfish and therefore managing populations is important. Changes in water levels that could result from development may increase the chances of predation and negatively affect the population. Water levels therefore should be monitored. GU advised that the water levels will be controlled by KCDC downstream of the site. GU advised that he is aware of mudfish being found elsewhere (not on this Application site) in the swamp. NMB acknowledged that the panel are aware of water level sensitivities and this is being addressed through other conferencing.

*JB left conference at 9.45am.

DOC not being a consultee on the ERMP

12. AA advised that DOC has a statutory interest in the Threatened and At-Risk species and wants to ensure consistency with the Wildlife Act Permit so should be consulted. ML advised that he is reluctant to include more parties when councils and Manawhenua are already involved. AB advised that the applicant would except a tailored review of the ERMP by DOC and update the conditions accordingly.
13. ML considered words to the following effect: the applicant will provide confirmation of consultation with DOC in respect of threatened species and the lizard management plan to ensure consistency with the wildlife permit.
14. ML confirmed that the applicant is happy to remove deemed certification.

Conditions to separate wetland enhancement from off-setting (conditions 70, 71 and 77)

15. TH sought clarity on what is wetland mitigation and what is wetland offsetting as offsetting has ongoing requirements. GU confirmed that the beneficial suite of measures is to both mitigate and offset. TH asked whether wetland 4 and its buffers require any management that is not ecological as this wetland is to receive stormwater. GU advised that wetland buffers are intended for ecological benefit. ML clarified no wetland will serve a stormwater treatment function and confirmed that there is no access to the buffer areas required for stormwater maintenance. TH asked for clarity as to whether wetland 11 and 17 are buffered. GU confirmed buffers are proposed for wetlands where feasible and where a buffer to the fullest extent is not possible it will be compensated for elsewhere. AB confirmed that wetlands 15 and 16 are on the neighbors land and are not being buffered. TH advises that buffers be considered mitigation not an area that relates to an offset output. GU advised that the model offers a more integrated mitigation/offsetting solution.
16. RO advised that the constructed wetlands will not perform stormwater management function.
17. SF advised that the buffers proposed are appropriate to KCDC, but that these are required as mitigation for works near wetlands, rather than a voluntary contribution.
18. TH confirmed that more wetland is required to offset the proposal (i.e. the buffers are not enough to offset). SF clarified that the proposed “package” does not neatly assign mitigation versus offsetting but as a whole is satisfactory to KCDC. MLe confirmed that it is not clear that buffer planting is excluded from offsetting. GU advised that the overall wetland values will be improved and their extents increased which would take in any buffer planting of existing wetlands. GU noted that there are benefits that have not been accounted for but are additive to the overall project outcomes.
19. FM confirmed that more detail is needed in the conditions to specify details of the effects management package, including objectives, outcomes, performance measures and contingency triggers. GU advised that a lot of work has gone into the management plans to provide specific details including objectives, management measures and monitoring. FM noted that the management plan is the appropriate place to detail the ‘how ‘ and ‘when’, but the specifics must also be mirrored in the conditions (both are needed). ML advised that the management plan approach including certification requirements is sufficiently robust in his opinion. FM considers that the necessary specific details of management plans should be translated into conditions, which is best practice for effects management. MLe confirmed that KCDC are also seeking to pull more detail into the conditions. JK agreed with MLe. SS noted that this detail is now becoming time critical.

Loss of the extent of the naturally uncommon ecosystem.

20. TH advised that the dune swales have been previously identified by DOC as significant (1990s assessment) but there is a loss of connection between the dune swales, the dunes along the perimeter of Te Harekeke and the wetland system and the wetlands W3 and W4 are considered dune swales and are naturally uncommon. GU noted that this is Jeroen Lurling’s area of expertise. The applicant is unclear on DOCs position and notes that the site is highly modified (JLs assessment is that these are not dune swales).
21. GUs understanding is that GWRC agree that these are not dune swales notwithstanding the applicant is still proposing offset measures. MD confirmed that because the dunes have stabilized these are no longer considered dune swales but W4 and W5 are distinct from other wetlands on the site and as dune impounded wetlands have values that should be managed. GU noted that a joint memo to this effect has been provided to the panel. MD advised that it is important to offset these appropriately to avoid loss.

22. TH asked whether the QEII wetland will be ephemeral. GU confirmed yes. NMB advised that the panel has sufficient time to decide on this matter and groundwater information is not necessary. TH queried whether connectivity between the dune system and the wetland system was explored during design. GU advised that the key ecosystems and connections between them have been maintained through design. TH specifically queried connections to W3 and W5. SS confirmed that the panel will consider the application before them. NMB queried what TH means by connectivity. TH confirmed that she means corridors for terrestrial fauna movement. NMB queried whether W3 and W5 add to connectivity if they are protected. GU does not consider that protection of W3 and W5 would significantly contribute to values. SS asked MD her views on protection of W3 and W5. MD advised that protection would maintain this wetland type on site which cannot be recreated offsite.

Ngārara Stream reclamation

23. AMT queried the diversion structure to be used and the SEV models consideration of current and future states. GU agrees the model considers the current state and is not aware of any other project where a future state is used for a stream diversion. GUs understanding is that the requirement is for the realigned stream to be the same or better values than the existing stream. GU considers that the renaturalisation is sufficient and offset is not required.
24. GT advised that the drawings and the management plan specify different future states (net gain versus no net loss) and the applicant will need to ensure that the conditions seek to align realistic and appropriate outcomes between the management plans and conditions. GU queried whether the amendment should be to the drawings or the management plan. GT suggested that going beyond the no net loss may allow for some level of compensation for other watercourses. The applicant is happy to lock in a net gain to the conditions. SF is seeking that specific restoration details are set out rather than model metrics and monitor restoration gains. GU suggested a combination of restoration and model metrics be used in conditions. GT suggested the SEV measure could be a target and the performance measures more tangible. AB advised that there will be sufficient measures to adjust and achieve outcomes. GT recommended that key outcomes be conditioned. AB agreed and said that this may be a good opportunity to deal with “the drains”.
25. SS queried whether the “drains” need to be individually assessed to be classified or whether assessing one can be extrapolated to all. GU advised that the applicant has determined that these are “drains” which has relied on some inference and no further work is required. JK advised that existing conditions lead GWRC to conclude they are streams. GT advised that the classification will direct assessment methods and treatment thereafter.

Te Harekeke Swamp buffer

26. TH acknowledged that a 20m buffer is what is required but a wider buffer is more appropriate for a wetland of such significance. SS queried the tangible difference between a 20m and 40m buffer. TH confirmed that a 20m buffer will likely be self sustaining (less need for weed control) but a 40m buffer assists with temperature control and plant survival. GU agrees that bigger is always better but the literature confirms that a 20m buffer for aquatic systems is better than 10m but the literature supporting larger than 20m buffers is not as clear. TH queried whether the covenant covering some of the 20m buffer is needed. AB confirmed that any buffers on private land should be secured by covenants.
27. TH clarified that buffers on other wetlands are 10m. GU confirmed yes. TH advised that as an SNL a 20m buffer around Pekapeka wetland should also be required. GU considers

that a 10m buffer is sufficient to protect and enhance existing values of the Pekapeka Wetland. ML confirmed that a larger buffer would have significant implications on the masterplan and RO confirmed that the dune toe is a limitation to the design. TJH then clarified that the northern and southern edges of the Peka Peka road swamp likely would allow a 20m buffer with the removal of a lot, it was not clarified if this would be considered.

Domesticated animals, including cat management options

28. SS summarized the key concern as enhancement will promote bird presence which may conflict with urbanization of the area and introduction of domestic pets.
29. AB summarized the solutions as:
 - a. Predator fencing
 - b. Containment of cats
 - c. No cats permitted (not preferred by the applicant)
30. AB suggested the discussion be directed to the robustness of each option. TT queried a fourth option to ban cats from just Paetawa Road sites. AB advised this fourth option was to reconcile their early development of these sites and the later delivery of the predator fencing.
31. TT advised that the predator fence will reduce predation but is limited in extent. TT noted that habitats outside the site are also at risk from roaming cats. The cat trapping and fencing maintenance are both limited in time after which cats remain. Also there is no evidence that the proposed spirals at the end of fences work to deter cats. TT queried whether its legal to cat trap domestic pets. Also trapping will be limited to the site and so won't protect threatened birds which are outside of the sites but within the foraging range of cats; and cat trapping will require skilled people tuned in to cat trapping, and a variety of trap types. TT considers also, in general, cats trapped once and returned to their owners will be a lot more difficult to trap the second time. TT considers containment is better than fencing. TT advised that studies around Zealandia has proved containment is difficult. Also who will monitor containment compliance. TT confirmed a cat prohibition is DOCS preferred option as it protects threatened wetland birds both in and around the site. Also this site is "isolated" by the beach and motorway and farmland, so a cat ban would not be undermined by having lots of existing cats as it would be in a more urban area.
32. NMB queried whether there were any publications about the effectiveness of the spirals at the end of the predator fencing. TT was unaware of literature but pointed to an example in Tawharunui. TT noted that predator fencing is usually fully enclosed.
33. MLe considers that a private covenant rather than a consent notice to secure outcomes is more appropriate which means KCDC do not have monitoring responsibilities although could assist with education. GU queried whether councils have a responsibility to monitor within 200m of SNAs.
34. GC queried how this issue lands and whether the panel has sufficient information to make a decision. SS advised which the panel has discussed at length and giving it the consideration it needs as a significant issue. GC is not clear on the experts positions. TT reiterated that a cat ban is her preferred option. NMB queried KCDCs position. SF agrees with TT that a cat ban is the simplest solution but acknowledges that the fence has benefits in preventing access by wandering dogs, feral cats etc. SF considered that no cats is a clear effects-based response. MLe reiterated that KCDC have no interest/resources to manage the issue if cats are allowed. GU advised that Plimmerton Farm has neighbourhood trappers to enforce covenants. FM advised that the ecological benefits being claimed for restored and created wetlands (e.g., establishment of bittern) may need to be revised if domestic cats are permitted.

35. JW and CW are satisfied with the information provided. CW queried whether Ngarara farms also had a cat ban. MLe to check.
36. AB is unsurprised by ecologists preference for no cats but considers that the options should be assessed through other lenses. GU referred to his memo issued recently to the panel on this matter. GU considers that there are options to manage and educate to best achieve ecological outcomes and that a total cat ban will fail. GU supports establishing a predator fence as it sends a clear message around cat ownership and responsibilities. GU noted that the wetland habitats are valuable but the bird communities recorded at the site are not especially at risk. GU does not consider future values are relevant to determining appropriate mitigation mostly because this would be a disincentive to restoration.
37. SF agrees that if done well a cultural shift around pet ownership is key and achieving community buy in has value but notes that current values are severely compromised. SF considers that if the conditions are measurable and enforceable cat ownership may be possible. TT disagreed with GUs position on presence of Threatened bird species and the value of the habitat available to them at this site as the birds rely on a network of wetlands of which there are few left. TT noted that there were bittern, 2 species of crane, dabchick and brown teal – all threatened birds either found on site or nearby well within the foraging range of cats. FM considers that the objective of managing cats (protection of wetland birdlife) is critical to consideration of the cat conditions, and suggested a total ban and cat trapping measures are appropriate. SF acknowledged that cat containment will work if embedded in house design but that a cultural shift is key as physical measures may be lost over time.
38. FM noted that Atiawa considers that the condition should include a robust process (including the appropriate parties) by which an option is selected and that ensures the desired outcome is provided for.

Fish rescue and relocation

39. MM confirmed that NHO have the technical capability to assist with fish rescue and relocation (as do Atiawa) and would seek a condition enabling their involvement. SS queried whether there was anything in particular about NHO's experience that could assist. MM highlighted that the applicant's dismissal of NHO's capabilities was concerning. MLe supports Manawhenua involvement. GU confirmed that anyone appropriately qualified is able to undertake the work. MM considers that the use of the word "ecologist" is limiting and could be amended to "appropriately qualified". AB noted that the applicant is keen to work with Iwi but would not want to be limited by a condition to only using Manawhenuas services.

*GC left conferencing at 1:30pm

Monitoring of the proposed 'nodes' of indigenous encroachment wetland planting

40. SFs understanding of the provisions is that proposed planting of constructed wetlands and buffers has performance targets but only 20% of the area of retained wetlands are proposed to be planted with no requirement that planting in retained wetlands survives or achieves a canopy cover target. Monitoring is proposed but the only requirement is that the vegetation cover of retained wetlands does not worsen (without specifics of what this means). SF considers that further indigenous wetland planting in retained wetlands is needed as supported by the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020.
41. GU advised that the retained wetlands will have improved hydrology but enhancement is not required and therefore the cost of revegetating retained wetlands or setting performance targets for planting nodes is not justified.

42. SF noted the development promotes net positive outcomes so it is unclear why the retained wetlands would be excluded. SF noted there may be pitfalls of raising water levels and holding water. A simple planting regime of flaxes could address the issue. AB advised that the applicant is committed to net positive outcome. SF advised that planting assists in securing / achieving predictable outcomes.
43. GU noted that purely removing stock will support enhancement albeit exotic rush growth although this will be perceived by most as an improvement. TH agreed with SF. NMB queried whether SF has visited the site. SF confirmed she hasn't. NMB queried whether conditions could be imposed to avoid a loss of values in the retained wetlands. GU confirmed yes but queried whether it should be conditioned.
44. SF considers that these "gaps" in conditions may result in less certainty in outcomes. SF considers a monitoring target for these retained wetlands of continuous wetland plant cover (e.g., rush and sedge-dominated) would be appropriate. MLe and MD agree with SF regarding monitoring target. AB noted that the consent status shouldn't be confused with effects mitigation and compensation and the overall target for ecological net gain. AB does not consider a monitoring target condition is necessary.

Ngārara Stream

- ***Monitor and report on the success of the realigned Ngārara Stream***
 - ***Required bed length and area of the realigned section of the Ngārara Stream***
 - ***Definition for the Ngārara Stream***
45. Regarding the definition, ML noted that the map should show existing and future alignments and form part of the definition.
 46. Regarding monitoring, GT noted that the future SEV score should reflect the drawing design. GU advised that there are target outcomes and mandated outcomes and that the conditions should only require the mandated outcomes. ML considers that the conditions should focus on outcomes rather than a specific SEV metric.
 47. Regarding bed length and area, JK noted that specific outcomes (e.g. xm2) should be listed in conditions and not just management plans. NMB noted that the "bed" will need to be defined. GT suggested "wetted area" may be appropriate.

*SF and MM left the conference at 1:40pm.

Wildlife Approval

48. AA advised that there is a dual certification process for the Lizard MP (under the RC and wildlife permit) and DOC wanted to ensure consistency. DOC would seek a similar process/condition to that agreed for the ERMP (above). ML noted that the applicant is generally happy with DOCs amendments to the conditions of consent, except that DOC are after a 10-year timeframe on the wildlife approval (rather than a 15-year timeframe). GU noted that other fast track panels have approved a 15-year duration. ML noted that this also lines up with the construction consents. GU noted that a 10-year timeframe lines up with the reclassification of species but given there has only been a common skink species found on the site, a 15-year timeframe is appropriate. SS clarified that DOCs issue is that other species could be present. AA confirmed that there is no DOC representatives present that can speak to the wildlife permit. ML was assisting the panel by giving a snapshot of where that process is at.

49. JK confirmed that GWRC are seeking that the condition be amended to specify a specific wetland area to be created. ML clarified that GWRC are after wetland type and area. JK confirmed yes. FM agrees that more details are required in Condition 68, including areas to be retained and removed.
50. TH queried whether condition 69 should make the distinction between mitigation, offsetting and compensation. Specifically, that W3 requires compensation due to the loss of a wetland type and hydrology that cannot be recreated. GU noted that condition 71 could be amended and that conversations relating to wetland restoration work at QEII Park had commenced with GWRC.
51. TH considers that there is a loss of extent to W3 and a wetland type that cannot be offset whether it is a 'dune swale' or 'impounded dune wetland'. GU agrees that there is a loss of extent and any replacement would need to be an offsite "unlike for like" replacement. TH confirmed that DOCs preference would be to avoid W3.

Condition 86

52. JK advised that the minimum management requirements should be included in this condition. This would be informed by the groundwater model (incorporating information from the groundwater monitoring). RO acknowledged the groundwater model timing has been agreed in other conferencing and can inform minimum management requirements.
53. MD queried whether this condition should also refer to Pekapeka swamp. ML noted that the original wording assumed that the condition would apply more broadly but the amendment to state Te Harakeke was to satisfy KCDC. GT suggested that the conditions could highlight Te Harakeke and Pekapeka swamps in an advice note (rather than just Te Harakeke in the body of the condition). ML noted that there is a further complication that ownership of Pekapeka swamp may be transferred to Te Atiawa.

Condition 139

54. JK clarified that the condition should be amended to require all culverts to be designed to comply with the NESF AND fish passage guidelines. GU considers that the NESF provisions are unworkable, whereas the guidelines are more sensible/pragmatic. GT agrees the guidelines are more pragmatic, but the application refers to the NESF.

Condition 152

55. JK clarified that the condition should be amended to require culvert design to meet the SEV target. GU advised that it would be difficult for a culvert on a natural stream to meet an SEV target. RO confirmed that the key outcome is that there isn't significant length added to the stream (as a result of the culverts). ML suggested adding to Condition 152 "so as to not adversely impact on the stream value outcomes sought by condition X (being a new condition relating stream value outcomes)". GT and ML agreed that the outcomes will relate to tangible measures. GU noted that SEV is not sufficient to ensure mitigation for extent changes. GT recommended a schedule of culverts, which the design would need to be "in general accordance with".

Integration of the management plans (landscape and ecology)

56. SS suggested that this be resolved in planning conferencing. RO advised that the intent of the CEMP is to integrate the range of management plans. GU clarified that there is independence between the landscape and ecological outcomes whereby the applicant isn't 'double-dipping' on mitigation/offsetting. FM considers that the plans should be independent, which will also be assisted by the detail coming through in the conditions. TH agrees with FM. JK suggested that the management plans not be referred to in multiple

conditions.

57. TH queried whether appropriate eco-sourced plants within the range of the site are required. TH requires exclusion of indigenous species not native to the region, specifically karaka. GU advised that he had reviewed the LMP to ensure this outcome in key habitats. ML is fairly certain that plants for the entire site are to be eco-sourced. GU and ML to confirm. ML noted that the LMP needs to be certified. GU suggested using the wording from Plimmerton Farms on this matter.
58. MD noted there are species in the LMP that will not be grown from seed in the region therefore specifying “eco-sourced” may be problematic. GU advised that the plant palette will be amended to ensure that all plants can be eco-sourced (MD noted that the current plans show some that cannot).

Extent of ecological benefits

59. TH considers that Policy 6 of the NPSFM directs enhancement when works take place in/ around a wetland, hence the need to specifically identify where mitigation has occurred and where wetland offsetting has occurred. With respect to offsetting, the project achieves a 1:1 replacement (just over) and is the minimum required. TH is comfortable that the applicant will explore conditions (as a result of conferencing) to ensure no degradation of proposed wetland restoration of retained wetlands. Policy 4 in the NPSFM directs that climate change needs to be considered in integrated management and larger buffers around Te Harakeke and Pekapeka would assist this. NMB sought clarification on the relationship between climate change effects and wider buffers. TH confirmed that a wider buffer supports wetland health as a buffer this wide regulates its own climate likely benefitting the wetland during drier periods. GU advised that a climate change response would mean that eco-sourcing is inappropriate and novel communities should be created to better support resilient outcomes (but suggested not opening that Pandora’s box).

SIGNATURES OF EXPERTS



Graham Ussher



Mitch Lewandowski



Andrew Beatson



Ray O'Callaghan



Sarah Flynn



Monique Leith



Katherine Greenaway



Melanie Dixon



Joshua Knowles



Gareth Taylor



James Blyth



Melanie McCormick



Greg Carlyon



Helena Gerretzen Parata



Liam McAuliffe



Fleur Maseyk



Tayla Hooker



Aidan Mora-Teddy



Annabel Averill



Tertia Thurley