



THE WEST COAST
REGIONAL COUNCIL

Further Submission on the Proposed Regional Coastal Plan 2016



Return your signed further submission to the West Coast Regional Council by 5.00pm, Friday 22 July 2016

Further submissions may be:

- Posted to: Proposed RCP, West Coast Regional Council, PO Box 66, Greymouth 7840
- Delivered direct to the West Coast Regional Council at 388 Main South Road, Greymouth
- Emailed to rcp@wrc.govt.nz

PART A: Further Submitter contact details

Public information - all information contained in a further submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. Your information is held and administered by the West Coast Regional Council in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. This means that your information may be disclosed to other people who request it in accordance with the terms of these Acts. It is therefore important you let us know if your form includes any information you consider should not be disclosed.

Full name: Neil Mount

Organisation:

[The organisation that this submission is on behalf of, if applicable]

Postal address: CM8 47 Pukekiki: R.D. 1 Runanga 7873 **Post Code:** 7873

Email: info@pauke-rocks.co.nz **Phone:** 7311839 **Phone (Cell):** 021 264 2600

Preferred method of contact and address for service: any

Contact person and address for service [if different from above]: Karen Dickson

Only certain people can make further submissions. Please tick the option that applies to you:

- I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest
- I am a person who has an interest in the Proposed Regional Coastal Plan that is greater than the interest the general public has.
- I am the local authority for the relevant area.

PART B: Trade Competition

As per Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a further submission only if directly affected by an effect of the Proposed Coastal Plan that:

- a) Adversely affects the environment
- b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Please tick the sentence that applies to you:

- I **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
- I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. *If you have ticked this box, please select one of the following:*
 - I **am** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission.
 - I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission.

Service of your further submission

Please note: any person making a further submission must serve a copy of that submission on the original submitter no later than 5 working days after the submission has been provided to the West Coast Regional Council. If you have made a further submission on a number of original submissions, then copies of your further submission will need to be served on each original submitter.

Signature:

[Signature of person making the further submission, or authorised to sign on behalf of person making the further submission]

Date:

12.7.16

(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means)

PART C: Request to be Heard

- I **do not** wish to be heard in support of my further submission; or
- I **do** wish to be heard in support of my further submission; and if so,
 - I would be prepared to consider presenting my further submission in a joint case with others making a similar further submission at any Hearing.

Original submission reference (Number in the Summary of Decisions Requested e.g. GS 3 or 4.56)	Person, or organisation, making original submission	I support or oppose the relief sought in the original submission (please give reasons)
PS 22 6.3 Policy 6.3.5	D.O.C.	All these submissions question gravel takes from rivers, and intimate or require further curbing of this activity without providing any evidence of any kind that this activity contributes to coastal
BCG, INIAF PS 12 PS. 63	BCG, Intaf 1,8 Policy 6.3.6	+ Rule 24 erosion. Instead, the broad thrust is that 'the PS 112 precautionary principle' ought to apply.
policy 3.3.10 3.81 PS 43	D.O.C.	+ 12.50 I reference Cass Sunstein U.S. legal authority: PS 112 'the problem is that the precautionary principle, as applied, is a crude and sometimes perverse method of promoting those various goals, not least because it might be, and has been, urged in situations which the principle threatens to injure future generations and harm others rather than help those who are most disadvantaged. A
6.25 6.2 PS. 63	D.O.C. TRONT	rational system of risk regulation certainly takes precautions. But it does not adopt the Precautionary Principle. Gravel takes are a community good, without which everyone would be most disadvantaged. This is undisputed.
Policy 3.3.9 decision 3.79	FENZ	Moves to further restrict or curb gravel takes must be accompanied by a reasoned scientific debate and
PS 43		risk management analysis themselves, or be dismissed as unfounded.