

Further submission by Paul Elwell-Sutton to West Coast Regional Council's Proposed Regional Coastal Management Plan 2016 (The Plan).

Name: Paul Elwell-Sutton.

Address: Snapshot creek,
Haast,
Westland 7886.

Phone: No phone

Email: pelwellsutton@fastmail.fm

Occupation: Environmentalist.

Statement:

- 1.) I have no pecuniary interest in the outcomes to this Plan.
- 2.) I represent only myself and no group, association, society, party or Trust.
- 3.) I am a previous submitter to the Plan (submitter number 4).
- 4.) I **do** wish to be heard and am prepared to present my case jointly with others.

Submission.

1.) With regard to the submissions by the Department of Conservation (DOC) and Forest and Bird (F&B), **I support** all references to the mandatory requirement for the Plan to adhere to the provisions set out in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS).

Reason: The NZCPS reflects the Purpose and Principles as described in Part 2 of the RMA.

It is surely unacceptable for any facet of the Plan to contravene the requirements of the NZCPS.

The proposed Plan appears to have been prepared to further the interests of developers in the extractive, agricultural and construction sectors, and may indicate that those responsible for preparing the plan have been "captured" by those sectors.

One would, of course, hope that this is not the case, as it would be a derailment of proper democratic process, and akin to a seriously corrupt practice.

2.) Regarding the submission of the Westland District Council (WDC) and Westpower, **I support** their concerns that no attempt be made to finalise the Plan until the Regional Policy Statement (RPS) has been completed and is active.

Reason: Preparing the Plan prior to the RPS becoming active risks having to rewrite it to comply with the RPS. This would be an inefficient, extravagant and wasteful use of ratepayers' funds.

To attempt to pre-empt the RPS through the Plan would be to subvert proper democratic and governance process.

3.) **I strongly support** all the relief sought by the Department of Conservation pertaining to discharges into the CMA.

Reason: Contamination of fresh and saltwater bodies within the CMA is, to me, intolerable, and I am confident that a great many New Zealanders and overseas visitors will share my sentiments.

The issue of untreated sewage and agricultural effluent and runoff polluting our coastal waters is completely out of line with the image NZ promotes overseas with its 100% pure NZ branding.

4.) **I strongly oppose** the relief sought by Federated Farmers to Policy 3.2.3 and **support** the retention of the original wording.

Reason: The relief sought by Federated Farmers undermines the statutory requirements imposed by the RMA, for the Plan to reflect and abide by Part 2 of that Act.

There is no attempt to define "appropriate", who decides what is "appropriate", what qualifications they must have and what conflicts of interest they must declare in deciding what is "appropriate".

Nor is there any definition of "sustainably manage", so the question arises; sustainably for what? The farmer's bank account, or ecosystem health?

5.) **I strongly oppose** the relief sought by Federated Farmers to Policy 3.3.7

Reason: There is no definition of "appropriate or necessary", and no indication of who would decide, what qualifications they would have and what conflicts of interest they might have.

A farmer cannot be expected to make 'arm's length' decisions on issues affecting their own farming activities adjacent to the CMA, and may not have the ecological information to do so.

End of submission

Paul Elwell-Sutton

Haast.

17 July 2016.



