



Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Further Submission to the West Coast Regional Council on the Proposed Regional Coastal Plan

22 July 2016



FURTHER SUBMISSION TO WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL ON THE PROPOSED REGIONAL COASTAL PLAN

Form 6

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on publicly notified
proposed policy statement or plan

Clause 8 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: West Coast Regional Council
PO Box 66
Greymouth 7840

rcp@wcr.govt.nz

Name of further submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Contact person: Angela Johnston
Senior Advisor, Regional Policy

Address for service: PO Box 20448
Bishopdale
CHRISTCHURCH 8543

ajohnston@fedfarm.org.nz

This is a further submission in response to submissions made on the Proposed Regional Coastal Plan.

The following pages detail the specifics in relation to our support or opposition to various submissions lodged, alongside our reasons for that position.

I am a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.

I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this further submission.

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission.

Where Federated Farmers submitted on the same variation point as any other submitter it stands by its original submission.

This Further Submission provides Federated Farmers views on points raised by other submitters.

Original reference	Person, or organisation, making original submission	I support or oppose the relief sought in the original submission (please give reasons)
GS13	Forest & Bird	Oppose. There is no requirement to include land adjacent to the CMA in the way proposed.
2.4	TRONT	Support in part. We have concerns with the proposal for Poutini Ngai Tahu to be provided with information on all resource consent applications. The RMA provides a clear regime relating to the appropriateness of when consents need to be notified beyond the applicant and we consider this submission goes beyond that. We also question whether Poutini Ngai Tahu are resourced, or need to be involved to the degree proposed.
3.6	Forest & Bird	Oppose. Submitter has sought significant additions to the plan, which we consider are unnecessary as are either already addressed through this Plan or through the proposed Regional Policy Statement.
3.13	Westpower	Support in part. The focus should be on 'significant' natural and amenity values (within Objective 3.2.3) as this is more consistent with the RMA.
3.19	Buller Conservation Group & Frida Inta	Oppose. Farming is a lawfully established practice that occurs in the CMA. Primary industries make a substantial economic contribution to the region and must be allowed to continue in a sustainable manner.
3.23	TRONT	Oppose. The recognition of the need to provide for employment opportunities in a sustainable manner should be its own objective. The recognition that both new and existing development fuels growth is fundamental to the sustainability of all communities in the region. The objective is consistent with the RMA.
3.45	Westpower	Oppose. It is not appropriate to specifically state that such activities need to be recognised and provided for. There is no legal requirement for this to occur. Provision for the National Grid in this regard comes from the NPS Electricity Transmission (NPSET). There is no equivalent for regionally significant infrastructure and network utilities (which based on submitter relief sought would encompass virtually all utilities within the Region).
3.54	Westpower	Oppose. Same reasons as 3.45
3.65	Dept of	Support in part. Appropriate to include 'significant' as this is consistent with the RMA

Original reference	Person, or organisation, making original submission	I support or oppose the relief sought in the original submission (please give reasons)
	Conservation	
3.72	Buller Conservation Group & Frida Inta	Oppose. We support the Council's aim of seeking to manage the natural character of the coast, and it is appropriate for that to specify that the natural character can sometimes be rural and farming related.
3.76	Kiwirail	Support in part. Factors (a) the degree of modification of the surrounding environment and (b) whether the landscape includes a working landscape, are the critical factors when considering effects of an activity within and adjacent to the CMA.
3.77	Westpower	Oppose. We do not support the proposed inclusion of or reference to infrastructure in this way. We don't consider the RMA requires or anticipates this level or provision. There is no legal basis for such provision and the degree of protection sought by the submitter is not appropriate, necessary or justified over other legitimate activities.
4.12	Forest & Bird	Oppose. Goes beyond the intent of the RMA. It is not necessary for more than minor effects to require resource consent in the way proposed.
4.17	Kiwirail	Support. Incorporating the word lawful will include areas used for farming in the CMA.
4.18	Richard Reynolds	Support. This is a pragmatic local solution for a local issue. The submitter raises a valid point re lack of alternatives and effects.
4.25	Buller Conservation Group & Frida Inta	Oppose. Esplanade strips or reserves will not always be appropriate in all circumstances. Flexibility as to when the Council requires esplanade areas is important because although well-intentioned, Council may not have the financial resources to keep up with compensation or management. Compensation is payable if the reserve/strip is wider than 20m on a <4ha lot (after subdivision) or if it is required by a district plan rule on lots larger than 4ha. On-going maintenance on council-owned esplanade reserves doing pest and weed control and upkeep of any structures will incur costs upon the council.
5.11	Westpower	Oppose. Protection is not required for infrastructure in the way proposed. Submitter's relief goes both the RMA and NPSET

Original reference	Person, or organisation, making original submission	I support or oppose the relief sought in the original submission (please give reasons)
5.29 (and where similarly sought elsewhere)	Westpower	Oppose. There is no requirement or need to extend such provision to ALL network utilities in the way proposed.
5.31	Community & Public Health West Coast	Support in part. However, not all structures would require being built to such a standard ie fences and farm sheds. Farm structures should be allowed to locate within the CMA. The low density land usage that primary production generally entails is well suited for natural hazard zones. For example, the flooding of a farm shed has far less ramifications than the flooding of a house or a school.
6.21	Kiwirail	Support. It is appropriate to consider the duration of an activity, particularly when only transient or short-term.
6.22	Forest & Bird	Oppose. Unnecessarily restrictive and goes beyond requirements of the RMA in the way proposed.
6.28	TRONT	Oppose in part. Goes beyond that necessary under the RMA and NZCPS. As a result of the King Salmon case, avoid may be taken as 'prohibited' and this will not be appropriate in the way proposed here.
7.5	TRONT	Oppose. Overly restrictive and beyond intent of RMA and NZCPS.
7.7	Dept of Conservation	Support in part. The ability to remove pest plants and the associated positive benefits should not be compromised
7.10	Inger Perkins	Oppose. Noxious weeds should always be controlled. Gorse and its control is included in the proposed Regional Pest Management Plan.
7.12	TRONT	Oppose. The full RMA hierarchy of 'avoid, remedy, mitigate' should be appropriately included.
7.13	West Coast Penguin Trust	Oppose. As for 7.10
10.11	Dept of Conservation	Oppose. The reference to 'unnatural noise' has not been appropriately justified and is not consistent with requirements elsewhere.

Original reference	Person, or organisation, making original submission	I support or oppose the relief sought in the original submission (please give reasons)
12.13	Kiwirail	Support. The fundamental property rights of landowners to restrict access to or across their land should also be included.
12.26	Buller Conservation Group & Frida Inta	Oppose. Additional proposed wording is unnecessary, especially regarding (n) other common birds, this level of protection is inappropriate. Proposed protection goes over and above that necessary.
12.37	Forest & Bird	Oppose. Proposed wording would include farm mammals. It also has not been shown to be justified – overly restrictive.
12.39	Westpower	Oppose. The submitters proposed wording essentially enables the upgrading of electricity lines. Upgrading of electricity lines has an adverse effect on landowners. We seek that upgrading and replacing electricity lines is a discretionary activity. It needs to be recognised that the distribution or transmission of energy can have adverse effects on other land uses, by restricting the ability to use that land.
12.52	Kiwirail	Support. An owner/manager should have the ability to maintain any structure under their management
12.76	Brian Jones & Kongahu Rating District	Support. As this activity has been consented for many years, it is an efficient and effective use of Council resources to enable the clearance to continue without requiring a resource consent, subject to conditions being met.
12.106	Kiwirail	Support. Maintenance generally prevents much larger and avoidable problems in the longer term.
12.174	Forest & Bird	Oppose. Farm mammals would be included in this condition. The rule should exclude routine farming practices.
12.191	Dept of Conservation	Oppose. Unnecessary to include the reference to untreated agriculture effluent as this issue is already addressed in other regional plans. The WCRC implements thorough parameters regarding agricultural effluent, which are inline with best management practices.
16.11	Westpower	Oppose. The treatment of electricity transmission and distribution infrastructure is a particular concern for farmers as large landowners, given the proportion of electricity transmission infrastructure situated on private

Original reference	Person, or organisation, making original submission	I support or oppose the relief sought in the original submission (please give reasons)
		<p>land. The National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission sets out the requirements for authorities to provide for electricity <u>transmission</u> specifically, and its implementation already imposes significant real and opportunity costs to landowners.</p> <p>Electricity <u>distribution</u> is not required under any national regulation. If distribution matters require a similar level of protection, this should be addressed consistently at a national level, via a National Policy Statement or National Environmental Standard.</p>
16.12	Westpower	<p>Oppose. As proposed this captures virtually all infrastructure within the region – it is too wide and it is beyond that necessary to achieve the objectives with the Coastal Plan.</p> <p>It is not appropriate that “all associated works and activities” needs to be recognised and provided for. There is no legal requirement for this other than that provided for by NPSET.</p>