



PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 1 TO
REGIONAL LAND AND WATER PLAN 2016

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED

Notified: Monday 17 October 2016
Closing date for further submissions: 5:00pm Monday 31 October

Table of Contents

Introduction	i
Table of Submitters.....	iii
Index of Decisions Requested: Submissions.....	v
GENERAL SUBMISSIONS ON PLAN CHANGE 1	1
PART 1: MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES.....	2
General Submissions on Miscellaneous Changes.....	2
Miscellaneous Change A: Introduction	2
Miscellaneous Change B: Surface water quality	2
Miscellaneous Change C: 17.3 Definitions - Riparian Margins	3
Miscellaneous Change D: 17.3 Definitions - Slope Ratios	4
Miscellaneous Changes D and E: Rules 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 86	5
Miscellaneous Change F: Rule 20	5
Miscellaneous Change G: Rule 28.....	6
Miscellaneous Change H: Rule 34.....	7
Miscellaneous Change I: New Rule 34a	9
Miscellaneous Change J: Rule 52.....	9
Miscellaneous Change K: Rule 72	9
Miscellaneous Change L: Rule 79	10
Miscellaneous Change N: Glossary – Vegetation Disturbance	10
Miscellaneous Change O: Schedule 1 and 2 Wetlands within or adjacent to the Coastal Marine Area	18
PART 2: CHANGES TO WETLAND BOUNDARIES WITHIN SCHEDULE 1 AND 2 TO OMIT AREAS THAT ARE NOT ECOLOGICALLY SIGNIFICANT	19
General Submissions on Schedule 1 and 2 Wetlands	19
KAMP001 Otumahana Estuary.....	24
KAMP002a Kongahu Swamp North	26
KAMP005 Oparara Lagoon	26
KAMP053 Tidal Creek	26
FOUP002, and FOUP003 Birchfield	27
FOUP005 Gillows Creek	27
FOUP007 Buller River Mouth Saltmarsh	28
FOUP008 Jones Creek Lagoon	28
FOUP009 Waimangaroa.....	28
FOUP011 Jones Creek	29
FOUP014 Okari Lagoon	29
FOUP016 South Westport	29
FOUP023 Caledonian Terrace.....	30
FOUP024 Costello Hill	30
FOUP052 Okari Road.....	31
BLUP050 Oweka	32
PUNP001 Barrytown Flats, Maher Swamp	32
MAIP003 Fletcher Creek	33
MAIP004 Giles Creek.....	33
ELLP002 Lewis Pass	34
HOCP004 Candlelight Pakihi.....	35

BRUP003 Lake Poerua	35
HOKP005 Kapitea and Kumara Reservoir	35
HOKP009 Totara Lagoon	35
HOKP018 Whiley Creek	36
HOKP086 Ross	36
HOKP099 Little Houhou	37
HOKP100 Houhou Creek.....	37
HOKP107 Serpentine and Acre Creeks	38
HOKP119 Lake Mudgie	38
HAAP009 Okuru Estuary and HAAP012 Turnbull Waitoto.....	38
PART 3: CHANGES TO WETLAND KAGP008 TO RECOGNISE CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES.....	40
KAGP008 Lake Kini.....	40
PART 4: OTHER	41
Submitter Address for Service.....	44

Introduction

Background

On 22 August 2016 the West Coast Regional Council (the Council) notified Proposed Plan Change 1 to the Regional Land and Water Plan (the Plan) in accordance with the provisions of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991. The closing date for submissions is **5:00pm, Monday 31 October 2016**. A total of 46 submissions were received on Plan Change 1.

This document summarises the submissions, and decisions requested, from the 46 submissions lodged.

Further Submissions

Further submissions are now invited in support of, or in opposition to, submissions received. A further submission is a submission that supports or opposes an original submission to Proposed Plan Change 1, either in full or in part. A further submission cannot extend the scope of the original submission, and can only seek acceptance or rejection of the original submission in whole or in part.

Under Clause 8(1) of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, the following persons may make a further submission:

- Any person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and
- Any person that has an interest in Proposed Plan Change 1 greater than the general public has; and
- The local authority itself.

When making a further submission, a copy must be served on the person who made the submission to which the further submission relates, within 5 working days of lodging it with the Regional Council. Names and addresses of the submitters are included at the rear of this Report.

A standard form for making a further submission in support or opposition is available. A copy is available with this document or can be downloaded from www.wcrc.govt.nz/pc1.

The closing date for making further submissions by those people entitled to do so is 5.00pm, Monday 31 October. Further submissions can be delivered to the office at 388 Main South Road, Paroa, Greymouth; posted to PO Box 66, Greymouth 7840; or emailed to Plan@wcrc.govt.nz.

Process from here

After the period for further submissions has finished, the West Coast Regional Council will set a hearing date to consider the original submissions and any further submissions lodged in support or opposition of original submissions. Pre-hearing meetings may also be held. Submitters and further submitters will be kept informed about the process by staff.

Any person wishing to obtain further information, or discuss aspects of Proposed Plan Change 1, may write to PO Box 66, Greymouth 7840; email Plan@wcrc.govt.nz or phone the Regional Council offices on 03 768 0466 or toll free 0508 800 118.

Readers guide

This document follows the order of the Proposed Plan Change 1, with the individual decisions requested by submitters grouped under the relevant part of Proposed Plan Change 1.

Each decision requested by a submitter has been assigned a decision number. The decisions are numbered sequentially for the Plan Change. For example:

- Decision 1.1 is the 1st decision requested for Part 1;
- Decision 1.10 is the 10th decision requested for Part 1.

Note: GS refers to general submissions made on Proposed Plan Change 1.

The following shows the format of this Summary of Decisions Requested Report.

Section of proposed Plan Change 1 on which a submission is made	→	Part 1 Miscellaneous Changes
Decision number	→	Decision Requested: 1.2
Who made submission	→	Submitter 17 DOC
Submission/Change sought	→	<p><u>Submission</u> Page 1 Introduction</p> <p>1.2 Area covered by the plan New Provision Second paragraph, and Figure 1</p> <p>Support in part. The introduction including Figure 1 does not give effect to Policy 1(2)(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) as the coastal environment includes the coastal marine area.</p> <p>Relief sought: Retain the second paragraph as notified with the last sentence amended to read: <i>...Unless otherwise stated, all objectives, policies, and rules in the Land and Water Plan apply to the "Coastal Environment" landward of the Mean High Water Spring Mark.</i></p> <p>And amend Figure 1 to have the coastal environment extent to extend from outer limit of the Territorial Sea to and landward of the Mean High Water Spring line.</p>

Copies of the submissions made can be downloaded from Council's website at www.wcrc.govt.nz/pc1.

The decisions sought by each submitter on Proposed Plan Change 1 can be found by referring to the following table *Index of Decisions Requested: Submissions*. The number assigned shows the relevant chapter and the number of the individual submission, as described above.

New text requested is shown as underlined and in italics, while text that is requested to be deleted is shown as ~~struckout~~. (as indicated above).

Table of Submitters

Submitter Number	Submitter	ABR	Wish to be heard	Heard with Others
1	Ahaura Plains Moss Limited	APML	No	
2	Bernadette Arnold	ARNB	Yes	No
3	Deborah Arnold	ARND	No	No
4	Steven Bagnall	BAGNS	No	
5	Buller Conservation Group	BCG	Yes	Yes
6	Andrew Bennett	BENNA	No	
7	Birchfield Coal Mines Limited	BCML	Yes	
8	Bonar Farms Limited	BFL	Yes	Yes
9	Gordon Bradley	BRADG	Yes	Yes
10	Mike and Wendy Brooks	BROM	No	
11	Coastpak	COASTP	No	Yes
12	Douglas Chinn	CHIND	Yes	No
13	Creative Water Solutions	CWS	Yes	Yes
14	Department of Conservation	DOC	Yes	Yes
15	Paul Elwell-Sutton	ELWEP	Yes	Yes
16	Gerald Essenberg	ESSEG	Yes	Yes
17	Estate of Graham R Boyd	ESTGB	Yes	Yes
18	Exotica Plants	EXOP	No	
19	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FFNZ	Yes	
20	Fish and Game West Coast	FGWC	No	
21	Graham Friend	FRIEG	No	
22	Grey District Council	GDC	Yes	
23	Andrew Grigg	GRIGA	No	
24	Sean Hayes	HAYES	No	No
25	Colin and Juliette Henry	HENRC	Yes	
26	Richard Henschel	HENSR	No	
27	Frida Inta	INTAF	Yes	Yes
28	Brian Jones	JONESB	Yes	Yes
29	Kauri 139 Limited / NZG Limited	KAURI	Yes	Yes
30	Allan Lowe	LOWEA	Yes	Yes
31	Hamish Macbeth	MACBH	No	
32	Alan Mark	MARKA	No	
33	Minerals West Coast	MWC	Yes	Yes
34	MJ & CE O'Regan Family Trust	OFT	Yes	Yes
35	Pacific Wide (NZ) Limited	PWNZ	Yes	
36	Provis Farms Limited	PFL	No	
37	Rainbow Park Nurseries	RPN	No	
38	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	RF&B	Yes	Yes
39	Nigel Snoep	SNOEN	Yes	
40	Warren Stratford	STRATW	Yes	
41	Supersphag Limited	SUPERS	Yes	Yes
42	Mary Tapp	TAPPM	Yes	
43	Sam Tapp	TAPPS	Yes	

Submitter Number	Submitter	ABR	Wish to be heard	Heard with Others
44	Gregory Topp	TOPPG	No	
45	Trustpower	TRUSTP	Yes	Yes
46	Waiomou Valley Farms Limited	WVFL	No	

Index of Decisions Requested: Submissions

Submitter Number	Abrv	Decisions Requested									
1	APML	1.39									
2	ARNB	1.35									
3	ARND	1.36									
4	BAGNS	1.38									
5	BCG	1.3	1.6	1.7	1.11	1.17	1.25	1.33	1.40	1.41	2.9
		2.14	2.19	2.21	2.24	2.27	2.29	2.31	2.33	2.36	2.39
		2.41	2.44	2.48	2.55	4.1	4.2				
6	BENNA	2.26									
7	BCML	2.7	2.51	2.53							
8	BFL	2.10									
9	BRADG	2.57									
10	BROM	2.8									
11	COASTP	1.37									
12	CHIND	2.65									
13	CWS	1.44									
14	DOC	1.2	1.4	1.8	1.14	1.15	1.18	1.26	1.29	1.45	1.56
		2.2	2.37	2.45	2.58	2.68					
15	ELWEP	1.46	2.3	2.71	4.9						
16	ESSEG	2.72									
17	ESTGB	2.1									
18	EXOP	1.50									
19	FFNZ	1.21	1.22	1.27	1.32	2.4					
20	FGWC	GS1									
21	FRIEG	2.69									
22	GDC	GS2									
23	GRIGA	2.70									
24	HAYES	2.42									
25	HENRC	2.11									
26	HENSR	2.6	4.3	4.4	4.5						
27	INTAF	1.5	1.9	1.10	1.13	1.20	1.28	1.34	1.48	1.49	2.12
		2.15	2.20	2.22	2.25	2.28	2.30	2.32	2.34	2.38	2.40
		2.43	2.46	2.49	2.56	4.6	4.7	4.8			
28	JONESB	2.16	2.18								
29	KAURI	2.63									
30	LOWEA	2.66									
31	MACBH	2.17	2.23								
32	MARKA	1.51									
33	MWC	2.13	2.50	2.52	2.54	2.60	2.64	4.10			
34	OFT	2.47									
35	PWNZ	1.43									
36	PFL	2.62									
37	RPN	1.42									
38	RF&B	1.1	1.12	1.16	1.19	1.23	1.30	1.47	2.5	3.1	
39	SNOEN	2.67	4.11								
40	STRATW	2.35									
41	SUPERS	1.55									
42	TAPPM	1.52									
43	TAPPS	1.53									
44	TOPPG	1.54									
45	TRUSTP	1.24	1.31	2.59							
46	WVFL	2.61									

GENERAL SUBMISSIONS ON PLAN CHANGE 1

Decision Requested: GS 1

Submitter 20 FGWC

Submission

Fish and Game supports the proposed changes to the Land and Water Plan as they will provide further clarity about permitted activities whilst adequately protecting freshwater resources for current and future generations.

Relief sought:

Fish and Game seeks that the proposed changes are implemented in their entirety without change from the currently proposed amendments.

Decision Requested: GS 2

Submitter 22 GDC

Submission

In general we support the entire plan change 1.

Relief sought:

There are no amendments we seek as a result of this submission.

PART 1: MISCELLANEOUS CHANGES

General Submissions on Miscellaneous Changes

Decision Requested: 1.1

Submitter 38 RF&B
Submission

Forest and Bird is generally supportive of the miscellaneous changes proposed. In most instances they are sensible amendments to ensure the Plan reads well and to provide clarity as to the intention of some provisions.

Miscellaneous Change A: Introduction

Decision Requested: 1.2

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

1.2 Area covered by the plan New Provision
 Second paragraph, and Figure 1

Support in part.

The introduction including Figure 1 does not give effect to Policy 1(2)(a) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) as the coastal environment includes the coastal marine area.

Relief sought:

Retain the second paragraph as notified with the last sentence amended to read:

...Unless otherwise stated, all objectives, policies, and rules in the Land and Water Plan apply to the "Coastal Environment" landward of the Mean High Water Spring Mark.

And amend Figure 1 to have the coastal environment extent to extend from outer limit of the Territorial Sea to and landward of the Mean High Water Spring line.

Miscellaneous Change B: Surface water quality

POLICY 8.3.5(f)

Decision Requested: 1.3

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

The term, "sewage effluent wastewater" is not correct. This change needs to decide what it is referring to:

- is it sewage - which is wastewater including faeces, and as specified in the glossary to this plan, specifically human waste.
- is it effluent - which is an outflowing, but can be more specific if identified as such e.g. included in the glossary to this plan,
- is it wastewater - which is any water that has been contaminated.

Relief sought:

"*human sewage wastewater*" needs to be replaced with "human sewage" and any further explanation annexed to the glossary.

"*wetland treatment*", needs to be qualified. It is not acceptable that a significant wetland be used for treatment of dairy effluent or human sewage.

Decision Requested: 1.4

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Support.

In the coastal environment outside of the coastal marine area, this policy gives effect to NZCPS Policy 23 (2).

The proposed amendments are also consistent with the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) in particular Part 2 including s5 and s6(e) and Schedule 4.

Relief sought:

Retain the proposed amendments to Policy 8.3.5 and its explanation as notified.

Decision Requested: 1.5**Submitter**

27

INTAF

Submission

The term, "sewage effluent wastewater" is not correct. This change needs to decide what it is referring to:

- is it sewage - which is wastewater including faeces, and as specified in the glossary to this plan, specifically human waste.
- is it effluent - which is an outflowing, but can be more specific if identified as such e.g. included in the glossary to this plan,
- is it wastewater - which is any water that has been contaminated.

Relief sought:

"*human sewage wastewater*" needs to be replaced with "human sewage" and any further explanation annexed to the glossary.

"*wetland treatment*"; needs to be qualified. It is not acceptable that a significant wetland be used for treatment of dairy effluent or human sewage.

Miscellaneous Change C: 17.3 Definitions - Riparian Margins**Decision Requested: 1.6****Submitter**

5

BCG

Submission**Riparian Margins:**

The dominant slope angle is the angle between the fullest flow/highest level of the bed of the lake or river, or major farm drain in the Lake Brunner Catchment and a point 20 metres upslope as illustrated in the diagram below.

Relief sought:

Comma after "*Lake Brunner Catchment*"

Decision Requested: 1.7**Submitter**

5

BCG

Submission

Use of word, "waterbody".

Retention of the word, "waterbody", is preferred, as it is all-inclusive, whereas, "river", and, "lake", can be exclusive. We understand, having read the S32 explanation, that exclusion is what is being aimed for, but we still prefer the encompassment of, "waterbody". What concerns us is the use of the word, "ephemeral". We note that in the glossary an ephemeral waterbody is defined as that holding water from a period of a few days to that of months. A waterbody that holds water for a period of months should not be classified as an ephemeral waterbody (or, "river", as it is referred to in the glossary). It is possible that at any future date, more wetland could be added to the schedule. Excluding waterbodies (or rivers) that hold water for months at a time from 17.3.4 could pre-empt those waterbodies from a deserved inclusion of wetland. If the glossary referred to ephemeral as being those waterbodies (rivers) holding water from days to weeks the change to 17.3.4 could be more acceptable.

Relief sought:

Retain, "waterbody".

Decision Requested: 1.8**Submitter**

14

DOC

Submission

Support in part.

The 20 metre riparian margin from the bed of lakes or rivers is strongly supported. This riparian margin creates a buffer between any adjacent land uses and these lake and river beds and strongly assists in managing land use effects on in particular water quality. It is also consistent with the RMA in particular Part 2 especially s6(a) and the esplanade reserve and strip provisions. The buffer should also apply to Schedule 1 or 2 wetlands and their margins to

be consistent with the Land and Water Plan policies.

The sentence in Riparian Margins and Advisory Note can be read that these provisions only apply to the Lake Brunner catchment.

Relief sought:

Retain the Section on Riparian Margins as notified with the following amendments:

The dominant slope angle is the angle between the fullest flow /highest level of the bed of the lake or river, or Schedule 1 or 2 wetland or in the case of Lake Brunner Catchment major farm drain in Lake Brunner Catchment and a point 20 metres upslope as illustrated in the diagram below.

And amend the advisory note 2. to read:

...terrestrial vegetation immediately adjacent to the lake or river or Schedule 1 or 2 wetland or in the case of Lake Brunner Catchment major farm drain in Lake Brunner Catchment water body.

Decision Requested: 1.9

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

Riparian Margins:

The dominant slope angle is the angle between the fullest flow/highest level of the bed of the lake or river, or major farm drain in the Lake Brunner Catchment and a point 20 metres upslope as illustrated in the diagram below.

Relief sought:

Comma after "Lake Brunner Catchment"

Decision Requested: 1.10

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

Use of word, "waterbody".

I prefer retention of the word, "waterbody", is preferred, as it is all-inclusive, whereas, "river", and, "lake", can be exclusive. I understand, having read the S32 explanation, that exclusion is what is being aimed for, but I still prefer the encompassment of, "waterbody". What concerns us is the use of the word, "ephemeral". I note that in the glossary an ephemeral waterbody is defined as that holding water from a period of a few days to that of months. A waterbody that holds water for a period of months should not be classified as an ephemeral waterbody (or, "river", as it is referred to in the glossary). It is possible that at any future date, more wetland could be added to the schedule. Excluding waterbodies (or rivers) that hold water for months at a time from 17.3.4 could pre-empt those waterbodies from a deserved inclusion of wetland. If the glossary referred to ephemeral as being those waterbodies (rivers) holding water from days to weeks the change to 17.3.4 could be more acceptable.

Relief sought:

Retain, "waterbody".

Miscellaneous Change D: 17.3 Definitions - Slope Ratios

Decision Requested: 1.11

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

Ratio is very confusing and a way of calculating must be included if ratios are being adopted in this plan.

Relief sought:

Ratios need to be qualified, being horizontal distance to vertical distance; HD:VD (or $\cotan A = HD/VD$)

Decision Requested: 1.12

Submitter 38 RF&B

Submission

Introduction to the Rules 17.3.2, Rule 3, 4, 5,10, and any others that relate to ratio/degree slope

Support: The addition of a slope ratio alongside degree slope is supported as provides additional and possibly more

helpful information for a landowner to assess plan provisions regarding erosion prone areas and within and outside riparian margins.

Relief sought:

Retain

Decision Requested: 1.13

Submitter

27

INTAF

Submission

Ratio is very confusing and a way of calculating must be included if ratios are being adopted in this plan.

Relief sought:

Ratios need to be qualified, being horizontal distance to vertical distance; HD:VD (or $\cotan A = HD/VD$)

Miscellaneous Changes D and E: Rules 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 86

Decision Requested: 1.14

Submitter

14

DOC

Submission

Support.

The standard conditions to manage effects of sediment discharge to water by using visual clarity and turbidity standards are supported as these standard conditions will manage the effects of sediment discharges on water quality.

Relief sought:

Retain Standard Conditions for visual clarity and turbidity as notified.

Decision Requested: 1.15

Submitter

14

DOC

Submission

Support.

Rules controlling earthworks on slopes will result in reduced discharge of sediment to water. It is noted in Rule 3 there is a typographic error. It should read 1:4.7 ratio.

Relief sought:

Retain these rules as notified with the following amendment to Rule 3:

Or a 1:4.7 ratio

Decision Requested: 1.16

Submitter

38

RF&B

Submission

Support. NTU is a better measure because it is a more effective and efficient method of identifying changes in water clarity.

Relief sought:

Retain

Miscellaneous Change F: Rule 20

Decision Requested: 1.17

Submitter

5

BCG

Submission

Allowing changes of 10% to an authorised structure should include a caveat as to the original size of the Structure. If the structure is small to start with then 10% is not a large change, but if the structure is large, then a 10% alteration could be quite significant.

We understand that the constraint, "10%", is already established in this rule and it is not part of the miscellaneous

changes, but nevertheless this term needs further quantification.

10% size of structure.

Relief sought:

Size of original structure needs to be included here e.g. for structures of volume less than (e.g. 10cumec?)

Needs quantification as to the original size of the structure, as 10% of a small structure is much less than 10% of a large structure.

Decision Requested: 1.18

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Support.

The proposed change ensures that structures on river or lake beds cannot be increased in extent by more than 10 % without an application for consent. This proposed change will manage the cumulative effects of extensions of structures on the values of lake and river beds.

Relief sought:

Retain the Change to Rule 20 (ii) (b) as notified.

Decision Requested: 1.19

Submitter 38 RF&B

Submission

Support. The addition of the words 'originally authorised structures' is supported. It makes clear that the permitted rule only applies to authorised structures.

The additional sentence to 'Note' in relation to Rule 20 (b) is supported as it clarifies that any changes to structures will require a resource consent if it is intended that the structure would increase by more than 10%.

Relief sought:

Retain

Decision Requested: 1.20

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

Allowing changes of 10% to an authorised structure should include a caveat as to the original size of the structure. If the structure is small to start with then 10% is not a large change, but if the structure is large, then a 10% alteration could be quite significant.

I understand that the constraint, "10%", is already established in this rule and it is not part of the miscellaneous changes, but nevertheless this term needs further quantification.

10% size of structure.

Relief sought:

Size of original structure needs to be included here e.g. for structures of volume less than (e.g. 10cumec?)

Needs quantification as to the original size of the structure, as 10% of a small structure is much less than 10% of a large structure.

Miscellaneous Change G: Rule 28

Decision Requested: 1.21

Submitter 19 FFNZ

Submission

It is unclear why work must be completed within 5 consecutive days as per 28(d). The proposed wording creates unnecessary risk for landowners should a contractor start and is unable to complete work due to circumstances outside their control e.g. equipment failure or bad weather.

Relief sought:

Retain original wording.

Decision Requested: 1.22**Submitter**

19

FFNZ

Submission

Components of the proposed rule 28(k) present unnecessary regulation risk and potentially cost to the landowner if they have no "before" photos. In the majority of circumstances it will be easily ascertained the effects and damage a flood has caused.

Relief sought:

Delete 28(k) i and iii

FFNZ would like an explanation included in the plan regarding 28(k). Clarity is required as to what level of evidence is acceptable to WCRC e.g. mobile phone photographs, receipts for materials purchased and invoices from contractors.

Decision Requested: 1.23**Submitter**

38

RF&B

Submission

Support. Proposed additional clause (k) is supported as it provides for the better regulation of effects.

Relief sought:

Retain.

Decision Requested: 1.24**Submitter**

45

TRUSTP

Submission

Trustpower supports the proposal to amend Rule 28 as it simplifies the wording of the rule and clarifies the work that can be undertaken. This gives plan users certainty as to when resource consent is required and allows erosion repairs to be carried out while avoiding the placement of inappropriate structures.

Relief sought:

Trustpower seeks that the proposed changes to Rule 28 are retained as notified in Plan Change 1.

Miscellaneous Change H: Rule 34**Decision Requested: 1.25****Submitter**

5

BCG

Submission

Controlled activity: Resource consent required but always granted Activities which are specified as controlled activities require a resource consent, but the Council must grant consent. The conditions Council sets on the resource consent will be limited to the matters stated in the rule.

Whereas council has discretion to either decline or accept resource consent under the restricted discretionary category.

If rule 34 is changed from restricted discretionary to controlled then is it possible that anyone that applies for consent for a stand will be granted one? It looks to us as though changing that status would breach the extant limitations within the Plan pertaining to whitebait stands. Restricted discretionary must be retained. It doesn't matter if making it controlled creates a more stream-lined process due to environmental issues being well-known and generally standard conditions issued.

We believe the S32 Evaluation Report has erred in its argument to change the status of activity.

Of concern is incursion of the tidal influence up rivers as sea level rises (and unsustainable amounts of gravel are taken from just upstream of the CMA). Will this incursion be incentive to create more whitebait stands along rivers? We hope not. A controlled status of resource consent may oblige the council to issue consent for consent applications in such areas.

Relief sought:

Retain restricted discretionary status

Decision Requested: 1.26**Submitter**

14

DOC

Submission

Support in part.

The inclusion to the reference to the erection of whitebait stands listed in Tables 1 and 2 of Schedule 17 is supported as this rule clearly identifies where whitebait stands can or cannot be erected.

There is a potential concern about the change of the activity status from restricted discretionary to controlled activity. Whilst it is agreed the adverse effects are minor, there is a potential situation where two applicants apply to occupy the same space with a whitebait stand. One application will have to be declined, which cannot occur using a controlled activity rule.

Relief sought:

Amend Rule 34 to read;

The erection of whitebait stands listed in Tables 1 and 2 of Schedule 17 is a ~~restricted discretionary~~ ~~controlled~~ activity. In ~~considering~~ ~~granting~~ any resource consent under this Rule Council will restrict the exercise of its discretion ~~control~~ over the following matters:

....

Decision Requested: 1.27**Submitter**

19

FFNZ

Submission

FFNZ commends WCRC for proposing white bait stand consents be a controlled activity instead of a restricted discretionary activity. This is an efficient use of WCRC resources.

Relief Sought:

Adopt proposed wording

Decision Requested: 1.28**Submitter**

27

INTAF

Submission

Controlled activity: Resource consent required but always granted Activities which are specified as controlled activities require a resource consent, but the Council must grant consent. The conditions Council sets on the resource consent will be limited to the matters stated in the rule.

Whereas council has discretion to either decline or accept resource consent under the restricted discretionary category.

If rule 34 is changed from restricted discretionary to controlled then is it possible that anyone that applies for consent for a stand will be granted one? It looks to me as though changing that status would breach the extant limitations within the Plan pertaining to whitebait stands. Restricted discretionary must be retained. It doesn't matter if making it controlled creates a more stream-lined process due to environmental issues being well-known and generally standard conditions issued.

I believe the S32 Evaluation Report has erred in its argument to change the status of activity.

Of concern is incursion of the tidal influence up rivers as sea level rises (and unsustainable amounts of gravel are taken from just upstream of the CMA). Will this incursion be incentive to create more whitebait stands along rivers? I hope not. A controlled status of resource consent may oblige the council to issue consent for consent applications in such areas.

Relief sought:

Retain restricted discretionary status

Miscellaneous Change I: New Rule 34a

Decision Requested: 1.29

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Support.

This rule clarifies where whitebait stands cannot be erected. It is therefore strongly supported.

Relief sought:

Retain this Rule as notified.

Decision Requested: 1.30

Submitter 38 RF&B

Submission

Support. The prohibition of whitebait stands on rivers not listed in Schedule 17 is supported. The new rule improves clarity of existing provisions and consistent with sound resource management practice.

Relief sought:

Retain

Miscellaneous Change J: Rule 52

Decision Requested: 1.31

Submitter 45 TRUSTP

Submission

Trustpower opposes the proposed amendment to Rule 52. Trustpower is concerned that this rule does not take into consideration the impacts of reconstituting community water supply takes on other existing consented water users. Trustpower supports the concept of ensuring security of water supply for communities, however appropriate consent conditions must be imposed in relation to residual flows, rates of take, volume and timing etc. in order to ensure that there are no adverse effects on other existing water users in the catchment.

Relief sought:

Trustpower seeks that the West Coast Regional Council insert an additional matter of control to Rule 52 as follows:

In granting any resource consent for the taking of surface water in terms of this Rule, the Council will restrict the exercise of its control to the following:

...

(i) Any adverse effect of continuing the taking of water on any existing lawfully established take, use, dam, discharge or diversion of water.

The requested amendment to the matters of control for existing community water supply takes is similar to the matters for control of existing hydroelectricity generation takes (Rule 54).

Miscellaneous Change K: Rule 72

Decision Requested: 1.32

Submitter 19 FFNZ

Submission

FFNZ agrees with WCRC removing burning of silage wrap, which is consistent with the Regional Air Quality Plan and the National Environment Standard for Air Quality. However, the permitted alternatives need to be readily available and easily accessible to all e.g. recycling and landfill locations.

Relief Sought:

Adopt proposed changes.

Miscellaneous Change L: Rule 79

Decision Requested: 1.33

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

Rule 79(c) refers to AS/NZS1547:2012 'On-site Domestic Waste Water Management'.

This should not be included unless there is further reference to what the soil classes are. To find out what is referred to requires payment of over \$100 to buy that AS/ NZ Standard.

Relief sought:

Include explanation of soil categories referred to.

Decision Requested: 1.34

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

Rule 79(c) refers to AS/NZS1547:2012 'On-site Domestic Waste Water Management'.

This should not be included unless there is further reference to what the soil classes are. To find out what is referred to requires payment of over \$100 to buy that AS/ NZ Standard.

Relief sought:

Include explanation of soil categories referred to.

Miscellaneous Change N: Glossary – Vegetation Disturbance

Decision Requested: 1.35

Submitter 2 ARNB

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Relief sought:

Rules. Wetland cannot be drained or induced to cause drying out.

Decision Requested: 1.36

Submitter 3 ARND

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Relief sought:

Rules. Wetland cannot be drained or induced to cause drying out.

Decision Requested: 1.37

Submitter 11 COASTP

Submission

I support this proposed change by the Council. This change removes one possible hindrance to the industry as it strives firstly to retain and then maintain these sphagnum moss producing wetland areas. The nature of the industry is environmentally friendly and the effects are accurately described in the Regional Council document as "Less than minor ". With the loss of huge areas due to development over the last 25 years it is critical that the remaining

sphagnum moss producing wetland areas (In both public and private ownership) are able to be managed to be sustainable and economically viable for the Owner, Industry and the region. (Approx. 65 Jobs) A Ministry of Economic Development Report identified Sphagnum Moss as a sustainable West Coast Industry. I feel the proposed plan change by the West Coast Regional Council is positive.

Decision Requested: 1.38

Submitter 4 BAGNS

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Decision Requested: 1.39

Submitter 1 APML

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Decision Requested: 1.40

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

The exclusion of sphagnum moss harvesting from the definition of vegetation disturbance removes the protection of the natural character, indigenous biodiversity and other values of wetlands in the region, where any modification is likely to result in the degradation or loss of the values of the wetlands.

S32 Evaluation Report – Reasons for the Change:

“Presently the Plan requires harvesters of sphagnum moss to obtain resource consent before undertaking the activity. This was an unintended outcome of the Environment Court case on identifying wetlands, and requiring resource consent is unnecessary as the effects of this activity on the environment are known to be minimal.”

The Land and Water Plan’s section 2 says that widespread loss of wetlands is an issue of significance of Poutini Ngai Tahu, who seek to restore degraded wetlands.

Section 6 objective 6.1 says: To recognise and provide for the protection of the natural character, indigenous biodiversity and other values of wetlands in the region;

with policies saying “...to identify and protect their values by controlling activities in those wetlands and their margins to ensure their natural character and ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats) are sustained.”,

and Explanation saying, “... Any wetland modification is likely to result in the degradation or loss of the values of the wetlands or the wetlands themselves.”.

Also in Explanations, “...the need to manage all wetlands sustainably...”.

Rule 36(b) says that, “To excavate, drill, tunnel, or otherwise disturb the bed”, is a discretionary activity, and Rule 37(b) says the same, both in relation to Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands.

In the glossary, track within a scheduled wetlands is of concern.

Schedule 3; Ecological criteria:

Summary:

- Wetlands play an important role in protecting adjacent ecological values, and have an important contribution to ecological functions and processes.
- A representative wetland must, by interpreting the criteria, include sphagnum moss in its virgin form, due to it being a typical wetland plant. Wetlands should be intact and contain cushion bogs.

- Wetlands are identified by the dominant species present.

Some of our group has been involved in sphagnum moss harvesting in the past. Actual harvesting by hand is a minor activity. The moss, once collected, being water-laden, is very heavy. Harvesters often drag sacks out by hand, creating drag paths along a cut route. Routes may be cut in to provide for quad bike passage. More adventurous harvesters cart out by helicopter. Some harvesters erect drying racks at the harvesting sites, often clearing shrubbery to do so. Tracking in can deposit gorse, broom and other weeds and also pest invertebrates via boot soles, tools etc. Dogs often accompany harvesters, where indigenous fauna can be put at risk. Without controls on moss harvesting, peripheral activities, such as track creation and site drying racks, will be harder to monitor also.

Moss harvesters harvest the moss on a 7-year cycle, because that is how long it takes for the moss to recover, but all harvesters know that the initial harvest reaps the best moss, of very long fine, pastel-coloured strands. Any subsequent harvest can never reproduce that quality, where regrowth strands become broader, shorter and darker-coloured.

Sphagnum moss is intrinsic to most wetlands, being a critical plant in wetland health. It is also a critical plant in flood amelioration, sedimentation, and water purification. Sphagnum moss is the most amazing sponge – while absorbing incredible amounts of water during wet conditions, it can also dry out during dry spells but remain viable, so long as it is not contaminated.

Allowing sphagnum moss harvesting as a permitted activity (by excluding it from any rule) in wetlands breaches the Land and Water Plan in a number of ways, including those we have listed above. Mainly, allowing the indiscriminate harvesting of the moss in any wetland, anywhere, will ensure that incremental degradation of these wetlands will occur. We understand that sphagnum moss harvesting should be a permitted activity for small-scale harvesting; however, there is a lot of landing the region that is not a scheduled wetland, nor anywhere that could be considered for inclusion the wetland schedule, that will have good cushions of sphagnum moss for harvesting.

We absolutely object to sphagnum moss being a permitted activity via exclusion from any rule in regional plans. We suggest it should be included as a facet of vegetation disturbance, (vegetation disturbance it is), thus excluding it from scheduled wetlands, also excluding it from wetlands with potential to be included in that schedule via assessment of environmental effects in consent applications, but allowing it on other, unclassified land within the region.

Relief sought:

Include sphagnum moss harvesting as vegetation disturbance.

Decision Requested: 1.41

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

All fences should be erected outside of riparian margins. The Land and Water Plan in general tries to discourage grazing within riparian margins but this vegetation disturbance definition encourages grazing within riparian margins.

Relief sought:

Should not include fencing within a riparian margin.

Decision Requested: 1.42

Submitter 37 RPN

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Decision Requested: 1.43

Submitter 35 PWNZ

Submission

Pacific Wide (NZ) supports the change proposed by Council as per Miscellaneous Change N.

We have been involved in the sphagnum moss industry for 28 years and know first-hand that the industry is an iconic industry, important for a very large number of people and businesses on the West Coast and in other regions of New Zealand.

A key goal of our business is only to use renewable resource (moss, bark), sustainably managed, which requires us to protect the physical environment sphagnum moss grows in to ensure the long levity of the moss industry and our business. Pacific Wide strives to follow management practices for growing and harvesting of moss which results in minimal or no disturbance to the dynamics of the wetlands that it grows in.

There has been a lot of wetland swamps and moss resource lost over the years to development, especially dairy conversion (with reduction in moss industry activity and jobs). This makes it more important than ever for the future wellbeing of the West Coast, its residents and businesses, that the remaining wetland areas are maintained in good health and available for economic harvesting.

Relief sought:

Make proposed Miscellaneous Change N., to remove the "harvesting of sphagnum moss" from the definition of Vegetation disturbance

Decision Requested: 1.44

Submitter 13 CWS

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Decision Requested: 1.45

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Oppose.

Allowing sphagnum moss harvesting in Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands as a permitted activity may have adverse effects on other indigenous vegetation and have adverse effects on any brown mudfish populations present. On Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands on land managed by the Department, the proposed changes are contrary to the West Coast Conservation Management Strategy as it is considered these wetlands are significant.

Relief sought:

Retain this definition as notified with the deletion of the following words:

...excludes sphagnum moss harvesting, tree pruning ...

Decision Requested: 1.46

Submitter 15 ELWEP

Submission

I oppose the proposed change to exclude sphagnum moss harvesting from the definition of 'vegetation disturbance' in the glossary on page 22.

Reasons:

a.) By excluding sphagnum moss harvesting ('moss harvesting') from the definition of vegetation disturbance, in the context of Rules 9, 10, 17 and 19 (which govern vegetation disturbance), of the operative Land and Water Plan ('the Plan'), moss harvesting will become a de facto permitted and uncontrolled activity in all scheduled (1 & 2) wetlands, as well as any wetlands which might or could become scheduled.

The Evaluation Report provided by the WCRC, claims that the effects of moss harvesting on wetlands 'are known to be minimal', 'less than minor', 'well known and minor'. These statements are unsubstantiated and specious because:

No account has apparently been taken of the scale, timing and method or mode of harvesting, or of the ecological characteristics and values of individual wetlands, including the schedule 3 (Ecological Criteria for Significant Wetlands) values of all schedule 1 wetlands and potentially some or all schedule 2 wetlands which are still awaiting schedule 3 assessments.

There has been no apparent recognition or study of the effects of any scale or mode/method of moss harvesting and the activities associated with it, on the birdlife largely peculiar to, and dependent on wetland habitats, such as Australasian Brown Bitterns (*Botaurus poiciloptilus*), Fernbirds (*Bowdleria punctata*) and potentially White Herons (*Egretta alba*) and White-faced Herons (*Ardea novehollandiae*), plus other indigenous birdlife commonly found living

and breeding in wetlands. Some of these species are nationally endangered (bittern) vulnerable, rare and/or in decline.

b.) Objective 6.2.1. of the Plan states "To recognise and provide for the protection of the natural character, indigenous biodiversity (my bold lettering), and other values of wetlands in the region", while Policies 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 refer to "controlling" activities within schedule 1 and schedule 2 wetlands in order to "identify and protect" their values.

Policy explanation 6.3.1 explains that "Any wetland modification is likely to result in the degradation or loss of the values of the wetlands or the wetlands themselves".

The proposed change does not make clear how uncontrolled moss harvesting within schedule 1 wetlands will not result in "the degradation or loss of values" of those wetlands. The same criteria apply to schedule 2 wetlands.

By making moss harvesting a permitted activity in scheduled wetlands this Plan change fails to "recognise and provide for the protection of the indigenous biodiversity" of wetlands, and fails to exert control over that activity in "order to identify and protect" their values.

c.) Part 2 of the Resource Management Act (RMA), sets out the environmental protection principles against which human activities can take place, and places an onus on decision-makers to sustain, safeguard, protect, maintain and enhance environmental values.

In proposing to allow uncontrolled moss harvesting within scheduled wetlands, Council is seeking to override and subjugate these principles, and indeed the spirit of the RMA, for apparent political expediency.

Relief sought:

Therefore I request council to withdraw the proposed exclusion of sphagnum moss harvesting from the definition of vegetation disturbance.

Note:

If moss harvesting is to take place in wetlands on the Coast, it must be subject to controls, and not take place in schedule 1 wetlands. Any other wetlands must be assessed according to schedule 3 criteria prior to being considered available for moss harvesting.

It may be advantageous and necessary to create a schedule of wetlands available for moss harvesting, plus conditions governing the scale, time and mode of harvesting.

Decision Requested: 1.47

Submitter

38

RF&B

Submission

Forest and Bird is disappointed to see, and is firmly opposed to the Council proposal to exclude the harvesting of sphagnum moss from the definition of vegetation disturbance, effectively providing for harvesting to occur in any wetland as a permitted activity.

Oppose. The proposal to exclude sphagnum moss harvesting from the definition of Vegetation Disturbance is opposed. The rationale for this exclusion is set in the s.32 as follows

Presently the Plan requires harvesters of sphagnum moss to obtain resource consent before undertaking the activity. This was an unintended outcome of the Environment Court case on identifying wetlands, and requiring resource consent is unnecessary as the effects of this activity on the environment are known to be minimal.

There is no evidence to support the s.32 contention that the need for resource consent to harvest sphagnum moss was an 'unintended consequence' of an Environment Court case nor that the effects of the activity 'are known to be minimal'.

Forest and Bird were involved in the Environment Court proceedings related to identifying significant wetlands and at the time carefully considered the impact on wetlands as a result of harvesting. In the absence of any information on the amount of sphagnum taken, where it was being harvested, the impact on the wetlands, minimal or otherwise, it was considered it could not be supported as a permitted activity.

Sphagnum moss harvesting has the potential to disrupt the natural function of wetlands, cause the introduction of invasive species and adversely impact on indigenous flora and fauna.

The protection of wetlands is considered to be a national priority.

Providing for harvesting as a permitted activity is contrary to Part 2 RMA including s6(a)(c). What is being proposed is contrary to 30(ga) RMA – Council to maintain indigenous biodiversity.

It is also contrary to various objectives and policies of the operative Land and Water Plan including:
 Chapter 4 Objective and Policy 4.3.3(d) to manage the disturbance of land and vegetation of avoid, remedy or mitigate any effects on significant vegetation and habitats of significant fauna.
 Chapter 6 Objectives and Policies.

Relief sought:

Reject – Delete 'excluding sphagnum moss harvesting' to the definition of 'vegetation disturbance'.

Decision Requested: 1.48

Submitter

27

INTAF

Submission

The exclusion of sphagnum moss harvesting from the definition of vegetation disturbance removes the protection of the natural character, indigenous biodiversity and other values of wetlands in the region, where any modification is likely to result in the degradation or loss of the values of the wetlands.

S32 Evaluation Report – Reasons for the Change:

"Presently the Plan requires harvesters of sphagnum moss to obtain resource consent before undertaking the activity. This was an unintended outcome of the Environment Court case on identifying wetlands, and requiring resource consent is unnecessary as the effects of this activity on the environment are known to be minimal."

The Land and Water Plan's section 2 says that widespread loss of wetlands is an issue of significance of Poutini Ngai Tahu, who seek to restore degraded wetlands.

Section 6 objective 6.1 says: To recognise and provide for the protection of the natural character, indigenous biodiversity and other values of wetlands in the region;

with policies saying "...to identify and protect their values by controlling activities in those wetlands and their margins to ensure their natural character and ecosystems (including ecosystem functions and habitats) are sustained.",

and Explanation saying, "... Any wetland modification is likely to result in the degradation or loss of the values of the wetlands or the wetlands themselves."

Also in Explanations, "...the need to manage all wetlands sustainably...".

Rule 36(b) says that, "To excavate, drill, tunnel, or otherwise disturb the bed", is a discretionary activity, and Rule 37(b) says the same, both in relation to Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands.

In the glossary, track within a scheduled wetlands is of concern.

Schedule 3; Ecological criteria:

Summary:

- Wetlands play an important role in protecting adjacent ecological values, and have an important contribution to ecological functions and processes.
- A representative wetland must, by interpreting the criteria, include sphagnum moss in its virgin form, due to it being a typical wetland plant. Wetlands should be intact and contain cushion bogs.
- Wetlands are identified by the dominant species present.

I have harvested, and helped in harvesting sphagnum moss in the past. Actual harvesting by hand is a minor activity. The moss, once collected, being water-laden, is very heavy. Harvesters I knew dragged sacks out by hand, creating drag paths along a cut route. Routes may be cut in to provide for quad bike passage. More adventurous harvesters cart out by helicopter. Some harvesters erect drying racks at the harvesting sites, often clearing shrubbery to do so. Tracking in can deposit gorse, broom and other weeds and also pest invertebrates via boot soles, tools etc. Dogs often accompany harvesters, where indigenous fauna can be put at risk. Without controls on moss harvesting, peripheral activities, such as track creation and site drying racks, will be harder to monitor also.

Moss harvesters harvest the moss on a 7-year cycle, because that is how long it takes for the moss to recover, but all harvesters know that the initial harvest reaps the best moss, of very long fine, pastel-coloured strands. Any subsequent harvest can never reproduce that quality, where regrowth strands become broader, shorter and darker-coloured.

Sphagnum moss is intrinsic to most wetlands, being a critical plant in wetland health. It is also a critical plant in flood amelioration, sedimentation, and water purification. Sphagnum moss is the most amazing sponge – while absorbing incredible amounts of water during wet conditions, it can also dry out during dry spells but remain viable, so long as it is not contaminated.

Allowing sphagnum moss harvesting as a permitted activity (by excluding it from any rule) in wetlands breaches the Land and Water Plan in a number of ways, including those I have listed above. Mainly, allowing the indiscriminate harvesting of the moss in any wetland, anywhere, will ensure that incremental degradation of these wetlands will occur. I understand that sphagnum moss harvesting should be a permitted activity for small-scale harvesting; however, there is a lot of land in the region that is not a scheduled wetland, nor anywhere that could be considered for inclusion in the wetland schedule, that will have good cushions of sphagnum moss for harvesting.

I absolutely object to sphagnum moss being a permitted activity via exclusion from any rule in regional plans. I suggest it should be included as a facet of vegetation disturbance, (vegetation disturbance it is), thus excluding it from scheduled wetlands, also excluding it from wetlands with potential to be included in that schedule via assessment of environmental effects in consent applications, but allowing it on other, unclassified land within the region.

Relief sought:

Include sphagnum moss harvesting as vegetation disturbance.

Decision Requested: 1.49

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

All fences should be erected outside of riparian margins. The Land and Water Plan in general tries to discourage grazing within riparian margins but this vegetation disturbance definition encourages grazing within riparian margins.

Relief sought:

Should not include fencing within a riparian margin.

Decision Requested: 1.50

Submitter 18 EXOP

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Decision Requested: 1.51

Submitter 32 MARKA

Submission

In relation to my good knowledge of the West Coast's many wetlands, based on detailed ecological research and publication on several in South Westland, Burmeister Morasse, Dismal Swamp and the Hapuka Estuary in particular, I strongly recommend that the Council's proposed Plan Change 1 to the Land and Water Plan (1a and 3), that moss harvesting in all West Coast wetlands must always be defined as a 'controlled activity', never uncontrolled and further, that in the definition of vegetation disturbance, the harvesting of Sphagnum moss must be included.

This would be a relatively small but nevertheless, an important amendment in view of the ecological importance of these West Coast wetlands.

Decision Requested: 1.52

Submitter 42 TAPPM

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Relief sought:

Rules. Wetland cannot be drained or induced to cause drying out.

Decision Requested: 1.53**Submitter**

43

TAPPS

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Relief sought:

Rules. Wetland cannot be drained or induced to cause drying out.

Decision Requested: 1.54**Submitter**

44

TOPPG

Submission

I support the Harvesting of Sphagnum from Wetlands without the need for resource consent due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a Wetland.

A well managed harvesting cycle will result in a Wetland and a Moss Industry, the jobs and export dollars that come with that. The two can co-exist indefinitely for the benefit of both whilst retaining diversity in our economy.

Decision Requested: 1.55**Submitter**

41

SUPERS

Submission

I support the proposal to allow a continued ability to harvest sphagnum moss from wetlands, without the need for resource consent, due to the low impact of this activity on the overall health and integrity of a wetland.

I have sustainably owned and operated a moss harvesting business for a number of years and support the Councils intention to allow that activity to continue on a permitted provisions.

The proposed amendment seeks to rectify an unintended outcome relating to previous changes to wetland provisions of the Regional Land and Water Plan. It also recognises that sphagnum moss harvesting operations have been, and are able to be, undertaken on a sustainable basis on the West Coast.

The ongoing industry on the West Coast indicates that a well managed moss harvesting cycle will result in the sustainability of both wetlands and the local sphagnum moss industry, including from a community perspective the associated jobs and export dollars that come with that.

The two can co-exist, and indeed have for a considerable period of time on the West Coast, indefinitely for the benefit of both the environment and moss industry whilst retaining wetland values and diversity in our economy.

Having said that the proposed definition is slightly ambiguous in its wording and should be amended to ensure that the exclusion of "sphagnum moss harvesting" from the definition of "Vegetation disturbance" applies in all circumstances, as is intended by the Council.

Relief sought:

That, with an amendment as to wording, the exclusion of "sphagnum moss harvesting" from the definition of "Vegetation disturbance" be retained. Such an amendment to ensure that it is clear that sphagnum moss harvesting is not contained with the definition of "vegetation disturbance", including with respect to Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands.

That the wording be amended to read (or to like effect), "Vegetation disturbance includes the cutting spraying of vegetation. Vegetation disturbance excludes any of the following activities;

(i) sphagnum moss harvesting,

(ii) tree pruning utility operators unless a rule in relation to a Schedule 1 or 2 wetland expressly identifies any of these specific activities."

Miscellaneous Change 0: Schedule 1 and 2 Wetlands within or adjacent to the Coastal Marine Area**Decision Requested: 1.56*****Submitter***

14

DOC

Submission

Support.

The case by case assessment of whether the Regional Coastal Plan or the Land and Water Plan applies to wetlands on or adjacent to the coastal marine area is supported as it is pragmatic way of managing a complex situation.

Relief sought:

Retain the provision with regard to Scheduled wetlands within or adjacent to the coastal marine area (CMA) as notified.

PART 2: CHANGES TO WETLAND BOUNDARIES WITHIN SCHEDULE 1 AND 2 TO OMIT AREAS THAT ARE NOT ECOLOGICALLY SIGNIFICANT

General Submissions on Schedule 1 and 2 Wetlands

Decision Requested: 2.1

Submitter 17 ESTGB

Submission

This should have been on the LIMS report as it was a court requirement. Information of this importance should be past on to other Council or authorities.

The Regional Council should have come around and marked where these purpose new boundaries as a pencil line on a aerial photo map of GPS are just not accurate enough and this needs to be accurate.

I will not support this submission or proposed boundary change!

The Regional Council can buy the land they want.

Decision Requested: 2.2

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Support.

The Schedules and Maps for the Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands is supported as the maps accurately reflect the extent of the wetlands. The following wetlands are excluded and will be discussed below:

- Schedule and Map for wetlands FOUP016 South Westport and FOUP052 Okari Road;
- Schedule and Map for wetland BRUP003 Lake Poerua;
- Schedule and Map for wetland HOKP107 Serpentine and Acre Creeks;

Relief sought:

Retain the reference guides and Maps for the Schedule 1 or 2 wetlands as notified except for:

- Schedule and Map for wetlands FOUP016 South Westport and FOUP052 Okari Road;
- Schedule and Map for wetland BRUP003 Lake Poerua;
- Schedule and Map for wetland HOKP107 Serpentine and Acre Creeks;

Decision Requested: 2.3

Submitter 15 ELWEP

Submission

I oppose all changes to scheduled wetland boundaries where those changes remove marginal strip-like areas along the wetland margins.

Reason:

Policies 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 and their explanations in the WCRC's Land and Water Plan refer to protecting wetlands and their margins, and mapping them to include "sufficient margins where necessary to control adjoining land drainage activities that might otherwise affect the natural water level within the wetland itself and have adverse effects on the values present".

The proposed changes do not make clear whether or not the margins removed are in fact what are "sufficient margins where necessary", and are mapped as integral to the wetland for that reason.

Relief sought:

Therefore I request that the Proposed Plan Change make clear whether or not the strips proposed for removal have in fact been assessed for their importance or otherwise as "sufficient margins" for the wetlands concerned, and list the qualifications of the person(s) making those assessments, and whether those assessments were peer-reviewed.

Decision Requested: 2.4**Submitter**

19

FFNZ

Submission

FFNZ supports the boundary changes for wetland areas where these areas are not ecologically significant, especially on farmland, as this allows farmers to use their land as normal. The proposed boundary changes need to consider current land use and should there be no wetland values associated with a mapped area, that area should not be subject to the land use restrictions imposed on wetland areas.

We are concerned that some mapped 'wetland' areas still cover developed and drained farmland, which could unnecessarily restrict normal farming activities.

Relief sought:

Remove all developed and drained farmland from the mapped 'wetland' areas.

Decision Requested: 2.5**Submitter**

38

RF&B

Submission

The shapefiles showing the amended wetlands do not identify any hydrological buffer. Failure to delineate a buffer (and in fact in all schedule 1 and 2 wetlands notified in the operative Land and Water Plan) does not give proper effect to objectives and policies in the proposed Regional Policy Statement, the operative Land and Water Plan and section 6(a) RMA.

The wetland definition set out the Plan Glossary includes the land water margins. Objective 5.2.1, Policy 5.5.2 and the Objective and Policies in Chapter 6 refer to the protection of wetlands and their margins.

The provision of a hydrological buffer was intended to be provided for as an outcome of Environment Court proceedings in relation to the identification of significant wetlands in the Plan. (Friends of Shearer Swamp v WCRC [2012] NZEnvC 006)

Relief sought:

Add a 20m buffer to each wetland shapefile of amended Schedule 1 and 2 wetlands, and all other scheduled wetlands, to provide for a hydrological buffer and ensure any land owner and decision maker are aware of the need to protect the land margins of these wetlands.

Decision Requested: 2.6**Submitter**

26

HENSR

Submission

Amending the wetland boundaries is efficient because it will ensure areas that are not ecologically significant will not be subject to provisions within the Plan relating to wetlands. Areas which have not been mapped in error will be retained within the wetland designation ensuring the objectives within the Plan remain achievable. SUPPORTED.

Relief sought:

The areas to be removed 'Section 32 report: Maps showing Changes to Scheduled Wetland Boundaries' have been agreed to by the Regional Council and DOC. Because:

- a. The area was developed prior to notification of the Plan and is not a functioning wetland.
- b. The area has a combination of exotic vegetation and development occurred prior to notification of the Plan, and so it is not a functioning wetland.

Decision Requested: 2.7**Submitter**

7

BCML

SubmissionOriginal Wetland Identification Process

The background to the process of wetland identification needs to be considered. The original process for identifying and classifying the current 'wetland' was and is flawed with no input sought from the landowner. No distinction is made between land removed from the wetland area and those left in.

Birchfield Coal Mines Ltd. Have been operating in the Mai Mai Valley for over 30 years and through this time have gathered significant local knowledge around the land covered by and surrounding the current coal mining activity.

There appears to have been no on ground assessment of the characteristics or historical use of the land covered by

the 'wetland' definition. Nor has any evidence been provided to BCML who either own the land or have an interest in the land area through minerals permit rights regarding identification of the values associated with the so called wetland.

The boundaries don't appear to have been defined by any scientific process as some areas of land adjoining the 'wetland' appear to be similar in characteristics.

Economics / Development

Coal won from these areas [MAIP003 Fletcher Creek and MAIP004 Giles Creek] are delivered direct to industries in the South Island ensuring the continued prosperity of this region. BCML customers depend on the ability to receive quality energy units direct to their factories. The known minerals deposits under these blocks are coal and gold. BCML has invested significantly to provide continued supply to industry users and if these areas are not removed it would be detrimental to both BCML and their customers.

The wetlands areas have been put on top of either granted working coal or gold mining licences' or over granted prospecting licences. There are proven coal reserves under these areas which will continue to ensure the economic prosperity of the primary industries of West Coast in particular and the New Zealand as a whole.

Relief sought:

We submit that the entire areas of nominated wetland identified as MAIP003 and MAIP004 be removed.

Decision Requested: 2.8

Submitter

10

BROM

Submission

General discussion

I am a bit annoyed by the lack of consultation and general help by the W.C.R.C.

i.e. We own the land and have no say as to what we can do on our land. If you look at aerial maps on our land you will see that we have preserved most of our stands of trees. So we are conservationists at heart, however we do this by choice not dictation.

I have approached the WCRC on occasion to ask for help towards fencing and spraying of weeds etc. to help preserve the land they want to lock up. They politely told me no and where to go. I think that if you want to preserve land that is not yours you need to do your bit.

If we were to let loose our herd of beef cows on the said land (which is supposedly of significant ecological value) they would soon destroy it. As we seem to care more about the said land than yourselves we have fenced most of it to keep the animals out. Maybe you need to work in with people rather than act as dictators which always puts peoples backs up.

Rates: I think that the landowners of scheduled lands should be exempt of paying rates on the parts of land in the schedule in both WCRC and WDC (I don't think DOC pay rates on their land).

Land Values: I think that some of the land owners have been financially disadvantaged by having a schedule 2 slapped on them, as it has made it harder for them to sell as they or future owners can't do what they want (We personally bought the land knowing it was on there).

I think the land owners that have a large proportion of their land affected should be financially compensated or buy their land off them if mutually agreed. As you know DOC assessed our land as significantly of ecological value and tried to buy it. They absolutely insulted us with a pathetic offer. We did not want to be greedy but only wanted a fair price. So maybe if our land has no real financial value – take it off the schedule altogether so that its value can be increased by whatever means.

P.S If any of your team care enough they are welcome to see what we have done and will do the future without land.

We are happy to meet with you regarding the above letter.

Decision Requested: 2.9

Submitter

5

BCG

Submission

There are a lot of deletions involved but very few additions. The only places we found proposed additions are at Otumahana, Mahinapua, Kapitea. There are 77 wetland sites with proposed deletions.

The Land and Water Plan's section 6, objective 1, Explanation, says, "...Mapping included sufficient margins where necessary to control adjoining land drainage activities that might otherwise affect the natural water level within the wetland itself and have adverse effects on the values present."

Most of the deletions are in marginal areas of wetlands. These marginal areas are buffer areas to the wetlands. Note that the Land and Water Plan says that mapping has included sufficient margins to control adjacent activities.

Some areas proposed for removal, especially some block areas, are obviously developed and it is understandable that they be excluded, however a buffer margin to the wetland should still be included from those blocks.

Of major concern is that some areas proposed for exclusion are on public land. Too many adjacent landowners on the west coast have developed, and profit, from public land whilst paying no rates and having no lease. It is a breach of regional and district plans that private activity, including indigenous degradation/ destruction, occurs on our public lands in cases where no permission/ lease for such has been issued.

Relief sought:

We would like to see any marginal areas around these wetlands retained as buffer areas where restricted activities are permitted, with any drainage activity excluded.

These marginal areas could be allowed to continue to function as they are but any land drainage should be prohibited via rules in the Plan.

Exclude such developed block areas but include buffer margin.

Any public land proposed for removal from the wetland schedule is objectionable. Such areas, even if developed, should have any private activity removed from it and the land allowed to revert to its natural state.

Decision Requested: 2.10

Submitter

8

BFL

Submission

Process of handling of our situation

Drawing in Boundaries on a Map without proper consultation with us landowner.

Boundary

We made a fair offer and was not even considered.

River protection

What proportion of river is to be paid DOC/WCRC?

Who are we dealing with?

DOC/ WCRC?

Consent put in to finish development, was not expected.

Relief sought:

Un-bias person to walk our boundary with us.

We want a proper negotiation process.

Decision Requested: 2.11

Submitter

25

HENRC

Submission

Time taken. This is year number 4.

Are our submissions really going to be heard? Or is this yet another joke?

That this is yet another VORTEX for schedule 1 and 2 owners. Even Methuselah had to die at some time.

Schedule 1 and 2 are preventing farmers from the enjoyment and husbandry of their land which is rightfully theirs. As a result they are not seen as adding to the economy of this land.

Rule 28(j)(iii) is ridiculous. Whose land is this? Who is paying the rates? These rules, whilst dictating what can and can't be done on Schedule 1 and 2 land, do not contain a provision for the sale of said land as was outlined in original legislation.

Relief sought:

That farm owners in this designated Schedule 1 and 2 be bought out at a fair and reasonable price, or be given a land exchange post haste. Or the designation of a wetland is taken off their title.

If this piece of land cannot be bought by the powers that be then the designation of wetlands be removed. Forth with.

Decision Requested: 2.12**Submitter**

27

INTAF

Submission

There are a lot of deletions involved but very few additions. The only places I found proposed additions are at Otumahana, Mahinapua, Kapitea. There are 77 wetland sites with proposed deletions.

The Land and Water Plan's section 6, objective 1, Explanation, says, "...Mapping included sufficient margins where necessary to control adjoining land drainage activities that might otherwise affect the natural water level within the wetland itself and have adverse effects on the values present."

Most of the deletions are in marginal areas of wetlands. These marginal areas are buffer areas to the wetlands. Note that the Land and Water Plan says that mapping has included sufficient margins to control adjacent activities.

Some areas proposed for removal, especially some block areas, are obviously developed and it is understandable that they be excluded, however a buffer margin to the wetland should still be included from those blocks.

Of major concern is that some areas proposed for exclusion are on public land. Too many adjacent landowners on the west coast have developed, and profit, from public land whilst paying no rates and having no lease. It is a breach of regional and district plans that private activity, including indigenous degradation/ destruction, occurs on our public lands in cases where no permission/ lease for such has been issued.

Relief sought:

I would like to see any marginal areas around these wetlands retained as buffer areas where restricted activities are permitted, with any drainage activity excluded.

These marginal areas could be allowed to continue to function as they are but any land drainage should be prohibited via rules in the Plan.

Exclude such developed block areas but include buffer margin.

Any public land proposed for removal from the wetland schedule is objectionable. Such areas, even if developed, should have any private activity removed from it and the land allowed to revert to its natural state.

Decision Requested: 2.13**Submitter**

33

MWC

SubmissionProvisions to which submission relates

- MAIP003
- MAIP004
- HOKP086
- HOKP009
- PUNP001

Minerals West Coast supports the proposed removal of areas of the following wetland areas:

- HOKP009
- PUNP001

Minerals also supports the proposed removal of areas of the following wetlands but also requests that further areas are removed due to previous modification and development of these areas.

- MAIP003
- MAIP004
- MAIP006
- HOKP086
-

The wetland identified above cover existing minerals permits that allow the holder to either explore or mine for minerals and coal. The incorrect classification or identification of wetlands in these areas will result in increased costs associated with the exploration and development of the mineral and coal resources in these areas.

In some cases this classification has the potential to adversely affect existing mining activities, including current and future investment and employment opportunities.

In assessing the current wetland maps and the associated areas designated for amendment, it appears that there is no consistent approach taken to identification or classification of wetland areas.

In some instances, areas of previous track or road construction and previous land development has been removed where in others this has not.

As a general comment, Minerals West Coast holds concerns regarding the process for identification of the wetlands and the subsequent this process has had on landowners across the region. The inclusion of wetland areas without appropriate assessment has resulted in additional costs being imposed on exploration and mining activities without any information being available to either the land owner or permit holder.

Relief sought:

The following amendments are sought:

- Removal from MAIP003 all areas of previous modification including Perserverance Road, previous tracking and roading and areas of previous modification associated with logging activities within Minerals Exploration Permit EP60154
- Removal of MAIP006 from within Minerals Mining Permit MP41646 given the level of previous modification within this area as evident on the attached aerial photograph.
- Removal of MAIP004 from within Minerals Mining Permit 52160 given the level of previous modification within this area.
- An increase in the area to be removed from HOKP086 to more fully capture land that has been developed prior to the notification of the Land and Water Plan.
- A more thorough assessment of the values associated with the wetlands identified above and this information provided to the land owners or persons holding interests over the land in question, including minerals permit holders, prior to confirmation or removal or addition to these areas.

The maps attached to this submission show the areas initially identified by the submitter as being consistent with other areas that have been removed from the current wetland areas. Given the significance of the mineral potential underlying these areas a fuller assessment of the identified wetland areas should be undertaken.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.52, D.R 2.54, D.R 2.64, & D.R 4.10]

KAMP001 Otumahana Estuary

Decision Requested: 2.14

Submitter

5

BCG

Submission

Object

We took a desktop look at scheduled wetlands in our local area (and some further afield), comparing them to the WCRC GIS database, and also to Google Earth. Also, talking to locals. This is what we found:

Otumahana Wetland: here is yet another case of public land beng used by adjacent landowners as their own, and no doubt indigenous vegetation all cleared from that land to put it into pasture, where no rates are being paid on that public land.

P3 The 2 areas to the west of valuation reference 1878015100 are on public land so it is objectionable to have this removed. It is public land and we have a right to retain and enhance its wetland status. The middle area to be included should encompass all of the public land in that enclave.

P4 West of 1878028302 – public land – object
 South-west corner 1878028101 – partly on public land – object
 Estern end 1878028300 – rich ecology – object
 North-east of ID3649099 – public land – object

P5 middle east of ID3649099 – public land – object – wetland should be reinstated.
 Western side of eastern 1878030500 – high ecological value – object
 Public land in between 1878030500 sections – reinstate indigenous value – object

P6 marginal land but will still have wetland value – object

P7 upper bottom part within 1878028600 – will encroach on high ecological quality – object
 Bottom part within 1878028600 – ditto – object
 upper eastern part of 1878031400 – ditto - object

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.15

Submitter

27

INTAF

Submission

Object

I took a desktop look at scheduled wetlands in our local area (and some further afield), comparing them to the WCRC GIS database, and also to Google Earth. Also, talking to locals. This is what I found:

Otumahana Wetland: here is yet another case of public land being used by adjacent landowners as their own, and no doubt indigenous vegetation all cleared from that land to put it into pasture, where no rates are being paid on that public land.

P3 The 2 areas to the west of valuation reference 1878015100 are on public land so it is objectionable to have this removed. It is public land and we have a right to retain and enhance its wetland status. The middle area to be included should encompass all of the public land in that enclave.

P4 West of 1878028302 – public land – object
 South-west corner 1878028101 – partly on public land – object
 Eastern end 1878028300 – rich ecology – object
 North-east of ID3649099 – public land – object

P5 middle east of ID3649099 – public land – object – wetland should be reinstated.
 Western side of eastern 1878030500 – high ecological value – object
 Public land in between 1878030500 sections – reinstate indigenous value – object

P6 marginal land but will still have wetland value – object

P7 upper bottom part within 1878028600 – will encroach on high ecological quality – object
 Bottom part within 1878028600 – ditto - object
 upper eastern part of 1878031400 – ditto - object

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.16

Submitter

28

JONESB

Submission

I submit that I am in favour of changes to schedule 2 wetlands affecting my property (KAMP001 Otumahana Estuary – Brian Jones 1 and 2). Areas to be removed (in Brian Jones 1) include areas of shade (which led to parts of developed paddocks being designated wetland presumably working from aerial photos) and farm roadways that should not be included, as well as water-courses which if included restrict important works such as stream clearance. It should be noted that “Brian Jones 2” involved parts of the Coastal Marine Area which have now been totally obliterated by coastal erosion so are irrelevant.

Decision Requested: 2.17

Submitter

31

MACBH

Submission

My wife and I own a property on the eastern edge of the Otumahana Estuary, Karamea. We are extremely pleased that the significance of the estuary has been recognised and classified as such.

We are also aware that the original broad-brush approach was not entirely accurate and applaud the council and DoC

for their efforts in correcting the errors. An on site visit was conducted on our property and in my opinion a more accurate line was identified, excluding a formed road in particular.

It is my opinion that generally this has been the case for the slivers of land that have been identified for inclusion or exclusion in the Otumahana and Karamea waterways. However there is one parcel of land at the northern end of the 'Jones' spit' – the southern spit – which has now eroded and is effectively coastal dune. I am not sure how that could now be deemed to not be a wetland or within the CMA.

In conclusion, I am fully supportive of the changes proposed bordering our property which are certainly not significant. Other areas within the Karamea/Otumahana Estuaries are generally appropriate with one exception on the Jones's spit.

KAMP002a Kongahu Swamp North

Decision Requested: 2.18

Submitter 28 JONESB

Submission

I also wish to know if boundaries of the schedule 1 wetland (shown above) are being officially adjusted? Parts of this wetland were originally drawn including a bush area (North Western corner) which I have developed after negotiation with the Regional Council and DoC in October /November 2015 (Alyce Melrose and Jane Marshall)..

This Schedule 1 wetland also includes part of the Blackwater Creek channel which is part of the Kongahu Rating District's drainage infrastructure. The actual creek and a minimum of 5 meters of the bank should be excluded to allow for routine maintenance to be done by excavators without breaching wetland regulations and allow the Rating District's drainage to function properly.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.18]

KAMP005 Oparara Lagoon

Decision Requested: 2.19

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P8 This is important estuary right through this area. It needs to be retained. The most probable reason it has been requested to be removed is so that stock can access it; stock should not be allowed anywhere near such fragile, estuarine areas. A fair part of this is also public land – object to any removal of wetland status here.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.20

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P8 This is important estuary right through this area. It needs to be retained. The most probable reason it has been requested to be removed is so that stock can access it; stock should not be allowed anywhere near such fragile, estuarine areas. A fair part of this is also public land – object to any removal of wetland status here.

Relief sought:

Object

KAMP053 Tidal Creek

Decision Requested: 2.21

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P9 The marginal area here is largely around the perimeter of that property. There is little to no modification of the wetland area therefore this proposed exclusion is unacceptable. The small amount of modified land at the southern border of this property has already been excluded.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.22**Submitter**

27

INTAF

Submission

P9 The marginal area here is largely around the perimeter of that property. There is little to no modification of the wetland area therefore this proposed exclusion is unacceptable. The small amount of modified land at the southern border of this property has already been excluded.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.23**Submitter**

31

MACBH

Submission

I understand that the area to be excluded form Schedule Two in the inland Tidal Creek area may be removed but is to be made into a reserve by the subdivision developers; in which case I consider that a Schedule Two designation would not be necessary. I am not aware of the existing values of the area proposed to be excluded.

FOUP002, and FOUP003 Birchfield**Decision Requested: 2.24****Submitter**

5

BCG

Submission

P10 The proposed deletion does not look as though it has been developed. It is in forest just south of the developed area. Wetland status there needs to be kept.

P11 north-eastern line to be removed – is on public property – object
 bottom-most south-eastern line – there is little or no development - object
 western bottom block – ditto – object

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.25**Submitter**

27

INTAF

Submission

P10 The proposed deletion does not look as though it has been developed. It is in forest just south of the developed area. Wetland status there needs to be kept.

P11 north-eastern line to be removed – is on public property – object
 bottom-most south-eastern line – there is little or no development - object
 western bottom block – ditto – object

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP005 Gillows Creek**Decision Requested: 2.26****Submitter**

6

BENNA

Submission

My family has had a long term interest and been involved with the creation of the Gillows Wildlife Sanctuary under the Land and Surveys and Ian M^cCallen who was the Fish and Game Representative at the time. We are unsure why there has been no consultation on the 120 hectares that has been taken and added to this sanctuary. We have personally invested a lot of time and money into reinstatement of Gillows Dam and waterways, which was created by

early settlers in the late 1800's.

We have no problems in continuing in the maintenance when necessary.

My submission is that the freehold land owners should have the opportunity to have a say in the whereabouts of the boundaries of the SNA.

FOUP007 Buller River Mouth Saltmarsh

Decision Requested: 2.27

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P15 All proposed removal appears to be on public land. Why should the status be revoked in such cases?

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.28

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P15 All proposed removal appears to be on public land. Why should the status be revoked in such cases?

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP008 Jones Creek Lagoon

Decision Requested: 2.29

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P16 once again all revocations appear to be on public land or on the cusp.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.30

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P16 once again all revocations appear to be on public land or on the cusp.

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP009 Waimangaroa

Decision Requested: 2.31

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P17 left-hand top revocation looks as though it still has functioning wetland value.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.32

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P17 left-hand top revocation looks as though it still has functioning wetland value.

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP011 Jones Creek**Decision Requested: 2.33**

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P18 North-west bottom revocation – some is on public land so objectionable.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.34

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P18 North-west bottom revocation – some is on public land so objectionable.

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP014 Okari Lagoon**Decision Requested: 2.35**

Submitter 40 STRATW

Submission

My submission is: I strongly oppose any boundary changes to any part of my property under my ownership. The property concerned at the present time (labelled as FOUP014) is property which I purchased and paid for. The land is used for grazing and farm income and is not wetlands. Any part of this that is not grazed or farmed is currently in scrub which will be developed. If anyone wants to use this property for any other use they will be required to purchase this from me like any other person or company requiring land by anyone else.

Relief sought:

I seek the following amendments from the WCRC: that the WCRC leave any private property owned by anyone else alone and makes no further changes to any of these boundaries. If the WCRC does however wish to purchase any of the land required then it is to be negotiated with the property owners and agreed upon.

FOUP016 South Westport**Decision Requested: 2.36**

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P21 areas marginal to development – where is any buffer? Such areas should be left to create a buffer zone.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.37

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Support in part.

Minor boundary changes are required by shifting the shape file to exclude farmland and include the wetland that is presently outside of the proposed wetland boundary.

Relief sought:

Amend the Map FOU016 as notified by shifting the shape file to exclude farmland and include wetland outside of the wetland boundary.

Decision Requested: 2.38

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P21 areas marginal to development – where is any buffer? Such areas should be left to create a buffer zone.

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP023 Caledonian Terrace**Decision Requested: 2.39**

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P22 the 2 blocks of darker blue appear to be waterbodies, or at least very wet - these need to be retained as wetland.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.40

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P22 the 2 blocks of darker blue appear to be waterbodies, or at least very wet - these need to be retained as wetland.

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP024 Costello Hill**Decision Requested: 2.41**

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P23 Middle block area. The area is a natural indentation/ gully most likely has rich ecology/ wetland and needs to be retained.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.42

Submitter 24 HAYES

Submission

Our property is situated at Costello Hill and is identified on you map as being FOU024 Costello Hill – Sean Hayes.

In relation to the changes proposed under Plan Change 1 to the Regional Land and Water Plan (Letter dated 22/08/2016 – Sarah Jones), we would like the following noted:

We SUPPORT the area to the south of our property (adjoining Casey Marks property) to be taken off the Wetlands 2 Schedule. This area is not wetlands, and has no ecological values as it is just tailings from old gold mining activity, covered in Manuka.

Near the northern end of our property, there is a line (in red), indicating an area to be removed from the schedule. This line covers no area, and is within our boundary, which is all grassed. The area to the north of this line (in blue) is an extension of the same pakihi terrace that our farm is on, and is not a wetland.

Relief sought:

On that basis, we ask that the line be moved out to the northern boundary of our property, and not be within it.

I would like to note that in December 2013, Hamish Fairbairn (WCRC Wetland Co-coordinator) visited our property, and inspected both the southern area, and the northern area, and concluded that there was no wetland, and nothing of ecological significance.

Overall we SUPPORT the removal of wetland classification over the two affected areas on our property, as they are not wetlands, or areas of ecological significance.

Decision Requested: 2.43

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P23 Middle block area. The area is a natural indentation/ gully most likely has rich ecology/ wetland and needs to be retained.

Relief sought:

Object

FOUP052 Okari Road

Decision Requested: 2.44

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

P26 – Marginal to wetland - retain as buffer.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.45

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Support in part.

Minor boundary changes are required by shifting the shape file to exclude farmland and include the wetland that is presently outside of the proposed wetland boundary.

Relief sought:

Amend the Map FOUP052 as notified by shifting the shape file to exclude farmland and include wetland outside of the present wetland boundary.

Decision Requested: 2.46

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

P26 – Marginal to wetland - retain as buffer.

Relief sought:

Object

BLUP050 Oweka

Decision Requested: 2.47

Submitter

34

OFT

Submission

Part 1, Oppose. The rules in the original identification of the wetland were unreasonable as they did not allow for consultation with the landowner. As the owner of the land involved I find it unusual that we are now expected to submit on how a proposed change to a decision that was made without any opportunity to submit to the original decision. We do not accept this area is a Wetland.

Part 2, Oppose. This type of land and vegetation is well represented in other land held by the Department of Conservation in the Inangahua Valley.

This land was offered to the Department of Conservation to be purchased through the Heritage Fund by the previous owner, we have offered this land as part of a land swap with the Department of Conservation. Both of these have been turned down.

Relief sought:

Compensation should be payable for land that is privately owned but can not be used by the land owner due to it being of significance to the rest of NZ.

If these areas are to stay as recognized wetlands, land owners should be compensated for the cost of seeking a resource consent to use the area.

Rates should not be paid on these areas by the land owner but instead be paid by the central government.

Where applicable a land swap of the same financial value should be offered to the land owner.

Owners should be advised as to the effect on the value of their property that these areas are part of. Banks should be consulted as it is part of their loan security.

This area to be removed from the Wetlands schedule. (Boundaries removed completely).

PUNP001 Barrytown Flats, Maher Swamp

Decision Requested: 2.48

Submitter

5

BCG

Submission

P30 This swamp particularly needs all the protection it can get.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.49

Submitter

27

INTAF

Submission

P30 This swamp particularly needs all the protection it can get.

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.50

Submitter

33

MWC

Submission

Minerals West Coast supports the proposed removal of areas of the following wetland areas:

- PUNP001

MAIP003 Fletcher Creek

Decision Requested: 2.51

Submitter 7 BCML

Submission

A recent survey of the area has identified significant historical logging and development through tracking and road construction. Much of the area is regenerating bush and is not considered to be wetland. The land is made up of alluvial gravels and river flats. There are three opencast coal mines in the area marked. This area has granted mining licences and prospecting licences over it.

The area was extensively logged from 1970 to the early 1990 and has pinus radiata and eucalyptus plantations. The roads and areas of previous logging have not been taken into consideration which is inconsistent with other changes being made to wetland boundaries. There is little or no information regarding the values associated with this wetland available to the submitter in order to make an informed assessment of the proposed changes therefore there can be little confidence in the assessment of the overall area.

- Granted mining on licence on land
- Land has been mined.
- Has a granted EP over area.

Area is not wetland. It is free draining alluvial gravel base with steep terraces. Re vegetated forest cover. No ecological assessment has been done to prove significance of the area.

Granted mining licence on the area.

Relief sought:

Given the above BCML submit that the entire MAIP003 Wetland be removed given the level of error associated with the current wetland boundary.

Remove area from Regional Land and Water Plan.

Decision Requested: 2.52

Submitter 33 MWC

Submission

Relief sought:

- Removal from MAIP003 all areas of previous modification including Perseverance Road, previous tracking and roading and areas of previous modification associated with logging activities within Minerals Exploration Permit EP60154

The maps attached to this submission show the areas initially identified by the submitter as being consistent with other areas that have been removed from the current wetland areas. Given the significance of the mineral potential underlying these areas a fuller assessment of the identified wetland areas should be undertaken.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.52]

MAIP004 Giles Creek

Decision Requested: 2.53

Submitter 7 BCML

Submission

In 2012 BCML purchased the neighbouring freehold land in order to provide certainty of access and to make land available for activities associated with mining, including water management infrastructure, as well as mine development. This land has granted MP and is mined in conjunction with the adjacent coal licence.

The current coal mining activity employs approximately 20 full time equivalent staff with a large number of technical, service and professional industries also supported through this coal and gold mining activity.

This land consists of dissected alluvial river terraces. A feature of this land is usually coarse grain well drain land covered by low forest. The land has been developed to include ponds for Giles Creek and the alluvial gravels are processed for gold recovery.

There is a considerable amount of proven coal on this freehold land but due to the fact this information is open to the public we will not disclose details.

It would be prudent to evaluate this area and the adjacent area of Fletcher Creek has one of the West Coast largest deposits of low sulphur low ash coal clean burning coal on the West Coast with is now being requested by the end users of coal.

Environmental

- Mitigation water quality of adjacent ML 41454 & ML 37210.
- This land is not a functioning wetland. No study has been undertaken by WCRC to identify significance of land.
- The land identified is elevated river terrace and not a wetland.
- This freehold land was purchased in 2010 by Birchfield Coal Mines for the purpose of settling water from Giles Creek Mine which is adjacent.
- The blocks identified have a granted mining licence M L 56210 over the area.
- This licence is currently being mined.
- The land is used for settling of water.

Economic

- Provided continued employment for existing employees.
- Lack of consultation from WCRC. No notification of boundary adjustment after visit from Hamish Fairbairn in 2013.
- Lack of compensation
- Boundaries are non-specific. Land has been altered prior to notification.

Relief sought:

Remove all areas of Birchfield Coal Mine freehold land from the Regional Land and Water Plan.

Blocks secs 4, 5, 9, 10, 11

Identifier: NL 122/215 9-11

Identifier: NL 4B/1343

Identifier: NL 4B/1344

Decision Requested: 2.54

Submitter

33

MWC

Submission

Relief sought:

- Removal of MAIP004 from within Minerals Mining Permit 52160 given the level of previous modification within this area.

The maps attached to this submission show the areas initially identified by the submitter as being consistent with other areas that have been removed from the current wetland areas. Given the significance of the mineral potential underlying these areas a fuller assessment of the identified wetland areas should be undertaken.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.54]

ELLP002 Lewis Pass

Decision Requested: 2.55

Submitter

5

BCG

Submission

P34 This is public land – why would the perimeter want to be changed?

Relief sought:

Object

Decision Requested: 2.56

Submitter

27

INTAF

Submission

P34 This is public land – why would the perimeter want to be changed?

Relief sought:
Object

HOCPO04 Candlelight Pakihi

Decision Requested: 2.57

Submitter 9 BRADG

Submission
Support in part.

Relief sought:

That the remaining mapped area on my property is removed from the Schedule 2 wetland classification.

The S32 map highlights the reason for removal being that the area is not a functioning wetland, it has conspicuous pasture development, under gone spraying for pest plants and sown with exotic grass seed.

As all the mapped areas of my farm has been modified in exactly the same way (subsurface drainage, pasture development, and sown with exotic grasses) it is unclear why only a portion is proposed to have the wetland classification removed. This area has no wetland values attached to it and should not be subject to the land use restriction imposed on wetland areas.

For consistency and workability all mapped wetlands areas on my farm should be removed.

BRUP003 Lake Poerua

Decision Requested: 2.58

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission
Support in part.

The landward boundary of the wetland on the margins of Lake Poerua may not follow the drain that has been constructed to intercept drainage from the farmland.

Relief sought:

Amend the Map for Wetland BRUP003 Lake Poerua by ensuring the landward boundary of this wetland follows the drain constructed to intercept water from the surrounding farmland.

HOKP005 Kapitea and Kumara Reservoir

Decision Requested: 2.59

Submitter 45 TRUSTP

Submission
Trustpower supports the proposed boundary adjustments of scheduled wetland HOKP005 as the areas marked to be deleted are not functioning wetlands and do not have any significant environmental values. These corrections involve small areas but enable landowners to utilise this land without needing to obtain resource consent.

Relief sought:

Trustpower seeks that the proposed changes to Scheduled Wetland HOKP005 (Kapitea and Kumara Reservoirs) are retained as notified in Plan Change 1.

HOKP009 Totara Lagoon

Decision Requested: 2.60

Submitter 33 MWC

Submission
Minerals West Coast supports the proposed removal of areas of the following wetland areas:

- HOKP009

HOKP018 Whiley Creek

Decision Requested: 2.61

Submitter

46

WVFL

Submission

Thank you for your letter dated 22 August 2016, we accept and appreciate the proposed removal of the Area as outlined and hatched in red from DOC's proposed Schedule 2 extended wetlands on Waiomou Valley Farms Runoff (map identification HOKP018).

Relief sought:

Our main request of clarification is whether Waiomou Valley Farms Limited can still retain access over the unformed road portion that will still be under schedule 2 wetland classification on our property to the back gated entry that already exists. This was discussed with D.O.C staff and we believed they were happy to grant us this ongoing right.

It would seem the legend that was presented with this letter should have read the "land to be removed" was from the proposed schedule 2 wetlands area that D.O.C. had initially proposed to take.

Decision Requested: 2.62

Submitter

36

PFL

Submission

I am replying to a letter received by Provis Family Farms in relation to a proposed wetland as indicated on a map attached to the proposal. I note that my father (A C Provis) the former land owner has received some correspondence in regard this wet land and I have to admit I am not familiar as to what has been agreed in regards to the area marked as wetland.

Relief sought:

I would like to suggest that the land as marker in blue on the map enclosed be removed from the classification as wetland as it doesn't really fall within this category for the following reasons:

- 1) The 4 darker lines (within the blue zone), on the map, are pilot drains which were dug in the 1970's. The ground is actually relatively dry, and unfortunately for us we have had difficulty even getting the sphagnum moss to grow.
- 2) We have planted a mixture of exotic and native trees (mainly totara trees) in this area which are at different stages with the plan to use them for fence posts and fire wood.
- 3) The valuable wetland is further back beyond the boundary, where there is some drainage, we hoped to have been able to put an access track along the boundary to cut off the water which drains out of the wetland by using the track as a dual access and barrier to the drainage of this area.

I hope you will consider this proposal, and I look forward to your reply. If you would like a tour of the area, I would be more than willing to do this.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.62]

HOKP086 Ross

Decision Requested: 2.63

Submitter

29

KAURI

Submission

Kauri 139 Ltd/ NZG Limited support the removal of part of HOKP086, however the current area of removal does not fully cover the areas that have been modified previously. Therefore an amendment is requested, this is reflected in the attached map.

Relief sought:

The removal area should be increased to cover the area shown on the attached map.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.63]

Decision Requested: 2.64

Submitter

33

MWC

Submission**Relief sought:**

- An increase in the area to be removed from HOKP086 to more fully capture land that has been developed prior to the notification of the Land and Water Plan.

The maps attached to this submission show the areas initially identified by the submitter as being consistent with other areas that have been removed from the current wetland areas. Given the significance of the mineral potential underlying these areas a fuller assessment of the identified wetland areas should be undertaken.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.64]

HOKP099 Little Houhou**Decision Requested: 2.65**

Submitter 12 CHIND

Submission

I have attached a plan showing the change I would like to see in place on land designated as RS. 1182. (HOKP009).

I would like to retain all land within the True Right of the existing waterway that backs onto my grazing area. Also would like to retain the area that forms the bird habitat adjacent to my grazing area.

This water way is a major component with the grazing areas as it helps in the drainage process throughout the top farm. This drain needs to be cleared at times to maintain flow. Also this drain starts at the top of my property then continues through the adjacent land so this access water needs to be controlled on my property.

The area within the bird habitat has been built up over the years to provide a small pond for all bird life to use and also assist in water flow in high rainfall.

The wetland area within RS. 1068 and RS.1150 has also been used to supplement my income by picking moss. I have been picking moss over 25 years in this area. I have sprayed the gorse, crushed the gorse and have picked moss at various places over a 5-6 year cycle. This I hope to continue for future generations.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 2.65]

Decision Requested: 2.66

Submitter 30 LOWEA

Submission

I oppose this section of the Plan as I am a landowner who has lost significant value of my property and also lost the option to build on this land; without any compensation offered.

Relief sought:

Withdraw the reclassification of my property, which is now useless to me as an investment, or arrange appropriate compensation for the loss of value.

HOKP100 Houhou Creek**Decision Requested: 2.67**

Submitter 39 SNOEN

Submission

Policy 6.3.2,
Methods 6.4.6, 6.4.7

I own part of the Schedule 2 wetland HOKP100 (DP386432, Lot 2 block XIII Waimea SD)

In the 4 years since the Plan was notified, to the best of my knowledge, no assessment has been made by the WCRC or the original proponents of the wetlands to assert their claim and determine whether the whole of HOKP100 meets the Schedule 3 criteria for inclusion as a wetland.

I note that for HOKP100;

- (a) To the best of my knowledge HOKP100 is a man made wetland, having been part of the pre 1840 Rimu/ Kahikatea forest in the early 1900's for timber.
- (b) The area at approx. 18 hectares is less than the 40 hectares minim for a Pakihi type wetland.
- (c) Located approx. 1km distance from Houhou Ck, the nearest significant waterway in the direction of general surface water drainage flow.
- (d) The area is bisected by a partially formed road serving power transmission lines.

Relief sought:

I urge WCRC to make a timely assessment.

HOKP107 Serpentine and Acre Creeks**Decision Requested: 2.68**

Submitter 14 DOC

Submission

Oppose.

The deletion of the triangular shaped part of the wetland is opposed as this wetland values are the same as the neighboring two blocks managed by DOC:

- Kumara Scenic Reserve;
- Kapitea Creek Stewardship Area.

The values are also the same as the adjacent Kumara Junction pakihi management unit and ecosystem asset.

Relief sought:

Amend the Map for Wetland HOKP107 Serpentine and Acre Creeks by including the triangular piece of wetland proposed to be excluded as a Schedule 2 wetland.

Decision Requested: 2.69

Submitter 21 FRIEG

Submission

I support the move to remove the land from Schedule 2 wetlands because they are not ecologically significant.

HOKP119 Lake Mudgie**Decision Requested: 2.70**

Submitter 23 GRIGA

Submission

I am in support of each separate provision because the land is not wetland and this areas been developed for a long time.

HAAP009 Okuru Estuary and HAAP012 Turnbull Waiatoto**Decision Requested: 2.71**

Submitter 15 ELWEP

Submission

HAAP009 and HAAP012

I oppose the removal of any wetland areas in the Hapuka river catchment or basin (Maps HAAP 009 and HAAP 012 Turnbull Waiatoto pages 74-75).

Reason:

Unlike other South Westland rivers, the Hapuka river and estuary upstream of the Jackson Bay road bridge never carries a high sediment load, and its water quality is high, despite the brown coloration, due to the tannin content derived from the peaty indigenous forests and wetlands which it drains, making it particularly unique in New Zealand, and especially vulnerable to any land development in its catchment.

Despite these features, the Hapuka river is perhaps the most publicly accessible relatively unmodified estuary of its type in New Zealand, and certainly on the West Coast.

The Hapuka estuary walk, which is wheel-chair accessible and maintained by the Department of Conservation (DOC), is one of the West Coast's premier self-guide nature walks, and the river itself, plus the tributary of Groper creek, may be

kayaked upstream for several kilometres on a high tide to experience magnificent and primeval rimu and kahikatea forests, (the latter indicative of swampy ground), including past the main and largest of the wetland sections proposed for excision from the schedule 2 wetland classification. The Hapuka is also a catchment where, upstream of the Jackson Bay road bridge, whitebaiting is prohibited, in further and official recognition of its unique and highly valuable conservation status.

In addition, eminent New Zealand naturalist Kerry-Jayne Wilson, of Charleston (Buller), in her highly regarded naturalist's guide to the West Coast, "West Coast Walking", confirms the high conservation values of this river and its catchment.

Within the past 7 days I have, by kayak, visited the area on the true right of the Hapuka river for which excision from schedule 2 is proposed, and can assure Council that it is wetland forest and scrubland, with mainly typical wetland indigenous vegetation such as kahikatea, manuka, cutty grass (sedges), small-leaved coprosmas, astelias, and occasional rimu. The trees are scattered, and most vegetation is indigenous scrub.

The proposed excisions imply opening the excised areas for development. Land development in the still undeveloped parts of the Hapuka river basin will impact negatively on their very high conservation values, and degrade the remarkable nature experience which visitors can expect, and which is promoted as one of Haast's attractions.

For these reasons, it is crucial that no changes be made to existing wetland boundaries within the Hapuka river catchment or basin.

Relief sought:

Therefore I request to Council, that all reaches of the river upstream of the road bridge be scheduled as schedule 1 wetland and removed from all land development pressures and activities, with a full recovery plan developed and applied for those sections which have been cleared and developed for pastoral use (true left of river upstream of road bridge as far as Groper creek confluence and true left of Groper creek).

Decision Requested: 2.72

Submitter

16

ESSEG

Submission

HAAP012 Turnbull

Specifically Sec 1 SO 394482 Pt SEC 1 SO11949

This section in Schedule 2 wetland also needs to be removed from the Plan as it was incorrectly added. There has never been an ecological study undertaken on the land that shows that this is wetland. A study would identify that this land was previously logged in the 1950's and is slowly regenerating. The land is also dry under drought conditions and does not have any of the species normally associated with a wetland. Unless a detailed report can show that this is a significant wetland then the council must remove this from the schedule.

Relief sought:

That Sec 1 SO 394482 Pt SEC 1 SO11949 be removed from the Schedule.

PART 3: CHANGES TO WETLAND KAGP008 TO RECOGNISE CULTURAL AND SPIRITUAL VALUES

KAGP008 Lake Kini

Decision Requested: 3.1

Submitter	38	RF&B
------------------	----	------

Submission

- It is inappropriate to remove areas of wetlands (KAGP008) from Schedule 2 of the Operative Plan to recognise local Ngai Tahu cultural and spiritual values.
The identification of significant wetlands occurs as a result of ecological criteria.
The recognition of matters in relation to s 6 (e) should occur elsewhere in the Plan to address the management of wetlands with cultural values and these values addressed through a consenting process.
- The tenure of the subject land needs to be established. If it is fully or in part land subject to the South Island Native Land Act (SILNA) the Environment Court (Environment Court A039/01 paras 147-148) has found that a rule in a Plan relating to SILNA land did not 'necessarily fail to take into account the Treaty of Waitangi.
- Forest and Bird submits regardless of whether it is SILNA land or not identifying a wetland as ecologically significant in the Plan and on land owned by iwi does not in itself fail to properly consider the Treaty nor does exempting the land from any Schedule or rule.

Relief sought:

Retain Schedule 2 wetland status in areas on map KAGP008 proposed to be removed to 'recognise local Ngai Tahu cultural and spiritual values'.

[Note that the full Environment Court decision was included with the submission and is included at appendix 2.]

PART 4: OTHER

Decision Requested: 4.1

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

Rule 29: Gravel Extraction

Is ambiguous at (iii). (i) and (ii) list sites on rivers that gravel can be extracted from but (iii) says that any other river can have 10cumecs extracted from it.

Relief sought:

It needs to be clarified that "any river" either includes rivers mentioned in Schedules A, B, or 12; or it doesn't.

Decision Requested: 4.2

Submitter 5 BCG

Submission

2 Definition of "ephemeral":

"Months", is far too long a time to consider such waterbodies to be ephemeral;

Relief sought:

Should be restricted to waterbodies (rivers) holding water from a period of days to weeks less than 1 month.

"Ephemeral", needs to include lakes as well as rivers.

Decision Requested: 4.3

Submitter 26 HENSR

Submission

Chapter 4. Land Management

Policy 4.3.4 To manage the maintenance of existing land drainage activity to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on receiving water bodies or property.

The need to maintain watercourses on our property so that the water can flow through unimpeded from higher elevated properties. SUPPORTED

Decision Requested: 4.4

Submitter 26 HENSR

Submission

Chapter 4. Land Management

Policy 4.3.10 To encourage the retention, maintenance, or planting of appropriate riparian vegetation.

Encourage the retention, maintenance, or planting of appropriate riparian vegetation. Enhancing water quality by stabilising the banks against erosion and by filtering and trapping the overland flow of sediment. Riparian vegetation also contributes to the maintenance of indigenous biological diversity by providing shade and keeping water cool and providing a source of food for aquatic life and by controlling exotic weed. SUPPORTED

Decision Requested: 4.5

Submitter 26 HENSR

Submission

Chapter 6. Wetland Management

Method 6.4.7

Schedule 1 and Schedule 2 were derived from two different planning processes. Where assessments of the wetlands in Schedule 2 demonstrate that the ecological criteria in Schedule 3 are met those wetlands should be included in Schedule 1. Equally, where the criteria are not met, those wetlands should be removed from Schedule 2. Changes to Schedule 1 and 2 to either include or remove wetlands will be the subject of a plan change process. SUPPORTED

Decision Requested: 4.6

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

Rule 29: Gravel Extraction

Is ambiguous at (iii). (i) and (ii) list sites on rivers that gravel can be extracted from but (iii) says that any other river can have 10cumecs extracted from it.

Relief sought:

It needs to be clarified that "any river" either includes rivers mentioned in Schedules A, B, or 12; or it doesn't.

Decision Requested: 4.7

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

2 Definition of "ephemeral":

"Months", is far too long a time to consider such waterbodies to be ephemeral;

Relief sought:

Should be restricted to waterbodies (rivers) holding water from a period of days to weeks less than 1 month.

"Ephemeral", needs to include lakes as well as rivers.

Decision Requested: 4.8

Submitter 27 INTAF

Submission

There are still typo errors in the Plan which I found when reading through in relation to these miscellaneous changes. I found 2 further to that which I collated above (in, Riparian Margins), although I have now lost the place they were. They were repetitive mistakes, using the same word/phrase, twice in the same sentence – somewhere in sections 3 to 5.

Decision Requested: 4.9

Submitter 15 ELWEP

Submission

I propose and request that council schedule the wetland located on Callery Flat, on the true left of the Arawhata river as a Schedule 2 wetland in the Proposed Plan Change.

Reason:

This wetland is a very large wetland in one of the largest, if not the largest, of the wide and open river valleys in South Westland. The Arawhata river has an iconic landscape, recreational and conservation status, and its catchment is home to rare and threatened bird species including the Haast Tokoeka, Kaka, Kea, Kakariki and NZ Falcon, and has exceedingly high conservation values.

For these reasons, this wetland should in the first instance receive schedule 2 status pending a schedule 3 assessment (Ecological Criteria for Significant Wetlands).

Decision Requested: 4.10

Submitter 33 MWC

Submission**Relief sought:**

- Removal of MAIP006 from within Minerals Mining Permit MP41646 given the level of previous modification within this area as evident on the attached aerial photograph.

The maps attached to this submission show the areas initially identified by the submitter as being consistent with other areas that have been removed from the current wetland areas. Given the significance of the mineral potential underlying these areas a fuller assessment of the identified wetland areas should be undertaken.

[Map submitted in support of submission is included at Appendix 1, D.R 4.10]

Decision Requested: 4.11**Submitter**

39

SNOEN

Submission

Chapter 6. Wetland Mangement

6.1 Introduction, paragraph 2 'It is intended over time ... assessment...'

While I support the concept of protecting wetlands I oppose the open ended authorisation manner in which 'wetland' designations have been imposed on individual private land owners by 'outside' groups.

Relief sought:

Amend 6.1 by adding the following words to the end of Paragraph 2 at the top of page 23 of the Plan;

'Where a formal Schedule 3 assessment has not been completed by 31 August 2017 to confirm the status of any Schedule 2 wetland, then all un assessed Schedule 2 wetlands shall by default be permanently removed from this operational Land and Water Plan and the status of such lands shall revert to their pre 2012 status.'

Submitter Address for Service

<p>Submitter 1: APML</p> <p>Anton Becker Ahaura Plains Moss Ltd. 3530 Main Road Ahaura 7843</p> <p>Email: abecker@minidata.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 2: ARNB</p> <p>Burnadette Arnold 2 Coates Terrace Rapahoe 7803</p> <p>Email: Bernie.m.arnold@hotmail.com</p>	<p>Submitter 3: ARND</p> <p>Deborah Arnold 69 Granville Road RD1 Blackball 7871</p> <p>Email: dmaarnold@xtra.co.nz</p>
<p>Submitter 4: BAGNS</p> <p>Steven Bagnall PO Box 37 Ahaura 7843</p> <p>Email: steve.bagnall@xtra.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 5: BCG</p> <p>Buller Conservation Group PO Box 463 Westport 7866</p> <p>Attention: Frida Inta</p> <p>Email: karearea.f@gmail.com</p>	<p>Submitter 6: BENNA</p> <p>Andrew Bennett 65 Bradshaws Road RD2 Westport 7892</p> <p>Email: Jan Coll - jan@cjc.co.nz</p>
<p>Submitter 7: BCML</p> <p>Birchfield Coal Mines Ltd. PO BOX 264 Greymouth 7840</p> <p>Attention: Karen Birchfield</p> <p>Email: birchcoal@snap.net.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 8: BFL</p> <p>Andrew and Jackie Campbell Bonar Farms Ltd. Private Bag 758 Hokitika 7842</p> <p>Email: acam@xtra.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 9: BRADG</p> <p>Gordon Bradley 99 Blair Road RD1 Dobson 7872</p> <p>Email: bradleyfarming@gmail.com</p>
<p>Submitter 10: BROM</p> <p>Mike and Wendy Brooks Kaihinu Farms Ltd. 82 One Mile Line Road RD2 Hokitika 7882</p>	<p>Submitter 11: COASTP</p> <p>Ian Aynsley Coastpak Three Mile RD2 Hokitika 7882</p> <p>Email: ian@besgrow.com</p>	<p>Submitter 12: CHIND</p> <p>Douglas Chinn 342 Kumara Junction Highway 3 Mile RD2 Hokitika 7882</p>
<p>Submitter 13: CWS</p> <p>Creative Water Solutions 13809 Industrial Park Blvd. Plymouth MN 55441 USA</p> <p>Attention: Gina Chavez Email: gchavez@cwsnaturally.com</p>	<p>Submitter 14: DOC</p> <p>RMA Shared Services Department of Conservation Private Bag 4715 Christchurch Mail Centre 8140</p> <p>Attention: Ken Murray Email: kmurray@doc.govt.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 15: ELWEP</p> <p>Paul Elwell-Sutton PO Box 99 Haast 7844</p> <p>Email: pelwellsutton@fastmail.fm</p>

<p>Submitter 16: ESSEG</p> <p>Gerarld Essenberg 29 Kotare Place South Bay Kaikoura 7300</p> <p>Email: gerry@kaikoura.govt.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 17: ESTGB</p> <p>Karen Boyd Est. of Graham Avenue Carters Beach Westport 7892</p>	<p>Submitter 18:EXOP</p> <p>Geoffrey Mansell Exotica Plants 368 Hodges Road Cordalba Queensland Australia 4660</p> <p>Email: geoff@exoticaplants.com.au</p>
<p>Submitter 19: FFNZ</p> <p>Federated Farmers of New Zealand PO Box 20448 Bishopdale Christchurch 8543</p> <p>Attention: Angela Johnston Email: ajohnston@fedfarm.org.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 20: FGWC</p> <p>Fish and Game West Coast PO Box 179 Hokitika 7842</p> <p>Attention: Dean Kelly Email: dkelly@fishandgame.org.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 21: FRIEG</p> <p>Graham Friend PO Box 405 Greymouth 7840</p>
<p>Submitter 22: GDC</p> <p>Grey District Council PO Box 382 Greymouth 7840</p> <p>Attention: Katrina Lee Email: katrina.lee@greydc.govt.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 23: GRIGA</p> <p>Andrew Grigg PO Box 206 Hokitika 7842</p> <p>Email: bushmanz2002@yahoo.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 24: HAYES</p> <p>Sean Hayes PO Box 183 Westport 7866</p>
<p>Submitter 25: HENRC</p> <p>Colin and Juliette Henry 31 Bonar Drive Hokitika 7810</p>	<p>Submitter 26: HENSR</p> <p>Richard Henschel PO Box 396 Christchurch 8140</p> <p>Email: getmail@greenmail.net</p>	<p>Submitter 27: INTAF</p> <p>Frida Inta PO Box 463 Westport 7866</p> <p>Email: karearea.f@gmail.com</p>
<p>Submitter 28: JONESB</p> <p>Brian Jones 4300 Karamea Highway RD3 Karamea 7893</p> <p>Email: cb.jones@farmside.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 29: KAURI</p> <p>Kauri 139 Ltd. /NZG Ltd. C/- Resource Solutions West Coast Ltd. PO Box 257 Greymouth 7840</p> <p>Attention: Phillip McKinnel Email: phil@rswc.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 30: LOWEA</p> <p>Allan Lowe 3314 Karamea Highway RD1 Westport 7891</p> <p>Email: gghannabee@hotmail.com</p>
<p>Submitter 31: MACBH</p> <p>Hamish Macbeth 4545 Karamea Highway RD3 Karamea 7893</p>	<p>Submitter 32: MARKA</p> <p>Alan Mark University of Otago Department of Botany PO Box 56 464 Gt King Street Dunedin 9054</p> <p>Email: alan.mark@otago.ac.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 33: MWC</p> <p>Minerals West Coast C/- Resource Solutions West Coast Ltd. PO Box 257 Greymouth 7840</p> <p>Attention: Phillip McKinnel Email: phil@rswc.co.nz</p>

<p>Submitter 34: OFT</p> <p>MJ & CE O'Regan Family Trust 223 O'Regans Road RD1 Reefton 7895</p> <p>Attention: Matthew O'Regan Email: mcoregan@ihug.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 35: PWNZ</p> <p>Garry Clark Pacific Wide (NZ) Ltd. PO Box 4334 Christchurch 8140</p> <p>Email: garry@besgrow.com</p>	<p>Submitter 36: PFL</p> <p>Provis Farms Ltd. 2 Pine Tree Road Kaniere Hokitika 7811</p> <p>Attention: Graham Provis</p>
<p>Submitter 37: RPN</p> <p>Ken Caldwell Rainbow Park Nurseries PO BOX 415 Drury 2247</p> <p>Email: ken@rainbowpark.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 38: RF&B</p> <p>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand PO Box 2516 Christchurch 8140</p> <p>Attention: Jen Miller Email: j.miller@forestandbird.org.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 39: SNOEN</p> <p>Nigel Sneop 233 Taylors Mistake Road Christchurch 8081</p> <p>Email: nigel_sneop@yahoo.com</p>
<p>Submitter 40: STRATW</p> <p>Warren Stratford PO Box 426 Westport 7866</p> <p>Email: warren@zelan.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 41: SUPERS</p> <p>Bruce Truman Spupersphag Ltd. 81 Granville Road RD1 Blackball 7871</p> <p>Email: btruman@xtra.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 42: TAPPM</p> <p>Mary Tapp 181 Jollie Street Hokitika 7810</p>
<p>Submitter 43: TAPPS</p> <p>Sam Tapp 181 Jollie Street Hokitika 7810</p>	<p>Submitter 44: TOPPG</p> <p>Gregory Topp PO Box 4 Reefton 7851</p> <p>Email: gregtopp@hotmail.co.nz</p>	<p>Submitter 45: TRUSTP</p> <p>Trustpower Private Bag 12023 Tauranga Mail Centre Tauranga 3143</p> <p>Attention: Trudy Richards Email: trudy.richards@trustpower.co.nz</p>
<p>Submitter 46: WVFL</p> <p>Waiomou Valley Farms Ltd. Head Office 36 Pakaraka Road RD2 Tirau 3485</p> <p>Attention: Gordon Blake Email: waiomouvalleyfarms@gmail.com</p>		