

THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL
SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING

Notice is hereby given of a Special Council Meeting of
THE WEST COAST REGIONAL COUNCIL
to be held in the Offices of
The West Coast Regional (Council Chambers), 388 Main South Road, Greymouth,
Tuesday, 7 August 2018, commencing at 10.30 a.m.

A.J. Robb
CHAIRMAN

M. Meehan
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

SUBMITTERS WISHING TO BE HEARD

Submission Number	Page	Name of Submitter	Issue
1	1-30	G. Rzesniowiecki	TPP
2	31 - 32	Buller District Council	Various
3	33-35	A Woods	Wasps
4	36-40	Federated Farmers	various
5	41-43	Andrew Hocken	Various
6	44	NZTA	Waiho
7	45 - 54	L. Grammer (withdrawn and replaced with a subsequent submission) – will phone in.	Various

Those with strike through have since advised that they no longer wish to speak to their submission

LATE SUBMITTERS WISHING TO BE HEARD

D. Hawes	Various
L. Grammer (updated submission)	Various

SUBMITTERS NOT WISHING TO BE HEARD

8	55	GDC	Want WCRC to raise a Tourism Rate
9	56 - 65	Tourism NZ	various
10	66 - 82	PSGR	Drinking water, fluoride, Genetic Engineering Glyphosate
11	83 - 97	Community & Public Health, West Coast	Various
12	98 - 99	Waikato Regional Council	Fish Passages
13	100 - 102	Active West Coast	Various
14	103 - 104	P. Elwell-Sutton	various
15	105 - 110	Frida Inta (withdrawn and replaced with a subsequent submission)	Various
16	111	Judith Boyle	Various
17	112 - 113	Westland District Council	Various, CDEM & Waiho
18	114 - 116	R. Arlidge	Climate Change
19	117 - 121	PSA	various
20	122 - 127	Toimata Foundation	Enviroschools

21	128 – 130	Westland Milk Products	Various
22	131 - 133	Tom Skinner	Various
23	134 - 135	A Eaves	Coastal Erosion
24	136 – 137	Clare Backes	Various
25	138 - 139	I Perkins	Various
26	140 - 141	Blue Penguin Trust	Various
27	142	T. Barke	Various
28	143 – 145	J. Caygill	Various
29	146 - 147	L. Burke	UAGC
30	148 - 149	A Wright	UAGC
31	150	C. May	UAGC
32	151	Fortuna Trust	1080 use
33	152 - 154	A.Kremer	Various
34	155	J. Williams	Waiho
35		C. Brooks	Waiho
36		N. McKone	Waiho
37	156	R. Richards	Waiho
38		G. Berry	Waiho
39		N. Frendrup	Waiho
40		T. Bruning	Waiho
41		J. Meldrum	Waiho
42		S. Tinirau	Waiho
43		H. Tinirau	Waiho
44		R. Sharp	Waiho
45		C. Goodall	Waiho
46	157 - 160	N. Hende / Monsoon Restaurant	Waiho
47	161 - 169	M. Warren / Global Sanctuaries Ltd <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10 Kamahi Crescent • 50 Greens Road • 56 Cron Street (56 Cron Ltd) • 24 Kamahi Crescent • 46 Cron Street 	Waiho
48	170 - 171	O. Morgan	Waiho
49	172 - 173	M. Nicholson	Waiho
50	174	M. Nolan	Waiho
51	175	B & T. Morris	Waiho
52	176	D. Burrows	Waiho
53	177	J. O'Loughlin / Alice May Restaurant	Waiho
54	178	J & M. Goodall/Te Koha Aotearoa Ltd	Waiho
55	179	Bronwyn Burrows	Waiho
56	180 - 181	Peter York	Waiho
57	182 - 183	Dianne Ferguson	Waiho
58	184 - 191	L. Skinner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paganini Road (Glacier Country Campervan park) • CBR No. 2 Ltd Director • Little Lamb Ltd, 5 Graham Place • West of Alps Trust, 7 Graham Place • 64 Cron Street (Franz Josef Tree Tops) • Franz Josef Campervan Park • 8 Graham Place (10 Cottages) • 15 Cowan Street (The Terrace Motel) 	Waiho
59	192 - 193	Paul Cumming	Waiho

60	194	I & K .Hartshorne	Waiho
61	195 – 196	W. Costello	Waiho
62	197 - 198	A.Haugh & Adam Haugh Ltd	Waiho
63	199 - 200	C. Lin <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 58 On Cron Motel • Punga Grove Motels 	Waiho
64	201 - 202	CMR Jones Trust	Waiho
65	203 - 205	Scenic Circle Hotel Group	Waiho & Various
66	206	M & O. Morris	Waiho
67	207 - 208	R & B. McLennan	Waiho

LATE SUBMITTERS NOT WISHING TO BE HEARD

P. Berry	Blackball Quarry
C. Robbins (Blackball Residents Assoc)	Blackball Quarry
P. Dennehy	Various
I Mulholland	Various
P. Perrott	Various

Trish Jellyman

From: West Coast Regional Council <noreply@wcr.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 6 August 2018 05:32
To: feedback
Subject: WCR Website - Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Submission Form ref: WCR-QF-180806-35WWC-ZVL

WCR Website - Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Submission Form

Reference: WCR-QF-180806-35WWC-ZVL

Attachment: not attached

First Name:: David

Surname:: Hawes

Postal Address:

66 Soldiers road
PO box 31

Email:: jaws@kinect.co.nz

Phone:: 0212695643

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?: Individual

I wish to present this feedback to the council in person at the hearing.: Yes

Is implementing a Uniform Annual General Charge the fairest way to smooth out the council's finances?: No

UAGC Comments:

This is effectively a poll tax and doesn't reflect benefit received in any way. Regional council benefits farming and high resource users far more than general householders and a progressive tax rather than this form of regressive taxation is the fair way to reflect this.

Do you support increasing our capacity and capability to provide a better response during an emergency?:

No

Civil Defence and Emergency Management comments:

The West Coast is a far too large a region to rely on a central emergency response base. Tyrannies of distance, (long and narrow) and single link roading, (no alternate routes), mean that a centralised CD and Emergency base would leave us exposed and vulnerable. Yours should be a role of information sharing co-ordinator and the District councils should be the primary Civil Defense and Emergency response units.

Do you support a Whole of Waiho Rating District?: not supplied

Whole of Waiho Rating District comments:

not supplied

Is outsourcing the management of the quarries, and ensuring a true user pays model, the best way to deliver the service in the future?: Yes

Quarry service delivery change comments:

not supplied

Do you support Council resourcing an extra engineer to better meet the needs of the community? Is the best way to fund this through the proposed changes to the quarry management?: No

Working with communities to manage Coastal Erosion Comments:

This core business should have progressed more than it has.

In your last LTP 2015-2018, you stated that one of your priority undertakings through this identified period was Westport flood planning, starting with community consultation.

You didn't even manage to achieve the consultation process, in fact it could almost be said that you didn't even initiate this.

You continue to bury your heads in the sand over Global climate change and sea level rise, factors that are accelerating rapidly and unless you accept this and develop plans accordingly, then I believe central government will need to step in, as this effectively mirrors ECan's water management woes that led to statutory management.

The management of this issue, will by nature, mean special rating districts will need to be established and this will increase rates for those affected. This is a major concern as affordability issues are bound to play a large role in how and what is delivered on the ground.

Central government advocacy is a major role of the Regional council and you should have this as a prime focus of yours over the immediate future in an attempt to meet these costs.

This is no different to the Central government buy out of the red zone in Christchurch.

Do you support, in principal, the expansion of the biodiversity/biosecurity special rate across the region?: No

Biodiversity/biosecurity special rate comments:

This is a central government responsibility and by engaging in this, you are taxing West Coasters twice. Department of Conservation is the vehicle provided and funded to undertake this work and I consider attempts to shadow this is extremely naive as the cost of gaining any marked difference would be enormous.

Again, this is at the expense of pensioners and low income people who should not be expected to fund such expansionist ideals.

To engage in this is nothing more than Empire building.

Additional comments:

Focus on your core business.

Trish Jellyman

From: Linda Grammer <linda.grammer@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, 6 August 2018 11:58
To: feedback
Cc: info
Subject: further submission by Linda Grammer in response to WCRC consultation document LTP 2018/28

att: draft Long Term Plan 2018/28 team
West Coast Regional Council
PO Box 66
Greymouth 7840

Further Submission to West Coast Regional Council
in response to WCRC "Long Term Plan Consultation Document 2018/28"
(after extension was given to submission period till midday Monday 6 August 2018)

Submission by:

Linda Grammer

Contact details:

Ms. L Grammer
PO Box 50
Westport 7866

email: linda.grammer@gmail.com

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission, so that together we can achieve sound environmental, economic and public health outcomes. I am a member of Rural Women NZ and the Buller Tramping Club.

I wish to be heard.

I am disappointed at the lack of emphasis in the WCRC LTP consultation document 2018/28 on the critically important issues of Sustainable Environment and Environmental Protection and the failure by council to even mention a Sustainable Futures vision or protection of Outstanding Landscapes (including Te Kuha above the Kawatere river).

In my view, protection of our unique ecosystems, natural character of these areas and Outstanding Landscapes, and remaining ecologically significant wetlands (and details on how to achieve these worthy aims) should be in the Long Term Plan. The distinctive character of our Natural Environment should be retained and the degraded water quality of the lower reaches of a significant number of streams and rivers on the West Coast. Adverse impacts affecting water purity including mining (acid mine drainage, sediment), farming (issues as a result of livestock not fenced out of waterways, dairy effluent, fertilizers, and pesticides), poor forestry practices (resulting in sediment, destabilisation of river/ stream banks), etc

I see on p. 26 of the WCRC Long Term Plan 2018/28 that there is one "Community Outcome" to do with the Environment "Environment: the high quality and distinctive character of our environment is retained."

In my view, however, WCRC is not doing enough to deliver on this community outcome. WCRC resource consent processes are obviously flawed, otherwise WCRC would never have given Stevenson Mining Ltd/ Rangitira Developments Ltd approval for resource consent/s for new open cast coal mine on Te Kuha, above Westport.

On p. 27 of the WCRC LTP 2018/28 it states:

"Resource consent processes help to ensure environmental matters are given due consideration by setting appropriate conditions on specific resource uses, in accordance with the policies set by council plans. Compliance monitoring work ensures the conditions set are adhered to."

In my view Council failed to give "environmental matters" on Te Kuha "due consideration" (an Outstanding Landscape on the north side of the Kawatere river, opposite the Bucklands Peaks/ northern Paparoa).

"Compliance monitoring work" will not help Te Kuha, as the proposed new open cast mine will destroy a large area of ecologically significant native forest- the home of rare endangered species and some endemic ones. This is unacceptable. It may be that other WCRC documents including the Regional Land and Water Plan, Regional Coastal Plan, Freshwater Management Plan, Regional Policy Statement etc have deficiencies in them (I understand that the West Coast proposed new Regional Policy Statement hearings will take place soon).

In my view, council's approach to Sustainable Development (briefly mentioned on p. 24 of the WCRC Long Term Plan 2018/28) does not achieve the right balance.

The WCRC decision and recommendations regarding Te Kuha has not "made sure that the quality of our environment is not unduly compromised."

In the section (p. 24 of the WCRC Long Term Plan 2018/28 document, which oddly is not described as a draft document) it states (under "Council's Approach to Sustainable Development") that "Council is committed to furthering our Community Outcomes for the betterment of the West Coast, and S14 (h) of the Local Government Act requires us to adopt a sustainable development approach, taking into account both socio-economic well being, environmental quality and the needs of future generations."

"Therefore much effort is spent on decision-making that achieves the right balance between:

- making sure the quality of our environment is not unduly compromised; and
- enabling economic development to occur relatively unconstrained by regulatory processes."

(end quote)

I note that Rangitira Developments Ltd's mining proposal is for an area that is the last, untouched portion of the highly unique Brunner coal measures, being part of the north-west Nelson Cretaceous peneplain. Coal mining has already caused extensive destruction to unique ecosystems in the Buller District, with toxins including heavy metals and acidic mine drainage adversely affecting downstream waterways* The Te Kuha area just to the north of the lower reaches of the Buller river, our local

streams and rivers, and the town of Westport must be protected from companies like Stevenson Mining/ Rangatira.

CLIMATE CHANGE

I am disappointed at insufficient detail in the WCRC LTP consultation document about how West Coast Region can minimize its contribution to harmful climate change (climate change threatens Westport, coastal communities and other West Coast ratepayers and residents).

I note that in the introduction to the WCRC LTP Consultation Document Andrew Robb (Chairman) and Mike Meehan (Chief Executive) state "There are also new opportunities arising, particularly in the space of biodiversity and biosecurity funding. The West Coast has a unique advantage in this area given the extent of indigenous flora and fauna here. We have a unique opportunity to capitalise on this while delivering some exceptional outcomes for our communities, districts and wider region."

And yet there is no mention of protecting Outstanding Landscapes or ecosystems of particular Ecological Significance. It is highly disappointing that WCRC did not act on its duty of care to the Environment and the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, by declining Stevenson Mining Ltd/ Rangitira Development Ltd's inappropriate application for resource consents (from WCRC) as part of a new open cast coal mine on public conservation lands of high ecological value on Te Kuha, in an Outstanding Landscape above Westport. I note that this application also puts at risk the Buller District Council "Water Conservation Reserve"- the source of Westport's water supply.

In my view, WCRC should advocate that the natural environment and Outstanding Landscapes are valued and protected. This would be in keeping with the "West Coast-Untamed Natural Wilderness" brand.

Sustainable environment

Land use, natural hazards, biodiversity, landscape/natural character, air and water quality, contaminated land, climate change and ecosystem services (soils, waterways,

public conservation land, etc) should be analysed (and natural assets protected and valued).

There are a number of planning challenges associated with any projected growth or proposed development (including on our valuable public conservation lands), which include proposed provision of infrastructure, managing cumulative effects of development on the environment, adverse impacts on waterways and soils, and implications for the productive potential of agricultural land.

Research and analysis should be undertaken on the environmental, social and cultural constraints and consequences of anticipated development, public conservation lands of high ecological value and Outstanding Landscapes must be protected.

The WCRC LTP 2018/28 should at least mention a clear strategy that integrates the key sustainability criteria contained within a Sustainable Environment concept (this should be further detailed in the various Regional Plans) - sustainable economy, environment, society and culture. This is in recognition that if development is to be beneficial to the region over the long term, it must not be at the expense of the natural environment.

There is some specific content in the WCRC LTP consultation document that I support including (in response to council's questions in the slim LTP 2018/28 consultation document)

#6 Working with communities to manage coastal erosion

YES I do support council resourcing an extra engineer. YES fund this through proposed changes to quarry management.

But council needs to do more to address activities in the West Coast that contribute to harmful climate change (which in turn contribute to the serious problem with coastal erosion). In my view council should not provide any resource consents to Stevenson Mining Ltd/ Rangitira Developments Ltd for a new open cast coal mine on our public conservation lands of high ecological significance at Te Kuha.

#8 Biodiversity/ biosecurity special rate

YES I support this, UNLESS it is for use of aerial 1080 (which I oppose). I particularly oppose aerial 1080 of easily accessible front country areas (council should support humane ground based feral control, which would provide ethical jobs for local people). I strongly support ground based feral control for suppression / eradication of feral pests.

I also OPPOSE the rate being used for any outdoor use of controversial risky GE/Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOS) or risky new genetic technologies including CRISPR and gene drive.

The Minister of Conservation Hon Eugenie Sage wisely opposes their use on our public conservation lands, or anywhere in New Zealand, stating on 5 December 2017 (NZ Herald) https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11952990

"Gene editing is an unproven technology for predator control. Gene technologies are problematic and untested and have significant risks.

"They have no social licence to operate. There is a lot at stake and there is a need for the utmost caution.

"There would be serious questions around the risks to New Zealand's GE Free reputation from being associated with any field trials of gene technology."

See also

Dr. Wayne Linklater's excellent 15 November 2017 article in the Dominion Post:

<https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/98856502/gene-editing-not-a-panacea-for-eradicating-wild-pests>

(Dr. Linklater is the Director, Centre for Biodiversity and Restoration Ecology, Associate Prof. of Conservation Science, Victoria University, Wellington.)

I would like to see some of the Biosecurity rate used by council to investigate the important Emerging Issue- the risks of outdoor use of GE/GMOs/ controversial new genetic technologies.

See below under EMERGING ISSUES. I support the more substantive submission by Physicians & Scientists for Global Responsibility Charitable Trust (NZ).

#9 I do support the Freshwater National Policy Statement work- well done. But I disagree where it states on p. 7 of the LTP consultation document "In general the West coast region enjoys good water quality throughout the region". High or good water quality is only in the headwaters/ upper reaches of rivers and streams. Downriver and downstream, contamination of beautiful west coast rivers and streams/ lowland waterways is widespread on the West Coast (as well as other areas of NZ), due to livestock including dairy effluent, acid mine drainage, sediment, fertilizers and pesticides, poor forestry practices.

I would like our lowland waterways protected to a higher standard, with WCRC compliance officers prosecuting those who breach consent orders.

I do not support #5 (One District Plan Local Government Commission Proposal)

EMERGING ISSUES

An important emerging issue is the risks of outdoor use of GE/ Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) and controversial risky new genetic technologies including gene drive and CRISPR.

As a primary producer, I urge council to investigate this issue and place (at the very least) a strong precautionary GE/GMO policy in the new Long Term Plan (as many Regional or Unitary Authorities have already done in Northland, Auckland, and Bay of Plenty). I am delighted that my former councils (Whangarei District Council and Northland Regional Council) have (along with all councils from south Auckland to Cape Reinga in the Far North) put in place strong precautionary and prohibitive GE/GMO provisions, policies, objectives and rules.

See
<http://www.wdc.govt.nz/PlansPoliciesandBylaws/Plans/Genetic-Engineering/Pages/default.aspx>
for details of the good work of the Northland/ Auckland "Inter Council Working Party on GMO Risk Evaluation & Management Options"***

There is an urgent need for WCRC to address this important issue as Northland Regional Council (in the Northland Regional Policy Statement), Bay of Plenty Regional Council, Auckland Unitary Plan, Nelson City Council, Hastings District Council etc have already done in various plans including Long Term Plans, District Plans, Regional Policy Statements, and Unitary Plans.

Various councils good work (to create a much needed additional tier of local protection against the risks of outdoor use of GE/GMOs) is necessary given serious deficiencies in the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act, as identified by Local Government NZ, many councils and primary producer boards. Deficiencies in HSNO include no mandatory requirement for the EPA to take a precautionary approach to outdoor GE/GMO applications and inadequate liability provisions.

The Case law is clear (with Principal Environment Court Judge Newhook's recent unequivocal 12 April 2018 decision in favour of appellant Whangarei District Council and respondent Northland Regional Council) and the jurisdictional issue settled (that local councils can put in place bans on outdoor use of GE/GMOs or stricter controls than HSNO Act requires).

Both the High Court and Environment Court have ruled that regional (and district) councils have jurisdiction under the Resource Management Act (RMA) to regulate the use of GMOs through regional policy statements or plans. The recent RMA amendments (Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017, in which Parliament recognises that local councils can create enforceable GE Free Zones) further entrench the legal rights of councils to do so.

As you may be aware, the new National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) bans the use of/ planting any GE trees/ rootstocks in NZ. Both global certification bodies for truly sustainable forests (FSC and PEFC)

prohibit the use of any GE trees, due to the serious ecological risks, adherence to the Precautionary Principle, and market aversion.

I am aware that here on the West Coast the proposed Regional Policy Statement (RPS) is well under way, with (unfortunately) no opportunity for further submissions at this time.

But it would a great start if council would place a strong precautionary GE/GMO policy in the new Long Term Plan 2018/28.

Council needs to act on its duty of care to its farmers/ primary producers and other ratepayers and the environment/ our biosecurity. The valuable enterprises of existing GM free primary producers (conventional, IPM and organic) need protection from the risks of transgenic pollution/ GMOs. Farmers and other primary producers need ongoing access to key markets and premiums (many discerning customer unhappy with even trace GE contamination). Councils and their ratepayers need protection from unintended and unforeseen adverse impacts of EPA approved outdoor GE experiments and releases.

NZ has a valuable "Zero Tolerance Policy" for any GE content in imported seeds, including adventitious presence. However, at any point, a overseas multinational, NZ Crown Research Institute, or private company can apply to the EPA for an outdoor GE experiment/ field trial, conditional release or full release of a GMO on the West Coast. Transgenic contamination does not respect boundaries and may well be irreversible.

Council needs to act- doing nothing about the risks of GE/GMOs is not an option, and may cost council and its ratepayers many millions of dollars in attempting to clean up unwanted transgenic contamination. Three major reports commissioned by the Northland/ Auckland "ICWP on GMOs" have identified a range of risks involved with the trailing and release of GMOs. These also include approaches to managing those risks, including outright

bans and additional requirements (including the posting of bonds) on top of what the HSNO Act/ EPA requires.

RECOMMENDATION: Local Government Act

I ask council to support the Local Government (Four Well Beings) Amendment Bill by Local Government Minister Hon Nanaia Mahuta, which would amend the Local Government Act (LGA) 2002 to reinstate the references to social, environmental, cultural, and economic well-being that were inappropriately removed by the National Party (when in government in 2012).

The "four well-beings" were a very important part of the LGA 2002 when it was put in place in 2003. The "four well-beings" ensure that local councils manage natural and physical resources in a truly sustainable manner and act on their duty of care to their constituents/ local communities.

Thank you for the opportunity to submit. I wish to be heard.
Please notify me of all hearings.

Sustainability Vision

"Our productive and diverse rural environment - supporting communities, protecting the environment, the soils and waterways which underpin all primary production on the West Coast, unique and Outstanding landscapes, and endangered native species (like Hector's dolphins), and a thriving economy based upon truly sustainable primary production, eco-tourism, protection of marine mammal species like Hector's dolphins on our coast, and other sustainable businesses and industries."

In this vision 'productive' is defined as primary and secondary industries including farming, horticulture, forestry, dairy processing, quarrying, recreation, eco-tourism and manufacturing. It also includes our biodiversity and productive ecosystems as these are equally important to the health and wellbeing of communities and the economy.

*

WATER QUALITY- DEGRADATION THAT WOULD BE CAUSED BY THE PROPOSED MINE

Te Kuha waterways are unmodified and of high value (and should remain this way).

The proposed mine would cause degradation of the Westport Water Conservation Reserve and toxic discharges to side creeks and the Kawatiri/ Buller river. Stevenson Mining Ltd's own aquatic ecologist stated (when he gave evidence at the Westport hearing):

"The mine would discharge extra sediment and heavy metals into tributaries of West and Camp creeks which become part of Coal creek and discharge into the Buller River."- Ian Boothroyd, 19 September 2017 Westport News

Large-scale opencast mining in particular permanently changes natural landscapes and destroys high value ecological areas. It can result in significant water pollution. The loss of habitat means the loss of aquatic habitat and associated aquatic flora and fauna (which is unacceptable).

The proposed mine access road would be through a mix of old-growth indigenous forests on the lower slopes leading up to the plateau, and the indigenous shrublands and herb fields characteristic of the Buller plateau, crossing wild, beautiful and unmodified streams carrying the purest water.

The adverse effects to the Te Kuha waterways include but are not limited to: Loss of pristine, beautiful waterways (also visited and enjoyed by trampers and hunters), loss of quiet enjoyment, loss of water quality, loss of indigenous aquatic species and habitat, adverse impacts on the water quality of the Buller River, with potential negative implications for white baiting. I am mindful of what has happened to the beautiful Ngakawau river (below an existing mine site), which is still (despite recent best practice efforts to clean up the river) highly degraded.

** Northland/ Auckland "Inter Council Working Party on GMOs"- Risk Evaluation and Management Options

The Inter-Council Working Party on Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO) Risk Evaluation and Management Options was established to respond to community concerns in the Northland region about GMOs. The Far North, Whangarei, and Kaipara District Councils, Auckland Council and Northland Regional Council are represented on the working party.

Three major reports commissioned by the Working Party have identified a range of risks involved with the trialling and release of GMOs. They also include approaches to managing those risks.

Environmental risks

- GMOs becoming invasive and affecting non-target species including indigenous flora and fauna
- the development of herbicide or pesticide resistance creating 'super-weeds' or 'super-pests'
- long term effects on ecosystem functioning.

Socio-cultural risks

- effects on Maori cultural beliefs of whakapapa, mauri, tikanga
- ethical concerns about mixing genes from different species including human genes
- concerns about the long term safety of genetically engineered food.

Economic risks

- loss of income through contamination (or perceived contamination) of non-GMO food products
- negative effects on marketing and branding opportunities such as 'clean and green' or 'naturally Northland'
- costs associated with environmental damage such as clean-up costs for invasive weeds or pests.

Linked to these risks are limited liability provisions under the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms (HSNO) Act 1996.

West Coast Regional Council

Long Term Plan Consultation Document

2018 - 2028



Your details

First name: Paul

Surname: Berry

Postal address:

Email: l.pmoonlight@extra.co.nz

Phone: 7323 856

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation? (tick one)

Individual Organisation

Organisation (if applicable):

I wish to present this feedback to the Council in person at the hearing. (tick one) Yes No

You will be notified of when the hearing date is.

Signed: P. Berry

Note that your submission and any information you supply as part of your submission is considered public information and will be available in reports and documents relating to this process and may be published on our website. Only submissions on proposals in the consultation document will be considered by the Council.

i The underlying information supporting this Consultative Document can be accessed on the Council's website www.wcrc.govt.nz/ltp/underlyinginformation

Your feedback

1 Implementing a Uniform Annual General Charge

Q. Is implementing a UAGC the fairest way to smooth out Council's finances?

Please tick your preferred option Option 1 Option 2

Comment/Feedback:
start with \$30-

2 Civil Defence and Emergency Management

Q. Do you support increasing our capacity and capability to provide a better response during an emergency?

Please tick your preferred option Option 1 Option 2

Comment/Feedback:
you must be joking
\$1260 - per year,
6 extra staff plus
6 extra vehicles
This is a Govt role
the same as Fire Service

3 Whole of Waiho Rating District

Q. Do you support a Whole of Waiho Rating District?

Please tick your preferred option Option 1 Option 2

Comment/Feedback:



Note that this proposal affects only those within the Franz Josef, Lower Waiho Rating Districts and surrounding area (refer map page 3)

4

Quarry Service Delivery Change

Q. Is outsourcing the management of the quarries, and ensuring a true user pays model, the best way to deliver this service in the future?

Please tick one Yes No

Comment/Feedback:

- 1) Blackball to be made safe before sale (overhang)
- 2) proven attributes for Quarry Service Delivery and rock on the floor
- 3) need accurate of true quarry costs so comments will have real meaning

6 Working with communities to manage Coastal Erosion

Q. Do you support Council resourcing an extra engineer to better meet the needs of the community? Is the best way to fund this through the proposed changes to quarry management?

Please tick one Yes No

Comment/Feedback:

- 1) use Govt funding through Envirolink
- 2) Quarry Fees are to win rock on the floor only and not subsidize other activities

8

Biodiversity / Biosecurity Special Rate

Q. Do you support, in principal, the expansion of the biodiversity/biosecurity special rate across the region?

Please tick one Yes No

Comment/Feedback

- 1) There are already other contestable avenues to gather funding.
- 2) This is definitively not a R.C. role.
- 3) We still pay other levies for possum control to eradicate T.B.
- 4) our other Biosecurity is on farm then Vets after that M.P.I.

Trish Jellyman

From: West Coast Regional Council <noreply@wrc.govt.nz>
Sent: Thursday, 2 August 2018 09:30
To: feedback
Subject: WCR Website - Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Submission Form ref: WCR-QF-180802-5J7VZ-173N

WCR Website - Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Submission Form

Reference: WCR-QF-180802-5J7VZ-173N

Attachment: not attached

First Name:: Cynthia

Surname:: Robins

Postal Address:

26 Hart St

Email:: blackballresidentsassociation@gmail.com

Phone:: 03 7324705

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?: Organisation

I wish to present this feedback to the council in person at the hearing.: No

Is implementing a Uniform Annual General Charge the fairest way to smooth out the council's finances?: No

UAGC Comments:

not supplied

Do you support increasing our capacity and capability to provide a better response during an emergency?:

not supplied

Civil Defence and Emergency Management comments:

not supplied

Do you support a Whole of Waiho Rating District?: not supplied

Whole of Waiho Rating District comments:

not supplied

Is outsourcing the management of the quarries, and ensuring a true user pays model, the best way to deliver the service in the future?: not supplied

Quarry service delivery change comments:

The Blackball Community has partnered with the Dept Internal Affairs for 5 years as a Community Led Development Programme, this will assist the Blackball Community to work towards getting ready for the opening of the Paparoa Track and Pike 29 Memorial Track and other community initiatives. We have planned to repoint the chimney at the Blackball Mine Site and funding has been allocated to the Blackball Blackball Quarry, Community to get this work completed. It would be counter-productive to commence quarrying again after the restoration and potentially cause further damage from blasting. We can already hear blasting from the Roa Mine some 12 kilometres away, to blast in a quarry so close to the Blackball township would be irresponsible. We also have concerns about sediment in Fords Creek which is one of the finest examples of a mudstone canyon in New Zealand and the Community would like to develop this further as a tourist experience. The Blackball Quarry has been disused for a number of years, we understand that it is no longer a viable quarry with poor quality rock, as it is already DOC land with the WCRC having a licence and an historic access agreement,

perhaps it is time to alter the use of the land and close the quarry. This would protect the Blackball Mine Site which is a Category 1 Heritage site so is of significant historical value.

With the projected opening of The Paparoa Track and the Pike 29 Memorial Track in 2019 we believe that vulnerable visitors (cyclists and pedestrians) will be put at risk by any increase in heavy traffic on a narrow road, further quarrying would have a detrimental effect on a positive visitor experience.

Cynthia Robins

Chairperson

Blackball Residents Association Trust

Do you support Council resourcing an extra engineer to better meet the needs of the community? Is the best way to fund this through the proposed changes to the quarry management?: not supplied

Working with communities to manage Coastal Erosion Comments:

not supplied

Do you support, in principal, the expansion of the biodiversity/biosecurity special rate across the region?: not supplied

Biodiversity/biosecurity special rate comments:

not supplied

Additional comments:

not supplied

have
your
say

West Coast Regional Council Long Term Plan Consultation Document

2018 - 2028



Your details

First name: Peter

Surname: Dennehy

Postal address:

2947 Whataroa Highway
RD 1, Whataroa 7886

Email: pete.sonia@xtra.co.nz

Phone: 027 7177023

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation? (tick one)

Individual Organisation

Organisation (if applicable):

I wish to present this feedback to the

Council in person at the hearing. (tick one) Yes No

You will be notified of when the hearing date is.

Signed:

Peter J Dennehy

Note that your submission and any information you supply as part of your submission is considered public information and will be available in reports and documents relating to this process and may be published on our website. Only submissions on proposals in the consultation document will be considered by the Council.



The underlying information supporting this Consultative Document can be accessed on the Council's website
www.wcrc.govt.nz/ltp/underlyinginformation

Your feedback

1 Implementing a Uniform Annual General Charge

Q. Is implementing a UAGC the fairest way to smooth out Council's finances?

Please tick your preferred option Option 1 Option 2

Comment/Feedback:

We need to spread the load equally of \$50 + gst. This is a fair way of doing this.

2 Civil Defence and Emergency Management

Q. Do you support increasing our capacity and capability to provide a better response during an emergency?

Please tick your preferred option Option 1 Option 2

Comment/Feedback:

Why do farmers always have to pay alot more than other. There is a huge difference between \$12 pla and \$220 pla This could be smaller difference.

Submission Form

3 Whole of Waiho Rating District

Q. Do you support a Whole of Waiho Rating District?

Please tick your preferred option Option 1 Option 2

Comment/Feedback:

Yes totally agree.

We have land south of the bridge and we are currently losing land to the Waiho river.



Note that this proposal affects only those within the Franz Josef, Lower Waiho Rating Districts and surrounding area (refer map page 3)

4

Quarry Service Delivery Change

Q. Is outsourcing the management of the quarries, and ensuring a true user pays model, the best way to deliver this service in the future?

Please tick one Yes No

Comment/Feedback:

If rock becomes unaffordable then what is the long term outcome.

No rock
We believe this needs to be kept in house and subsidised.
(See our answer in question 6)

6 Working with communities to manage Coastal Erosion

Q. Do you support Council resourcing an extra engineer to better meet the needs of the community? Is the best way to fund this through the proposed changes to quarry management?

Please tick one Yes No

Comment/Feedback:

We don't agree with the ~~proposed~~ quarry service.

It is not in the best interests of the community who live with rivers.

When it gets so expensive, some people opt out and it leaves other with more expense and with gaps holes ~~in~~ along the river which can be breached.

It makes the other people

8

Biodiversity / Biosecurity Special Rate

Q. Do you support, in principal, the expansion of the biodiversity/biosecurity special rate across the region?

Please tick one Yes No

Comment/Feedback:

Probably unaffordable.

Any other comments/feedback

As farmers we already pay tens of thousands in rates. We believe we already pay enough without it becoming a free for all - for councils to keep increasing our amount depending on capital value. We cannot even sell our farms - at the ~~rate~~ capital value. Our farms have decreased in value.

We see our farm rates as subsidising the work in Hokitika or elsewhere.

~~Very very little money has ever come whatabouted~~

Instead of council being proactive with the Waiho river in Franz, they are being reactive. The Milton stopbank, on the south side, is in urgent need of an upgrade → to save the whole south side, Waiho frst. ratepayers.

How can you have your say?

have
your
say



Your submission must arrive at the Regional Council by 4.00pm, 26 July 2018.



Feedback can be provided by either:

Online: www.wcrc.govt.nz/ltp By email: feedback@wrc.govt.nz

By post: Use this form to make your comments: pull out of the Consultation Document, fill in, fold along the dotted lines, secure, and freepost back to Council.

388 Main South Road, Paroa
PO Box 66, Greymouth 7840

freephone: 0508 800 118

phone: 03 768 0466

email: feedback@wrc.govt.nz



THE WEST COAST
REGIONAL COUNCIL

wrc.govt.nz



Trish Jellyman

From: Ian Mulholland <ian2mulholland@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, 5 August 2018 23:17
To: feedback
Subject: Ian Mulholland submission to West Coast Regional Council

Submission to WCRC by:

Ian Mulholland
PO Box 50
Westport 7866

to the WCRC Long Term Plan Consultation Document 2018-28

Contact phone:
027 771 342

Best contact:

email: ian2mulholland@hotmail.com

SUPPORT

Working with communities to manage coastal erosion- yes I support

-council resourcing an extra engineer

-funding this through proposed changes to quarry management

-more effort by council to address climate change (and reduce the contribution of the region to harmful climate change)

I am very concerned about increasing extreme weather, violent storms.

I support a biodiversity / biosecurity fund

totally support ground based feral control to kill possum, stoats, weasles, rats but totally OPPOSE any use of aerial 1080

In my view, the WCRC factory at Rollseton, Canterbury should be shut down.

Aerial 1080 is a cruel poison, has considerable bykill of native birds, also impacts on farming communities/ hunters, killing/ harming dogs, pigs, deer

I want to see a strong precautionary GE/GMO policy in the Long Term Plan 2018/28
ie. a precautionary policy prohibiting the outdoor use of Genetically Modified Organisms

Thank you for receiving my submission, keep me informed.

I do not wish to be heard.

Trish Jellyman

From: West Coast Regional Council <noreply@wrc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, 6 August 2018 10:19
To: feedback
Subject: WCR Website - Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Submission Form ref: WCR-QF-180806-62G6E-11NZ

WCR Website - Long Term Plan 2018-2028 Submission Form

Reference: WCR-QF-180806-62G6E-11NZ

Attachment: not attached

First Name:: Phil

Surname:: Perrott

Postal Address:

117 Torea St

Email:: phil@perrott.co.nz

Phone:: +6437828664

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?: Individual

I wish to present this feedback to the council in person at the hearing.: No

Is implementing a Uniform Annual General Charge the fairest way to smooth out the council's finances?: No

UAGC Comments:

This is a disgrace. 1/. Almost no effort has been made to make ratepayers aware of this provision. 2/. Once introduced it is capable of increase also without warning. 3/. In this area there is no excuse for an increase. 4/. Control costs as the population has no appetite for increases of whatever magnitude.

Do you support increasing our capacity and capability to provide a better response during an emergency?:

No

Civil Defence and Emergency Management comments:

Civil Defence was previously covered by District Councils and that is where funds should come from. So far the Civil Defence performance has proved to be totally abysmal. Total lack of effective planning, training, warning systems, equipment, manpower.

Fire Service is better placed to perform this function.

Do you support a Whole of Waiho Rating District?: not supplied

Whole of Waiho Rating District comments:

no view

Is outsourcing the management of the quarries, and ensuring a true user pays model, the best way to deliver the service in the future?: not supplied

Quarry service delivery change comments:

no view

Do you support Council resourcing an extra engineer to better meet the needs of the community? Is the best way to fund this through the proposed changes to the quarry management?: No

Working with communities to manage Coastal Erosion Comments:

WCRC has far too many staff as it is,

Do you support, in principal, the expansion of the biodiversity/biosecurity special rate across the region?: No

Biodiversity/biosecurity special rate comments:

No. WCRC performance is totally inaequate in all functions.

Additional comments:

The conversion of the WCRC Headquarters into a Geriatric Hospital would be an ideal solution for your functions. The current CEO could very easily perform the function of Matron whilst the elected councillors could be the first customers.

WCRC LTP 2018

Submission from:

Frida Inta,

P O Box 463,

Westport,

Buller 7866.

email: karearea.f@yahoo.com

ph: 03 782 1813

I do not wish to be heard.

This submission replaces my earlier submission. Issues 1 to 10 remain the same. Below Issue 10 there is, "Further Issues", that I would like to have WCRC consider also.

1. General rate:

The core functions of a regional council are (RMA, s30(1)):

- the integrated management of natural and physical resources;
- the use, development or protection of regionally significant land;
- ensuring there is enough housing and business land to meet the needs of the future;
- soil conservation;
- protecting water quality and quantity;
- overseeing issues with natural hazards and contaminated land;
- controlling discharges;
- maintaining indigenous biodiversity.

From this list it appears to me that ratepayers should be charged by land value not capital value.

The WCRC has other options if it wants to increase the take from ratepayers:

1. Ratepayers contributions should be assessed more on land value than either capital value or a flat rate through the region.
2. Calculate what percentage of core services are either spatially or demographically-based and then base rate take on that percentage weighting (could be a little

complicated and the results debatable).

3. Have a targeted increase in either a land value rate or capital value rate in increments over a number of years whilst keeping any UAGC small; or
4. Have no UAGC but base a targeted land value rate or capital value rate rise, in annual increments, to (according to the consultation document) hedge against global financial volatility.
5. Before any UAGC rate is implemented more information needs to be made public such as mail-outs to all ratepayers in the region, giving more detail than this consultation document gives, so we all can be involved in making this decision.

Rates on my property would go up around 100%, I find this unacceptable. No doubt some properties would have greater than 100% rate rise (empty sections?). The proposed rate will be harder on those who can least afford it.

2. CD and EM:

I have good information to say that these people have already been employed, that there is already a hazards analyst and a regional director, also 3 district council CD and EM staff. If these roles are already filled why are we being asked about these roles retrospectively?

Robert Mallinson, WCRC corporate services manager, said,

"Yes they have (already been employed). This proposal is about expansion of the Group Welfare Response capability and providing funds for hazard investigation work."

In which case Proposal 2 is not at all explanatory of the status quo nor of exactly what is intended.

In response to the question:

Do you support increasing our capacity and capability to provide a better response during an emergency?

I believe that in response to the 2 severe weather-related incidents this year a stellar effort was made by local councils with the CD and EM capability that was already in place.

Ratepayers do not need further financial burden but rather need financial relief in order to be able to function more capably during emergencies. Emergencies are not only about the council officers involved but about us, the people, and our capabilities to respond physically and intelligently as individuals. Thus I do not support further expansion of CD and EM capability.

3. Waiho:

Any significant geological structure needs to be protected from river management. Notable is the internationally important Waiho Loop, but there will be others in this geologically important area that will also need to be protected.

4. Quarries:

I think it is good that all WCRC ratepayers subsidize to some extent specific rock protection works. It really is the fault of the Crown and the extant property ownership structure, that people have bought and are living in, seaside properties which are now being inundated by the sea. The West Coast, as a caring community, should help subsidize protection works to take the burden off these maligned ratepayers.

If the WCRC quarry manager was responsible for the decapitation of Lookout Point at Whitehorse Creek/ Fox River then it is time he retired.

The most important issue is that quarry work is properly supervised to ensure compliance with consent conditions. Outsourcing quarry work may make this goal less achievable as private companies may be less accountable.

Privatisation is often not the best outcome for ratepayers.

WCRC should retain its quarries and install a new quarry manager.

I oppose paying another engineer through changes to quarry procedures.

It has been suggested (WCRC RMA meeting minutes, possibly Cr Birchfield) that the WCRC consider relaxing the gravel extraction policies implemented in 2016, which included a new monitoring and compliance charge. I cannot stress enough the importance of retaining these measures. Gravel extractors have been allowed to override their consent conditions grievously for far too long, resulting in coastal starvation, serious, choking sedimentation of river substrates leading to lower aquatic diversity, serious destruction of indigenous riparian margins which are important habitat and corridors for birds, and introduction and proliferation of undesirable weeds. Extractors' consents do not allow them to degrade the environment in which they extract so monitoring and enforcement needs to ensure compliance with conditions. The new policies brought in in 2016 need to continue.

5. One District plan:

Consistency across districts on the West Coast will be beneficial to all people, activities and businesses concerned.

Unique policies tied to each of the three districts due to their slightly different geographical and cultural settings will be an important inclusion in a united district plan.

Development and administration of the plan should not be the domain of the WCRC.

Creating the unified plan should be overseen and administered by a committee of planners from the three district councils, the number of planners from each council based on population of the district.

6. Coastal erosion:

It is foolhardy to divorce the serious coastal erosion that the West Coast is experiencing from global climate change and the need to address its underlying causes.

Just as New Zealand produces about 0.01% or less of global climate-warming gases, the West Coast possibly produces a small fraction of our national emissions. We should not justify not acting on these emissions due to making little difference in the big picture. We all have to be accountable for our actions, including our emissions' footprint.

Our regional council needs to show leadership here to address the underlying causes of this coastal erosion by firstly endorsing the Zero Carbon Bill and then taking a leading role in adopting not only the bill (or at a later stage the Act) but by also leading on it. The WCRC needs to produce a discussion paper for our region on zero carbon in order to create objectives, policy and rules.

Employing another engineer: WCRC has not provided any detail on why another engineer is needed.

Are the 2 engineers WCRC already employs civil engineers?

Are they capable of assessing and implementing solutions to coastal erosion and other climate-related engineering issues?

What would be the relationship of another engineer with contracting consultants? i.e. how many, if any, consultants would another engineer replace? i.e. how cost-effective would employing another engineer be?

Mr Mallinson said,

"It would be totally inappropriate for me to comment on the merits and capabilities of individual Council staff."

These are reasonable questions, the answers to which should be in the consultation document so that we, the ratepayers, can provide informed answers to the questions put to us.

If the WCRC sees the need to employ an engineer with a specialist discipline e.g. a

coastal hazards engineer, which speciality perhaps WCRC engineers do not have, then that is a valid argument. If a further engineer would be cost-effective in replacing costly consultations then that would also be a valid argument.

Until this information is provided it is futile to speculate on the best way forward.

Managed retreat is an awful future for many seaside dwellers. These people need financial help to relocate.

7. Staff hourly rate:

Mileage charges are a more honest approach. A better method than the WCRC proposes would be to accumulate mileage and then spread the charge across consents according to the wealth of the resource consented for, so those in remote areas would be subsidized. If staff hourly rate is increased then the mileage goes into the pockets of the staff involved, not the council - this appears to me a bizarre way of charging mileage. Or perhaps I am misinterpreting, the staff are not paid that but applicants are charged that hourly rate. Perhaps a better way of expressing it would be the hourly processing charge rather than staff rate.

8. Biodiversity Rate:

I am opposed to the use of 1080 in easily accessible areas. I would not support the implementation of a biodiversity rate on that basis. In particular the WCRC has a strong interest in a 1080 factory in Rolleston which I am strongly opposed to, both to the secret process by which that factory was set up, and its intended use. There is a possibility that the biodiversity rate could help fund that factory's costs and feather its output. From that viewpoint I am opposed to the biodiversity rate.

If the rate was used only for genuine, grass-roots trapping I would support it.

9. Freshwater:

You say,

" In general the West Coast region enjoys good water quality throughout the region".

It is true that most waterways in the conservation estate run clean but the same cannot be said of lowland waterways, which waterways are compromised by dairy effluent, pesticides and fertilizers, both run-off and point source, acid mine drainage, and sediment. I can cite numerous instances where the WCRC has refused to take action on poor water quality due to any of these water quality issues. All it requires often is ensuring that consent holders comply with their conditions; this does not require extra staff, it requires

compliance officers to either have the education to recognise breaches or have the intellectual strength to acknowledge and act on those breaches in order to ensure that our waterways are clean. If WCRC compliance officers were thus capable, our lowland waterways would be much the better. Tertiary environmental science qualifications were instated through New Zealand universities following the implementation of, and to complement, the RMA. The basic qualification of any compliance officer should be a tertiary qualification in environmental science or other complementary discipline. Anything less undermines the practical implementation of the RMA.

10. Economic Development:

The emphasis of the regional West Coast has been on mining. Diversity needs to occur. The West Coast Community needs to accept that there will be no new mining on conservation land and then get on with future plans that incorporate that status. This fact needs to be reflected in regional growth studies and programmes.

Further issues:

1. **Emerging issues:**

Genetic Engineering/ Genetically Modified Organisms:

A number of years ago, when the GE issue was fresh, and Pat O'Dea was mayor of Buller District Council, he declared the district symbolically GMO-free. With a moratorium in place for many years on GMO's in New Zealand there is a laissez-faire attitude to the issue. However there is growing pressure and lobbying from some research sectors to push the GE agenda into acceptance, often by surreptitious means, where field trials could slowly gain acceptance, and which could lead eventually to the moratorium being lifted. A number of other regions and districts have declared enforceable GE-free zones, in accordance with the wishes of their residents through the submission process, albeit defending their decisions through multiple appeals by Federated Farmers. Our region needs to look at the GE issue and take the views of our region's residents into consideration, especially now that the Environment Court has decreed, and associated amendments made to the RMA, that local authorities have the authority to enforce GE-free zones. At the very least the WCRC needs to provide a precautionary measure in its 2018 - 2028 Long Term Plan. It is also an issue that should have been addressed in the Proposed Regional Policy Statement.

Outdoor use of GE/GMOs presents a serious risk to our biosecurity, unique biodiversity, wider environment, existing GM-free primary producers, economy and the public health.

The West Coast has huge potential for organic farming, and the number 1 offensive of organic farming would be GE contamination. We cannot let this unproven technology potentially compromise organic farming on the West Coast before organic farming has even gotten off the ground here. There needs to be policies and rules in place around GE right now because GE lobbyists seeking the freedom of growing within our environments are restless and pushing to allow it to happen.

2. **Air Quality:**

WCRC is only concentrating on coalsmoke with respect to the Reefton airshed but all towns on the West Coast suffer from bad air in winter-time. Sometimes it is only a single chimney in a neighbourhood belching smouldering coalsmoke but it can nevertheless impact on the health of the whole neighbourhood. PM10 (PM2.5?) monitors are set up in the wrong places in some, probably all, West Coast towns so the full extent of coalsmoke in neighbourhoods is under-monitored. The WCRC needs to work on the assumption that any coalsmoke in a neighbourhood is damaging to health (which it is) and work to alleviate the situation. Any complaints concerning coalsmoke need to be taken seriously and acted on to protect health. WCRC also needs to regain authority for controlling domestic fires, both outside and inside fires, thus making it an issue that both the district and regional council can deal with concurrently.

I have noticed that the air in Westport this winter is better than previous years; hopefully this is due to individuals making informed choices as to keeping warm in winter, but it is no reflection on a pro-active council with respect to such. The WCRC has been seriously negligent in this respect, I am not sure that any of its newsletters address the issue. The winter newsletter sent with rates invoices should address air pollution and what people can do to keep the air in their neighbourhoods clean, primarily addressing the issue of smouldering coalsmoke, where the WCRC should be advising against the use of coal in fires in order to keep neighbourhoods healthy in winter-time. Coalsmoke can impact on both intellectual and physical ability and if West Coasters want to excel then one important way is eliminating coalsmoke from domestic fires.

I would like to see the Long Term Plan endeavour to reduce the pollution of coalsmoke in West Coast neighbourhoods.

Frida Inta
2018.08.03


