

# Further Submission on Te Tai o Poutini Plan

---

**Brian Anderson**

---

## **1. Summary**

The TTPP needs significant amendment because it does not recognise the role of land use and other activities in increasing, or mitigating, greenhouse gas emissions. This is despite the fact that we still need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the next 7 years by around 50% to be consistent with the Paris Agreement's goal of limiting warming to 1.5 °C. We are dangerously close to climate system tipping points, beyond which sea-level rise will risk making coastal communities unsustainable.

The TTPP is overly permissive towards mining, which does not recognise the large and often permanent impacts of mining activities. In their submissions, the mining industry has argued against 'best practice' which indicates clearly why robust consenting is required.

While I have not had time to comment specifically on the Objectives, Policies, and Rules around clearance of indigenous vegetation, I have read some of these submissions and support those which request stronger rules, and oppose those which support the TTPP as notified, or weakening of the TTPP notified Objectives, Policies, and Rules.

In this further submission to the TTPP, I have responded to some of the points of other submitters, generally reinforcing my initial submission. However, I have not had time to respond to each relevant point, and where I have not that does not mean that I agree, or disagree with that point. In particular, I have responded to many points on the Objectives and Policies, but not so much on the rules. However, my submission is that the rules should be amended or removed to be consistent with my submissions on the Objectives and Policies.

## **2. General comments**

I have made specific comments by submitter and submission point in the attached table. More general comments, and comments on matters which are not included in the summary of submission points are outlined here.

### **2.1. RPS**

The TTPP as notified does not adequately reflect the RPS. The TTPP has selectively chosen those parts of the RPS which support mining, but have actively neglected the parts of the RPS which aim to protect indigenous biodiversity. The importance of these rules has been recognised by the Environment Court in the decision on the proposed Te Kuha coal mine, which has come out since the TTPP was notified. This decision is relevant, because it clearly shows the significant indigenous biodiversity of the Buller Coal Plateaux is so high that it is more important than any potential economic benefits. Many mining industry submitters point to the economic importance of mining, but this decision, informed by the RPS, shows that in the case of the Buller Coal Plateaux, biodiversity is more important. I therefore oppose the points that various submitters have made in support of the BCZ, and support those points which oppose the BCZ, or seek to make the rules more rigorous.

## **2.2. Climate Change**

Recent amendments to the RMA have come into effect which mean that the impact of proposed activities on climate change can now be considered:

”These amendments include sections 17 to 21, 35 and 36 of the Resource Management Amendment Act 2020. The amendments will repeal sections 70A, 70B, 104E and 104F of the RMA that limit the circumstances in which:

- Regional councils may have regard to the effects of discharges into air of greenhouse gases on climate change in making rules to control the discharges of GHGs
- Consent authorities may have regard to the effects of discharges into air of GHGs on climate change in considering an application for a discharge permit or coastal permit.”<sup>1</sup>:

The TTPP is largely silent on climate change, which means that no guidance is given by the TTPP on how to implement this consideration. As a result, I supported submissions that have called for climate change to be taken into account. But the TTPP needs to be amended significantly to do this properly.

## **2.3. Mineral extraction zones**

Submissions have been received on the proposed MEZ and the BCL in the plan. Many of the submissions from mining companies welcome the recognition of the mining industry in the plan, and the economic benefits that it brings. However, the TTPP is not a place for an industry to gain recognition, it is a place where appropriate rules are put around activities. The suggestion is that the economic benefits of mining will flow from the proposed MEZ and BCZ, However, where numbers are quoted regarding economic activity they are, of necessity, from the past. This means that there is already significant mining activity on the West Coast, despite the fact that at present there is no MEZ and BCZ.

The question has to be asked - why exactly does the TTPP proposed such a significant unbalancing of the present system? The reality is that mining already has large and often permanent impacts on the environment, and these are not sufficiently controlled by the present system of industry practice, consenting and enforcement. The proposed TTPP will not improve industry practice, rather it will make it worse by enhancing the sense of entitlement that many mining companies have. The proposed TTPP will not improve consenting practices, they will make them much worse by, in many cases, not requiring consent at all. This means that the final point, enforcement, cannot happen effectively because councils do not, in general monitor permitted activities.

In fact, in their submissions the mining industry has made it clear that it does not want to adhere to 'best practice'. In their submissions on MINZ-P3 in particular, nine mining companies or industry representatives urge the words 'best practice environmental standards' to be removed, and replaced with the much weaker 'the best practicable environmental standards'. It would seem that, for the West Coast mining industry, 'best practice' is an unattainable goal. This is consistent with my observations of West Coast mines in operation, which certainly do

---

<sup>1</sup><https://environment.govt.nz/acts-and-regulations/regulations/discharge-to-air-of-greenhouse-gases/>; these amendments came into force in March 2023

not meet any 'best practice' standard.

The Buller District Council has highlighted some of the issues around the proposed permitted activities in terms of bonding. How do you effectively bond a permitted activity. It appears that there are so many issues around the permitted activities that a significant amount of paperwork will have to be submitted before undertaking mining anyway. Why not just require a resource consent, as at present.

Many submitters oppose the BCZ and the MEZ in their entirety, and I agree with these submissions. In many cases submitters proposed stricter rules within the BCZ and MEZ. I support these submissions, if the BCZ and MEZ are to be retained, however, they should not be retained because they will result in significant and uncontrolled adverse impacts on the environment.

I oppose some or all of the following submissions on the MEZ

#### 2.3.1. S604: BIRCHFIELD ROSS MINING LTD (BRML)

This submission proposed the addition of the Mikonui Valley into the Ross Mineral Extraction Zone, for the following reasons:

1. there is a gold resource, and
2. much of the resource is on farmland

There is a gold resource here, which has been known about for many decades. And yet there has been no large-scale mining in the valley, with the exception of at the confluence of Blacks/Redmans Creek, and other uses have overtaken the valley. It would seem that the horse has bolted, and BRML is now trying to bolt the door shut some decades later. The main use of the valley, as mapped in their proposed addition, is now residential (with 8 sites for residential dwelling), conservation (with three QEII and one DoC covenant, and a large area of Public Conservation Land).

Residential activity has been part of the Mikonui Valley at least since the Gold Rush. There was a School at Redmans, McLeods Hotel on McLeods Road, a series of mining claims, a roadman's hut, and the original Shearer Homestead. This residential occupation has been almost continuous, but the most recent phase started in 1995 when the first RMA residential consent was granted on McLeods Terrace, followed by more consents in the late 1990s, and 2010s.

Part of the area (the steep slopes with first growth and regenerating indigenous forest) has been rejected for mining applications twice by the Department of Conservation (Sigma Resources in the 1980s, and Butlers Mining Company).

My submission is that the MEZ should be removed from the plan, because they:

- are inconsistent with planning guidelines because they do not reflect the dominant use of the area,
- are unnecessary because mining is adequately allowed for under the current planning framework with no evident impediment to mining (mining consent applications are hardly ever declined),

- have a negative impact on other potential uses of the land (e.g. farming, forestry, residential) through onerous (and in some cases non-complying) resource consent requirements for other activities.
- seek to externalise the costs of mining to the environment and nearby residents, rather than internalising the costs through better mining practice.

The submission of BRML has cemented in my mind some of the onerous restrictions of the MEZ. For example, fencing is a permitted activity in the General Rural Zone, but non-complying in the MEZ. This means that, while grazing stock might be feasible in the short-term, the required maintenance of fences, and building of new fences (for example to keep stock from areas of bush) would be non-complying. In the medium term this would make grazing infeasible.

Much of the land in the proposed MEZs has already been mined, or is being mined at present. And yet, even once mining has finished in an area, the land would still be subject to the extreme restrictions of the MEZ. For example, putting up a new fence, and perhaps even maintaining an old fence, would be non-complying activities.

In that case that MEZs are removed from the plan, there is no need to specifically argue against BRML's proposed addition to the Ross MEZ. However, if the MEZ are retained in the plan, the Ross MEZ should be removed. As mentioned in my original submission, the overall effect, for a township like Ross, surrounded by a MEZ, is that it will be come 'frozen in time'. On the outskirts of Ross, development would be severely restricted by the Mineral Extraction Zone itself.

Even in the case the MEZs are retained in the plan, and the Ross MEZ is also retained, it should not be expanded to the Mikonui valley. While BRML may make assertions about the size of the gold resource, these assertions are irrelevant without evidence. The size of the gold resource is also only part of the story, and it has always been said that the lower part of the Mikonui valley cannot be mined because of the coarse sediments and massive infiltration of river water. The water extracted from the L&M mine at Redmans in the 1990s was very large, further down the valley it is probably unfeasible to keep a pit dry.

It would appear that BRML is proposing a very large gold mining operation at Mikonui. If this is so, then the provisions of the MEZ are of little benefit to BRML. Specifically, the limits on operation size for a permitted activity within the MEZ are clearly much smaller than the size of the operation. There would only be a marginal benefit to BRML in terms of the permitted baseline.

Finally, in the case that the MEZ is expanded to include the Mikonui valley, the proposed boundaries of the MEZ make little sense. Firstly, it includes areas that are primarily residential (i.e. McLeods Road), areas that are primarily for conservation (i.e. the actual McLeods Terrace which, confusingly, is on the south side of the river and is unmodified conservation land) and the slopes above McLeods Road, which are also conservation land with very high values. Both of these areas of PCL are within an outstanding natural landscape, as identified in the TTPP, and should in fact be zoned as NOSZ.

In the ongoing review of PCL which is presently held as Stewardship Land, the PCL part of the Mikonui valley was assessed:

*This area is viewed as having high freshwater ecological values. This is a pristine area with a diverse range of*

*freshwater habitat from >1700 m down to near sea level ... This area is almost unmatched in the degree of value it has for our native (fluvial) freshwater biodiversity, and offers extensive and undisturbed habitat for multiple threatened species.<sup>2</sup>*

In light of the steep slopes, very high freshwater values, and its status as an outstanding natural landscape, the PCL areas of the Mikonui valley cannot be included in the Ross MEZ.

Finally, if there was to be a MEZ in the Mikonui valley, we ask that our property, at LOT 1 DP 3858, and LOTs 1-3 DP 504346 is not included in the MEZ. The Mikonui nohoanga should also be excluded so that they can be activated without requiring a non-complying resource consent.

However, my primary submission remains that the MEZ should be removed from the plan. The above discussion shows that the result of the MEZ is to imposed extraordinary restrictions and costs on landowners in and around the MEZ, while increasing the ability of the mining industry to externalise the significant, and often permanent, impacts on the environment.

#### **2.4. Buller Coal Zone**

My submission is that this Zone should be removed. While I support the submission of DoC, which generally makes each set of rules at a higher level (i.e. permitted becomes controlled etc), and proposed that the MEZ and BCZ are merged, my primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ are inappropriate, and that mining should be dealt with as any other activity, primarily in the General Rural Zone. Accordingly I oppose the submissions of mining companies which are trying to make mining in the BCZ easier.

---

<sup>2</sup>DoC Technical Report



Submitter	Submission Point	Further submission on this point	Decision requested	(a) primary submission (b) secondary submission in case the primary submission is not accepted
Skyline	S250.005	oppose	No SPZ for this development	No SPZ for this development
NZ Energy	S462.002	oppose	Having a SPZ for each individual piece of hydroelectric infrastructure is unnecessary as these activities have been dealt with in the general rural zone without issues	No SPZ for hydro infrastructure
F&B	S560.391	support	These explanations are necessary because it is not at all clear how different parts of the plan interact. An explicit statement that the ECO objective and NC chapter rules are required to be followed here is necessary	Explanation added
F&B	S560.0541	support	same reason as above	Amend
F&B	S560.0542	support	these amendments are required to ensure that s2 matters of the RMA are considered	Amend
John Caygill	S290.005	support	the TPPP needs to recognise the biodiversity value of the Buller Coal Plateau, and that emissions from the burning of coal (including in steel making) is incompatible with maintaining the life supporting processes of land, air and water. The TPPP should include a rapid phase out of coal production on the West Coast. Historically, much of the coal mined in the proposed BCZ area has been burnt in NZ. Now that the	Remove BCZ
Heather Muir	(S385)S385.002	support	the TPPP needs to recognise the biodiversity value of the Buller Coal Plateau, and that emissions from the burning of coal (including in steel making) is incompatible with maintaining the life supporting processes of land, air and water. The TPPP should include a rapid phase out of coal production on the West Coast.	Remove BCZ
Karen Lippiatt	(S439)S439.002	support	agree this zone is superfluous, but the BCZ should just be removed rather than become a MEZ	Remove BCZ
Suzanne Hills	(S443)S443.053	support	agree this zoning is unnecessary	Remove BCZ
Clare Backes	(S444)S444.014	support	agree BCZ is unnecessary, and all mineral activities should be subject to resource consent	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) remove other permissive rules for mineral extraction
Katherine Gilbert	(S473)S473.006	support	agree BCZ is not necessary or appropriate, areas mapped are inappropriate for these zones	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) remove MEZ
Papahaua Resources Limited	S500.006	oppose	no rational give by submitter, but the BCZ is not necessary or appropriate.	Remove BCZ

Straterra (S536)	S536.010	oppose	Straterra suggests that regulation that ensures that environmental values are recognised and impacts are avoided is incompatible with mining and the generation of GDP. I disagree, and suggest that the externalisation of environmental impacts helps neither short-term GDP or long term sustainability of the mining industry. Indeed, robust regulation increases GDP and widens the diversity of jobs in the minerals industry. Straterra should not be afraid of scrutiny.	Remove BCZ
Buller Conservation Group	S552.189	support	Agree: "A permissive approach will not address environmental issues adequately."	Remove BCZ
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.189	support	Agree: "This chapter is far too enabling of coal extraction."	Remove BCZ
F&B	S560.015	support	Agree: "The approach to mineral extraction and ancillary activities in the Plan is too permissive."	Same as this submitters request
F&B	S560.392	support	Agree with submission point	Same as this submitters request
Minerals West Coast	S569.047	oppose	This is a vacuous point, there is no debate that a coal resource exists	Remove BCZ
BDC	S538.583	oppose	No rationale is given by the submitter, but the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes	Remove BCZ
Karen Lippiatt	(S439)S439.033	support		Remove mention of national significance (and remove BCZ)
Jacobus Wiskerke	S95.005	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.  One of these reasons is because of the impacts of the climate change, and the urgency with which we now need to reduce emissions. The BCZ should be removed, but throughout the plan time limits for coal exploration and mining should be implemented. After the time limit, these activities would be prohibited.	(a) remove BCZ, include time limits for coal exploration and mining throughout the plan
Karen Lippiatt	(S439)S439.034	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.  The BCZ should be removed, but here and throughout the plan the negative impacts must be recognised so the effects hierarchy can be applied.	(a) Remove BCZ, include proper treatment of adverse affects of mining throughout the plan
Karen Lippiatt	(S439)S439.036	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.  The BCZ should be removed, but here and throughout the plan the negative impacts must be recognised so the effects hierarchy can be applied.	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) protect biodiversity, including in gullies on the Buller Plateaux from mining impacts



BDC	S538.582	oppose	No rationale is given by the submitter, but the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes	Remove BCZ
Karen Lippiatt	(S439)S439.035	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree that this policy should be removed	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) remove PCZ – P1
Jacobus Wiskerke	S95.006	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree put a time limit on these activities	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) adjust clause as submitter suggests
DoC	S602.222	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, amend to include these adverse affects to be considered	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) adjust policy as submitter suggests
Karen Lippiatt	S439.037	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, make policy more stringent and protective	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) adjust policy as submitter suggests
Karen Lippiatt	S439.038	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, delete this policy	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete policy as submitter suggests
Katherine Gilbert	S473.004	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, delete all permitted activities in this zone	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete permitted activities as submitter suggests
BDC	S538.584	oppose	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. This submission point should be rejected as it does not protect the biodiversity values present on the Buller Coal Plateaux	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete permitted activities in BCZ

BCG	S552.190	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, there should be a spatial limit on drilling	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete permitted activities in BCZ, (c) impose spatial density limit on drilling
Frida Inta	S553.190	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, there should be a spatial limit on drilling	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete permitted activities in BCZ, (c) impose spatial density limit on drilling
Te Mana Ora	S190.1095	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, there should be a drinking water zone exclusion	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete permitted activities in BCZ, (c) amend rule as submitter suggests
Lynley Hargreaves	S481.010	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, rules for mineral extraction are too weak.	Prospecting and Exploration should have similar limits placed on them to the current Westland District Plan
Lynley Hargreaves	S481.015	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, the 'lawfully established' rule will add to confusion around activity conditions	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete rule
BTL/BTM	S491.048	oppose	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Disagree, the 'lawfully established' rule will add to confusion around activity conditions	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete rule
BDC	S538.585	oppose	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, there is a significant issue around bonding with these proposed permitted activities. The complexity around dealing with all of these issues means that the most parsimonious solution is to simply require a resource consent, as at present. My proposal is that the rule should be deleted, rather than amended.	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete rule

Sheet1.

MWC	S569.012	oppose	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. MWC seems concerned that mining will be subject to freshwater regulations, as any other activity would be. My suggestion – the mining industry should have to meet the freshwater rules. The advice note should be retained.	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) retain advice note
Te Mana Ora	S190.1096	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, there should be a drinking water zone exclusion	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete permitted activities in BCZ, (c) amend rule as submitter suggests
Lynley Hargreaves	S481.016	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, ancillary activities should not be permitted	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete rule
BTL/BTM	S491.031	oppose	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Disagree, structures associated with coal mining should not be permitted	Remove BCZ
BTL/BTM	S491.049	oppose	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Disagree, these activities should not be permitted	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete rule
BDC	S538.586	oppose	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, there is a significant issue around bonding with these proposed permitted activities. The complexity around dealing with all of these issues means that the most parsimonious solution is to simply require a resource consent, as at present. My proposal is that the rule should be deleted, rather than amended.	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete rule
Te Mana Ora	S190.1097	support	My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes. Agree, there should be a drinking water zone exclusion	(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete controlled activities in BCZ, (c) amend rule as submitter suggests

BTL/BTM	S491.050	oppose	<p>My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.</p> <p>Disagree, this is not a significant impediment, but rather provides an extremely limited protection for significant indigenous biodiversity. The purpose of the zone is flawed in any case.</p>	<p>(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete controlled activities in BCZ, (c) retain this rule (but amend according to S602.224</p>
BDC	S538.588	oppose	<p>My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.</p> <p>Disagree, this amendment is still insufficient to protect indigenous biodiversity.</p>	<p>(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete controlled activities in BCZ, (c) retain this rule (but amend according to S602.224</p>
DoC	S602.224	support	<p>My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.</p> <p>Agree, with the proposed changes which would remove the controlled status of this rule, and improve the rules around indigenous vegetation.</p>	<p>(a) Remove BCZ, (b) delete controlled activities in BCZ, (c) amend this rule according to this submitters proposal.</p>
BDC	S538.589	oppose	<p>My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.</p> <p>Disagree, this rule should be amended to a discretionary rule with additional changes restrictions.</p>	<p>(a) Remove BCZ, (b) amend this rule to be Discretionary according to S602.225</p>
DoC	S602.225	support	<p>My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.</p> <p>Agree, with the proposed changes which would remove the restricted discretionary status of this rule, upgrade it to Discretionary, and improve the rules around natural values.</p>	<p>(a) Remove BCZ, (b) amend this rule according to this submitters proposal.</p>
BDC	S538.590	oppose	<p>My primary submission is that the BCZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.</p>	<p>(a) Remove BCZ, (b) R7 should be amended to that it includes Mineral Extraction and Processing and Ancillary Activities not meeting the Discretionary rules (amended R6). R6 should be amended to make it clear that these activities that do not meet the R6 are non-complying</p>
SOPHIA ALLAN	S82.003	support	<p>Agree, the MINZ should not be applied</p>	<p>Do not apply MINZ anywhere on the West Coast</p>
Trevor Hayes	S377.010	part support	<p>HMC mining does appear to be growing on the West Coast, and does have somewhat different impacts from other mining. I agree that HMC mining (in fact all mining) should be discretionary, but my primary submission is that the MEZ should be removed.</p>	<p>(a) Remove MEZ, (b) mining within a MEZ should be discretionary</p>

Richard Arlidge	S419.002	support	Agree, Mining should only continue where this is to support a low carbon future.	(a) Remove MEZ, (b) consider climate change for each mining proposal (i.e. no permitted activities)
Karen Lippiatt	S439.039	support	Agree, there is no need for this zone.	Remove MEZ
Suzanne Hills	S443.052	support	Agree, there is no need for this zone.	Remove MEZ
Aggregate and Quarry Association	S521.003	oppose	Avoid is an integral part of the affects management heirachy, and should not be removed from the TTPP	Leave 'avoid' in the TTPP
Alvin & Kay Godfrey	S580.001	oppose	Quarrying has occurred for decades without a MEZ, it is not necessary for local employment.	Remove MEZ
Christine Robertson	S99.003	support	Agree, the proposed TTPP clearly elevates the rights of mining companies over the rights of residents.	Remove MEZ
WDC	S181.054	oppose	The rules for mining throughout the region should be similar to those already in place under the Westland District Plan	Remove MEZ
Newcoast Resources Limited	S191.001	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ
Deb Langridge	S252.008	support in part	HMC mining does appear to be growing on the West Coast, and does have somewhat different impacts from other mining. I agree that HMC mining (in fact all mining) should be discretionary, but my primary submission is that the MEZ should be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ, (b) mining within a MEZ should be discretionary
Jane Neale	S262.002	support	Agree, do not prioritise mineral extraction over other land uses, which is what the proposed TTPP does.	Remove MEZ
John Caygill	S290.004	support	Support in full – MEZ are not justified and should be removed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas.
Collin Robertson	S293.001	support	Agree, there should be no mining as a permitted activity on the Barrytown flats, or anywhere on the West Coast	Remove MEZ and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Dean Mason	S356.004	part support	Agree, there are significant and somewhat new impacts from HMC mining. Stringent rules need to be in place to ensure that there are not adverse impacts on local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Heather Muir	S385.001	support	Support in full – MEZ are not justified and should be removed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas.

Peter Haddock	S417.007	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas.
Anne Chapman	S425.007	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas.
Karen Lippiatt	S439.003	support	Support in full – MEZ are not justified and should be removed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Clare Backes	S444.015	support	Support in full – MEZ are not justified and should be removed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Alistair Cameron	S452.007	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas.
Alistair Cameron	S452.009	oppose	The restrictions on other activities are extremely onerous and should be removed. The restrictions proposed are a serious imposition on private property rights.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas.
Murray Stuart and Karen Jury Rob Lawrence	S455.003	??	The summary of submissions is unclear, as it suggests this submitter support the MEZ, but the text does not seem to support the MEZ. I agree that mineral extraction to require a resource consent so that impacts on surrounding communities are able to be avoided, remedied or mitigated	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Greenstone Retreat	S459.003	support in part	I agree that mining needs to be managed so that it does not hard neighbours and communities.	Remove Kumara MEZ
Davis Oglvie & Partners Ltd	S465.009	support in part	The submitter suggests that the extreme restrictions on appropriate land uses in the MEZ should be amended so that these are permitted. I agree, but the best way of doing this would be to remove the MEZ altogether so that there is no explicit hierarchy of land uses which the MEZ imposes.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
New Zealand Coal & Carbon Limited	S472.037	oppose	no reason for supporting the MEZ was given by this submitter in the summary of submissions	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones

Katherine Gilbert	S473.007	support	Support in full – MEZ are not justified and should be removed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Rocky Mining Limited	S474.011	oppose	no reason for supporting the MEZ was given by this submitter in the summary of submissions	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Rocky Mining Limited	S474.013	oppose	no reason for supporting the provisions and rules of the MEZ were given by this submitter in the summary of submissions	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Lynley Hargreaves	S481.004	support	Support in full – MEZ are not justified and should be removed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Papahaua Resources Limited	S500.007	oppose	no reason for supporting the provisions and rules of the MEZ were given by this submitter in the summary of submissions	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Trevor Thorpe	S528.001	oppose	The goal of the TPPP is not to recognise the importance of mining. It is to place appropriate rules around mining to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects on the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Trevor Thorpe	S528.004	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Straterra	S536.011	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
F&B	S560.016	support	This submission provides a balance approach to the economic benefits of mining and the requirements to avoid, remedy and mitigate its adverse affects.	Same as submitter
MWC	S569.048	oppose	Agree that zoning is not an appropriate planning solution for mineral activities, but propose a different solution.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones

WMS	S599.162	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
BCML	S601.101	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
DoC	S602.220	support in part	Agree that it is unnecessary to have two mineral extraction zones (MEZ and BCZ) with different provisions. However, it is also unnecessary and inappropriate to have either of these zones, so my primary submission is that both zones are moved, the areas within them are rezoned appropriately according to their values, and the rules in other zones are rebalanced so that mining does not take precedence over other activities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) simplify zones into a single
BRML	S604.091	oppose	no reason for supporting the provisions and rules of the MEZ were given by this submitter in the summary of submissions	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.098	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.076	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Avery Brothers	S609.096	oppose	This is a spurious argument, as it suggests that mining, and its associated economic benefits, would not occur without the MEZ. In reality mining is occurring without the MEZ and the MEZ is therefore not necessary. Rather the MEZ seeks to externalise the large and often permanent impacts of mining onto local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Te Mana Ora	S190.1153	support in part	Agree that "the benefits associated with mineral extraction are in tension with the health and wellbeing of the environment and communities due to the adverse effects of mineral extraction. It is important that these adverse effects are mitigated and minimised following the adverse management hierarchy – and rehabilitation of land occurs following mineral extraction.". However, I don't that believe that a balance has been struck in the plan – the rights of mining companies are clearly being put above the rights of local residents and the environment.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Ross Wildbore	S389.002	support in part	Agree that the guidelines should be 'and not impacting on other businesses, housing & farms etc.'. In my view, this means that mining should be treated like any other activity where its benefits and impacts are assessed for individual projects through the resource consent process.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones



Rocky Mining Limited	S474.045	oppose	Without the overlays, there would be essentially no protection of natural and built values from mining in the TTTP at all. This is a rather extreme submission point that should not be accepted.	Maintain overlays as relevant for all zones
Stevenson Mining Limited	S502.002	oppose	Coal mining is not a long-term, discrete mineral activity. It needs to come to an end rather swiftly.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Straterra	S536.014	oppose	This point really highlights the superfluous nature of the MEZ and BCZ – especially the MEZ cannot be defined because there is potential mineral extraction throughout the West Coast. Hence mining should be treated like any other activity in the overall zoning scheme, rather than having special purpose zones.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
BDC	S538.607	oppose	My primary submission is that the MEZ is unnecessary and inappropriate, and all mineral activities should be subject to a robust resource consent process, commensurate with the large and often permanent impacts that mining causes.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Karen Lippiatt	S439.040	support	Agree, and this relates back to Te Mana OraS190.1153, "the benefits associated with mineral extraction are in tension with the health and wellbeing of the environment and communities due to the adverse effects of mineral extraction". The creation of the MINZ does not create social wellbeing, rather it tips the balance of mining vs people too far towards mining, and ends up reducing social well being. The true outcome of the MEZ is to increase mining company profits, so perhaps the TTTP should be a bit more honest about that an put it as an outcome.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.110	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Terra Firma Mining Limited	S537.025	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
WMS	S599.168	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
BCML	S601.102	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones

BRMDL	S603.053	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
BRML	S604.092	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.077	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.077	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Karamea Lime Company	S614.214	oppose	This objective tips the balance too far towards mining activities, and is opposed.	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones
Lindy Mason	S355.006	support	Agree that better rules around HMC mining are required	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) amend this objective to recognise the impacts of HMC mining
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	S450.295	support in part	Agree that the impacts on the environment need to be recognised, but further submit that this objective is not strong enough.	
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.111	oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirarchy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'
Terra Firma Mining Limited	S537.026	oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirarchy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than adding words that are not in the RMA 'offset' and 'compensate', which would allow environmental bottom lines to be exceeded.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'

WMS	S599.126		oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirachy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'
BCML	S601.103		oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirachy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'
BRMDL	S603.054		oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirachy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'
BRML	S604.093		oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirachy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.078		oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirachy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.078		oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirachy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'
Karamea Lime Company	S614.215		oppose	If we are to allow for the full affects management heirachy, the wording should be 'to avoid, remedy, or mitigate', rather than the rather meaningless 'manage'	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) change wording to 'avoid, remedy or mitigate', rather than 'manage'

Deb Langridge	S252.002	support	Agree, the RMA now allows for the consideration of greenhouse gas emissions, and mining is an emissions intensive activity. However, we must also recognise that offsetting is not a complete solution, so credit should be given for mining activities that use low or zero emissions technology. This should apply to the full life cycle of the minerals (i.e. include Scope 3 emissions, especially relevant for coal mining).	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Insert a new Policy MINZ-PX, The impacts of greenhouse gas emissions from mining activities should be taken into account, including emissions from any mined material.
Tiga Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.112	oppose	Mineral resources do not need recognition, they need strong and appropriate regulations and rules	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones.
WMS	S599.127	oppose	Mineral resources do not need recognition, they need strong and appropriate regulations and rules	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones.
BCML	S601.104	oppose	Mineral resources do not need recognition, they need strong and appropriate regulations and rules	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones.
BRMDL	S603.055	oppose	Mineral resources do not need recognition, they need strong and appropriate regulations and rules	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones.
BRML	S604.094	oppose	Mineral resources do not need recognition, they need strong and appropriate regulations and rules	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones.
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.079	oppose	Mineral resources do not need recognition, they need strong and appropriate regulations and rules	Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones.
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.079	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TTPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2

TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.113	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2
Terra Firma Mining Limited	S537.027	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2
WMS	S599.128	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2
BCML	S601.105	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2
BRMDL	S603.056	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2
BRML	S604.095	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2

Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.080	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.080	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P2
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.114	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3
Terra Firma Mining Limited	S537.028	support in part	yes, rehabilitation should be provided for during mining operations	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) allow for rehabilitation during mining in MINZ-P3
WMS	S599.129	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3
BCML	S601.106	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3
BRMDL	S603.057	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3

BRML	S604.096	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.081	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.081	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3
Straterra	S536.070	oppose	'best practice' is not an unobtainable goal. Rather, best practice is the minimum requirement and should be retained in MINZ-P3.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain 'best practice' in MINZ-P3
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.115	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and': Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:
Terra Firma Mining Limited	S537.029	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and': Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:

BCG	S552.193	support	air pollution is an adverse impact of mining and should be included	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) amend as submitter suggests
Frida Intra (S553)	S553.193	support	air pollution is an adverse impact of mining and should be included	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) amend as submitter suggests
WMS	S599.130	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and'; Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:
BCML	S601.107	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and'; Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:
BRMDL	S603.058	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and'; Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:



BRML	S604.097	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	<p>(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and': Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:</p>
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.082	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	<p>(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and': Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:</p>
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.082	oppose	MINZ-P4 does not adequately protect the environment and should be strengthened.	<p>(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) retain wording in original MINZ-P4(d), but remove 'as far as practicable' and add 'in and': Maintain the quality of the environment, landscape, ecological values, character and amenity of the areas in and surrounding the MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone as far as practicable by:</p>
Te Mana Ora	S190.1159	support in part	support the protection of drinking water zones	<p>(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) amend as submitter suggests</p>
Craig Schwitzer	S96.007	support	Agree, and this should be backed up by a requirement for an assessment of ecological significance	<p>(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) No area or significant indigenous vegetation should be included in any MEZ. Any are of indigenous vegetation must be assess for significance before inclusion in an MEZ</p>

Karen Lippiatt	S439.041	support in part	Partly agree, but rather than just removing the Policy, make it explicit that areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat are not impacted	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
TIGA Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.116	oppose	Mining can occur without impacting any area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
Terra Firma Mining Limited	S537.030	oppose	Mining can only occur if there is no impact on any area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
BCG	S552.194	support in part	The proposed wording is an improvement, but really there should be no mining in area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
Frida Intra (S553)	S553.194	support in part	The proposed wording is an improvement, but really there should be no mining in area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'

WMS	S599.131	oppose	Mining can only occur if there is no impact on any area of significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
BCML	S601.108	oppose	Mining can only occur if there is no impact on any area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
BRMDL	S603.059	oppose	Mining can only occur if there is no impact on any area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
BRML	S604.098	oppose	Mining can only occur if there is no impact on any area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.083	oppose	Mining can only occur if there is no impact on any area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'

Whyte Gold Limited	S607.083	oppose	Mining can only occur if there is no impact on any area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) Amend this Policy to read 'MINZ-P5: No area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant indigenous fauna habitat shall be impacted by mining activities'
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.118	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TTPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7
Terra Firma Mining Limited	S537.031	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TTPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7
WMS	S599.133	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TTPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7
BCML	S601.110	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TTPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7
BRMDL	S603.061	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TTPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7

BRML	S604.100	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.085	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.085	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TPPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P7
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.119	oppose	The WCRC has a different set of rules to apply, and it is inappropriate for the overly permissive approach of the TPPP MEZ to leach into the WCRC approach to mining	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P8
WMS	S599.134	oppose	The WCRC has a different set of rules to apply, and it is inappropriate for the overly permissive approach of the TPPP MEZ to leach into the WCRC approach to mining	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P8
BCML	S601.111	oppose	The WCRC has a different set of rules to apply, and it is inappropriate for the overly permissive approach of the TPPP MEZ to leach into the WCRC approach to mining	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P8
BRMDL	S603.062	oppose	The WCRC has a different set of rules to apply, and it is inappropriate for the overly permissive approach of the TPPP MEZ to leach into the WCRC approach to mining	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P8

BRML	S604.101	oppose	The WCRC has a different set of rules to apply, and it is inappropriate for the overly permissive approach of the TTPP MEZ to leach into the WCRC approach to mining	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P8
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.086	oppose	The WCRC has a different set of rules to apply, and it is inappropriate for the overly permissive approach of the TTPP MEZ to leach into the WCRC approach to mining	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P8
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.086	oppose	The WCRC has a different set of rules to apply, and it is inappropriate for the overly permissive approach of the TTPP MEZ to leach into the WCRC approach to mining	(a) Remove MEZ and rezone according to NOSZ if PCL, else General Rural according to surrounding areas, and remove permitted activity mining rules in all other zones, (b) remove MINZ-P8
Rocky Mining Limited	S474.044	oppose	Many settlements and places where people live have been established on or near mineral deposits – this is the pattern of pakeha settlement of the West Coast. It is therefore unreasonable to exclude people from living in proximity for areas of mineral resource. There is already proposed MEZs in the plan, and it is unreasonable to extend the provisions of reverse sensitivity beyond these areas	leave as is
West Coast Regional Council	S488.037	support in part	Agreed that landowners should be consulted before restrictive zones and precincts are imposed on them. In addition to the HPL, the same reasoning applied to other restrictive zone, and BCZ and MEZ should also be put on hold pending landowner consultation.	Put the pTTPP HPL, MEZ and BCZ provisions on hold and undertake consultation with affected landowners.
Papahaua Resources Limited	S500.031	oppose	Many settlements and places where people live have been established on or near mineral deposits – this is the pattern of pakeha settlement of the West Coast. It is therefore unreasonable to exclude people from living in proximity for areas of mineral resource. There is already proposed MEZs in the plan, and it is unreasonable to extend the provisions of reverse sensitivity beyond these areas	leave as is
F&B	S560.370	support	Agree that there needs to be more clarity around the interactions between different parts of the plan	amend as suggested by this submitter
Alvin & Kay Godfrey	S580.005	conditional support	The TTPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Anna & Jeremy Hart	S582.002	conditional support	The TTPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones

Steve and Anne Staples	S584.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Tane & Rachel	S586.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Linda Elcock (S587)	S587.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Tim Burden (S585)	S585.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Marty & Nicky Von Ah	S588.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if this is not the case, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Charmaine Michell	S589.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Phil and Helen Cook	S600.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Paula Elcock	S590.002	conditional support	The TTTP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTTP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ. (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
F&B	S560.0543	support	Agree that there needs to be more clarity around the interactions between different parts of the plan	amend as suggested by this submitter

F&B	S560.0544	support	Agree, mining requires consent in all zones, except NOSZ where it is prohibited.	Mining requires consent in all zones, except NOSZ where it is prohibited.
F&B	S560.371	support	Agree that there needs to be more clarity around the interactions between different parts of the plan	amend as suggested by this submitter
F&B	S560.374	support	Agree, need explicit protection of natural values	amend as suggested by this submitter
Newcoast Resources Limited	S191.002	oppose	The TTPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Richard Arltidge	S419.005	support	Agree	amend as suggested by this submitter
Frank and Jo Dooley	S478.021	support	Agree	amend as suggested by this submitter
Frank O'Toole	S595.009	support	Agree	amend as suggested by this submitter
F&B	S560.373	support	Agree, need explicit protection of natural values	amend as suggested by this submitter
Celine Stokowski Anthony Thrupp	S522.007	support	Agree	amend as suggested by this submitter
Papahaua Resources Limited	S500.010	oppose	The TTPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
GDC	S608.107	oppose	Reverse sensitivity is an overstated concept. What it really means is that property owners and other members of the community have the right to quiet enjoyment of the land or place of residence, and the mining industry objects to this rather strongly. The response of the TTPP, primarily through this objective, is to remove many of the property rights of people living in or adjacent to MEZ, and indeed in the wider General Rural and other zones. If the mining industry would like to restrict the lawful activities of landowners, then it should just buy the land in question, rather than imposing costs and impacts on people and communities.	do not add new policy
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.090	oppose	Amenity and character values are important	Retain RURZ-O1 as is
Federated Farmers	S524.106	oppose	Amenity and character values are important	Retain RURZ-O1 as is



WMS	S599.105	oppose	Amenity and character values are important	Retain RURZ-01 as is
BCML	S601.084	oppose	Amenity and character values are important	Retain RURZ-01 as is
BRML	S604.074	oppose	Amenity and character values are important	Retain RURZ-01 as is
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.059	oppose	Amenity and character values are important	Retain RURZ-01 as is
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.059	oppose	Amenity and character values are important	Retain RURZ-01 as is
Michael Hill	S70.010	conditional support	The TPPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) amend according to submitters suggestion
Suzanne Hills	S443.036	conditional support	The TPPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
New Zealand Coal & Carbon Limited	S472.033	oppose	The TPPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
BRL/BTM	S491.041	oppose	The TPPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.091	oppose	The TPPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
Straterra	S536.056	oppose	The TPPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones

F&B	S560.372	support	Blanket support of mining inappropriate	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
MWC	S569.032	oppose	The TPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
WMS	S599.106	oppose	The appropriate word is not support, or provide for, but 'regulate'.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones, (c) amend to 'RURZ - O5: to regulate the use and extraction of mineral...'
BCML	S601.085	oppose	The appropriate word is not support, or provide for, but 'regulate'.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones, (c) amend to 'RURZ - O5: to regulate the use and extraction of mineral...'
BRML	S604.075	oppose	The appropriate word is not support, or provide for, but 'regulate'.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones, (c) amend to 'RURZ - O5: to regulate the use and extraction of mineral...'
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.060	oppose	The appropriate word is not support, or provide for, but 'regulate'.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones, (c) amend to 'RURZ - O5: to regulate the use and extraction of mineral...'
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.060	oppose	The appropriate word is not support, or provide for, but 'regulate'.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones, (c) amend to 'RURZ - O5: to regulate the use and extraction of mineral...'
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited	S493.092	oppose	The TPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) remove mining provisions in the Rural Zones
BCG	S552.174	support	This explicit protection is required	amend as submitter suggests
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.174	support	This explicit protection is required	amend as submitter suggests
WMS	S599.108	oppose	The TPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) explicitly exclude mineral extraction in RURZ-P1

Sheet1

BCML	S601.086	oppose	The TTPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) explicitly exclude mineral extraction in RURZ-P1
BRML	S604.076	oppose	The TTPP proposes a series of MEZ zones. Under the planning guidelines, special purpose zones like this should be for activities that cannot be managed in other zones. Therefore, it is inappropriate to have mineral provisions in both the MEZ/BCZ and the Rural Zones. My primary submission is that the MEZ and BCZ should be removed from the TTPP. However, if they are removed, the mineral provisions of the Rural Zones must be removed.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) explicitly exclude mineral extraction in RURZ-P1
WMS	S599.109	oppose	Agricultural activities, and their impacts, are accepted in the rural zone. Mining has quite different, and usually much greater, impacts and has always been treated separately from general rural activities. This distinction should be retained.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) maintain wording as 'agricultural production'
BCML	S601.087	oppose	Agricultural activities, and their impacts, are accepted in the rural zone. Mining has quite different, and usually much greater, impacts and has always been treated separately from general rural activities. This distinction should be retained.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) maintain wording as 'agricultural production'
BRMDL	S604.077	oppose	Agricultural activities, and their impacts, are accepted in the rural zone. Mining has quite different, and usually much greater, impacts and has always been treated separately from general rural activities. This distinction should be retained.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) maintain wording as 'agricultural production'
Phoenix Minerals Limited	S606.062	oppose	Agricultural activities, and their impacts, are accepted in the rural zone. Mining has quite different, and usually much greater, impacts and has always been treated separately from general rural activities. This distinction should be retained.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) maintain wording as 'agricultural production'
Whyte Gold Limited	S607.062	oppose	Agricultural activities, and their impacts, are accepted in the rural zone. Mining has quite different, and usually much greater, impacts and has always been treated separately from general rural activities. This distinction should be retained.	(a) Remove MEZ and BCZ, (b) maintain wording as 'agricultural production'
Manawa Energy Limited	S438.137	support	support	amend as suggested by this submitter

