

Further Submission

This is a further submission on the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan that was lodge online.

Further Submitters Name	Inger Perkins
Further Submitter Number	FS33
Wish to be heard	Yes
FS qualifier	a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.
FS qualifier reason	<p>I have previously made a submission on a variety of topics including notable trees. I live in this area and am seeking greater protection for several large old trees. There are very few large old trees in the Hokitika town area. The mental and physical benefits of trees for residents are numerous. A growing body of evidence links exposure to trees with reduced rates of mortality, cardiovascular disease, stress, and depression. Other areas of interest include the climate and biodiversity crises. I am seeking greater priority for these issues.</p> <p>A serious concern is the lack of accurate definition of the coastal environment in the overlay maps and connection to the definition provided by the NZ Coastal Policy Statement.</p> <p>I also have concerns about residential zones, mineral extraction zones and the sections on energy and noise - for the protection of residents from residential to rural areas, and the need to move towards more sustainable and distributed sources of electricity.</p> <p>I note that I have not had and will not have time to review corrections on submissions.</p>
Joint presentation	Yes
Attention:	Ms. Inger Perkins
Contact organisation	
Address for service	231 Revell Street Hokitika, West Coast 7810
Telephone	+6437558600
Mobile	0273701876
Email	ingerp@xtra.co.nz
Date lodged	30/06/2023 3:19pm

Further submission points

Raw FS number	Related Submission Point	FS Decision requested	SupportOppose	Reasons
FS33.1	S553.055	Allow	Support	I wish to see the addition of notable trees to the schedule as straight forward as possible
FS33.2	S558.067	Allow	Support	Adding support for notable tree policies
FS33.3	S574.067	Allow	Support	Adding support for notable tree policies
FS33.4	S566.067	Allow	Support	Adding support for notable tree policies
FS33.5	S190.260	Allow	Support	Adding support for notable tree policies, especially to recognise the value to health
FS33.6	S190.256	Allow	Support	Adding support for notable tree policies, particularly for the health benefits
FS33.7	S190.257	Allow	Support	Adding support for notable tree policies, particularly for the health benefits
FS33.8	S190.256	Allow	Support	Adding support for notable tree policies, particularly for the health benefits. I would like to see large old trees at Seaview, Hokitika, added to the schedule of notable trees, Schedule 2.

FS33.9	S190.259	Allow	Support	<p>I would like to see large old trees at Seaview, Hokitika, added to the schedule of notable trees, Schedule 2 to ensure that they are protected. I propose that they be assessed using STEM. They have historic value, associated with the old hospital site.</p> <p>They have botanical value where, for example, native orchids (Easter orchid, <i>Earina autumnalis</i>) are supported by them, being epiphytes and cascading down the huge trunks.</p>
FS33.10	S481.003	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p>
FS33.11	S262.003	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p>
FS33.12	S269.001	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p>
FS33.13	S70.020	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p> <p>There must be stronger objectives in this regard including reducing emissions.</p>
FS33.14	S560.003	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p>
FS33.15	S443.006	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p> <p>There must be stronger objectives in this regard including reducing emissions.</p>
FS33.16	S443.014	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p> <p>A renewable energy strategy is overdue and must extend to and support micro renewables.</p> <p>New build projects should be required to include a reasonable degree of energy self-sufficiency.</p>
FS33.17	S444.017	Allow	Support	<p>The most critical issue of our time is the climate crisis.</p> <p>It must lie at the heart of TTPP.</p>
FS33.18	S443.007	Allow	Support	<p>Our environment and our people need to be the focus - if they are well, the economy will be well.</p>
FS33.19	S190.165	Allow	Support in part	<p>Propose rewording 'managed retreat' to 'managed relocation'. That will enable a more positive proactive approach.</p> <p>In addition, somehow emphasise the need to plan for managed relocation now. Consultation with communities needs to be underway without delay to determine trigger points/events and actions so that the region has a plan for each site at risk of flooding like that developed for Hawkes Bay: https://www.hbcoast.co.nz/assets/Uploads/Planned-Retreat-Implementation-Costs-Report-2022.pdf. Can that be built into TTPP?</p>

FS33.20	S181.038	Disallow in part	Oppose in part	<p>It is not appropriate to zone one side of Revell Street in Hokitika as a Medium Density Residential Zone while the opposite side remains a General Residential Zone.</p> <p>The plan's approach must be to retain character and neighbourhood values. Both sides of Revell Street must be retained within the General Residential Zone.</p> <p>The only other part of Hokitika proposed for medium density zoning is an area of the racecourse, subject to consultation at present and that area must not be disposed of nor plans agreed for its use before a plan has been determined for the town as a whole in terms of trigger points and actions related to flooding and managed relocation.</p>
FS33.21	S181.038	Disallow in part	Oppose in part	<p>In addition to my further submission on this point and medium density zoning in Hokitika, enabling more residential units and development on the seaside of Revell Street, within metres of the Coastal Tsunami Hazard and the Flood Susceptibility hazard defies belief. It is entirely inappropriate.</p> <p>In addition, it risks loss of amenity for existing home owners there due to greater density and height of buildings.</p> <p>Revell Street is not the right place for MRZ.</p>
FS33.22	S602.063	Allow	Support	<p>Proposed amendments strengthen and clarify the section and emphasise the special biodiversity values of the West Coast and the need to protect important and reducing features such as lowland forests.</p>
FS33.23	S560.196	Allow	Support	<p>Supports consistency and timely action.</p>
FS33.24	S602.065	Allow	Support	<p>Strengthens and prioritises the focus on protection of indigenous species.</p>
FS33.25	S443.026	Allow	Support	<p>Biodiversity offsetting is fraught with risk. Any possible consideration of biodiversity offsets must only be allowed where there is no net loss and no risk to irreplaceable or vulnerable species. Clear guidance must be available to planners and consent applicants with a principle of not allowing the biodiversity offsets approach if there is any risk at all. DOC provides guidance but spent years attempting to develop it, largely concluding that there are many risks and limits. It was published in 2014 and may not even have been applied and therefore not updated due to the extremely complex nature of the process and accounting. https://www.doc.govt.nz/about-us/our-policies-and-plans/guidance-on-biodiversity-offsetting/</p>
FS33.26	S602.073	Allow	Support	<p>Great caution must be applied when considering biodiversity offsetting. DOC itself provides guidance (https://www.doc.govt.nz/about-us/our-policies-and-plans/guidance-on-biodiversity-offsetting/) and it is critical that the caution it recommends in its submission is applied as a minimum.</p>
FS33.27	S602.105	Allow	Support	<p>Strengthens NC - P2</p>
FS33.28	S275.006	Allow	Support	<p>Useful clarity</p>
FS33.29	S560.277	Allow	Support	<p>Essential to update overlay and/or clearly define coastal environment.</p>

FS33.30	S290.004	Allow	Support	Mining needs to be managed through consents, not through zones. A regulatory process is expected for all mining applications by miners and by the public. Minerals zones could put other values at risk - landscape and biodiversity as well as amenity.
FS33.31	S99.003	Allow	Support	I do not support the creation of Mineral Extraction Zones.
FS33.32	S262.002	Allow	Support	I agree that there should not be mineral extraction zones.
FS33.33	S252.008	Allow	Support	Eloquent and constructive submission by someone who, with her family, is directly affected. It is not appropriate to create Mineral Extraction Zones.
FS33.34	S560.016	Allow	Support	Not appropriate to create Mineral Extraction Zones.
FS33.35	S455.003	Allow	Support	Agree with potentially affected residents. Mineral Extraction Zones are not appropriate.
FS33.36	S473.007	Allow	Support	MINZ - not needed and not appropriate.
FS33.37	S190.833	Allow	Support	RESZ - O2 to maintain or enhance character and amenity and protect from inappropriate development is very important and this is an excellent objective. Zoning one side of Revell Street in Hokitika differently (medium density) to the other (general residential) goes against this objective as well as reason and common sense; it must not be allowed.
FS33.38	S190.540	Allow in part	Support in part	Wise advice to manage effects of noise where the potential effects occur, which is where it is received. In addition, where those effects are heard and for the wellbeing of persons affected by noise, they should not exceed 45dB L Aeq (15 min).
FS33.39	S383.002	Allow	Support	Important to take into account those choosing to live in rural areas and protecting them from the adverse effects of noise on their health and wellbeing. In addition, the noise received at a residence should not exceed 45 dB L Aeq (15 mins) at any time.
FS33.40	S190.541	Allow	Support	relate to sites receiving rather than emitting noise
FS33.41	S190.542	Allow	Support	relate to sites receiving rather than emitting noise
FS33.42	S421.005	Allow	Support	Just what I wanted to say - maps need to be far more user friendly and useful.