

My name is Amy Young I am a Resource Management Act Planner for the Department of Conservation.

Please accept my apologies as I note that there is a minor error in my evidence in paragraph 36 which relates to Topic 2 and 3 and should refer to topic 1 and 2.

The Director General's submission covered several points in relation to Topic 1: Introduction/ Whole Plan and Topic 2: Strategic Directions. The majority of these points have been accepted in the recommendations in the Officers report and in those cases I agree with the Officer's recommendation.

The D-Gs submission identified that in the pTTPP the terms 'impacts' and 'adverse effects' are used interchangeably and sought that adverse effects should be rereferred to consistently. The Officers report rejects this submission, stating that impacts can be positive and points to the West Coast Regional Policy Statement as using the term impacts frequently.

The key point, that I agree with, is that this needs to be considered on a case by case basis rather than a general approach, as in certain contexts the use of the term 'impacts' could be appropriate.

D-Gs submission sought a general approach to controlled activity and restricted discretionary rules requiring a consideration of alternatives to be a matter of control or discretion, particularly where activities affect "scheduled areas and SNAs". The Officers recommendation considers it an appropriate amendment to rules of the plan but only in relation to restricted discretionary rules.

While consideration of alternatives is typically a requirement of resource consent applications, I consider there is merit in including a specific matter of discretion considering alternative approaches to development. I agree with the Officer's findings in relation to adding this matter of control to controlled activity rules given it would have limited utility, because consent would have to be granted in any event.

In relation to Hearing Topic 2 I have one matter to raise today.

Mineral Extraction strategic objective MIN – O2

The D-Gs submission on this strategic objective sought additional wording to introduce an element of sustainable management to an otherwise enabling provision.

In response to this submission and that of Waka Kotahi the Officer has accepted this additional wording as appropriate. I support that change as it would not be appropriate to enable mineral extraction without reference to the managing adverse effects, and that approach would be in consistent with the mineral zone provisions that fall from this objective.

I note the D-Gs submission on this objective also sought to remove reference to the 'Buller Coalfield Zone' (BCZ). The reason for this is that the submission considers that the BCZ and the Mineral Extraction Zone have similar reasons for being and have almost identical provisions for managing activities in these zones, and therefore should simply be combined as a single Mineral Extraction Zone in the pTTPP. The Officer's response notes that this issue will be addressed in a later minerals topic hearing. Therefore, this will be addressed in greater detail in evidence and or submissions for that hearing stream. There are no other matters that I have to discuss today but look forward to further hearing topics where matters relevant to the Director General will be considered in more detail.