

Trevor Simpson

Treaty Settlements and Land Change

Today I wish to deal with issues mentioned in my written submission and expand on some points.

I am a firm believer in the Vision and Strategy document. This document was accepted by all ratepayers in the region after a full consultation process in 2008.

Plan Change 1 is required to adhere to the objectives and strategies for the V&S document.

Today my spoken submission is in two parts.

Part 1 demonstrates PC1 does not adhere to the objectives of the V&S.

Part 11 deals with the land change policies 6 and 16

Part 1

Quite clearly the V&S instructs the owners of PC1, (the Waikato Regional Council) that all communities must prosper. See included statement from V&S.

Under the proposed PC1 this is not the case. The Commissioners will hear in the submission process private studies done, at great expense, prove this point

The V&S also states the latest scientific methods must be used.

The V&S states the rivers cannot be further degraded and must improve over time.

If scientific methods had been used in the production of PC1 a range of time spans would have had to be investigated, 100 to 300 years for instance, to see which period allowed for all objectives of the V&S to be achieved.

It is unacceptable an 80 year time span is demanded by Waikato Regional Council on the sole unscientific reason that it is intergenerational.

The V&S clearly indicates in objectives ' b' 'c' 'd', the social economical and cultural values of all ratepayers in the Waikato Region are to be taken into account.

Policy 6 and 16 of the land change rule clearly show those objectives have been totally ignored for those associated with objectives 'd'.

PC1 states the plan is aspirational, higher standards than the national Water standards, will be costly to implement and difficult to achieve.

The V&S indicates PC1 has to be affordable to allow communities to prosper and as long as water quality shows it is improving overtime, no time targets are required.

The Commissioners need to indicate to the Waikato Regional Council PC1 is not fit for purpose and is therefore invalid.

I believe the Commissioners need to deal with this submission before any other because if PC1 is not fit for purpose as I have shown all other submissions are immaterial.

Vision and Strategy

Our Vision

Is for a future where a healthy Waikato River sustains abundant life and prosperous communities who, in turn, are all responsible for restoring and protecting the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River, and all it embraces, for generations to come.

This Vision and Strategy is

Te Ture Whaimana o

Te Awa o Waikato

Part 11

Policy 6 and 16 of the Land Change rule

Policy 6 is quiet clear.

Policy 16 is very confusing.

The Waikato Regional Council has attempted to tick the box with Policy 16 in regard to the RMA and Treaty Settlement agreements but have over compensated with wonderful words which appear to have no substance.

Those ratepayers who don't fall under Policy 16 need a Resource Consent to intensify their property but probably won't get it.

Those ratepayers who do fall under Policy 16 also need resource consent to intensify their properties but are given a range of favourable conditions which others don't have to be considered by the Waikato Regional Council.

Under PC1 no landowner can increase their contaminant loading. All landowners must reduce their contaminant loading over time.

So just what does Policy 16 mean?

When Waikato Regional Council indicates those under Policy 16 can self manage their land and resources, what the hell does that mean compared to those under Policy 6?

The only way under PC1 a landowner will be allowed to intensify their property is to purchase contaminant loading or be granted contaminant rights.

If contaminants are granted to any landowner the term "robbing Peter to pay Paul" comes into play as the region has a fixed contaminant load.

If this was to occur I believe the Human Rights Act of NZ has been broken. To confirm my thoughts I have made a claim to that effect to the Human Rights Tribunal and I include their reply.

PC1 is on very dangerous ground, as a result of the tribunal findings. I would like the Commissioners' to recommend to the Waikato Regional Council the land change rule must be covered by one policy.

I believe Policy 6 must be removed from PC1 and either Policy 16 applies to all ratepayers or a new policy is written that is acceptable to all ratepayers and ticks the box for any RMA or Treaty Settlement concerns.

I would like to thank the Commissioners for their time.

Any questions

Trevor Simpson

Member of PLUG