

Submission on Proposed Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region

David and Pauline Innes


15 December 2023

Summary

We wish to make the following submission:

1. The plan change document is extremely difficult to read, inaccessible and the maps associated with the document are unclear.
2. We are unclear whether the stream that is located at the rear of our property is listed in the schedule. We are therefore unclear what wildlife has been identified for this stream. The stream passes through Hair Street and is subject to multiple water control features associated with the urban development. It also is covered for a part of its length from Hair Street to Gibbs Crescent. We want GWRC to note that there is no natural passage for fish on this stream.
3. We object to the description of Wainuiomata-iti Stream (Wainuiomata Stream). We believe that this waterway needs to be described in light of a proper survey of the wildlife found in the stream.
4. We object to the stock number limitation indicated as this is not appropriate for a rural area.
5. We object to the fact that not enough account has been taken of the effects of pest species on publicly owned land. We want the GWRC, DOC and HCC to undertake pest control on public land.
6. We want an urgent investigation into the extent of the wetland at the end of Moores Valley Road.
7. We object to the set levels of copper and zinc contamination.

We wish to provide a verbal submission in addition to this written submission.

1. The plan change document is extremely difficult to read, inaccessible and the maps associated with the document are unclear.

Although the notification for the change advised that hard copies of the proposal were available this proved not to be the case.

The map system that is linked to the plan document is not fit for purpose. Streams that had been individually listed in the schedule of the document were merged together in the GIS data. We were unable to identify the streams associated with our property. Many streams in the schedule were identified by coordinates. This was not an appropriate level of identification. Each stream should have been shown on a map and properly identified with reference to features that the reader could identify.

The wording of the planning document was very difficult to read. We do not believe that this document is fit for purpose. The connections between the policies to the geographic areas that the policies are supposed to apply to are entirely inadequate.

2. We are unclear whether the stream that is located at the rear of our property is listed in the schedule. We are therefore unclear what wildlife has been identified for this stream. The stream passes through Hair Street and is subject to multiple water control features associated with the urban development. It also is covered for a part of its length from Hair Street to Gibbs Crescent. We want GWRC to note that there is no natural passage for fish on this stream and want this officially noted.

In 2021 we received an abatement notice from Paul Duffin who stated that he held a warrant from both Hutt City Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council. This abatement notice falsely stated that a hanging culvert had been constructed on this stream. The notice also falsely stated that the stream was a tributary to Black Creek. It is in fact a tributary to the Wainuiomata River. It also falsely assumed that had a hanging culvert been constructed, that this would be a barrier to the passage of fish. The stream in question has multiple Council constructed water control features down stream and is covered between near the end of Hair Street and Gibbs Crescent.

3. We object to the description of Wainuiomata-iti Stream (Wainuiomata Stream). We believe that this waterway needs to be described in light of a proper survey of the wildlife found in the river.

This waterway appears to be badly affected by bacterial life. Very few living creatures appear to be surviving in this stream. While some of the listed species may have once lived in the stream, eels are the only species that appear to survive and even these are far less common than previously observed.

4. We object to the stock number limitation indicated as this is not appropriate for a rural area.

The limitations on stock do not seem to take adequate account of the differences in the effect on waterways of different stock types.

5. We object to the fact that not enough account has been taken of the effects of pest species on publicly owned land. We want the GWRC, DOC and HCC to undertake pest control on public land.

We are concerned about the lack of pest control on land owned by Hutt City Council (and HCC land managed by GWRC), Greater Wellington Regional Council and the Department of Conservation. Our property is being adversely affected by pest animals coming in from neighbouring publicly owned land. The understory of the bush has been destroyed by deer. We have achieved a marked improvement in part of our property by fencing off the area and clearing it of deer. This area is subject to a QEII covenant. Private landowners should not be restricted because of the effects of pest animals on poorly managed public land.

6. We want an urgent investigation into the extent of the wetland at the end of Moores Valley Road.

We understand from a former real estate agent who inspected the property that extensive parts of flat area of Lot 60 DP 354855 is wetland.

7. We object to the set levels of copper and zinc contamination.

Under the levels set a pregnant woman would need to 16 litres of trade waste to have a problem.

Concluding remarks

We have found that communication from the Greater Wellington Regional Council on the Proposed Change 1 to the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region has been extremely poor.

We object to the short period being allocated for submissions. We also object to the end date for submissions being so close to Christmas.