

Proposed Natural Resources Plan:

Submitter:

Susie Mills

Submitter Number:

S161

FORM 5: SUBMISSION FORM – PROPOSED NATURAL RESOURCES PLAN FOR THE WELLINGTON REGION

This is a submission on the Proposed Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region pursuant to Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

NAME/ORGANISATION

SUSIE MILLS

NUMBER

STREET NAME

51 FIELDWAY

SUBURB/TOWN

POSTCODE

WAIKANAÉ 5034

PHONE

EMAIL

021549221 SUSIE@SUSIEMILLS.COM

The Wellington Regional Council has a preference for providing information about the Proposed Natural Resources Plan via email. We will send you updates on the process, information and provide you with details of any meetings and the hearing. Please tick here if you do not agree to receive communication via email

The specific provision(s) of the Proposed Natural Resources Plan that my submission relates to is:
Please specify the provision/section number:

My submission on this provision is:

- I support the provision
- Oppose the provision
- I wish to have the specific provision amended

Reasons for my submission: I live alongside the Waimaha Stream. I have done so for 50 years. I am also a member of the Fieldway Dune Restoration Group & we have planted 1000s of spinifex at the Waimaha Estuary. This has been so successful that the river did not need the mouth to be dug for over 2.5 years - the largest

I seek the following decision from WRC (give precise details): See attached

Please continue on separate sheet(s) in similar format or download a submission form from www.gw.govt.nz/regional-plan-review

Attendance and wish to be heard at hearing(s)

- I/We do wish to be heard in support of my/our submission at hearings
Note: This means that you wish to speak in support of your submission at the hearing(s)
- I/We do not wish to be heard in support of my/our submission. *Note: This means that you cannot speak at the hearing. However, you will still retain your right to appeal any decision made by the Wellington Regional Council to the Environment Court*
- If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Trade competition

[Cross out this shaded section if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission]

I/we could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission
I/we could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I/we am/am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of my submission that:
(a) adversely affects the environment; and
(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Publication of details

The Wellington Regional Council is legally required to publicly notify a summary of submissions including your name and address. Your name and address will be there to enable other submitters who may wish to make a further submission to be able to serve you with a copy of it.

Signature: Russie Mills Date: 25/9/2015

Person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making submission. NB. Not required if making an electronic submission

Post your submission to: Freepost 3156
Wellington Regional Council
PO Box 11646
Wellington 6142

Page 2.

* period of non digging in about 20 years.

Finally it was flowing without 2-3 digs a year at a price of \$4000 per dig.

My submission is as a result of what happened next, which was:

Golf Club upstream complained of wet greens due to river level upstream - near Bowling Club.

G.WRC ~~dig~~ ^{dig} the "mouth" of the river & directed it to the north.

Since then it has been dug twice as it ate into the dunes, the spinifex dunes were destroyed & a "cliff" of 3 metres was created.

My submission:

One boat doesn't fit all.

This decision was not a good decision. KCDC + Residents could have been consulted about the upstream flooding. Alternative engineering solutions should have been looked at.

Digging the mouth of Waimaha Stream should be done only if ~~dangerous~~ certain trigger points are met which relate to the Estuary.

A trigger point which is reached due to upstream flooding should not necessarily result in the same action as if a trigger point at the Estuary is reached.

I submit that a more comprehensive approach & range of options be considered.

I also submit that KCDC + any person should be able to act if a trigger point is reached - not just G.W.R.C.

G.W.R.C needs to take a more scientific & considered approach to:

- : what has happened
- : what is happening
- : what will happen if they do not stop applying the same "fix" i.e. digging the mouth" to all issues.

To Summarise:

If G.W.R.C / KCDC / Local residents determined at an "early stage 1" trigger point was reached early on in the process (not when 1/2 the done has gone) then there would still be time to pursue options.

So, golf club flooding - trigger point reached could result in:

- 1) Clearing the stream - upstream
- 2) Deepening the stream past the groin
- 3) NOT re-aligning the stream

However, because we have a "one boot fits all" regime, the entire river mouth gets dug into a straight line & re-aligned to the opposite direction to what it was, at the time.

There appears to be no science attached to this.

Page 4

We have met with KCDC, GWRC + some restoration people.

Our local restoration group is very onboard with being involved in some more technical discussion.

To conclude - I am submitting that we need to look at some better options + new triggers at Waimaha

Quene M:K
Solicitor
Waikanae.

P.S. Sorry it is handwritten - its late in day!