

With respect, I think your reporting officer has missed the implications of my suggested change – or rather addition to the wording of the plan. I wasn't suggesting limiting the plan's benefits to locals, but I believe by including these few extra words one can bring the needs, desires and wellbeing of the Council's clients, its people, into the plan. It is a very simple little change, but I believe it could have great effects.

What I'm suggesting will, in effect, focus the Plan on who its clients are. The District Council is there to serve the people of the district, and the plan is one of the main tools it has at its disposal to undertake that duty – yet the people of the district are not mentioned. But it is the people who are the Council's clients, and the Council is producing this new district plan for its clients – the people it serves. It is, I think it is a very good idea to give those clients, those people who pay rates, contribute to the social structure, work and play in the district a bit of priority. They need a mention. Their lives and lifestyles are important to the Council, and the district plan is one of the main tools the council has available to improve things for them.

Underlying problem is the fact that the RMA is very light on people, the protection of the habitat of people, let alone their pleasure in life. It makes special provision for the protection of the habitat of trout and salmon, but It does not make much allowance for people themselves. It is all about the environment in which they live, which is fine, but not about people's lives themselves. Yes, it does provide for the use and protection of natural and physical resources for people in paragraph 2 of section 5, where sustain able management is defined – but that is only in the context of the actual use of the resources, not of the possible non-use of resources, or in more general terms. You can't, from that, say that people need space, that they need security, lack of worry and stress, that they need community, or that they need psychological well being.

Beyond that the RMA is silent on the benefits which might arise for people of a district by the possible non-use of a resource. Ie sustainable management factors and the wellbeing of people come into consideration in the granting of a consent, not in the decline or refusal of a consent, or the suggestion that a particular proposal may not lead to the wellbeing of local people. The RMA is all about the use of a resource, not the possible non-use of it.

Mentioning the council's clients in a District Plan isn't inconsistent with the RMA. It is just bringing in something that the Act is pretty well silent about... Waimakariri can exceed the Act's standards, and be better for its people than is envisaged by the Act. Perhaps legislators thought that there was enough about them in social welfare legislation and so on...

As I said, RMA doesn't say that the interests of the people can't be included in the DP.

In effect my suggested addition to the wording means that one of the relevant questions in a consent is not only 'what are the benefits of this proposal to the residents and other people of the district?' but also the other side of that, not mentioned in the RMA, along the lines of 'Would the council's clients be better served if this consent was not granted?'

The creation of an accessway that runs through to a school's back gate or that will give firefighting access to the back of a forest. A produce stall on a commuter route. The availability of a higher-capacity power grid in the area so that others can install car chargers or solar panels. A better view

of the mountains. Security of knowing that your neighbour won't open a brothel or store ammonium nitrate is part of what the planning process should be able to achieve. Yes, those activities would be controlled, and as part of the consent process the madame may have promised to plant more trees and the fertiliser firm may have donated a reserve, but how good is the control when it comes to actually operating the activity? Are people in the vicinity going to lie in bed at night and worry?

At present these sorts of benevolent actions can be used as 'environmental trade-offs' – but the Act doesn't encourage them in the first place – and the result is that they are only promoted where there is some detrimental environmental effect occurring elsewhere which needs trading off against. At present it is 'we'll subdivide as close as we can to the boundary of that historic property, BUT we'll give you a walkway around the back'. What I'm suggesting is "we'll keep back from the boundary of that historic property, AND we'll give a walkway around the back so that your kids can get to school'.

Example of large scale use of resources – perhaps a well head for a bottling plant on this side of the Waimak, but which is supplying a bottling plant in Belfast or a waste composting plant to serve the needs of Chch. Is that really contributing to the well being of the people of the district?

If they were shown to be environmentally fairly neutral they might get the OK – but would they improve life for Waimakariri's residents? That improvement of life for its clients is a core responsibility for a council – and it shouldn't miss the bus when implementing a new DP.

My suggested wording should help deal with a lot of the problems which people currently have with those controversial proposals. Developers will be able to argue that their proposals benefit the people of Waimakariri, and not just themselves – and will therefore be encouraged to develop plans which don't just not harm the environment but genuinely make Waimakariri a better place to live and do business in. It would open the way for a submitter to argue that a proposal should be declined because it is not in the interests of the council's clients, the people of the district, whether its direct effects on the physical and natural environment are otherwise minor or not.

The answer to 'nimbys' is really for a developer to show that there are real benefits for the people.

In the end it is the people that matter, and they are the Council's clients. They need a mention in the District Plan. The DP needs to specifically protect their interests.

By agreeing to include the interests of the ultimate clients, the people, at the start of the process, you will be able to hold other changes and amendments up to the mirror 'what will this change do for the wellbeing of people?' That should lead to a better and more comprehensible and comprehensive plan which better suits the district, and the country.

He tangata, he tangata, he tangata. The people, the people, the people.

61. Michael Alexander de Hamel [261.1] seeks an amendment to the “Purpose” chapter of the district plan to reference “landowners, residents and visitors to Waimakariri District” as the types of people or plan users that the District Plan is written for and for whom decisions are made.

5.4.2 Assessment and recommendations 65. Whilst understanding Mr de Hamel’s intent, I consider that the District Plan is not limited to a particular class of plan readers or users. It is merely a legal requirement that the Waimakariri District must have a plan, without a requirement to specify the types of people that may read it. I recommend this submission [261.1] be rejected

5 2 RMAct, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—