

Contact Details

Name: Mike Drake, Heather Spence

Postal address: 105 Fairhall Road, RD2, Wakefield 7096

Telephone number: 03 522 4458

Email: mike@mikedrake.nz, heather@heatherspence.nz

Date: February, 2019

Details

Section <i>(Identify the section, objective, outcome, policy, milestone, table or map that your submission relates to.)</i>	Submission <i>(Explain the nature of your submission stating whether you support or oppose the approach in the draft Plan. Please provide brief reasons.)</i>	Decision Sought <i>State clearly the decision sought or changes you would like to see. Please be as precise as possible. For example:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if supporting: 'retain Policy X' - if opposing: 'delete Policy X' - if seeking changes 'reword Policy X to read (give suggested wording)
General - focus of this submission	This submission has two principal focuses: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The perceived negative impacts of increasing scope and frequency of air traffic for tourists. 2. Need for objective, measurable targets for all milestones. Without these and without monitoring them, the plan is wasted effort. 	
General - partners' experience in Westland NP	Have all partners involved in developing this plan been in the park's mountains, been recreational climbers/trampers, experienced the solitude and tranquillity that the direction of this plan will negatively impact? Or have they just been up onto a glacier in a plane for a brief period and not appreciated the impact on the intrinsic quality of the Westland National Park of increased tourism-aircraft activity, over a wider area than currently permitted?	
General - identifying changes from previous plan	Is it possible to write this plan in such a way that a reviewer can identify the difference between the current plan and the proposed changes?	
General - navigating this	One has to keep scrolling back to determine	Place the current section at the top right.

<p>plan</p>	<p>which section at particular point comes under.</p> <p>Note: The example below is the Mount Cook Draft Plan. But the same principle applies.</p> <p>Having a heading, for example 2.3.3 Haupapa ... (p132) and then having independent numbering within 2.3.3, eg. Aircraft 7.</p> <p>By having a proper structure the table of contents would have meaning.</p> <p>The only way to reference items is by page number, which will change as the document is modified.</p> <p>A document, like software if written without structure will be difficult to read, maintain. It will become a doorstop, rather than a working useable document.</p> <p>Furthermore, it will cost much time and money, now and in the future, for people to easily understand the content.</p>	<p>Alternatively, the document could be structured that all headings have a reference, eg.</p> <p>Use section numbering to see the structure of the document, and for clear referencing without using pages numbers.</p> <p>See below</p> <p>To illustrate:</p> <p>2.3.3 Haupapa Place</p> <p>2.3.3.1 Outcomes</p> <p>2.3.3.2 Policies</p> <p>2.3.3.2.1 Recreation</p> <p>2.3.3.2.2 Guiding</p> <p>2.3.3.2.3 Watercraft</p> <p>2.3.3.2.3.1 Should grant</p> <p>2.3.3.2.3.2 Should grant</p> <p>2.3.3.2.3.3 Should grant no more</p> <p>Having a numbering system that has absolute referencing system. The table of contents will quickly show the structure and any inconsistency with the structure.</p>
<p>General - length of plan</p>	<p>Too Long</p> <p>At one hundred and seventy six pages this plan is far too large. This plan is put together by paid employees; their time is paid for.</p> <p>The people whose feedback you are seeking have a day job.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the introductory text could be placed in Appendices; ● the five different places create lots of duplication. <p>If the objective of this document is to be a working document and gather feedback from a large number of people; then think it has failed dismally.</p> <p>The DOC estate is for people to enjoy; it is not a commercial playground. We have a Labour Government now, so the commercial imperatives to survive under the previous government are no longer valid.</p> <p>However, DOC infrastructure growth is required to meet the expanding tourist population; it</p>	<p>Oppose: The long wording of the document and the lack of good structure. It will be a barrier for getting a wide range of feedback.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When designing such an important document keep in mind the two primary (wethink) objectives: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Write the plan to be a working document, ie. write in plain language for everyone to understand. b. Make it as easy as possible for people to provide feedback.

	<p>needs to be funded by tourists.</p> <p>Focus must be placed on reducing anthropogenic noise. "Quick-fix" tourists should not compromise the enjoyment of people who use their feet.</p>	
p7 The Journey	<p>Support focus on Treaty Partnership and partner obligations - a good approach. Have individuals and representatives of the three papatipu rūnaka spent time in the region, particularly the remote areas, and experienced the qualities of tranquility and natural quiet that tourism operators have such a huge impact on? That is, do they understand the reality of this plans' intent for aerial tourism?</p>	
p58	<p>Oppose use of word 'Tranquility'.</p> <p>You are specifically talking about the noise footprint within that Westland National Park. Noise created by machines; mainly aircraft.</p> <p>Tranquillity (also spelled tranquility) is the quality or state of being tranquil; that is, calm, serene, and worry-free. <i>Wikipedia</i></p> <p>Tranquil (to me) is a state of mind (above). Helicopters passing overhead would disturb my tranquility, as would moving through a crevasse field, or walking down a gully with stones falling.</p> <p>'Noise' would be more understood by the many different nationalities visiting the park. If you said that an area had a very high noise level, this would be more readily understood, than saying this area had a very low tranquility level.</p>	<p>Reword, substitute 'noise' for 'tranquility'.</p> <p>Table 2 would then have 'Noise levels', rather than 'Tranquility Rating'..</p>
Map 2, p26	<p>Westland National Park needs stand out on the map.</p> <p>The idea is to show WNP in context. The current map fails in this respect.</p>	<p>Highlight Mt Cook National Park in a standout colour.</p> <p>Remove the heavy boundary, as this is implied if it is correctly highlighted.</p>
Map 3, p41	<p>WNP is a more detailed map. Not sure what is attempted to be shown here.</p>	<p>Reword to clarify what this map is trying to illustrate.</p>
1.2.3, p52	<p>Oppose emphasis on heli-skiing/hiking activities.</p> <p>Traditional use of Westland NP was (and still is) for climbers and trampers; people who</p>	<p>Reword to emphasise climbing and tramping are the main activities of the park.</p>

	<p>worked hard to experience the serenity of the park.</p> <p>Heli-skiing/hiking are “recent” introductions. These activities along with glacier landings and overflights for “quick-fix” tourists all impact the serenity sought by the climbers and trampers.</p> <p>I (Mike Drake) have flown into (and out) Pioneer Hut to climb in the area. This we believe is different from people who touch down on glaciers only for a brief moment, photo opportunity etc.</p>	
<p>1.2.3, p42</p>	<p>we find the structure on this section could progress from the climbing history, through to the more “quick-fix” tourist activities, eg. glacier landings.</p> <p>A SCRAP structure would be useful. For example:</p> <p>Situation: There are a wide range of visitors to the park. Those who are prepared and skilled enough to walk into the backcountry and experience the rewards and serenity that this brings.</p> <p>Complications: Other visitors have neither; the time, fitness, motivation or experience to work for the serenity. Overflights and brief landings sought by these tourists impact on the tourists who have worked for their “fix”.</p> <p>Recommendation: Establish more shorter walks to cater for these tourists.</p> <p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● survey tourists to find out what type of non-flight activity would meet their requirements. ● establish walkways ● establish cycleways ● create a rental bike/e-bike outlet <p>Politeness: Suggest other areas for heli-skiing/hiking. People who can afford to pursue these activities should be relocated. Why should their activity impact the serenity of others? This should be a core principle for DOC.</p>	<p>Reword. Apply a SCRAP structure.</p> <p>S - Situation C - Complication R - Recommendation A - Action P - Politeness (may not always be applicable).</p>
<p>2.4, p59 “desired tranquillity outcomes for Places and Map 5 describe and</p>	<p>Oppose use of ‘Tranquillity’</p> <p>As mentioned using the word ‘tranquility’ and now ‘soundscape’ are just ways to confuse the issue. We are talking about ‘noise’ pure and</p>	<p>Reword. Replace ‘tranquility’ with ‘noise’. Replace ‘soundscape’ with ‘noise footprint’.</p>

<p>represent the desired future state of natural soundscapes in the Park”</p>	<p>simple.</p> <p>Who decides the noise levels (in your language “desired tranquility outcomes)? A New Zealand climber/tramper, a DOC bureaucrat, kaitiaki rūnaka, a tourism operator, a “quick-fix” tourist (who wants a selfie on the glacier)?</p> <p>Apart from finding parking space this is the most important issue facing DOC in many areas. We need to keep to simple language and not cloud peoples’ understanding by using woolly words.</p>	
<p>2.4.1, p61, Policy 2.b)</p>	<p>wefind the Objectives and Policies rather nebulous. Would all DOC staff understand “<i>add value to the visitor experience in the Park, including opportunities to express the importance of the Park to mana whenua.</i>”? Would visitors understand this?</p>	<p>Reword. Use plain simple language that is understood by everyone. Also needs to be objective and measurable.</p>
<p>2.4.1.6, p62, Policies “Avoid, remedy or minimise adverse effects on the qualities of tranquillity and natural quiet, solitude and remoteness where these are important features and expectations of the visitor experience in Westland Tai Poutini National Park.”</p>	<p>Again, what does this mean? If you have a defined ‘noise footprint’, operators who compromise this are penalised. There is enough smart technology for monitoring.</p> <p>All non-core activities that do not allow people to experience the natural quiet should be avoided.</p>	<p>Reword Clarify this policy.</p>
<p>2.4.1./Milestones, p62</p>	<p>Where are the KPI?</p> <p>2. Increased the number of visitors having an exceptional experience in Westland Tai Poutini National Park (Years 3 and 8). What does this mean? By how much percent?</p> <p>3. Updated all signage and other public information in Westland Tai Poutini National Park to include te reo Māori (Years 3, 5, 8 and 10). Is this an expense we can afford? Why have Years 3, 5, 8 and 10. What does this mean?</p>	<p>Have more meaningful policies and measurable milestones.</p>
<p>3.1.5 Waste Management,</p>	<p>The management of shit (again, using plain language) is a big problem for DOC. A number</p>	<p>Recommendation: DOC speak with major airlines bringing tourists to New Zealand to show a video</p>

<p>“Seek a bylaw to require visitors to the Park to remove all human waste from alpine (non-organic soil) areas generated by them where not disposed of in an approved waste receptacle.”</p>	<p>of foreign tourists and probably some New Zealand tourists do not know how to shit in the woods.</p> <p>When Mike did the NZAC High Alpine Course we carried out our human waste. Mike also did this when he climbed Nuns Veil.</p> <p>NZ alpine courses require participants to carry out their own human waste - why should it be any different for a commercial tourism operator or a tourist?</p>	<p>on how to shit-in-the-woods (there is a book with this title). We are sure we have sufficient talent to create a video that will be very memorable. It should make people think about their responsibility when they are about to make a deposit.</p> <p>Again, keep it simple.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pack out human waste on glaciers in popular areas; whether guided, or not. 2. Pack out human waste in high usage areas, even if it could be buried in soil.
<p>3.2.1.1 “Advocate to aviation controllers and aircraft operators that they establish voluntary codes of conduct to manage flight paths that.”</p>	<p>Oppose: Generally found that self/voluntary regulation doesn't work.</p>	<p>Recommendation: DOC need to define and monitor flight paths. Remember; national parks need to have a low noise level to allow people to enjoy their surroundings. Any noise intrudes on this commune with nature.</p>
<p>3.2.2 Aircraft</p>	<p>“3.2.2 Aircraft” is incorrectly indented.</p>	<p>Reformat: Outdent to the same level as 3.2.1</p>
<p>4.2.2, Policy 1c, p119 “high quality visitor experience”</p>	<p>These are all woolly words. What does this mean? A highly subjective measure.</p>	<p>Reward: Clarify meaning in such a way to be measurable.</p>
<p>4.2.2.3, p119. Aircraft landings</p>	<p>Oppose: Planned increase in heli-skiing and aircraft use for tourism in a national park, especially over such a large zone.</p> <p>We are not sure why heli-skiing/hiking have such a high priority and such a large zone. Is a national park the best place to allow a highly mechanical activity? It contradicts all the words at the front of the document; natural quiet, serenity.</p> <p>Oppose: Any increase in landings for frivolous activities. Landings in national parks should have a purpose that is empathetic with the original purpose of a national park - to enjoy the peace, tranquility and scenery. Not to land, take selfies, then fly to the next iconic destination.</p> <p>Castle Rocks Hut is another special place. Although access is difficult, the rewards are worth it.</p> <p>Oppose: Any commercial frivolous flights into Castle Rocks Hut.</p>	<p>Reward: What are the current landing numbers?</p>
<p>4.2.2.3, p119 “pilot</p>	<p>In my experience helicopter pilots always exit</p>	<p>Reward: Define accurately what is meant by this</p>

<p>leaves aircraft”</p>	<p>the aircraft to open doors and ensure correct loading/unloading of gear. Does this mean pilots have left the aircraft?</p>	<p>statement.</p>
<p>Discussion box – Proposed amenities area in Franz Josef Glacier/ Kā Roimata o Hinehukatere valley</p>	<p>If the gondola would allow access to the glacier and result in reduced helicopter flights, then it may have merit. However, this is adding another Icon, accessible from Franz Josef township.</p> <p>The counter argument is that, once built this could be seen as precedent for more gondolas within national parks.</p> <p>To take the pressure of Franz Josef it might be appropriate to locate a similar facility that is not within a national park.</p> <p>How would the crowds of people be managed, as this would be a highly sought after destination?</p> <p>If it goes ahead, then it needs to provide full facilities; world class facilities, cf. Switzerland.</p> <p>Question 4: My vision would be to see a reduction in noise levels on the Franz Josef Glacier. A gondola may/or may not be part of this scenario.</p> <p>Tourist numbers need to be reduced in order not to severely degrade the experience of tourists and New Zealanders.</p> <p>Spreading the tourist load by distributing them around the DOC estate using aircraft is not the solution. This will frustrate tourists and New Zealanders.</p> <p>DOC - do not lose the plot.</p>	<p>Support (with conditions): Support if, and only if aircraft flights are reduced. It should not set a precedent for other gondolas in other national parks.</p> <p>This would mean long term access to the glacier could be guaranteed. This may not be feasible, given the dynamic nature of the West Coast glaciers.</p>
<p>Discussion box – Recreational dog walking</p>	<p>No general dog walking. It is a national park - simple.</p> <p>Allow dog walking by recognised groups, for example disabled people, hunters.</p>	
<p>Conclusion</p>	<p>If we had the time and patience this submission could have equalled the number of pages in the plan.</p> <p>It is a beautiful weekend out there so we must conclude this submission.</p> <p>We are concerned for the future of our national parks when we have such a document. One</p>	<p>I trust from the above that you will have the idea that flying anywhere within the WNP must have a very worthwhile meaning.</p> <p>Disturbing the enjoyment and serenity of others by having superficial flights (“quick-fix”/“selfie” tourists should be eliminated from all national parks.)</p> <p>Summary</p>

	<p>could have the perception that DOC are agents for commercial operators.</p> <p>Commercial operators do play a roll, but they should be used to help people to get to difficult places, so that they may then start their own adventure.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Employ professional writers to clearly communicate and engage with the intended audience. 2. Structure and condense the document to be readable and useable. 3. Have clear measurable milestones. 4. The document should be a working document written to engage people, rather than repel.
<p>Thank You</p>	<p>Thank you for extending the deadline for the submissions.</p> <p>Mike Drake</p>	

Hearing

<p>Do you wish to be heard in support of your comments?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
---	------------