

My name is Jan Roxburgh

The second substantive response by Rangitane O Wairau to the proposed east coast vehicle bylaw is considered as being quite irrelevant to the proposed bylaw. Whether their arguments are valid or not the fact is no one is attempting to deny any person or group of persons access to any part of the coast. All people are (within any appropriate regulations), entitled to walk, run, ride a horse, land by boat, or helicopter on practically any part of the coast, just as they were entitled to before access was enhanced by the 2016 Kaikoura earthquakes.

The response would appear to be an attempt to delay passing the proposed bylaw by forcing a review of a perceived problem which in this case does not exist and should be addressed elsewhere.

With regard to the proposed bylaw the addition to the stated 4(c) purposed is reasonable but not really necessary as no one is trying to remove customary rights of Tangata Whenua. If the definition of Tangata Whenua at the end of part 1 is considered important then so be it.

The Rangitane O Wairau's proposed addition to Part 2. 7. 3 and 4 is viewed as being so racially discriminative that could cause disharmony and much resentment, that would, liable lead to!

- 1 Widespread disregard of the bylaw.
- 2 Possible deliberate destruction of ecological values.
- 3 Possible deliberate damage to identified cultural sites, the bylaw is intended to protect,
- 4 Trashing of the environment as for example dumping of rubbish or the disposal of vehicles as evidenced by the burnt out stolen vehicle at Canterbury Gully.
- 5 Judicial challenges which would serve only to delay the bylaw's adoption. Laws once enacted are difficult, and time consuming and expensive to amend or rescind.

The Rangitane O Warau's proposed additions thus must must be rejected.

My closing comment can only be,
"What on earth were they thinking of."