

RECEIVED
15 SEP 2023
BY: free bayd

Bayd



Submission Form 16 to the Otago Regional Council on consent applications

This is a Submission on (a) limited notified/publicly notified resource consent application/s pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991.

Submitter Details:
(please print clearly)

Full Name/s: Susan Elizabeth Keith

Postal Address: [Redacted]

Post Code: [Redacted]

Phone number: Business: - Private: -

Mobile: [Redacted]

Email address: [Redacted]

I/we wish to **SUPPORT** / **OPPOSE** / submit a **NEUTRAL** submission on (circle one) the application of:

Applicant's Name: Onumai Enterprises Ltd

And/or Organisation: _____

Application Number: Rm 22.550

Location: Marine Parade Taieri Mouth

Purpose: Residential & water activities as per application for consent

The specific parts of the application/s that my submission relates to are: (Give details)

Commercial + residential accommodation use

My/Our submission is (include: whether you support or oppose the application or specific parts of it, whether you are neutral regarding the application or specific parts of it and the reasons for your views).

Refer attached appendix

RECEIVED

BY

I/We seek the following decision from the consent authority (give precise details, including the general nature of any conditions sought)

Any decision to exclude commercial
or residential accommodation use.
No objection to the sale of locally
caught fish

I/we:

- Wish to be heard in support of our/my submission
 Not wish to be heard in support of our/my submission

If others make a similar submission, I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

- Yes
 No

I, ~~am/am not~~ (choose one) a trade competitor* of the applicant (for the purposes of Section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991).

*If trade competitor chosen, please complete the next statement, otherwise leave blank.

I, ~~am/am not~~ (choose one) directly affected by an effect as a result of the proposed activity in the application that:

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

I, ~~do/do not~~ (choose one) wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application.

I ~~do/do not~~ request* that the local authority delegates its functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority.

I ~~have/have not~~ served a copy of my submission on the applicant.



Signature/s of submitter/s
(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter/s)

15/9/2023
(Date)

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, which is very faint and difficult to read.

Vertical handwritten text on the right side of the page, possibly a list or a column of data.

Handwritten text at the bottom of the page, possibly a footer or concluding remarks.

Notes to the submitter

If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B.

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

Privacy: Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and the public, including publication on the Council website. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the notified resource consent process

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners.

You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

The address for service for the Consent Authority is:

Otago Regional Council, Private Bag 1954, Dunedin, 9054
or by email to submissions@orc.govt.nz

APPENDIX TO APPLICATION IN OPPOSITION

We live at Taieri Mouth and regularly walk down past the wharf and love the current view from the roadside looking out to the river and the island.

We have used the wharves for fishing and other activities.

Although some people consider this area ramshackle, in our opinion it is rustic and has huge character which fits in with this part of Taieri Mouth. There has been a lot of redevelopment of the homes which has all been within the current character of this part of the township.

The application as submitted is largely for a house to be built over the river with the recreational facilities simply as just a part of it and in our opinion a means of getting support from the locals.

I do not oppose the recreational facilities as proposed – only the house.

Main items of objection in random order are:

The current regional coastal plan does not have any guidelines relating to houses being built over water.

Coastal permits relate only to fishing and other water based activities and not residential dwellings. Approval to the building of a house in this case will set a precedent for the entire Otago region and would set the scene for wealthy people to buy up boat sheds and rebuild into houses which are inappropriate for the charm and character of the Otago coastal communities. Currently these boat sheds and coastal areas can still be accessed easily by local people of all status regardless of wealth.

There is no need for any residential house to be built over water in this region as there are plenty of other areas where houses can be built without encroaching on the water front and over the water.

Building a house in this area would also reduce the parking available for people using the boat ramp. It is easy to say that there is plenty of parking at the boat ramp but in reality it has been our own experience that on many occasions the boat ramp is full and there are many vehicles and their trailers right along the road side by the wharves.

AIRBNBs are now very popular and it is likely that the facility which would be quite spectacular would be used often and although the applicants state that the recreational facilities will still be there for one and all, over time like many other facilities the rules change and there would be no guarantees that they would not apply for a variation of consent for this to happen.

I attended the meeting the applicants held at the Taieri Mouth hall on Tuesday 12 September and their answers to most questions were largely in the “we don't know” category which means that in reality as locals we have no idea of what their final proposal will be.

They advised that their own consultant considers that the height of the house has little or no impact. That is a ridiculous thing to say as the current boat sheds are not very high at all and this house is proposed to be far higher than any normal house is. Our own is under five metres which is around normal and this is proposed at 5.9m so would be very imposing against the remaining buildings on the wharf area and will impede a significant amount of the view from the roadway. It would also cause light pollution at such a height.



Handwritten title or header text, possibly a date or subject line.

First paragraph of handwritten text, starting with a capital letter.

Second paragraph of handwritten text, continuing the narrative.

Third paragraph of handwritten text, providing further details.

Fourth paragraph of handwritten text, showing a change in thought.

Fifth paragraph of handwritten text, possibly a concluding sentence.

Sixth paragraph of handwritten text, starting a new section.

Seventh paragraph of handwritten text, continuing the flow.

Eighth paragraph of handwritten text, adding more context.

Ninth paragraph of handwritten text, showing a shift in focus.

Tenth paragraph of handwritten text, providing a summary.

Eleventh paragraph of handwritten text, possibly a final thought.

Twelfth paragraph of handwritten text, concluding the page.

Thirteenth paragraph of handwritten text, starting a new line.

Fourteenth paragraph of handwritten text, continuing the text.

Fifteenth paragraph of handwritten text, adding more detail.

Sixteenth paragraph of handwritten text, showing a transition.

Seventeenth paragraph of handwritten text, ending the document.

The applicants advise they intend to instal a sling for disabled people to be able to go aboard boats etc, This is a marvellous idea but in all practicality the health and safety requirements for this will be considerable and most likely only be able to be operated by a licensed person. This would mean that limited use would be available and likely only by appointment in advance. So a case of "sounds good but.....".

The pontoon is supposed,y to be available for school groups but the pontoon is too small for that and it is more likely that the schools will continue to use Knarsden Park or Riverside Road.

Use of the facility as a house may well lead to noise complaints. We have many boats and jet skis etc go down the river in the early hours to capture the right tide for going out over the bar and in the quite of the morning they can be very noisy which would likely be worse with the house being over the water. These users like all other users of coastal areas have the right to enjoyment of water related activities without impediment or complaint by residential activities within the water based domain.

The applicants claim that the facilities can be used by emergency services however that will rely on the facility not being used by others and no locks on the gate. Helicopters currently set down at Knarsden Park and take on patients from the boats that "beach" there. To use the pontoon would mean double handling of patients and likely require additional rescue personnel. Like the other ideas the applicants have put forward they sound good but are not entirely practical.

ORC needs to take into account very carefully the full impact on coastal permits before consent is considered to a residential house being built over a significant river in the region as to the precedent it will set. It has been my experience in the past that once such applications are approved then requests for variations to the consent are submitted with each variation being slight but ultimately over time make a considerable difference.

