

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: Troy McNeill

Postal Address:

Post Code:

Phone number:

Business:

Private:

Mobile:

Email address:

I wish to **OPPOSE** the application of:

Applicant's Name: Onumai Enterprises Limited

And/or Organisation: Onumai Enterprises Limited

Application Number: **RM22.550**

Location:

Common Marine and Coastal Area adjacent to 21 Marine Parade,
Taieri Mouth at about NZTM2000 E1382750 N4896314

Purpose:

Coastal Permit RM22.550.01 to alter and extend existing structures •
Coastal Permit RM22.550.02 to occupy the common marine and
coastal area with a wharf, floating pontoon, and multipurpose building

The specific parts of the application/s that my submission relates to are:

Both coastal permits.

My/Our submission is

I oppose the application for a number of reasons, including but not limited to:

- 1) As pointed out by the Technical Landscape Planner's review, the precedent this proposal would create. This has the potential to change the complexion of the entire wharf area. Impacts could include environmental, light spill and view of/from the river/Marine parade and loss of the iconic fishing village aesthetic. If this development happens, what stops other lease holders doing the same – resulting in a total loss of the character that so many identify with this area.

Contrary to the applicant's views, this area has its own beauty and personifies the Taieri Mouth historical fishing village, which holds value and meaning to residents and visitors, old and new.

Statements have been made by the applicants that there are potential issues with neighbouring wharves and their project would help improve the outlook when compared with these existing buildings - those are matters for the other individual lease holders and should not be used as reasoning to justify this new development.

- 2) The application lacks a lot of clear and finalised details of important environmental matters. Including detail on works that are likely to require further consents to disturb the CMA, namely but not limited to the need to use public (King's Chain land) to site their dwelling, and potentially dig up to underground the cables, underpin the building on land or potentially re-pile, based on no finalised design report from a certified engineer. The lack of detail on tankage. Notes accompanying the application state "grey and black water will be collected in storage tanks on the landward side of the building". The applicants concept drawings appear to show tankage internal to the building, yet at a recent public meeting, the applicants showed brochures for tankage that would be under slung under the wharf/building. This third option of underslung tanks, I am sure most people would agree, would come with significant risk of damage to the structure or puncture/damage of tanks from debris, high water and/or swell.

And related to the above:

- 3) More robust legal debate, consideration and opinion on this matter needs to take place regarding this major change to allow private entities to run permanent dwelling/businesses sited on public/King's Chain land. Should the application not acknowledge and explain the legal and environmental implications of this use of public land/Kings chain? It would be a big step to go from having a local Coffee Caravan being stopped from trading in this same area, to allow a "niche B & B over the water" to operate on public land/water.
- 4) There is no immediate need that requires this development to occur. This development appears to be a financial endeavour to benefit the applicants, rather than the community asset that they have made it out to be. Wharf access already exists for the public, Coast Guard and MPI, as does access to public bathrooms, water access for water sports and boat access via the boat ramp.
- 5) While the noble consideration of water/boat access for persons with physical disabilities is an important consideration, there appears to be far more involved than simply offering a davit for public use. Who maintains the health and safety around such equipment? Related to the davit is the matter of the pontoon to aid in access which noted by the notification report "*This pontoon is already in place, although it **does not appear** to be authorised by the current coastal permit 2006.321.*" Will this pontoon be assessed to even be allowed to stay in place on this basis? How does this unauthorised pontoon increase in footprint in the form of the pontoon affect the safe operation of other wharves around it?

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

That the consent in its current form is denied. The development would be dramatically reduced to fit within the existing size and aesthetic of surrounding buildings. The development would not operate as any form of accommodation, but simply be used within the existing commercial activity rules/regulations for this area, under the current lease terms. Additionally, a more robust public consultation process needs to occur to ensure that people who may not have been comfortable with written submission get to have their say to the people who are deciding the outcome of this application.

I may wish to be heard in support of my submission

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

I, **am not** 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, **do** wish to be involved in any pre-hearing meeting that may be held for this application.

I **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** served a copy of my submission on the applicant.



14th September 2023

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

(Date)

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