

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: Chris Knight

Postal Address:

Post Code:

Phone number:

Business:

Private:

Mobile:

Email address:

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

Applicant's Name: Onumai Enterprises Limited

And/or Organisation:

Application Number: **RM22.550**

Location:

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

Purpose:

Residential, recreational, commercial, and emergency use activities

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

Local amenities, aesthetics, safety, conservation, similar precedents & historical.

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)*.

Having lived in Taieri Mouth for 26 years I feel I am entitled and qualified to state the wharf, the boat ramp and its general surroundings have remained little more than an constant eyesore. The wharf consists of a jumble of wood and corrugated iron sheds, shipping containers and a fuel tank, none of which are coordinated as far as colour or style. It is furthermore clearly evident the location has, with respect, been

overlooked by the relevant authorities who have allowed the area to become dilapidated and it is clearly neglected. Certainly what limited improvements have been made would appear to have been carried out by the owners of the various sheds (licence holders) in order they might conduct their business in safely whilst accessing vessels and performing activities such as off loading. Whilst it is accepted the location is an active wharf principally for commercial fishing vessels together with the adjacent boat launching ramp which is also used by casual visitors & boat owners, there remains no justification for the location to be unkempt. With a modicum of effort by the authorities the wharf could look much more pleasing to the eye without compromising its potential to charm.

On the subject of aesthetics. There have been no constraints whatsoever as to the types of buildings allowed to be erected in the township, it is a veritable smorgasbord of styles, concrete panel, block, timber facing & homes, some so badly illuminated from within that they look as if they are a theatre stage. At least consideration has been given to ensure the proposed building is in keeping for its location considering its location and will maintain a discrete visual presence both during daytime and when illuminated from within. I do not foresee any issues with the height of the building considering the steep backdrop and because it does not affect the view of any other building. Furthermore the pitch of the roof would be ideal for the deployment of solar panels should the owners choose to install them further reducing its potential carbon footprint.

Taieri Mouth has changed in recent decades from being a township of cribs and part time occupancy to a growing permanent resident base, it is also a vibrant community consisting of many million dollar properties, it must be noted in consequence the ongoing development feeds large amounts of money to the local authorities coffers, none of which would appear to be directed towards providing infrastructure improvements to the area nor to the wharf area specifically!

The wider Otago community has clearly supported and mandated a requirement to retain the traditional boat sheds located in the region as they possess historical and great aesthetic value which consequently also adds value to the tourism industry. The certainty of long term ownership imparted to boat shed owners also fosters re-development and a willingness to invest in maintenance and improvements. Under no circumstances am I suggesting the area to become another 'Auckland Waterfront', rather let's see the location cleaned up develop the area to be visually pleasing, to be an asset and provide overall benefit to the community and its visitors. I would personally like to see the local authority assist the community to clean up the wharf area, they could start by removing the left over concrete ramparts of the old bridge and maintaining the boat ramp. It must be noted the majority of boat ramp users are also non-residents for which the community obtains little benefit however we are always the first responders in cases of emergency!

The applicants proposal incorporates a number of safety features and most importantly provides much needed facilities for the disabled and critically lifting

facilities for anyone injured on a vessel. All of which are excellent additions aside from improvements to the area in question. The change of use request cannot therefore be considered to be unreasonable. If the change of use is approved it will potentially set a precedent however rather than having any negative effect it will clearly lay a foundation of quality standards for future marine/jetty/boat shed developments.

Lets be fair, disabled people deserve reasonable access rights to the water as are able bodied abet with of course due consideration for their safety is taken as read.

Having been employed in professional maritime operations, search and rescue, recovery and salvage and now as a boat owner myself, I cannot stress the requirement to be able to access well maintained wharf facilities is sacrosanct. The proposed lifting crane is an excellent facility for the reasons outlined previously.

The local community is a self-starter. It has shown itself many times to be able to progress ideas and improvements, this proposal is one and the same. With the local authorities assistance additional work to make good the wharf, river banks, boat ramp all can be improved with the added advantages of preventing erosion, access and to improve the overall aesthetics of the area in question.

Therefore re-development of the wharf and this proposal must be considered to be a significant improvement, hopefully it acts as a catalyst for further improvements and therefore it unequivocally carries my full unwavering support.

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

Grant permission to the application without imposing undue constraints and caveats.

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.



13/9/2023

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