

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: Juliet Anderson

Postal Address:

Post Code:

Phone number:

Business:

Private:

Mobile:

Email address:

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

Applicant's Name: Greg and Ange Mirams

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:

Residential, recreational, commercial, and emergency use activities

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

1.2 Proposed Activity/1.2.2. The Proposal

The current coastal permit for this wharf enables commercial use of the wharf for the mooring and unloading fishing boats and the storage of fishing and boating equipment. The applicants are proposing to restore and upgrade their wharf and align the coastal permit with uses more suitable to the current economic direction of Taieri Mouth, being a recreation and holiday base.

My submission relates to the proposal to change the current permit to allow the building of a residential/commercial dwelling in/on the CMA.

Consents Sought: • 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. Current consents: Coastal Permit 2006.321.

My submission is: I strongly OPPOSE the proposal to allow the building of a residential/commercial dwelling at the Taieri Mouth Fishing Wharf. I believe it will create a private residential and boating marina and if permitted, will open the door regionally and nationally, to boatsheds becoming private housing opportunities.

“Policy 5.4.9 Activities in the Coastal Marine Area:

In the coastal marine area minimise adverse effects from activities by all of the following: a) Avoiding activities that do not have a functional need to locate in the coastal marine area;...”

If the Mirams are wanting to create further accommodation options for visitors to the area, I believe they can easily find alternative land-based options in the vicinity. The applicants’ claim of a ‘multipurpose building’ is disingenuous. It is clearly a residential dwelling for family, friends and paying guests for commercial gain.

“8.4.9 Structures should only be allowed to locate in the coastal marine area where there are no practicable alternatives elsewhere.”

The proposed dwelling cannot be described as a boatshed – it is a 5.9 metre high private residence with full glass frontage which will stand out on entering the village from the north. The plans make no allowance for storage of boats within the structure – it is clearly a residence with master bedroom, 2nd bedroom, bathroom, kitchen, living and dining room.

“8.4.5 New and existing structures will be required to be maintained in a structurally sound and tidy state, and should blend as far as is practicable with the adjoining landscape to minimise the visual impact of that structure on the character of the area. Explanation Structures in the coastal marine area will be required to be maintained in a sound and tidy state and to blend as far as is practicable with the landscape to minimise the visual impact on natural character.”

While I support their intention to upgrade the wharf and include an opportunity for their disabled friend to access the water, I note the applicants’ state ...

“1.1 The wharf is currently in a sad and dilapidated state of repair after years of neglect “...

“2.2 The wharf, and associated structures, along with many of the other wharves in the area, is in a poor state of repair, arguably in breach of conditions 5 and 6 of the existing permit, which requires the structures to blend into the environment and be kept in a tidy state.”

Also within the existing permit is condition 4 which states that every five years” the consent holder shall submit a structural integrity assessment for the wharf and all its appurtenant component and accessory structures from an independent and suitably qualified person such as a building inspector or structural engineer”. This would suggest to me that this is not being enforced at Taieri Mouth and should be followed up by the Otago Regional Council or appropriate authority before the wharves are beyond repair. Any leaseholders not complying should lose their right to hold a lease.

As to the benefits to the community, Taieri Mouth already has a public boat jetty adjacent to the wharf which is currently used to launch watercraft for recreational or emergency use. A rescue helicopter or ambulance would use either Knarston Park or this jetty. Again, I see this as a private commercial venture, of benefit to the family, friends and paying guests of the applicants.

The applicants also claim not to restrict public access any further than already occurs, referring to Policy 7.4.3(d) to protect personal property of the consent holder. As this allows locking access to the wharf, this is not in the public’s interest and therefore not of benefit to the community.

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

I wish the current application to be DECLINED. While I support the applicants’ intention to upgrade and strengthen the current wharf for recreational and fishing use and access, I do NOT wish to see a private housing/airbnb marina in the quaint fishing village of Taieri Mouth. I therefore strongly object to the proposal to build a residential dwelling by/on the CMA. Also considering the recent events in

the Hawkes Bay/Gisborne area with the flooding, it would seem very shortsighted to allow a residential build at a large river mouth in a tsunami zone.

I do not 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.

No

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

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.

J.E. Anderson

15 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