

Online submission

This is a submission that was made online via the Council's website.

Submitter No.	S151
Submitter Name	Misato Nomura
Submitter first name	Misato
Submitter surname	Nomura
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	m080392@gmail.com
Wish to be heard	Yes
Joint presentation	Yes
Trade competition	I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
Directly affected	N/A
Withhold contact details?	No

Submission points

Plan section	Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision sought
Whole Plan	Whole plan	Amend	<p>A lot of the titles of rules and the rules themselves are written in very long sentences with little to no punctuation. It is very difficult for a lay-person to understand. Many of the rules are going around in circles about similar topics and it is difficult to distinguish what the activity status is.</p> <p>In some of the chapters it may be easier to perhaps write it out as a table instead of spelling everything out in very long sentences that do not make much sense.</p>	<p>That the rules in the entire plan be re-written in clear, concise english with punctuations as necessary or to use tables to distinguish between the different activity levels instead of long-written forms. We request for the format of the plan to be changed to one that is easier to be understood.</p>

Noise	NOISE - R3	Oppose	<p>This rule does not take into account Buller's low traffic volumes as compared to other highly populated parts of the country. The amount of traffic experienced on SH6 and SH67 will be much lower than an average road in Christchurch city where you can hear the noise effects of cars within the city throughout the day.</p> <p>It also does not take into account the potential for property owners and developers to come up with a unique way to block noise based on the property that they own. With Buller, there are many different landscapes that are adjacent to the SHs. There are possibilities to build bunds, use heavy curtains internally, or grow some shelter to block the noise just to name a few. It will be too costly and time-consuming for property owners to hire a qualified engineer to assess the noise based on a home design on paper. How many qualified engineers do we have in the region and how much would this cost? It seems like this has been made as a blanket rule that is too strict with not much merit to the district besides increasing the cost of build at a time of high inflation and increasing cost of building. To hire an engineer would also potentially add weeks or months to get the building plan approved.</p> <p>We believe it is up to the individual owners to come up with ways to block the noise from Statehighways if even necessary.</p>	<p>That this rule be deleted.</p> <p>Or amended to be a permitted activity if noise mitigation designs have been provided. E.g. Bunding, growing a shelter belt or providing fencing.</p>
Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R10	Oppose in part	<p>SASM17 is currently not listed in R9, making the same activity jump an activity status to R10, under controlled activities.</p> <p>The matters of control under R10 are related to the extent of earthworks and vegetation trimming or removal, as well as the cultural impacts on the sites significant to Maori.</p> <p>If a resource consent application is sought for this activity, the assessment of the matters of control will likely be done by the relevant Poutini Ngai Tahu Runanga instead of Council Planners as there are no permitted baselines for the physical aspects of earthworks and vegetation clearance taking place. If so, it will make more sense for this activity to be directly approved by the relevant Poutini Ngai Tahu Runanga. This way, it will save time and money not only for the applicant but also for council staff and all other relevant parties.</p>	<p>That R10 becomes a permitted activity instead of a controlled activity.</p> <p>With the written approval from the relevant Poutini Ngai Tahu Runanga that is provided to the relevant District Council at least 10 working days prior to the activities commencing as per other permitted activities in this chapter.</p>

Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Support in part	<p>As landowners of a SASM site, we would like to help protect and preserve Maori culture. There are currently several rules listed in the proposed plan that outlines the need for approval from the relevant Poutini Ngai Tahu Runanga. However, there is no clear information regarding who to approach, how to approach them, what the expected timeframes are and the associated cost for it (if any). Hence, it is difficult to plan the build in advance. Under the RMA process, councils are expected to respond within a given timeframe.</p> <p>Without a timeframe, there is a potential for activities to be held up and we are not aware if the relevant Poutini Ngai Tahu Runanga are well equipped to handle the surge in enquiries that they may face. A quoted article says that this is not about royalties - we would like confirmation that there is no to minimal charge for us seeking approval from iwi.</p> <p>On a newsroom article, the chair of Ngati Waewae was quoted: Ngāti Waewae chair Francois Tumahai says the letters have caused needless alarm and shouldn't have been sent.</p> <p>"We've had people ringing [iwi offices] to say 'does this mean I can't build a shed?' and some think iwi will want money for these sites - it's been crazy.</p> <p>"What we want people to know is nothing changes. Having a site doesn't stop you doing anything, and it's not about royalties or anything like that."</p> <p>https://www.newsroom.co.nz/iwi-soothe-coasters-property-fears</p> <p>Currently, there is also no guidance about what the iwi would like protected on the site. Hence it is difficult to understand what basis our application will be approved or declined. We would like more guidance regarding what the significance of each site is and how to manage the site better for all parties to benefit.</p>	That the plan outlines the timeframes for relevant Poutini Ngai Tahu Runanga to provide approvals for SASM activities and that the approvals are given at no charge.
[General]	[General]	Amend	There are currently too many precinct and overlay layers that makes the plan harder to read. Some of the overlays and precincts are similar and it is not clear if it is necessary to have them separated.	To combine or delete some of the overlays present.
Subdivision	SUB - S1	Support in part	<p>Settlement zone is a new zone that did not exist in the Buller district plan. We are agreeable to the minimum lot sizes in Sub S1.</p> <p>Support in part as we have no comments for other zones' minimum lot sizes.</p>	Support Sub S1 minimum lot size for settlement zone sizes.

Coastal
Environment

Coastal
Environment

Oppose

We would like to question how the Coastal Environment has been mapped.

Our property in Kawatiri Place has no Coastal Environment whatsoever.

We are not able to look out to sea, we do not smell the sea and do not have any marine life within our property.

On the otherhand, half of Carters beach which is known to be a coastal settlement has been left out. In areas such as Elley Drive which has been well sought after for it's proximity to the coast and its sea view properties have been completely left out of this overlay.

We would like clarification on how this map was drawn, what data was used and why certain coastal settlements have been left out while areas like Kawatiri place and Eastons road have been included.

Please justify including Kawatiri Place in this overlay.

There are also 3 Coastal Overlays.

High Coastal Natural Character Area, Outstanding Coastal Environment and Coastal Environment.

It is difficult to distinguish the difference between High Coastal Natural Character Area and Outstanding Coastal Environment. There are also little to no rules that speak to the Coastal Environment and if there are, it has not been clearly outlined.

We would like to suggest reverting back to standards in Buller District Plan and identifying Coastal Environments using areas within 150m of the Mean High Water Springs instead.

To remove Kawatiri Place from the Coastal Environment Overlay,

OR

delete Coastal Environment Overlay and set the boundary to within 150m of Mean High Water Spring as per the Operative Buller District Plan.

Documents included with submission

None

Whole Plan

Whole plan

Amend

In Table 1 of General Approach, the following is mentioned

To remove reference to other rules within a rule.

"Permitted activities do not require resource consent, provided standards and all other relevant rules are met."

This implies that all rules within the Permitted Activities have to be met in order for an activity to be Permitted. However, throughout the entire plan, Permitted activities are referenced within other permitted activities, making it confusing for the plan user as they may assume that only the referenced rule within the permitted activity rule has to be complied.

For example in GRUZ:

The following can be seen throughout the Permitted Activity rules.

Where:

1. All performance standards for Rule GRUZ - R1 are complied with;

Using the example above, and applied to Rule GRUZ R2, it may be interpreted that GRUZ R3 to R14 does not have to be complied with for R2 to be complied with.

As it has already been stated within the general approach that all rules have to be met, this seems unnecessary, confusing and makes the plan much longer than it has to be.