

Online submission

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

Submitter No.	S281
Submitter Name	Pete McDonnell
Submitter first name	Pete
Submitter surname	McDonnell
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	peteandleanne@xtra.co.nz
Joint presentation	No
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
--------------	-----------	----------------	---------	-----------------

Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Amend	<p>We accept that areas significant to Maori are included in the TTPP - history contributes to the fabric of the West Coast as we know it today. However history should not, on its own, be an encumbrance on individual property owners' rights. Our property has been included in SASM 104 Kawhaka Catchment. It covers a random area of our property (to us - we can walk in a straight line from our house to the Fox Creek boundary, a distance of approx. 800m and be in, out, back in and out again of the SASM). It has no rules associated with it. In the 15 years we have owned this property no representative of Ngai Tahu or local iwi have ever approached us regarding the significance of the area to them. We bought our property as unencumbered, freehold land. It had been significantly developed and modified prior to us owning it and to my knowledge no historical artefacts or any thing of significance has been found.</p> <p>Therefore nothing needs to be recorded against our property, all existing property rights should remain and no rights divested to any other group or individual.</p> <p>*Joint submission with Leanne McDonnell</p>	That SASMs with no rules applicable are not required to be recorded on District Council individual property LIM reports and that no additional or subsequent rules can be applied to SASMs.
--	--	-------	--	---

[General]	[General]	Neutral	<p>Is this plan more enabling than existing plans? No! Too many rules and policy open to interpretation and therefore influence by pressure and lobby groups. The rights of freehold landowners and the ability for people to go about their everyday lives will be further diminished under this plan. No recognition of the disabled community.</p>	No decision sought, except maybe start again with a more enabling mindset.
-----------	-----------	---------	---	--

Documents included with submission

None