

Online submission

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

Submitter No.	S285
Submitter Name	Richard Henschel
Submitter first name	Richard
Submitter middle name	Clark
Submitter surname	Henschel
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	rmhenschel2@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
--------------	-----------	----------------	---------	-----------------

[General]	[General]	Oppose in part	<p>In general we agree that there is a need for Te Tai o Poutini Plan but disagree on: the extreme level of risk management proposed; the lack of inclusion of likely future planning changes due to ongoing scientific assessment of risk also due to climate change; and central government action; the lack of specificity in identification of risk/s across individual property titles; and how it affects the property and ourselves as occupiers and kaitiaki of the property 4456B Karamea Highway Karamea.</p> <p>The points we wish to be reconsidered in respect of how they would affect the property are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agriculture – Currently the property has been identified as being highly productive land. We don't agree that the property can be considered highly productive land. There is no record of it being used for horticulture or anything other than grazing livestock. Being such a small property, this is not a viable use of the land. The current flora doesn't indicate anything significantly productive about it either. Consequently we wish that Precinct category not be applied to the property 2. Natural hazard policies which we believe affect the property disproportionately by being poorly quantified and too extreme towards risk averse are: Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert We don't agree with the arbitrary and generalized mapping of these across the property. Without a proper survey or expert inspection, the property has been identified in its entirety, as being susceptible to coastal inundation. This has been done despite no historical evidence, as well as, during our 11 year ownership, never having been affected by coastal inundation or flooding across the most part of the land (we are able to support this with written official confirmation if required). For example, during our own time as owners, there have been extreme weather events as well as at least twice when the estuary water has covered the highway adjacent to the property. However, the incoming water from the most serious event only once came onto the property land and only adjacent to that highway boundary. That surge was caused by a blocked culvert beneath the highway so was an anomaly. We don't find the process of identifying for Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert being robust but rather, a 'worst case scenario' to mitigate risks. This impacts the usability, insurability, and value of the property as well as the well-being of the owner of the property (against Strategic direction 1.). The risk management proposed is also too extreme for a time scale that reflects only current knowledge of climate change and its mitigation. Consequently we wish to have this Flood hazard susceptibility and the Coastal hazard alert category removed from the property or returned to the previously identified area adjacent to the highway. 3. The Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes identification. We disagree with that being applied to the property. It is clear that this identification is a result of a part of the property having been previously erroneously designated as Schedule 2 wetland. To explain further, the property has some area adjacent to the highway, identified for Schedule 2 as a significant wetland. This is not an appropriate application to the property. That area of the property was described as such by a Wetland coordinator, without any expert's inspection and assessment of the fauna and flora, who then went on to obfuscate the submission process (we are able to support this with written official confirmation if required). The land on the property described as Schedule 2 wetland was later visited by a Regional Council appointed wetlands expert together with a WCRC planning leader and a report was made by that expert concluding that the area did not have that Schedule 2 wetland value. However, due to submission process technicalities caused by the ill advice of the wetland co-ordinator previously mentioned, the only area that was able to be excluded from this erroneous judgement was a farm drain strip to enable access to the highway and farm drains that take the water from a common access for 6 other properties that formed part of the original subdivision. (we are able to support this with written official confirmation if required) We were further informed by the WCRC via email, after that submission process, that this 'Schedule 2 wetland' boundary error may be able to be rectified at a future time. Consequently we now apply for this to be enacted and the Outstanding Coastal Natural Character and High Coastal Natural Character designation be removed from the property title. 4. Zoning General Rural. It appears that the property has been zoned General Rural. We disagree with this. The size of the property, and the user intent ongoing and at time of purchase is in line with Rural Lifestyle. We have a building site identified for a home, and a Scalar Penetrometer test conducted to confirm suitability for a Pole house foundation. We also have a consented on-site wastewater service and a consented 2 bay shed in preparation to building this home. The property was part of a subdivision and none of the other properties are being used or are of a size for commercial farming. The property is also some distance from farms, adjacent to a number of other lifestyle properties as well as residences. Consequently we wish to have this General Rural zone identification be made Rural Lifestyle. 	<p>In general we agree that there is a need for Te Tai o Poutini Plan but disagree on: the extreme level of risk management proposed; the lack of inclusion of likely future planning changes due to ongoing scientific assessment of risk also due to climate change; and central government action; the lack of specificity in identification of risk/s from across individual property titles; and how it affects the property and ourselves as occupiers and kaitiaki of the property 4456B Karamea Highway Karamea.</p>
STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Agriculture	Oppose in part	<p>We don't agree that the property can be considered highly productive land. There is no record of it being used for horticulture or anything other than grazing livestock before being subdivided for lifestyle rural use. Being such a small property, grazing livestock is not a viable use of the land. The current flora doesn't indicate anything significantly productive about it either. Consequently we wish that Precinct category not be applied to this property.</p>	<p>1. Agriculture – Currently the property 4456B Karamea Highway has been identified as being highly productive land. We would like that category to be dismissed in favour of lifestyle usage.</p>

Documents included with submission

None

Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - O1	Oppose in part	<p>Firstly, we aren't sure if this is the correct point to be making for this part of our submission. Hence we have also included it in the General initial submission.</p> <p>We disagree with that 'Outstanding Coastal Natural Character and High Coastal Natural Character' designation being applied to this property. It is clear that this identification is a result of a section of the property having been previously erroneously designated as Schedule 2 wetland.</p> <p>To explain further, the property has some area adjacent to the highway, identified for Schedule 2 as a significant wetland. This is not an appropriate application to the property. That area of the property was described as such by a Wetland coordinator, without any expert's inspection and assessment of the fauna and flora, who then went on to obfuscate the submission process for us (we are able to support this with written official confirmation if required).</p> <p>The land on the property described as Schedule 2 wetland was later visited by a Regional Council appointed wetlands expert together with a WCRC planning leader and a report was made by that expert concluding that the area did not have that Schedule 2 wetland value. However, due to submission process technicalities caused by the ill advice of the wetland co-ordinator previously mentioned, the only area that was able to be excluded from this erroneous judgement was a farm drain strip to enable access to the highway and farm drains that take the water from a common property access road for 6 other properties that formed part of the original subdivision. (we are able to support this with written official confirmation if required)</p> <p>We were further informed by the WCRC via email, after that submission process, that this 'Schedule 2 wetland' boundary error may be able to be rectified at a future time.</p> <p>Consequently we now apply for this to be enacted and the Outstanding Coastal Natural Character and High Coastal Natural Character designation be removed from the property title.</p>	<p>We disagree with that 'Outstanding Coastal Natural Character and High Coastal Natural Character' designation being applied to this property. 4456B Karamea Highway property does not meet this designation. We would like to have this overlay changed.</p>
---------------------------------	----------	----------------	--	--

Natural Hazards	NHP2	Oppose in part	<p>We don't agree with the arbitrary and generalised mapping of these across the property. Without a proper survey or expert inspection, the property has been identified in its entirety, as being susceptible to coastal inundation. This has been done despite no historical evidence, as well as, during our 12 year ownership, never having been affected by coastal inundation or flooding across the most part of the land. (we are able to support this with written official confirmation if required)</p> <p>For example, during our time as owners, there have been extreme weather events as well as at least twice when the estuary water has covered the highway adjacent to the property. However, the incoming water from the most serious event only came onto the property and only on a part adjacent to that highway boundary. That surge was caused by a blocked culvert beneath the highway so was an anomaly.</p> <p>We don't find the process of identifying for Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert being robust but rather, a 'worst case scenario' to mitigate risks. This impacts the usability, insurability, value of the property as well as the well-being of the owner of the property (against Strategic direction 1.).</p> <p>The risk management proposed is also too extreme for a time scale that reflects only current knowledge of climate change and its mitigation.</p>	<p>Natural hazard policies which we believe affect the property 4456B Karamea Highway disproportionately by being poorly quantified and too extremely slanted towards risk averse are: Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert</p> <p>Consequently we wish to have this Flood hazard susceptibility and the Coastal hazard alert category removed from the property or returned to the previously identified area adjacent to the highway.</p>
-----------------	------	----------------	--	---