

Online submission

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

Submitter No.	S395
Submitter Name	Black Singlet Investments Ltd
Submitter Company/Group Name	Black Singlet Investments Ltd
Submitter is contact	Yes
Email	diana.matchett@bdo.co.nz
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
--------------	-----------	----------------	---------	-----------------

Sites and Areas
of Significance
to Māori

Sites and Areas
of Significance
to Māori

Oppose

11 November 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan - SUBMISSION

Further to correspondence received dated 14 July 2022 advising that the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan, the combined district plan for the West Coast has rules with immediate legal effect that apply to our property at 130 Mawhera Quay, Greymouth (“the Property”).

Your correspondence advised that the Property has been identified as containing Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori specifically:

- SASM 57 Mawhera Gardens - Pa site, cultivations
- SASM 58 Greymouth Railway land - Pa site, Maori Reserve
- SASM 62 Mawhera Nature Reserve – Maori Reserve, Pa Site, Urupa Cultivations

- Property is subject to a “Pounamu Management Area”.

We write to advise that we oppose SASM 57, 58 and 62 being recorded against the Property and oppose any other “Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori” being recorded against the Property in the future.

The Property was purchased as freehold land on 5 February 2007 and at that time there was no reasonable detail to support that the Property may in the future be encumbered as a site and area of significance to Māori (noting that Mawhera sold the Property to the Vendor to whom we purchased the Property from). At the time the Property was acquired we were aware that it was classed as a Heritage Area (Reference: HH69 – Description: Government Building) Historic Place Category One Building.

We don’t consider that the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan should have an impact on privately owned land nor should the above SASM or the “Pounamu Management Area” be noted on the LIM for the Property. We consider the proposed designation(s) will have a negative impact on the future value of the Property and will likely lead to additional costs being incurred by the owners. We consider the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan with respect to the Property as intrusive to privately owned status.

Documents included with submission

None

We understand that SASM 57, 58 AND 62 of the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan currently states that there are “no relevant permitted activity rules” for each of the SASM against the Property. Given this, why do they need to be referenced against the Property at all?

We understand that the Resource Management Act 1991, states that SASM are considered a type of historic heritage and as such, the rules associated with them have legal effect from the time the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan was notified.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission.

11 November 2022

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan - SUBMISSION

Further to correspondence received dated 14 July 2022 advising that the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan, the combined district plan for the West Coast has rules with immediate legal effect that apply to our property at **130 Mawhera Quay, Greymouth ("the Property")**.

Your correspondence advised that the Property has been identified as containing Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori specifically:

SASM 57 Mawhera Gardens - Pa site, cultivations

SASM 58 Greymouth Railway land - Pa site, Maori Reserve

SASM 62 Mawhera Nature Reserve – Maori Reserve, Pa Site, Urupa

Cultivations

.

Property is subject to a "Pounamu Management Area".

We write to advise that we **oppose** SASM 57, 58 and 62 being recorded against the Property and oppose any other "Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori" being recorded against the Property in the future.

The Property was purchased as **freehold land** on 5 February 2007 and at that time there was no reasonable detail to support that the Property may in the future be encumbered as a site and area of significance to Māori (**noting that Mawhera sold the Property to the Vendor to whom we purchased the Property from**). At the time the Property was acquired we were aware that it was classed as a Heritage Area (Reference: HH69 – Description: Government Building) Historic Place Category One Building.

We don't consider that the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan should have an impact on privately owned land nor should the above SASM or the "Pounamu Management Area" be noted on the LIM for the Property. We consider the proposed designation(s) will have a negative impact on the future value of the Property and will likely lead to additional costs being incurred by the owners. We consider the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan with respect to the Property as intrusive to privately owned status.

We understand that SASM 57, 58 AND 62 of the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan currently states that there are "no relevant permitted activity rules" for each of the SASM

against the Property. Given this, why do they need to be referenced against the Property at all?

We understand that the Resource Management Act 1991, states that SASM are considered a type of historic heritage and as such, the rules associated with them have legal effect from the time the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan was notified.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission.