

Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan

Submission form

Have
your
say!

Te Tai o
Poutini Plan
Proposed
Plan

We need your feedback. We want to hear from you on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan. What do you support and what would you like changed? And why? It is just as important to understand what you like in the Proposed Plan as what you don't. Understanding everyone's perspectives is essential for developing a balanced plan.

Your details:

First name: Waitakere Trust Surname:

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation? Individual Organisation

Organisation (if applicable):

Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission? Yes No

If you **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

I am /am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Postal address: P.O. Box 217

Westport

Email: marie.dickson@gmail.com Phone: 021 022 1402

Signature: M. Dickson Date: 10-11-22

Your submission:

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic Direction | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy Infrastructure and Transport | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Risks |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historical and Cultural Values | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Environment Values | <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General District Wide Matters | <input type="checkbox"/> Zones | <input type="checkbox"/> Schedules |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appendices | <input type="checkbox"/> General feedback | |

All submitters have the opportunity to present their feedback to Commissioners during the hearings process. Hearings are anticipated to be held in the middle of 2023. Please indicate your preferred option below:

I wish to speak to my submission I do not wish to speak to my submission

If others make a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing?

Yes, I would consider presenting a joint case No, I would not consider presenting a joint case

Public information - all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. The content provided in your submission form will be published to the Te Tai o Poutini Plan website and available to the public. It is your responsibility to ensure that your submission does not include any personal information that you do not want published.

Want to know more?

www.tppp.nz

0508 800 110



Te Tai o Poutini
PLAN

TTPP proposed plan...submission from Marie Dickson 713 Virgin Flat Road Buller

Submission re SASM 22 & adjacent Okari Lagoon SASM 19

OUTLINE...

I oppose the designation SASM 22 placed on my land & also the same concerns apply to private areas covered by SASM 19

- WCRC has stated the matter has immediate legal effect giving me no choice but to seek professional advice if my plans conflict with SASM 22 whatever it is.
- WCRC is still consulting on the matter despite legality claims
- WCRC provides no evidence as to the boundaries or rationale for SASM 22 which prevents any assessment of effects on private property owner rights or claimants. The "significance" and "values " need definition.
- Planning laws should give certainty as well as protections so must be evidentially based. No information has been given nor can one follow the accepted planning methodology of "greater interest than the public in general" when you don't know what is behind SASM 22, the need for consultation, let alone possible veto.
- I believe WCRC must do more work on SASM areas (as with SNAs) as they affect private property - particularly when there is potential for challenge as to their validity. Council says consultation is not compulsory but they also will decide if it is to happen...
- WCRC is placing the onus on private property owners to prove matters - not the designating authority - which takes power away from people as legal costs can be prohibitive. This is a perverse outcome & abuse of position.
- In the case of my property I accept that the rural zone policies & requirements should apply as they have a common purpose to protect valuable land or have some unique conditions / biodiversity , hazards etc.
- The Historic Places Act should provide enough protections to cover most situations. This country, unlike for example the UK, has not experienced extensive & continuous modification through ages of tribal warfare, exploration, conquest & growth of settlements plus is not densely populated.
- The concept of "place" is valid to many peoples ...to country, to generational ties, language.....I consider my generational values for this area to be equally important.

I support the special status of the Okari Lagoon, including the spit. It is a highly significant area of natural biodiversity, its established value as a food source & stop over / refuge for

not only Maori but subsequent settlers, gold prospectors, current residents & visitors to the West Coast - all its historic connections over time. To anyone the definition of "significant" is clear & unambiguous, in contrast to the SASM areas identified on private land like mine.

I do however want further explanation of issues raised

Enforcing planning constraints on land use & requiring consultation with iwi cannot be subject to dispute without extreme cost to a private landowner. Some of these uses are already identified on Land Use capability maps as being suitable for the area yet now require consent & iwi consultation if WCRC so determine

Planning rules set by Councils should be clear & unambiguous with definitions provided where special constraints are applied. If there is no definition of an area or rationale for "value" how are effects to be measured. & assessed against the reason for the designation or control in the first place.

Archaeological sites can be protected but the Okari / Totara area is not a static entity & much has already been changed even since Ngai Tahu sold to the Crown. The last 50 years has seen massive changes & what might have been significant in terms of visible evidence is gone.

If the plan does not ensure certainty really important areas/values risk being subsumed in the debate. Who will be responsible for protection & enforcement and who will pay the bill ?

I look forward to receiving a more detailed map with accompanying explanations of the actual rationale for the designation. There must be cogent reasons for the need to have it highlighted & for its defined perimeter to be given valid recognition. What is its significance without specified values. I note Ngai Tahu sold the land so there would seem to be nothing special surrounding it but its placement next to an area of transitory use & particularly for food supply probably even before Ngai Tahu took control.

I request WCRC address the issues raised including the long term plans for actioning such requirements for control & protection. Its another Government devolution of demands but no funding to support them.

Should no further information or resolution be forthcoming re SASM 22 I would have to reaffirm my position & intention to continue opposing the plan designation.