

From: Chris Thomson <gytommo@xtra.co.nz>
Sent: Friday, 3 September 2021 8:35 a.m.
To: RPS
Subject: Submission on Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021
Attachments: CCE03092021.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Categories: Submission - Individual

Written Submission on Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021

(Submissions must be received by Otago Regional Council by 3 pm Friday 3 September 2021)

To: Otago Regional Council

1. **Name of submitter** *(full name of person/persons or organisation making the submission. Note: The submissions will be referred to by the name of the submitter)*

Chris Thomson

2. This is a submission on the **Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021**.
3. I **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
4. I **am** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment; and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition (See notes to person making submission)
5. I **do not wish** *(Select one)* to be heard in support of my submission
6. If others make a similar submission, I **will** *(Select one)* consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing
7. **Submitter Details**

- a. **Signature of submitter** *(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)*



- b. **Signatory name, position, and organisation** *(if signatory is acting on behalf of a submitter organisation or group referred to at Point 1 above)*

Name

Position

Organisation

- c. **Date**

3-9-2021

Address for service of submitter (This is where all correspondence will be directed)

d. Contact person (name and designation, if applicable)

Chris Thomson

e. Email:

gytommo@xtra.co.nz

f. Telephone:

027 363 2148

g. Postal address (or alternative method of service under [section 352](#) of the Act):

Box 51 Glenorchy 9350, Otago

8. My submission is:

<i>Column 1</i>	<i>Column 2</i>	<i>Column 3</i>	<i>Column 4</i>
<i>Activities/development which have significant risk are to be avoided</i>	Oppose	<i>I believe the natural hazard in the form of the Rees river to the Glenorchy township and its people is a very practical and achievable problem to fix, its does not involve modifying the river from its natural parameters, there is between 2 and 3 kilometres of natural river bed between the true left of the Rees river and the true right of the Dart river from where they meet to the lake. What Glenorchy needs is to prevent in times of flooding the Rees river spilling over the flats to the east and into the Glenorchy lagoon and consequently into the township.</i>	<i>Delete this policy or amend it to allow modification of braided river character if its required to protect existing communities from natural hazard risk. Any alternative or consequential relief to address the above</i>

		Glenorchy and its people, its history and its future deserve to be herd and protected as much as any other town or community in New Zealand.	
<i>Policy LF–FW–P13</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>The Glenorchy Community is resilient and has a high tolerability for natural hazard risk. The Glenorchy Community expects both ORC and QLDC to be doing what it can to protect the existing development rights and current and future generations of Glenorchy.</i>	<i>Delete this policy or amend it to allow modification of braided river character if its required to protect existing communities from natural hazard risk.</i> <i>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the above.</i>
<i>All provisions relating to natural hazards</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>The Glenorchy Community is resilient and has a high tolerability for natural hazard risk. The Glenorchy Community expects both ORC and QLDC to be doing what it can to protect the existing development rights and current and future generations of Glenorchy.</i>	<i>Delete these provisions or amend them to ensure that ORC or QLDC cannot seek removal of any existing use rights or avoidance of any proposal until after it properly engages with the Glenorchy Community to determine what might constitute a “significant natural hazard risk” versus what does not constitute a “significant natural hazard risk”.</i> <i>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the above.</i>