

SUBMISSION OF SUE KEITH

For clarity and for the purposes of this paper when I refer to the applicant or applicants it is intended that this be read as the applicant company and Mr and Mrs Mirams.

First I would like to correct aspects of the submissions made by Mr Moore regarding his reference to his "enclave of cribs upstream from the bridge". I don't know where he got this misinformation from but there are in fact currently five permanent residences, one semi permanent residence and soon to be two more permanent residences. It is of concern to me that his report does contain incorrect information as it leads me to wonder about the rest of the report, in particular his reference to having had input into the CDC natural landscape plan which refers to it as being rated medium for character but that he now rates as low.

In my experience when a consultant is being paid to complete a report they do it based on the criteria as instructed by the client and this is somewhat supported by Ms Annans comment regarding "the narrowed assessment on amenities and natural character" in Mr Moores report.

On page 8 of his report he states that there will be no disturbance of the seabed - as I understand it there has been no actual engineering report done on the state of the piles and as to whether they are in fact strong enough to withstand the weight of a full dwelling and therefore there can be no guarantee of no such disturbance to the seabed. There is also the issue of disturbance to the adjacent crown land in order to engineer disabled friendly access from the road across the crown land to the walkway beside the house. There is also no indication of any plans for parking - perhaps the intent is to park on the said crown land nor is there any indication of the applicants offering to fund any of the necessities to make parking and access disabled friendly. Will this be a burden on us ratepayers.

As regards Mr Cubitts report it clearly states that all the community services the applicants will make available to the public will depend on the dwelling be permitted. This would appear to be a "Gun at the head" to get a commercial proposition over the line. The applicant refers to economic value to the local community implying in amongst other suggestions - significant employment - in reality this is likely to be one cleaner and the odd maintenance issue. I believe the cleaner they use for their current AirBNB lives in Waihola which as we know is outside the Taieri Mouth area. This may have changed and the applicants may wish to comment on how many employees from Taieri Mouth they currently employ and how many local contractors they use for maintenance etc. This would give us some idea of current benefits received by the community in this respect and would therefore be indicative for the proposed dwelling,

Mr Cubitt also states that "that the extent of the earthworks is unknown".

Currently there is only the local fisherman selling fish from his boat but the report implies there is also a takeaway cafe - for clarity this is not currently the situation albeit I understand one of the permit holders has such a consent. However in my opinion a takeaway cafe which would benefit not just locals but also passersby can clearly cannot be compared to a five star residential dwelling. The takeaway cafe was not a residence and clearly was not designed

as a residence but was simply a site for selling fish with a few ice creams and coffee. That has not operated for many years. At one stage a coffee cart did operate on the road reserve area but was required to cease operations as I understand it due to the impact of the extra road traffic stopping nearby.

I support fully all of the community aspects of the application as it applies to the wharf for the hoist, fishing, community access for schools and other such groups, for emergency services - but I qualify that by saying that the pontoon which was constructed without any consent is in fact too small for an ambulance gurney to be utilised on and for more than two or three people to be on safely at any given time. When I had a major car accident, I broke my back in two places so before I could be removed from the car I was placed on a back board and in order to be then removed it took 6 first responders to handle the back board with me on it. The photographs provided by the applicant are a little misleading in this respect as they do not show the ramp as it moves across the pontoon with the tide - at high tide the ramp extends around 2/3rds of the length of the pontoon leaving little space for manoeuvring a wheelchair and at low tide the ramp is very steep.. The way the wheelchair is photographed (as shown in the ORC report) makes it appear there is plenty of space around it but shows no other people which would give a true reflection of the actual space.

Regardless as far as the the community aspects of the application are concerned I am unaware of any objections to these parts of the application.

However this coastal marine area area is a very historic and iconic fishing area dating back to the 1800s and there are very few examples of such areas remaining in this country - Ms Annans report clearly supports this in her comments regarding "a shift in character". We currently have one commercial fishing boat, one very busy recreational boat and as I understand a potential charter boat all using the wharves as well as five other boats moored there. So clearly a busy marine area.

The area around the wharf in respect to this application is crown land as I understand it and any associated development that encroaches on this land would deny the rights of all to freely use the crown land. In the ORC report it raises the possibility of the need for some form of storage for marine based equipment which is clearly not included in the plan for the dwelling. Can anyone - perhaps Mr Cubitt advise if any survey has been done in recent times to clearly define the riverbed, crown land and CDC road reserve. If not is one being planned by the applicants?

However regardless of this, such historical areas should be cherished and not destroyed for personal gain.

Regardless of what I have said my only objection is as I said not to the wharf renovations - rather it is to the bigger picture of the area under the coastal marine permit being used for a purpose that is totally contrary to the RMA in that the application is for a residential commercial dwelling in a restricted area. The over riding requirement for activities in CMA is restricted to marine based or "need". There is no "need" here as there are other areas in Taieri Mouth and Taieri Beach where such a dwelling can be built. Not only would this change of use have huge implications for the entire Otago region but also for the rest of NZ.

This is the type of thing that our iconic New Zealander Sir Peter Jackson fought against in Shelly Bay - he paid a lot of money to protect a coastline from being destroyed.

The applicants also want to have a commercial activity over the water with a minimal annual levy for the CM permit - I understand it to be around \$70 but I am not too sure of this - but anyway at no cost to them for CDC rates but getting the benefit of what the rest of the property owners pay rates for.

For the benefit of those here I have regularly checked the availability of the applicants current AirBNB across the other side of the river and at no stage have I not been able to potentially make a booking which means there is no established need for another Air BNB - particularly at the five star rating. It also takes less than five minutes to get from this current AirBNB to the wharf. This would mean that those who may wish to use the disability hoist can stay in the area - have a wonderful view over the water and in fact probably an even better view *and* make the most of the wharf facility. During the prehearing meeting the applicants passed a comment in response to those of us who disagree with the dwelling being built over the water that they could just park their boat at the wharf and have people stay overnight in that. Well as I recall none of the opposers actually objected to that proposal and as such they could do that - using the hoist for their disabled guests to board and disembark thereby having all the benefits of sleeping over the water and not impacting on the environment.. I have the utmost respect for people who have disabilities of any kind and think the hoist could well offer them opportunities to make the most of access to the water but and again I say this with respect and based on what we hear from our disabled community - how many of them are in a position to pay for a five star rated AIR BNB and own a boat that they can use for river / sea access. I note with interest that the ORC report refers to the fact that the dwelling as proposed does not seem to have any direct access for disabled persons to the wharf. As a further comment to the access for the disabled community - in the original application this was mentioned but was not the overriding need for a dwelling being built over water. It seems it has now become the prime reason - I admit to now being a bit cynical in that this has become a much bigger issue only since the ORC Report and that of Aukaha recommend decline.

Also in the entire time I have owned a property at Taieri Mouth I have not seen a boat moored at the applicants wharf. That is not to say that it is not used but that it does not appear to have significant use for marine activities. The applicants also do not actually live in the area - rather they choose to live elsewhere with their current own holiday accommodation also being an AirBNB that they personally use at times - again this seems only to reinforce the fact that they want the commercial gain from this proposal.

Some of the submissions discuss the quiet peaceful nature of the area. Well in fact it can be incredibly noisy - we live twice the distance away from the noise from the coast and can easily hear the surf crashing. You then have the all the bird life including but not limited to, a pair of paradise ducks that reside on the hillside immediately above the wharf in question, which squawk incredibly loudly. Also the noise from the number of recreational fishing boats and jet skis that go out to sea at times that suit the tide level so can start from 5 in the morning as well as the actual larger boats which moor at the wharves can very loud so to try and say it is a quiet peaceful area is entirely misleading.

As regards the "scruffy" description of the wharf - most of the structures are in "used" condition but certainly similar to other such working areas in the CMA. The most scruffy of the boat sheds is in fact the applicants container which has been left to deteriorate. The application is to "extend and alter existing structures" - I am not sure the container will be worth retaining and therefore "altered" however I am not a professional in that field.

For dilapidated I consider the area iconic and rustic. Beauty is in the eye of the beholder.

Now with absolute respect for the integrity and experience of you ~~three~~ commissioners this application has far greater implications than just being a small localised development for the financial benefit of a one couple - it is totally contrary to an Act of Parliament and as such affects the entire country and therefore if not declined then needs to go out for far more extensive consultation. Acts of Parliament are put in place for a reason - in this case to protect the environment for all and not for the personal and commercial gain of one couple wanting to profit from a residential/ commercial development in a coastal marine reserve area.

The applicants and their representatives quote case law and other legal mumbo jumbo which I suspect they hope will confuse us opposers but it does simply come down again and again to the fact that accessibility access can be obtained by other means - as the applicants state there is available accommodation in Milton which is closer to Taieri Mouth than Dunedin is. It is simply a matter of good planning to ensure accessibility is in the right place but that does not require exclusive occupation of the CMA and public space.

I ask that this application as it relates to a residential dwelling for commercial/domestic purposes be declined. However should approval be granted may I respectfully request that any conditions imposed (including but not limited to those as per the ORC report) be on the basis that they relate to any and all residential / commercial activity in perpetuity for the current and any future permit(s) granted over the area subject to this application. For example should the Air BNB not be a viable proposition the applicants cannot simply ignore the conditions - nor could the permit be transferred to other parties with such conditions falling by the wayside.

Thank you