

## SUBMISSION OF GLEN PATTERSON

I would like to expand my submission against this proposal.

I first became aware of this application by reading about it online - I believe it was the ODT article and I was and remain extremely offended at their comments about the fishing industry in the area dying.

The proposal appears to be based on the idea that the use of the Taieri Mouth wharves by the fishing industry is declining to the point that it should be replaced in part by another use that will supposedly benefit the community - ie: a house. Such use is not permitted under the coastal marine permits as there is no established need for a house to be built in the area. Rather it is simply the wish of the applicants for their own personal use and for commercial non marine related activity - ie Air BNB. The house is being described as a "boat shed" and Mr Moore says that it will reflect the changing use of the Taieri Mouth CDA from commercial fishing to recreation and that the proposed structure would clearly read as a "live-in boatshed". Well look at any other boatshed in the Otago area and find one that does not have any space for fish bins, fuel storage, lifejackets, oars, wet weather, (fishing) gear etc. The term "boatshed" is being used as a euphemism to try and make it sound like the house will have a proper marine purpose.

The proposed house which will in fact be over the water, will be for both their personal use as residential accommodation and for commercial use as a five star high AirBNB as in "expensive". As compensation to the community the applicants will generously "allow" a range of water based activities to use their wharf and they will provide the pontoon and hoist. The applicants cannot "allow" the community to use the wharf as all permits under the CMA require access for the public at all times. This would seem to simply be "smoke and mirrors" to benefit themselves by making them appear generous to the community. I note the applicants do not have a permit for the pontoon they built to suit themselves and I am unaware as to whether it could currently be certified for public use.

Many of the social and community based proposed activities could already utilise the wharf as a right if the applicants would unlock access to their wharf.

The applicants and their consultants do not appear to understand that the use of the wharves by the fishing industry is variable and dependent on the state of the bar, the tides and seasonality of the fishing. For the past week or so I have been fishing out of Riverton proving the seasonality issue however I will be returning to Taieri mouth as soon as practical. My home of many years is at Taieri Mouth and I have a very personal association with the area. In fact when I was five I was selected to open the new bridge with the mayor and at the time I was also the youngest kid at the local school. Personally I have been fishing here for 22 years and my father fished here for 28 years hence I also have a long association with the area. It is quite clear that the applicants do not require income from this proposed AirBNB to provide for their family.

There is also one boat permanently based at the wharves used frequently by a local for sea fishing, crayfishing and river fishing and other recreational uses in the river itself.

I believe that one of the current boats moored at the wharves is going to be used for charters once its renovations have been completed.

That will be three working boats as well as at least five others that are semi permanently moored.

Indeed in my book that makes it quite a busy marine area for its size.

I also take umbrage at the comments that the wharves are dilapidated - in reality the commercial wharves are in good/reasonable condition and the buildings/storage facilities are generally solid and suitable for their intended use - that is - marine based activities. They may not look pristine but it is a working area and as such to expect the area to be pristine is simply silly. It is a working area and serves that purpose well.

We have a lot of locals who fish from the accessible wharves on a regular basis and to the best of my knowledge there have been no incidents where their condition has been deemed unsafe or been the cause of an accident.

It is very concerning that a number of other CMA permit holders are awaiting the results of this application and if approval is given then the value of the wharves will increase significantly and attract other parties wishing to pursue residential development in the wharf area which would then effectively reduce the availability to the fishing industry.

Fishing is my livelihood and how I provide an income to feed and provide for my family. To permanently relocate my boat and business would come at significant cost in money as well as time spent apart from my family with having to travel extensive distances to Port Chalmers or Riverton. I manage to fish from Taieri Mouth for most of the year but to have to relocate could well prove financially unsustainable - in other words I may lose my right to work from an area I have lived and worked in for many years simply to enable the applicants and any other parties that undertake similar developments, so that they can benefit from a commercial non marine related activity that can and should be located elsewhere in the area.

I note that the applicants promotes employment associated with the house be it of the lower level type - eg cleaners. I would note that commercial fishing offers real employment in the area - eg I have taken on and trained up to one step below skipper standards local youth.

If the applicant feels the "need" that a house is required in the area appropriate for use by the disabled then perhaps they should design one that incorporates the various standards necessary in such a house and locate it somewhere where it will not impede current and future marine based activities at the wharf.

The application does in no way establish "need" as regards the house as it can and should be located somewhere more appropriate and therefore I seek that the application as regards the house be declined.