

DDPR_feedback_0072s	
Name	Greg Wylie
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 31 22
Notes	
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	<p>Coastal Environment I do not agree with the extent of the Coastal Environment overlay as it affects my property. I questioned what criteria Council used to identify and map the location of this "inland extent"? The response from the Planning Team included that: The most relevant criterion for defining the inland edge is the crest of the first main ridgeline and complete aspect of the first main seaward-facing slope, as all the other criteria with the exception of estuarine areas pushing inland falls well within this criterion. With respect to headlands, it is also the full extent of landscape that is seen as the headland protruding out from adjoining sweeps of coastline." The draft mapping has used my property boundary to the west rather than the main ridgeline to define the draft overlay; however, the western inland proportion of my property does not meet the criteria as set out above. It is not visible from the coastline, coastal road or view due to the elevation from the ridgeline sloping to the west. A more accurate assessment is needed if this draft layer is to be progressed.</p>
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
	<p>Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori (SASM) I acknowledge Iwi's cultural values and I acknowledge Council's requirement under the RMA and other plans/policies to work with Maori. In seeking to understand how and why the SASM layer was determined, I sought further information on the methodology and criteria that has been used to define boundaries for applying this layer from the Planning Team at Council. I was told the rationale was provided by Aukaha Consultancy (based in Dunedin). I believe the rationale Aukaha provided me is too general and does not provide well defined criteria for process and boundary setting. I believe the Draft District Plan provisions are far too general and far reaching for example Mahika kai activities over private property (customary gathering of food and natural materials) and I do not consent to this fundamental right being given away over my private property. Council has stated (https://www.waitaki.govt.nz/News/SASM-mapping [https://protect-au.mimecast.com/s/ZVcWC3QNqYHoM4DSgjH8Q?domain=waitaki.govt.nz]) that this does not override the need for landowner permission to be obtained to access private property but there is no detail in the Draft District Plan as to how this process would work and opens a whole range of potential issues. With</p>

	<p>all of the additional rules applying to land in the proposed SASM layer, there will be large compliance costs worn by the ratepayer. For any productive farmland falling within this layer it will be a hindrance to progress for the District. Surely it also poses a significant additional workload and cost to Council to process resource consents in the district. I believe there will also be a negative impact on land values as a result of these proposed rules. In summary, I don't support the proposed changes in this chapter because of the potential significant impact on landowners. A far more evidence based approach is required, clearly defined, criteria driven to provide a fair and reasonable outcome.</p>
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here
	<p>Hi, I do not agree to the proposed unnecessary controls being added to private property in the Waitaki Draft District Plan. I consider private property rights to be sacrosanct to democracy and the direction of the draft District Plan proposes to erode those private property rights and to add unnecessary costs, time costs and bureaucratic obligations to rate payers.</p> <p>... Thank you for your consideration of my submission and I wish to speak to my submission. . Assessment 100453 Regards Greg Wylie</p>