

10 June 2025

**Buller District Council  
6-8 Brougham St  
Westport**


**Attention: Processing Planner**

Jessica Hollis

e-mail: jessica@hollisplanning.co.nz

**Re: Submission on the proposed development : 'Punakaiki Wild' – Luxury lodge and luxury accommodation, 4663 State Highway 6, Te Miko, Punakaiki, proposed by ACG Properties Limited**

Submitter: **Andrzej Suchanski**

Submitter's postal and email address: 

**Statement of submission:**

1. In general i do not oppose the proposal but in its current form it should not be allowed for the following reasons.
2. It lacks documentation in several areas eg:
  - 2.1. No final results of consultation with local Iwi, DoC (also refer to item 4.2), Fire Services (also refer to item 4.3) and Transit NZ (also refer to item 4.1.1)
3. It is not clear what is the relationship of the applicant (ACG) with Lindis Group.
4. Other concerns i have with the application which need to be satisfactorily clarified before the application can be approved are as follows:
  - 4.1. SH6 access to the property.
    - 4.1.1. The application is based on some unsupported and/or untrue statements such as the traffic along SH6 in this area is rather low. Obviously no observations of the traffic congestion especially during summer seasons are included in the application nor any inclusion of heavy vehicles in the traffic intensity consideration. Also the applicant deliberately downplays traffic count generated by the development eg stating that the guests wont be leaving their accommodation!!! But to explore is the point of visiting such interesting a place with amazing places to see. Does ACG think the guests will be watching TV during their stays?
    - 4.1.2. Also the traffic count due to the movement of permanent and off-site staff, servicing and goods delivery vehicles is evidently neglected or suitably downplayed.
    - 4.1.3. The development will also generate a large pedestrian and possibly bicycle traffic along SH6 where there is no provision for a footpath nor bicycle path.
    - 4.1.4. There is no detailed engineering plan/design of the access to SH6 which was based on the factual traffic data for current and projected traffic intensities.
  - 4.2. The regeneration of vegetation to its original native coastal bush: this is not very detailed and rather vague in the application and based on unsupported statements. This needs to be supported by a very detailed landscaping plan with timelines, and approved by DoC.
  - 4.3. Water supply: the proposal will generate rather a large demand for potable water. The applicant as in the supporting report by C Call Surveyors, wants to tap to the existing Punakaiki Water supply which runs from a private property further up north and adjacent to the hill side of SH6. Buller District Council (BDC) who manages and maintains the water supply system for the Punakaiki Township could not secure the source yet, and the negotiations with the owners of the land where the water is coming from have not been resolved. The water supply suffers from prolonged disruptions during which it relies on a modest storage near the water treatment plant and often the residents are asked by BDC to limit their water usage, especially during long periods of dry weather. The connection of the proposed development to the water pipe will "steal" water from the Punakaiki Township and no doubt make the situation worse. There is nothing in the proposal as to what steps will be taken to alleviate this very certain situation.

- 4.4. Though not touched on in the application many if not all residents of the area including myself fear the applicant will introduce some form of air traffic (helicopters and/or planes) to and from the site. This can not be over emphasised the residents of this area do not want any aircraft facilities in the area now and in the future.
- 4.5. There is no consideration in the application of the impact the development will have on the next door neighbours eg Carolyn Hewlett who's property is adjacent to the land for the proposed development. What does the applicant propose to mitigate the impact from the development on the adjacent neighbours?
- 4.6. The development will add a large number of people (guests and personnel) at any time to the population of the Punakaiki area. There is no clear explanation what the submitter will provide as emergency/contingency means in case of the Alpine Fault rupture (AF8) or in the event of any other natural disasters. The population increase from the development will create a considerable demand/load on the Local Civil Defence organisation if there is no sufficient provision for natural disaster contingencies by the development.

5. Submitters requests:

- 5.1. The application should be declined until all the information and clarifications are provided and further public consultation carried out.
- 5.2. A firm confirmation/statement from the applicant as to their plans with the regard to any air traffic to and from the site.

