



4. **A. Permission Application Number and Name of Applicant**

45654-OTH Fiordland Lobster

5. **B. Proposed Activity and Location(s)**

Restriction of access via installation of a permanent fence to the commercial port area of Deepwater Basin, Milford Sound Piopiotahi.

6. **C.2 Your name**

In placing your name and organisation below, you acknowledge that you are the person or authorised person submitting this objection or submission. You are also acknowledging that your name and organisation will be published.

Printed name of submitter or person authorised on behalf of submitter	David McCarlie
Organisation	individual
Date	28/01/2025

7. **D. Statement of Support, Neutrality or Opposition**

- ☐ I **Support** this Application (I am making a submission)
- ☐ I am **Neutral** on this Application (I am making a submission).
- ☒ I **Oppose** this Application (I am making an objection).

8. **E. Hearing Request**

- ☐ I **Do Not** wish to be heard in support of this objection or submission at a hearing.
- ☒ I **Do** wish to be heard in support of this objection or submission at a hearing

9. F. Objection or submission

The specific parts of the application that this objection or submission relates to are:

Wording of the proposed activity as advertised
 Restriction of access to the 'hard' area
 Restriction of access to the wharf
 Restriction of access and potential removal of the white house building

My reasons for my objection or submission are:

I oppose the erection of a permanent fence as proposed by Fiordland Lobster Company (FLC)
 I was told by DOC staff that permanent fencing was not allowed in the Fiordland National Park

The Deep-Water Basin hard area and boat ramp is the only driveable access point to the Fiordland National Park for recreational sea based activities, access to Martins Bay for residents, the Wapiti blocks and other hunting areas. The area including the wharf and white house building are an essential element for using the area North and South of Milford sound.

Compressing the area further than its current state, with kayak operators, water taxi operators, commercial paua and kina divers and recreational boaties, would make the area more dangerous and unworkable. The wharf provides access to users requiring fuelling not just the FLC.

FLC have outlined their reasons for a permanent fence and are using The Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 – If FL have been concerned with health and safety aspects, it taken them 9 years to propose such radical enforcement /change?

The principal gripe appears on the surface to be people wandering through this area to access the wharf. Vehicular traffic is well controlled by the temp fence present, as the wharf use by the fishing fleet is very sporadic at the best of times.

Simple solution allow access to the wharf for foot traffic along the break water in front of the FLC building which have a gate that will allow for people to safely access the publically owned wharf. If individual with physical limitations of disabilities that cannot get onto a boat prior to launching would be affected and with no access to the wharf, they are significantly affected.

Another gripe is people fishing off the wharf – simply requires signage and education to stop the practise Nothing has changed over this time, except the the entransigent attitude of the Dept. Of Conservation(DOC) to not address the issues in Deep water basin, which with the increased public and commercial water activities have stretched the area and minimal immenities to the maximum and thus provoking this overkill response by a commercial entity on public reclaimed land?(recently gazetted?)

Overkill, because with the proposed "small area" (as per add wording n the add) all public users will be significantly compromised to the extent without major change to the current area boats will not be able to launch due to the loss of the curent turning circle. The notion that FLC was going to give up the unused area is odd considering this would land DOC with having to find immediately new toilet facilities for up to anywhere from 80 to 150 users per day at the height of the summer season (water sports rec fishers, hunters, house owners etc) and would be landed with aging infrastructure in the form of the diesel tanks and bund.

FLC have made it very plain as have DOC that they want the white house building removed, and provide the impetus to remove the building as suddenly it would not be available. This building though being allowed to fall well behind in any form of maintenance is structually very sound and has a large septic tank thus removing the sewage burden from the currently stressed Milford scheme. It has been suggested that both the ramp and White house could be managed for the public at little to no coast to DOC but would significantly improve the visitor impressions and experience, and DOC image

The 2007 Fiordland National Park plan is still yet to be sorted so do not see how this new proposal could go ahead as it would require to meet whatever new changes would be submitted on in the new FNP plan.

The outcomes that need to be addressed by this application are:

Give precise details, including the parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought if the application is approved.

DOC needs to alter its practice of prejudicial wording in public adds ("small area of the National Park sounds benign but it is a very used and important area) it is and access point for Iwi to get to the traditional sights- limited / no access for them as well?

The White house building remains with access to all users of the deep water basin area and appropriate maintenance be undertaken and maintained / Lease be transferred to a Rec body and the Ramp with appropriate insurances as happens elsewhere in the country to maintain and upgrade.

Access to the wharf for recreational boats via the hard with consideration to machinery and commercial operations at the time.

Improved communication to recreational users of the Deep-Water Basin area about appropriate behaviour when commercial operations are undertaken.

DOC relook at the Deep-Water Basin area, consider the ideas proposed and sort out the issues that have been ongoing for years but must include recreational consideration AKA the public and iwi of this country. The latest example is the proposal with recourse to build a not fit for purpose boat ramp, expedient yes, but not fit for now or the future

We need for the DOC to have a meeting of all users and look to the future and many are prepared to form a public partnership to see a much better safer working / rec area. The equipment is there now, the knowledge is there now.

The "not ready FNP Park plan is a constant stumbling block for change so this should not progress any further till this stumbling block can be cleared or the public made aware of how and when change will occur without resort to legal remedies.

We have photos to back current topics not sure how to upload.

10. G. Attachments

If you are using attachments to support your objection or submission clearly label each attachment, complete the table below and send in your attachments with this 'objection or submission form'.

Document title	Document format (e.g. Word, PDF, Excel, jpg etc.)	Description of attachment

How do I submit my objection or submission?

Complete this form and email to DNSubmissions@doc.govt.nz. You may also mail your objection and submission to: Director-General, c/o Department of Conservation, Ōtepoti / Dunedin Service Centre, Level 1, John Wickliffe House, 265 Princes Street, Ōtepoti / Dunedin 9016.

Attention Ellanor Babbage

Further information to my original submission below, based on LATE information provided after closing date by FLC

1. Regards to " Fence" Counterproposal to fenced area based on current temporary fencing limits, this will address to a major extent issue raised in pts 1.1 thru to 1.4 it will also fence the Whitehouse out of the area maintaining toilet facilities in the Deepwater Basin area.

Black line indicates proposed fencing(described to DOC in 2018)

White line indicates gates.

This will preserve the current turning circle to allow for recreational user to access the boat ramp and the front and side entrances to the White House, therefore the only toilets in the basin.(recent example of use 80 kayakers, 72 boat owners in one day) able to cope due to the size of the existing septic tank.

It currently provides plenty of loading space for the forklift and if the freezer were moved slightly toward the breakwater more than adequate space is available for commercial activity, and is in line with current workable temporary fence





- 2.3 The fence and gate on the start of the actual pier could go in immediately to stop the concerns of non commercial boat owners having access along the pierage.
- 2.4 Is totally impractical as large amounts of the year there is no commercial activity requiring the precence of the FLC staff being resent.



2.5 Access for pedestrians could be controlled by putting a walkway along the Deep water basin side of the current FLC facility. At the wharf end a gate would control access to the wharf which would allow total control in the event a vessel was un/loading and

The walkway would provide access to smaller craft. Discussions to be had with Environment South, also checking the accuracy of the FLC/ Deepwater basin boundary,

Other points pursuant to covering letter.

Under access – claims for suitable and safe management. The photo shows a broken wharf board, marked with fish crate only this has been like this so for 3 weeks so far, surely not a great example of “maintaining the site at a very high level”



Materials outside the front nth corner of the White house



Regards to the current state of the Whitehouse (mentioned in original submission) we had a quote supplied to refurbish to a high standard and visual inspection done for asbestos, none found . Part of a discussion DOC in 2018 , totally doable as many of the users are builders and trades people so much of the required work on the fence and the return of the int/ exterior of the building was offered as a public / private partnership. The building is incredibly well build by the then MOW, raft concrete foundation block walls , large attached septic tank which was regularly emptied and steel roof. Through neglect it has got to its current stage but still functionally sound and upgradable

When talking to Greg Lind (area Manager Fiordland) he advised us to form a trust so that we could deal with the DOC and be able to source and be a source of funds for this access area for all residents.

Attached is a further photo offering a possible solution to this complex problem and reducing many possible OSH problems indicated in the extra and initial proposals especially as the machinery to do this and the materials are all present



I would like to have it in writing that the consultation period happened when most recreationalists would have been on holiday, away from normal communications so greatly reducing the effective consultation that could have occurred with this proposal. The wording of add also down played the importance of the area involved to every recreational user , by stating

" restricting access for a small area of the Fiordland National park"

It is the ONLY water access into Fiordland by road way, that every user can reach.(Deep Cove has a barge there fore no direct vehicular access)

Regards

Daveid McCarlie