Further Submission

This is a further submission on the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan that was lodge online.

Further Submitters Name	Anthony Christopher Eden
Further Submitter Number	FS128
Wish to be heard	Yes
FS qualifier	a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.
FS qualifier reason	I am a ratepayer in Okuru, and the provisions of this plan have a direct effect on my property, including its use and value into the future.
Joint presentation	No
Attention:	Mr. Anthony Eden
Contact organisation	
Address for service	10 Johnston Crescent Okuru Haast, 7886
Telephone	0272269400
Mobile	0272269400
Email	chriseden.nzl@gmail.com
Date lodged	17/07/2023 11:01pm

Further submission points

Raw FS number	Related Submission Point	FS Decision requested	SupportOppose	Reasons
FS128.1	S398.003	Allow	Support	No reason or purpose provided for this provision

FS128.2	S205.002	Allow	Support	Any further increase in the size and population of the village will require infrastructure upgrades which are unaffordable (unless the village is super-sized which is impracticable).

FS128.3	S261.002	Allow	Support

No evidence has been provided in the plan in relation to iwi values over the private properties at Okuru. The boundaries of the zone need to be redrawn to reflect specific sites of particular cultural interest, or else removed completely. It may be that the lagoon itself has some cultural value, being an important site of mohinga kai resources. But this would not apply to the private properties the land under which was substantially modified during and development of the subdivision. Overlays of potential or actual control like this can significantly affect the value of properties, the rights of freedom of use and the recreational pleasure of

				private use.
FS128.4	S203.001	Allow	Support	This applies to the whole village, not just the 2 properties stated. The lagoon and ocean frontage have moved around many times since original human passage over this land. The subdivision was bulldozed dune land, that was flattened then built on., There was no evidence of earlier occupation before the subdivision was created, and none has been found since.

FS128.5	S188.001	Allow in part	Support

There is no evidence of coastal erosion within the Okuru lagoon as the lagoon is well protected by the long sandspit. Because the river mouth does move up and down the coast there can be some erosion from wave action immediately behind the river mouth. For this reason the Okuru seawall was built in 2000 and it has proved extraordinarily successful. The residents paid the full cost of this wall. In the past few years the mouth of the river has stabilized at the far south end of the lagoon. As a result the sand spit has increased in volume and stability as it is not being washed away by movement of the river mouth. This has caused more debris (flowing down

the rivers) to be dropped into the lagoon, having the effect of raising the water level in the lagoon. As a result of this, in peak floods, higher lagoon levels have caused water ro filter through the seawall and pond within the village. This is an issue for a few low lying properties, but the village has proved safe from major flooding time after time. There is no danger of the seawall being over-topped by flood waters in the lagoon as the sand spit is generally lower and less robust than the seawall. Thus floods will overtop the sand spit, break through to the ocean, and create a new exit for flood waters. When that happens the level of water in the lagoon

FS128.6	S492.004	Allow	Support in part	drops markedly and very suddenly. Any future buildings on lower lying ground in the village should be built on stilts to mitigate the risks of ponding of rainwater inside the seawall. I do have some doubts about the value of artificial opening of the lagoon by digging through the sandspit as nature will usually decide where it wants the water to flow.

The NIWA report is floored due to the complex interaction of the rivers, lagoon, sandspit, ocean wave action and currents, and the seawall protecting Okuru village. The 50-100 year timeline is far-fetched. GNS reports that a major earthquake is most likely to occur inside of that timeframe. The effect of that will be to bring millions of loosened tonnes of debris down from the mountains, into the rivers, and build the Okuru river mouth further out into the ocean. That earthquake may well have a devastating effect on buildings and infrastructure, but that is an entirely different set of circumstances and outcomes to those being put forward in the NIWA

				report.
FS128.7	S514.004	Allow in part	Support in part	The flood plain as identified is a complex region formed over 15,000 years by normal river flood deposition but also by the movement of the sea back and forth between the Alpine fault and the current ocean frontage. Thus there are old sand dunes , swales, dune lakes which one might not expect to see on a normal flood plain. The layer should be removed. It serves no purpose anyway as there are other categories that identify the risks.