

I am here to represent a ratepayer but I am aware my views represent a great many. I request that no hazard zones be created now and council spend the next twenty years collecting local data to form the basis for their reappraisal when sufficient change is detected to confirm concerns that such zones may be needed.

REPRESENTATION

I readily admit I do not have the skills to properly advise or represent anyone in this process, I am here so that the views I have derived from conversations with many hundred of affected property owners are recorded.

Proper representation is unaffordable

Specialist knowledge, which costs, is required

Even a competent lawyer would be wise to seek specific professional advice

No affected property owner can afford professional advice regarding your proposed hazard zones

No ratepayer has the budget to afford proper representation but you, you have no budget, you don't need to budget, you just take whatever you care to spend and you take it through the rating system from those that cannot afford their own representation. It is a disgrace, it is disgusting I believe it is blatant authoritarian tyranny.

I would suggest the RMA is a more complex piece of legislation than the Crimes Act. A murder accused is afforded legal council by the state but here you sit in judgement, and capable of invoking a death sentence on peoples equity in their property based on data owned by someone else, gathered somewhere else by someone you have never heard of and you use that to try and justify calling their property a hazard NOW because the data referred to earlier intimates a hazard MAY exist in the future. It is perverse and should not happen. Defer this foolish plan until such time as authentic data is collected locally.

It is ironic that the \$8 million you have squandered so far on nothing more than words on paper, soothsaying on what the climate may be generations into the future, when that cash could be put to practical use protecting our property from current risks that exist now and always will exist due to the dynamic nature of the planet on which we live.

VALIDITY

Why are we here?

Why is this TTPP to replace the BDC scheme we used to have?

Under the LGA the Local Government Commission can involve itself in investigating change(s) in local government if they receive a petition from more than 10% of the electors of a district.

No such petition exists. Ten percent of electors in the Buller district did not sign a petition requesting this change, in fact they are vehemently opposed to it.

Therefore you have no validity here other than that forced upon us.

There is no democracy in this process.

We have been dictated to.

It is tyrannical and it is unjust.

If the LGC gave the task of creating a Combined District Plan to the WCRC then why have the WCRC created a seperate entity, the TTPP, to enforce it? Is it to distance WCRC's insurer from liability if at a future time a successful class action is taken against council for unjustified damage caused to property values?

The LGC forced amalgamations on us creating BDC and WCRC which have both been a disaster particularly the stripping out of all practical staff and leaving the bureaucrats in charge. For instance, the erosion at Hector wouldn't be an issue, Buller County Council

would have repaired the rock wall they had built earlier, now we have erosion, the landfill has been exposed which contains asbestos and the bureaucrats that presently run our councils say that is safe as the rain keeps it wet. It is certainly not. And you people are spending \$8 million on a perceived risk 100 years in the future!

DATA

The government charges you with the task of taking account of (possible?) climate change.

You cannot do that without data.

Where is the data? Who owns it?

NEMA, GNS, Sea Rise, the Auditor General's Office, the Ministry of the Environment, Universities, Regional Councils, District Councils, city Councils etcetera all point to one another and to NIWA but when asked NIWA states that the data they use is not theirs. It seems the ratepayer and taxpayer is paying tens of millions of dollars annually to pay for hordes of climate planning bureaucrats entrenched in local and central government but doesn't yet own any hard data that can be used for real and honest planning.

It's time to stop the cashflow to impractical bureaucrats to prepare expensive files and instead direct it into the hands of practical people to collect hard data to efficiently plan wise spending to mitigate the hazards our environment has, does and will always deliver.

The LGA charges you with considering "the social, economic, and cultural well-being of people and communities"

Then consider the economic harm you are doing to today's property owners by declaring hazard zones based on somebody else's data, collected somewhere else, predicting 100 years into the future. It is the duty of your authority to protect those that are here now and not to encumber them with economic harm in your belief that you might improve the environment of those that just might be resident here many generations into the future.

STACKING THE DECK

I have spoken to approximately 550 residents throughout the district who are angry that money is wasted on climate change planning when the money could be put to more urgent use now.

The 2021 Buller river flood was caused by a number of man made factors.

1. The Buller river harbour deliberately narrowed the river mouth to reduce dredging costs but this restricts flood flows.
2. The WCRC has never maintained Buller river protection works.
3. BDC/WCRC ignored/took no notice of a river engineers report (2016) that gravel extraction was needed to avoid a flooding situation developing that would affect Snodgrass and Westport.
4. The WCRC issued a consent to Kiwirail to build (effectively) a dam across the Buller river overflow channel (Orowaiti river).
5. BDC have allowed subdivision (infill housing) that increase immediate runoff into a stormwater system that was never designed for this increased volume.
6. BDC have installed a pumped sewage scheme (Brougham street, Orowaiti road and Eastons road that discharges into a combined sewerage/stormwater system that was never designed to take the increased volume
7. BDC have failed to effectively maintain/upgrade/replace its earthenware stormwater and sewage pipes that have been damaged by two major earthquakes. Plastic liners they have used has further reduced flow rates.
8. WCRC failed to maintain the mouth of the Orowaiti river and watching over many decades migrating approximately five kilometres eastward along the beach to a new exit to the sea.

When the 2021 flood occurred the gravel buildup that a consultant recommended be removed in 2016 directed the current at the Organs Island protection wall and destroyed it. This increased floodflow down the overflow channel (Orowaiti river) that was hindered by the Kiwirail damn which caused the river to head up and eventually destroy the railway embankment sending a wave of water downstream to inundate Snodgrass, Kawitiri Place and areas of Westport.

To defray culpability neither council has addressed the true causes of the flood instead referring to it as a "climate event".

To try and blame climate change for council deficiencies BDC has spent \$700,000 to reinforce a claim that Westport needs to relocate. "Mandatory relocation due to rising seal level and rising groundwater" is their claim.

BDC senior management cherry picked certain people, a significant number are or who have been on the council payroll (some for multiple spurious reasons) to pretend to represent the people of Westport and participate in a Master Planning exercise. The planners cost \$500,000 with BDC charging a further \$250,000 administration costs. With a great deal of partisan duplicity they claim that "ratepayer funds are not paying for it". This may be technically true but the hole they make in a particular bucket of money they have access to will have to be replaced by the ratepayer and as rates attract GST the ratepayer will be paying \$862,500 for a Stupid Plan that sensible people who are numerate, will question "Why spend \$billions on infrastructure for a new town when it would only take \$millions to protect what we have?"

LIDAR

Your related view of LIDAR would have the uninformed believe that it is LIDAR that is confirming the exact height of future water level due to climate change whereas it is merely a measurement tool to give an accurate representation of the contours of a landform. It cannot tell the floor level of a house. Your proposed Hazard zones are uniformly inflicted on properties irrespective of whether a residence will be inundated in a 1:100 storm surge or if it is just their lawn that will get wet. There is a huge difference.

WHERE ARE THE REST OF THE PUBLIC WHO REJECT YOUR HAZARD ZONES?

They feel intimidated.

They don't understand the process.

They cant afford professional advice.

They don't know where to begin stating their views.

They feel helpless.

They feel they will be ignored.

They feel victimised.

The most predominant view in the community to engaging in any "consultation" process with any council is:

"You're wasting your time, they just do whatever they want anyway!"

THE PLEA

Please scrap the Hazard Zones and embark on data collection for the next twenty years and then reappraise the possible need.