

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?:

Individual

First Name:

Finn

Last Name:

Lindqvist

Trade Competition (please choose whichever applies):

I/we could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

Postal address:

76 Passmore Crescent
Dunedin
9010

Email address:

suelind.nz@gmail.com

Phone number:

0211027570

Variation being submitted on:

Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping

My submission:

I oppose the variation 2 to the Coastal Hazards Plan. I would like the draconian building limitations reviewed and altered. While you may have improved Data from your LiDAR survey, it still documents small surface elevations in bush clad areas poorly. We own a property at Neil's Beach and have a bush covered hill at the back of our property on which we planned to build an extra room. This elevation is not documented on your LiDAR data and your red line passes on the inland side of this hill. In addition your "red line" appears to take no cognisance of the heavily forested buffer zone between our property and the coast. I note your plan is based on NIWA computer modelling of inundation risk. On reading the literature, it is obvious that no such modelling is perfect. It is relatively easy to predict tidal height but storm surges are much less accurately predicted and accuracy varies quite widely from site to site in New Zealand. During the 2002 storm in NZ, predictions of inundations based on best available modelling were only 40% reliable in some coastal areas. Estimations of rates of sea level rise are also imperfect and vary from locality to locality. Your data seems to take no notice of the documented land rise in the Neil's Beach area due to tectonic processes. To make such stringent conditions for living in your red areas based on such modelling seems draconian. The Government guideline, Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance, updated in 2024, details a step by step process for decision makers. The Tasman Council response in Ruby Bay is held up as a useful example. In this document there is frequent reference to adaptation

in building, using house floor level above seal level and encouragement of relocatable buildings as useful adaptations. Your response has no resemblance to this approach, instead you have chosen to severely limit landowners ability to live on and enjoy their land. You have essentially aimed to wipe out a small coastal community and reduced the value of our properties to zero. This variation is heavy handed and lacks acknowledgement of the importance of community engagement. I see no evidence of a dynamic adaptive pathway as outlined in the Government Guidance document.

I would like the following decision(s) to be made with respect to this Variation:

I would like the inflexible building limitations to be removed and replaced by a more nuanced adaptive approach as outlined in the Government Guidance document (2024). I would like rooms or dwellings with higher floor height above sea level and relocatable buildings to be included as allowed within your red mapped area.

Please indicate if you wish to speak to your submission:

I do not wish to speak to my submission*

If any others making similar submissions wish to be heard:

Yes, I would consider presenting a joint case with them