

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

Individual

First Name: Rod

Last Name: Thornton

Postal address: 45 Marine Parade
Carters Beach
Westport

Email address: rodthornton663@gmail.com

Phone number: 0212596318

Variation being
submitted on: Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping

My submission: I do not dispute climate change or that it will have an effect on our
environment

I oppose the rules in Variation 2 with regards to development in
areas identified as being in The Coastal Hazard Setback Overlay,
Alert Overlay and Severe Overlay areas

I consider the rules impinge on people's personal choice and
property rights to live and enjoy living in a coastal location and also
likely their property values. This is in regard to rights to develop their
properties to their requirements for their enjoyment as is the case
now (Subject of course to current zoning, building requirements) or
buy a property and develop it/change it. The conditions imposed will
affect property values to some extent.

The rules do this by placing significant extra barriers and restrictions
to that presently with regards to new builds and additions to what is
presently permitted. Cost may also be prohibitive given in likely
most cases building would require "detailed technical evidence to
show that the coastal hazard risk is mitigated". What reports and
evidence is required, who is deciding what is required, what
standards need to be passed before building is allowed and do you
know this before you start the process?. Even the basic question
can the risk be mitigated in this area at all, can Council say this
before sending people down the rabbit hole. I am taking a educated
guess that those reading this submission are well aware of the cost
of consultants and that the cost can be "as long as a bit of string" let
alone finding out down the track another report/more consultants
need to be engaged. How, does a "average" homeowner budget
for/handle this uncertainly.

With regards to property values and with the rules giving uncertainly
about what you can or cannot do/build, extra costs associated with
the build due to potential mitigation requirements, the cost of finding

out, and time to do this, it follows it will impact on values. A simple example would be say, I have a vacant section for sale which under the current regime can be built on through a relatively easy and certain process and any buyer knows this and can buy with confidence on this basis. Introduce the uncertainty about what/if I can build, will there be extra/more costly built requirements and the cost of finding out including and hassle and time to find out, it clearly follows that any informed buyer would apply a "risk" discount to the property, maybe even think well I am taking a punt so I have to get it real cheap. The same thinking would apply to say an old Bach which someone may be looking to buy to do up/extend.

As I see it there seems for want of a better term a "vested interest" by some players in the planning process in pushing a "managed retreat" agenda. The rules as proposed support this via placing significantly barriers on development in an area people may wish to live in and enjoy. There are well publicised comments/headlines from senior people involved in the TTPP process which to me "colour" a particular view including in the Westport News the Don't Panic by Buller Mayor Jamie Cleine and the No Effect of Day to Day in which planer Louis Easton said the rules set for properties with coastal or other natural hazards did not affect existing use rights "You can continue to be within those areas. It doesn't affect your day to day use of the property" True, but the full impact/implications of the rules are glossed over at best.

In recent years hazards have become more recognised/published and I have the view most people now buying in the coastal environment at least subconsciously but likely implicitly recognise and accept the risk.

It is my understanding that planners are working on a 100 level sea level rise plus a metre. Fine recognise that if need be, but it's not the reality today in twenty years and so on, yet we seem to be making rules for a "possible" end result today.

With particular reference to Carters Beach where I live the beach now is/has being building up significantly following a period of erosion. It may be just part of a cycle and continue for a long period and back to where it was or more - or not . However, this 'reversal' is not recognised in some of the literature I have read which states the area is eroding.

Further, while sea level rise might (Or might not) have the final say I consider a more considered/restrained approach with regards to allowing development in these areas is appropriate

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

I would like the following decision made;
That the status quo remains

Please indicate if you wish to speak to your submission: I 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