Te Tai o Poutini PLAN
A combined district plan for the West Coast

Variation 2 to Proposed TTPP – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping

Submission form

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

Your details:

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

☑ Individual ☐ Organisation

First Name: RAE Surname: REYNOLDS

Organisation (if applicable): NA

Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission ☐Yes ☑No

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:
I am/am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Postal Address: 20 Peel Street
WESTPORT

Email Address: rae.reynolds

Phone Number: 021 0660 405

Signature: R J Reynolds Date: 11/08/24

My submission:

(Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended, and the reasons for your views.)

I oppose TTPP's proposal to apply Variation 2 : TTPPs –Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping to the Buller Region for the following reasons:

- TTPP's intention to apply designated Hazard classifications using scenarios that do not currently exist using particular hypothetical, predictive, futuristic modelling of their own selection is *neither honest nor ethical.*
- The allowance for a worst case scenario storm, with sea surge, plus a 1 metre sea level rise over 100 years, *without providing affected property owners with any substantive scientific evidence* (sea level graphing of the area) to support this prediction is totally unacceptable.

PTO.

- In addition your chosen modelling neglected to take into account many other factors that may shape our Buller coastal communities, including seismic activity. *Have we a range of modelling that has been carried out to allow for a broader understanding?*
- *In its aim TTPP seeks to disadvantage and penalise current property owners for a situation that may never arise.* Given the lack of supply of evidence to support this hypothesis it can be construed as crystal ball gazing.
- *TTPP have not carried out this consultation in good faith.* Good faith includes undertaking your role in a clear, honest and open manner. This consultation has featured: a bungled mail-out, lack of identification of your organisation, lack of explanatory data and a lack of supporting evidence. Much fear and anxiety was generated and people could not find the answers and explanations they were seeking. Your communications have been abysmal.
- Given the lack of care for the rights of the community and the blatant disregard shown by those charged with undertaking this process your notification appeared to signal a mandated foregone conclusion rather than a chance for property owners to be afforded the right to be informed, heard and considered.
- Since time began people have had the freedom to choose where they live, to calculate risk and often to choose to live with it. This edict threatens to take away that fundamental right. I was raised in a coastal community where my mother was born and raised and I know that sea inundation and erosion there have been cyclic over generations. ~~When~~ Until you can provide supportive data demonstrating measured sea level rise and I am given evidential information to support rising sea level I will hold my view that you are intruding on our rights to live with nature as we have done over millennia.

(Please feel free to use additional sheets)

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

This Variation 2 should not be pursued until such a time as we have collected actual scientific data that records and proves the hypothetical guess work that this Variation has been based upon. Time and again we have asked for data. It has not been supplied.

(Please feel free to use additional sheets)

All submitters have the opportunity to present their submission to Commissioners during the hearing process. Please indicate if you wish to speak to your submission

☑ I wish to speak to my submission

☐ I do not wish to speak to my submission

(please note that with this option you will not receive correspondence in relation to the hearings but you can keep up to date on the TTPP website)

If any others making similar submissions wish to be heard:

☐ Yes, I would consider presenting a joint case with them

☑ No, I would prefer to present my own individual case

Enquiries

All queries regarding this variation or the TTPP in general can be addressed to the TTPP Team at info@ttpp.nz, 03 768 0466, or 0508 800 118.

Public information

All information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. The content provided in your submission form will be published on the Te Tai o Poutini Plan website and made available to the public.

We collect, use and share your information for the following purposes as directed by Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991:

- Original submission, and the associated address for service, is required (and made public) for:
  - Further submitters to serve their submission on an original submitter
  - TTPP Planning Technician to contact you about making an oral presentation supporting your written submission and/or advising you of the decision of the hearing panel.
- A summary of submissions report is produced following the close of submissions. This report assists the hearings panel and the public to review the submissions made.
- All submission data is required to ensure a sound and accurate consultation and hearings process.

If you wish to update or correct your name or address for service, please contact the TTPP Team on 0508 800 118 or by email at info@ttpp.nz

Validity of Submissions

Please note that submissions may be struck out in whole or in part if authorities (including Council staff, Independent Commissioners or Legal authorities delegated jurisdiction with respect to such decision-making) deem any submission partially or entirely:

- Is frivolous or vexatious in its content;
- Discloses no reasonable or relevant case for a position taken;
- Contains offensive language; and/or
- Is supported only by material that *purports* to be independent expert evidence, but has in fact been prepared by a person who is not independent and/or does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Those hearing submissions may also refuse to take a submission further in whole or in part if believing that there allowing otherwise would be an abuse of the hearing process.

The Chair – Rex Williams
Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee
P.O Box 66
GREYMOUTH 7840
by email

09 August 2024

Dear TTPP Committee Members

AN APPEAL: Variation 2: Coastal Hazard Mapping Submission Process

Having viewed your meeting of 07 August I write this appeal to your individual consciences regarding your duty to act in good faith towards the communities you represent.

The Variation 2 Submissions process needs to be redone. It needs to be notified clearly with access to information supporting your proposal supplied, including evidential data to support your modeling claims. We need understanding in order to make informed submissions and are entitled to fairness in this respect.

Throughout your meeting a range of faults and omission were acknowledged. These impact our rights to clarity. I urge you to consider that long after you have left your current positions the ramifications of your actions will have consigned your communities to long lasting and life changing impacts. These already include impacts to mental health and wellbeing as your carelessness and the confusion you have acknowledged generate anxiety and distress.

You Recognised: (Committee member quotes in italics):

- *Awful lot of people confused and upset by the way mapping has gone out.*
- *People have tried to contact you and no-one has replied*
- *Letters going out and it's caught a lot of people by surprise and they don't understand what it means and the letters are confusing even to us.*
- *Surely we can redraft the letter in plain English*
- *It's causing an awful lot of anxiety in the community – major risk affecting insurance and goodness knows what else.*
- *I thought I had changed them back to plain English, obviously I haven't. I will have to do better in future.*
- *The mapping on the website didn't work and I checked it twice – maps aren't working – Wasn't connection issue with me. I'm on the fastest broadband you can get.*
- *I don't think there's any way we can make it less complicated*
- *Been hearing about this problem since the website went up.*
- *People in Westport thought the letter had come from the Polytechnic – threw it away*

As an affected party who has provided support, particularly to elderly community members frightened by what the future holds I have noted to you previously a range of concerns.

- The mailout did not identify who it was from. The Maori language letterhead provided no explanation of who it represented or the links to our West Coast councils. It was extremely obscure.
- Many threw it away. Many say they never received it. Many today remain totally uninformed.
- It was stated that if you received this letter then it meant you were directly impacted by the Hazard notification. I helped many in trying to understand this letter and find information only to be informed that many of us who received it were in fact not directly impacted.
- Maps were difficult for the average person to locate and once found caused much anxiety with zero information having been supplied to advise what impacts or restrictions applied to the affected properties. To access further map information has proved unworkable to most.
- Recipients were advised the maps were based on very accurate Lidar mapping plus modeling. No information at all was supplied regarding what modeling meant or the particular model that had been selected to produce the worst case scenario of these maps.
- Many have complained that attempts to contact your office were unsuccessful and that calls and mail were not replied to.

An Appeal:

I listened to your meeting and heard the admissions made so I know that you know that this process has not been good enough. I was shocked that not one member during this meeting was prepared to stand and advocate on our behalf and state that those who have invested their lives, their families and their homes on this beautiful and wild West Coast, knowing full well the impacts of nature here over many generations, deserve to be treated respectfully and fairly in this process. Not one spoke up and said. “We need to do this properly”. It seems that this shoddy process is good enough for us!

I observed also in your meeting your decision to apply for some form of extension of eighteen months for your own Plan purposes in order to get your head around it and see you do things properly. Yet not one spoke up on our behalf to afford us that same right of time to become informed, to have this notification done properly, effectively and respectfully.

It’s not too late. I appeal to the TTPP Committee to acknowledge what we have all recognized, go back, admit your errors, and honor us with the courtesy of honest inclusion.

Yours sincerely

Rae Reynolds
20 Peel Street
Westport
Rae.reynolds@gmail.com

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?:	Individual
First Name:	Rae
Last Name:	Reynolds
Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission:	No
Postal address:	20 Peel Street
Email address:	rae.reynolds@gmail.com
Phone number:	+64210660405
My submission:	PLEASE NOTE: • This Submission is a replacement for my earlier submission • I have gone to lengths to keep my submission concise so that it remains unedited. I wish it to remain as written in its entirety. SUBMISSION I oppose Hazard Mapping Variation 2. The changes are unreasonably based upon an unsubstantiated catastrophic inundation scenario, predicted to occur in our Buller region in 100 years time. No evidence or balancing consideration of alternative models, potential geological or engineered changes or mitigations have been factored in. It is a one-sided theory. It is not science. It is social engineering. A centralised edict rather than a professional comprehensive analysis of local conditions constitutes the force behind these changes. Our residents, our communities and our region will pay very dearly for this grossly flawed and devastatingly punitive action.
I would like the following decision(s) to be made with respect to this Variation:	I oppose these changes being adopted. Changes should be formulated following a broad and fair investigation of conditions.

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:	No, I would prefer to present my own individual case