

Date Received	Submission Number

**Resource Management Act 1991**

**Submission to:**

**Proposed Kāpiti Coast District Plan 2012**

**Submissions close 4pm, Friday 1 March 2013**

**Post:**

Kāpiti Coast District Council  
Private Bag 60601  
Paraparaumu 5254  
Attention: Jim Ebenhoh, Sustainable  
Development Manager

**Deliver:**

Paraparaumu Service Centre, Unit 7, Kapiti Lights Complex,  
Paraparaumu  
Waikanae Service Centre, Mahara Place, Waikanae  
Ōtaki Service Centre, 81-83 Main Street, Ōtaki

**Email:** [submissions@kapiticoast.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@kapiticoast.govt.nz)

Please write contact details in clear BLOCK CAPITAL letters.

Is this an individual submission? (circle) **Yes** No

If this submission is from an organisation, please state the name of the organisation:

Title (circle) **Mr** Mrs Ms Miss Dr

First Name: **PAUL**

Last Name: **INGRAM**

House Number: **93**

Street Name: **MARINE PARADE**

P O Box:

Suburb: **PARAPARAUMU BEACH**

Town:

Post Code: **5032**

Email: **PINGRAM1970@HOTMAIL.COM**

Phone Day:

Mobile Phone: **021 242 9156**

Do you want to speak at the hearing in support of your submission? (circle) Yes **No**

If you circled **yes** then we will contact you about the timing of the hearings which will begin in mid 2013 following the submission process.

If others wish to make a similar submission would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case? (circle) Yes **No**

**Notes to person making submission:**

Please note that all submissions (including names and contact details) will be made publicly available at council offices and public libraries. A summary of submissions including the name of the submitter may also be made publicly available and posted on the Kāpiti Coast District Council website. Personal information will also be used for administration relating to the subject matter of the submissions, including notifying submitters of subsequent steps and decisions. All information will be held by the Kāpiti Coast District Council, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

If you are a person who could gain advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6 (4) of part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act.

**I could /could not\* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.**

**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 this submission that:**

- a) adversely affects the environment; and
- b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

\*please indicate by circling the word(s) in bold text that apply.

**Name/Organisation:** MR. PAUL INGRAM

**(Please continue on a separate sheet if necessary)**

Date 16/2/13

I have attached 2 pages to this submission.

**Don't Forget! Submission Deadline is 4pm, Friday 1 March 2013**



## **Background**

My wife and I came to Paraparaumu in 2009 and we immediately felt at home.

In 2010, we took possession of our own home at 93 Marine Parade, Paraparaumu Beach and since that time, we have invested tens of thousands of dollars into modernising it, in order to make ourselves comfortable for a long term future here.

## **Consultation**

At no stage, during the buying process, were we ever advised that there was a Coastal Erosion assessment programme about to be undertaken. The LIM report, that we purchased, certainly made no reference to it.

Reviewing that same LIM now, we find it to be ludicrous that the front cover page of it is entitled, "Know what you're buying into & protect your future."

The Coastal Erosion assessment programme was first brought to our attention when we received communication from KCDC in August 2012, informing us of the addition of the hazard lines onto our property LIM.

To date, communication and consultation with us remains at a poor level and the immediate move of updating our LIM with unsubstantiated science is most alarming.

## **Objections**

Regarding our home, we have lived here for three years and see no signs of erosion.

We oppose the coastal hazard lines shown on the planning maps and the associated provisions and restrictions contained in the Proposed District Plan. The provisions and restrictions that apply to properties affected by the lines are inappropriately restrictive.

Our grounds for opposition are that we consider that the provisions are contrary to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010, specifically the questionable, ultra precautionary approach used within the Dr. Shand report.

KCDC has given unfair weight to the views of just one scientist who refuses to take into account any other pertinent factors that should be considered when analysing long term coastal erosion.

We also consider that the Council by publicly stating that affected property owners must employ scientists to be able to have the lines removed or altered has demonstrated an extreme and unnecessary bias. It is the Council's responsibility to ensure that it has an appropriate report to enable it to make the decisions that it needs to make, rather than passing the burden on to individual ratepayers such as us.

The policy of managed retreat is simply ridiculous. It is totally unsuitable to the Kapiti Coastline which we know to be an accreting coastline. This is based on well documented scientific information that states that within the last 5000 years, sea level rise has averaged 1.8mm per annum and the Kapiti Coast coastline has accreted by several metres.

## **Relief Sought**

We seek the removal of the coastal hazard lines shown on the planning maps and the associated provisions and restrictions contained in the Proposed District Plan and the items that we have raised within our attached submission.

Mr and Mrs. P. Ingram  
93 Marine Parade  
Paraparaumu Beach  
5032

Please state the specific provisions of the Proposed District Plan that your submission relates to, and the specific changes or decision requested of Council including the reasons for your views	Support/Oppose/Seek Amendment
<p>Chapter 4, Section 4.2 (Page 4-8)</p> <p>"Managed scenario: where existing public sea walls and other protective structures are maintained in their current configuration for the next 50 years <i>and</i> existing management regimes at river and stream mouths (inlets) are also continued."</p>	<p>We seek amendment as follows:</p> <p>"Managed scenario: where existing public sea walls and other protective structures are maintained in their current configuration and when necessary, be improved upon, for the next 50 years and existing management regimes at river and stream mouths (inlets) are also continued and when necessary, be improved upon."</p> <p>We feel that KCDC upholds a cautious approach to its planning and has repeatedly conveyed the possibility and likelihood of a "worst case scenario event." With this in mind, the concept of, "maintaining," is simply too passive. If the approach is to preserve the quality of the coastal infrastructure, against a worst case scenario, the approach should be to have the ability to enhance, where necessary, the protective structures and management regimes</p>
<p>Chapter 4, Section 4.2 (Page 4-8)</p> <p>"Unmanaged scenario: where either there are no publicly-owned protection measures in place in 2012 or management regimes in place in 2012 no longer continue (the sea walls fail and are not replaced or the relevant Council decides not to continue the river/stream mouth management practices)."</p>	<p>We oppose because:</p> <p>We feel that a managed retreat option is not in the best interest of the community. It will have an adverse impact on the area and the concept of retreating simply isn't in-line with the KCDC own goals of, supporting growth and development of the community in order to promote the social, economic, environmental and cultural wellbeing of the Kāpiti Coast.</p>
<p>Chapter 4, Rule 4A.1 Activity 1 Standard 2 (Page 4-18)</p> <p>"Additions not exceeding 10 m<sup>2</sup> or 10% of the gross floor area, whichever is lesser, to existing (Prior to November 2012) non-relocatable <i>buildings</i>."</p>	<p>We seek amendment as follows:</p> <p>"Additions not exceeding 20 m<sup>2</sup> or 15% of the gross floor area, whichever is lesser, to existing (Prior to November 2012) non-relocatable <i>buildings</i>."</p> <p>We feel that 10m<sup>2</sup> and 10% are too restrictive and this control measure should be consistent with those detailed in Chapter 9 – Hazards:</p> <p>Rule B.1 Activity 7 Standard 1– Page 9 –16) Rule D.1 Activity 1 Standard 2 – Page 9 –44)</p>
<p>Chapter 4, Rule 4A.3 Activity 4 Standard 1 (Page 4-24)</p> <p>"Additions greater than 10 m<sup>2</sup> or 10% of the gross floor area to existing (prior to November 2012) non-relocatable <i>buildings</i> where the addition is not designed to be relocatable. "</p>	<p>We seek amendment as follows:</p> <p>"Additions greater than 20 m<sup>2</sup> or 15% of the gross floor area to existing (prior to November 2012) non-relocatable <i>buildings</i> where the addition is not designed to be relocatable. "</p> <p>We feel that 10m<sup>2</sup> and 10% are too restrictive and this control measure should be consistent with those detailed in Chapter 9 – Hazards</p> <p>Rule B.1 Activity 7 Standard 1 – Page 9 –16) Rule D.1 Activity 1 Standard 2 – Page 9 –44)</p>