

# **ATTACHMENT TO SUBMISSION OF JOHN MORRISON**

## **PRELIMINARY**

29 Field Way is on the seaward side of Field Way, fronting on to the dunes and overlooking the Waimeha Stream outlet with Kapiti Island in the background. Visibly over years the dunes have moved towards the island and the beach has risen. The latter phenomenon has become increasingly apparent with the frequency and extent of mechanical excavation and training of the stream. Accretion and progradation are real and observable along this section of the coastline.

Despite that, the Coastal Erosion Prediction Lines promulgated by KCDC variously predict the shoreline will be at the seaward boundary of the property in 50 years (managed) or obliterate it altogether in 100 years (unmanaged). The effect on future ability to develop and enjoy as proposed by the PDP is punitive, and the more so because foreshadowed “managed retreat” contradicts oft repeated references elsewhere in the PDP to building and encouraging “resilience” to enhance the enjoyment of life of others in the district.

## **SUPPORT FOR CROZIER/ALLIN SUBMISSION**

I have sighted a copy of the second submission of Rob Crozier and Joan Allin dated 26 March 2013. I respectfully support and adopt it as generally applying also to the section of coastline I am more familiar with. In particular I support and adopt the section under the heading COASTAL HAZARD MANAGEMENT AREAS AND HAZARDS – CHAPTERS 4 AND 9, DEFINITIONS AND MAPS. For the reasons I have just briefly described under “preliminary” I believe the situation at the Waimeha Stream is very similar to that described by the submitters at the Mangaone Inlet.

In supporting their submission I add that my concern about the reliance KCDC placed on the 2012 report of Dr Shand is exacerbated by the process its staff employed in:

- Procuring the report
- Acting on it in terms of drawing lines on maps and LIM reports
- Avoiding any consultation with the affected property owners

and, apparently only then, reporting to the elected councillors and obtaining their approval after the event. At that level there was a singular failure of process with the elected councillors apparently considering they could not and should not challenge the advice of their staff and engaged consultants. Put bluntly the interests affected property owners were carefully and cynically excluded from consideration.

As a result:

- There has been an absence of scrutiny and verification, which is continuing based on an alleged inability to look past the robustness claimed for Dr Shand’s report and

reliance on legal advice that the secretive process I have just described was appropriate

- The affected property owners are told they should instead look to the present procedure.

Accordingly, my expectation is that consideration of this and other like submissions on the PDP will also address KCDC's failure to permit or allow scrutiny of the report it relies on, and the failure of its elected representatives to challenge its staff and give the affected property owners any voice in the process to date.