

## Submission of David East

My name is David Colin East

I am a Graduate of UC = BSc in Geography and Geology

I am a fourth generation resident of North Beach and am a Life Member of Surf Life Saving, at Club (North Beach), District (Canterbury). and also for Surf Life Saving NZ.

I am a former Christchurch City Councillor ( 15 years of Local Governance experience) and am a current Environment Canterbury Councillor. I appear before today as a concerned coastal resident and any commentary that I give today is purely my opinion only

The beach and Christchurch Coastline has been my passion for decades. I have witnessed several severe storms, the resultant damage and the subsequent recovery of our coastline. I believe my decades of local experience coupled with my University studies gives me credible judgment on the processes and situations that prevail on our Coastline

You will have had many “experts” appearing before you elaborating on the merit of qualifying matters with respect to PC14, giving their opinion on studies and modelling with relation to climate change, natural hazards and sea level rise. Equally there will have been numerous individuals and community groups submitting on various aspects of PC14, outlining their experiences and giving their opinion

It is of great concern to me and I ask , what weighting is given to individual submissions and the observations and the experience that Local people have of our coastline and bring before you, as opposed to the body of “experts” who rely on modelling and text book scenarios.

I am reminded of a saying that I first came across post Earthquake that was a particular favourite of the former Dean of Christchurch and former City Councillor – Peter Beck

“The wisdom of the people far outweighs the knowledge of the experts”

My Submission is primarily with the qualifying matters

- - Coastal Hazard areas
- Tsunami Management area.

I support in its entirety, the submission of the South Brighton Residents Association that goes into greater technical detail, all of which I agree with.

I have advocated on behalf of our community on several topics on several occasions. A common outcome that follows our submissions is the negative attitude to Coastal areas that we have had to endure for decades. For some reason we are perceived as a “doomed area” when in fact predicted sea level rise would see more of the City inundated than coastal areas. Recent flooding has been far more severe in the city than on the coast. I want to ensure that proposed PC14 Qualifying matters, particularly those listed above, do not serve to control intensification in coastal areas, do not stop reasonable development or serve to stagnate our community (as Council attitude to coastal areas has done for decades)

Point 1. Of the SSRA submission is particularly poignant

“ ....concerned that the Council may use PC14 as a vehicle to replace the current District Plan provisions for Coastal areas.. We are concerned that CCC may use the qualifying matters in PC14 as an effective proxy for Plan Change 12 in the sense that it could incorporate many of the provisions (mapping, objectives and policies & rules) intended to be included in PC12”

Of some disturbing note is the fact the PC14 process has no appeal on merits and therefore no opportunity to remedy or pursue change through the Environment Court

Coastal hazard Planning in CCC is predicated on the continued use of RCP 8.5 and 8.5H+. Internationally the use of this scenario is now accepted to be highly unlikely and requires the worst level of every variable to occur simultaneously yet our planning is still based on this now unlikely scenario. Whilst I acknowledge there is a need to address climate change, a more reasoned, conservative and practical pathway should be considered.

Council’s continued reluctance to incorporate science they commissioned from NIWA on sediment and its impact on our coastline also beggars belief. This report indicates, that at even an RCP 8.5 scenario there is a very significant time lag (up to 100 years) before any erosion may occur. Using PC14 qualifying matters and continued use of of RPC8.5 with relation to Coastal Hazards planning on our New Brighton Coastline may stifle Community development in areas that are unlikely to be affected for a very long time

Tsunami Management Areas.

I am concerned re the emphasis on Tsunami and accompanying mapping. The occurrence of Tsunami waves generated as a result of South American earthquake is a rare and unlikely event. We have been subjected to a number of Tsunami warnings from South American events and on our City coastline there has not been any effect. Our primary concern and mapping should be Banks Peninsula inlets and the Estuary with Tsunami waves travelling up the Avon & Heathcote rivers

Our near Tsunami effect comes from the Kaikoura Trench and Kermadec trench, both of which arrive laterally to our coast. More concern should be directed to Banks Peninsula and Sumner. Ironically coastal defences in Sumner are minimal, yet our coastline is subjected to significant regulation.

I request Tsunami mapping is reviewed as currently the mapping is inappropriate for a District Plan.

### Summary

Our primary concerns are mirrored in the SSRA summary

1. Clarify Plan Change 14 Qualifying matters – Coastal hazard areas and the interaction and relationship to PC12. Proxy use of PC14 to enact parts of PC12. Alignment of PC14 Qualifying matters and objectives of PC12
2. Reservations about the continued use of RCP 8.5 and 8.5+ to inform planning maps, given the now internationally recognised unlikely status
3. Tsunami mapping. Clarify the basis / methodology of mapping. Is it appropriate for a District Plan.

A final quote

Climate Change has become a religion that actually has nothing to do with the climate and is really about power and control