

Submission on the resource consent application for the proposed extension of the Hokitika Seawall (RC-2022-0039 and RC220053)

From Clare Backes, [REDACTED]

*Submitting as an individual.*

*I wish to speak to my submission and I may consider presenting a joint case with those making similar submissions.*

I oppose the granting of a resource consent to allow the construction of a seawall as presented in resource consents RC-2022-0039 and RC220053. The proposed seawall is not in the proper place for a seawall.

I would not object to the seawall if:

- the seawall was built adjacent to the property boundaries, and
- there was a trigger point when the erosion line is within 10m of that property boundary before which the wall could not be constructed.

The construction of the proposed seawall would see a huge hole in the foreshore area, and an associated vehicle track which would cause devastation of the vegetated foreshore area including some privatised parts of the foreshore. There is no need to have this devastation at this stage, when neither the private properties or the town are particularly threatened by the sea.

The application is contrary to section 27/4 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement, which should, and would be challenged under the RMA.

There is no consideration of end effects, these have not been taken into account properly.

The temporary walls along Revell Street still have no consents, this matter needs to be sorted out before any further construction is considered.

Both Westland District Council and West Coast Regional Council need to develop a comprehensive plan in case the sea does start to threaten the town- this plans need to encompass far more than building sea walls.

I support both Nigel Snoep's submission and that of Inger Perkins, and their more detailed discussion of the issues.