

Submission to the Westcoast Regional Council  
On the proposed extension of the Hokitika Seawall ( RC-2022-0039 and RC  
220053)

From  
Greg Maitland

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Submitting as an individual , My preferred option is that the Council investigate my submission on the construction of Moles off the Hokitika river to build up sand and gravels on the Hokitika foreshore however secondarily I also support the submissions of Clare Backes, Inger Perkins, Nigel Snoeps and The Hokitika Coastal Alliance INC .

I oppose the the granting of resource consents for the following reasons.

1. Should the Science be correct on sea level rise, the proposed seawall will prove to be an expensive temporary measure. However not all climate scientists by any means are in agreement as to what the future holds in regards to sea level rise. The Hokitika beach by my long term observation has an approximate 30 year erosion cycle . I recall in the early 80's when I worked in the business area of Revell st ,driving through town one morning and there was beach drift wood that had washed through the street between what is now Sock World and Postie Plus that had reached all the way to where the Weld st roundabout is now All the coastal lagoons on the Westcoast show an ebb at times but also a predominance of a build up of sand and gravels on the foreshore . There is no doubt that the "fear factor in regards to climate has changed markedly. In the past it was not uncommon for the Hokitika business district to be flooded and people just got on with it. The proposed works would destroy the coastal marine habitat. and also destroy the natural Mana of the foreshore.
2. It now seems that there is no consequence for Councils to incur ever burdensome costs on ratepayers . for needless infrastructure . Our rates have risen over 400% in the last 16 years , which is totally unsustainable . There have been many new consented private builds on the beach side of Revell st ,long after concerns about climate change and erosion of the foreshore . When people make a financial decision to build ,that is their decision to make and no responsibility should be placed on others to protect their financial interests. Thats what insurance

is for. If a disaster was thought to be imminent ( crystal ball gazing ) on my property I would not expect the rest of the community to pay to protect my house. I believe the same must be applicable in regards to these consents to properties on Beach and Revell st.

### 3. Options.

,I would like to see the option to build rock Moles out from the mouth of the Hokitika river , with the South Mole extending further out to sea ( 50 metres) than the north mole. The predominant northerly current would deflect off the south Mole causing the aggregate being transported down the Hokitika river to be deposited on the Hokitika beach front . This action the Moles create can be clearly seen at the mouth of the Buller river where the sand build up on the north side is considerable with several hundred meters of sand and dunes between Westport and the sea. This I believe is by far the best option . it is working with nature not against it and would help protect the foreshore habitat and be much much more cost effective.

### 4. As a passing note

I believe increasing the height of the Hokitika river flood wall was un necessary . Although i agree it did need maintenance) it was reported that during a recent major flood that the river level was only 400 mm below the wall beside Westland Milk Products . It is clear that the engineers didn't take into account the catchment of Southside Hokitika's ability to store millions of cubic metres of flood water. I can recall a time in the 1960's when 28" (720mm) of rain fell in the upper Hokitika catchment in 24 hours and even then it did not go over the top of the river wall although it was lapping between the planks on the deck of the then wooden rail and road bridge. Yet another example of wasted Tax and Ratepayers money.