



## Submission on the Proposed Regional Coastal Plan 2016

**Return your signed submission to the West Coast Regional Council by 5.00pm, Monday 21 March 2016**

Submissions may be:

- a) Posted to: Proposed RPS, West Coast Regional Council, PO Box 66, Greymouth 7840
- b) Delivered direct to the West Coast Regional Council at 388 Main South Road, Greymouth
- c) Emailed to [ICDP@wrc.govt.nz](mailto:ICDP@wrc.govt.nz)
- d) Sent by facsimile (03) 768 7133

### **PART A: Submitters contact details**

**Public information** - all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. Your information is held and administered by the West Coast Regional Council in accordance with the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and the Privacy Act 1993. This means that your information may be disclosed to other people who request it in accordance with the terms of these Acts. It is therefore important you let us know if your form includes any information you consider should not be disclosed.

**Full name:** Michael Rogers

**Organisation:** \_\_\_\_\_

*[The organisation that this submission is on behalf of, if applicable]*

**Postal address:** 7 Main Road Hector

**Post Code:** 7822

**Email:** rockiesmining@hotmail.co.nz

**Phone (Hm):** 03 7828124

**Phone (Wk):** \_\_\_\_\_

**Phone (Cell):** 0211372165

**Preferred method of contact:** Phone

**Contact person and address for service [if different from above]:**

\_\_\_\_\_

**PART B: Trade Competition**

As per Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission may make a submission only if directly affected by an effect of the proposed policy statement that:

- a) Adversely affects the environment
- b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

**Please tick the sentence that applies to you:**

- I **could not** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission; or
- I **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. *If you have ticked this box, please select one of the following:*
  - I **am** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission.
  - I **am not** directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission.

**Signature:**

*[Signature of person making submission, or authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission]*

**Date:** 17 March 2016

(A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means)

**PART C: Request to be Heard**

- I **do not** wish to be heard in support of my submission; or
- I **do** wish to be heard in support of my submission; and if so,
- I would be prepared to consider presenting my submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any Hearing.

1

I have a concern that marking the majority of the local coastline as a coastal hazard area. Will this affect future insurances and coastal development?

## **2 Extraction of gravels from rivers.**

There appears to be no plan in place to minimise the extraction of gravels from active riverbeds. In particular, my concern is with Northern Buller. The beaches in most of this area are subject to severe erosion. In some areas, ~ 1metre of erosion has occurred since 2010, this is a major problem and cannot continue. The only natural source of supplementation of sediment on the beaches is from local rivers. In Karamea Bight, the local rivers include the Buller, Waimangaroa, Ngakawau, and Mokihinui.

The lower Buller has been dredged and the gravel has been dumped at sea for many years. Can this process be altered to deposit the gravel north of the river mouth and nearer the beach for the drift to take it northwards.

The Waimangaroa River has a severe deficit of gravel, yet it appears that the Council is still allowing resource consents to extract. (Eg the SH67 upgrade at Birchfield).

The Ngakawau River. It appears that the rate of erosion north of the river mouth has increased since the Mangatini sump was installed at Stockton, (about 1 m per year at our property). Of particular note, the proposal for the sump was to last for more than 50 years, and is near full capacity in less than 10 years. It therefore appears that there has been a vast miscalculation of sediment movement via Mangatini prior to the sumps installation. This sediment previously supplemented our beaches.

Does the Council have a solution to this?

## **3 Coastal Protection:**

Following on from the above, there appears to be little in the plan to cover coastal protection. Again, this situation with the erosion in Northern Buller requires urgent attention. A recent report compiled by NIWA suggested such things as monitoring erosion for 2 - 5 years and eventually retreating. The long term goal for this plan needs to be maintaining existing coastlines and therefore retreat would not be included in the medium term.

The suggestions for retreat and monitoring in most instances are impractical and unrealistic due to the issue being urgent now. The monitoring has been done over many years by locals and one only has to look at aerial photos to see the amount of erosion over time. The suggestion for retreat is impractical in most cases as properties are bounded by SH67. To move houses to new sections is most probably not practical as one, there has to be sections available to move to and if they are adjacent to the hill, they may be in an earthquake/ rock fall hazard zone.

My concern is; if these properties are inundated by the sea, people will abandon their properties and just move on. This will leave unsightly homes, lack of rates and this is not a good look for an area pursuing tourism as a major industry.

4

The Council needs a short and long term plan to deal with erosion region-wide. The local areas could have a special rating system or the ability for individuals or

groups to gain a resource consent at minimal and reasonable cost. As an example, I quote the Merritts wall (NIWA report). I believe the cost was within the region of \$6000 to gain the resource consent alone. I do not consider this reasonable. The bulk of this money should have been going into the cost of the construction, and rock, not the paperwork!

The plan refers to no mechanical removal of gravels from the beach for beach protection works (revetment, rock walls etc). Supplementary and similar gravels are to be brought in instead. This makes little sense to me, as these gravels would be sourced from local rivers nearby. The gravels will end up on the beach naturally and this process just adds cost. Any gravels used for infill around placed rocks (not a huge amount), should be sourced from the beach. This would need to have some controls around extraction.

It is important to note that any gravels used for this purpose are not actually leaving the beach.

The plan needs amending to allow beach gravels to be used for this purpose.