

RC14513L - Glen Isla Protection Society - Submission Speaking notes

Nigel & Jessica Goodhue

Reginald & Marylyn Goodhue

I am speaking to the submission made by myself and my wife, Jessica.

I am also speaking to the submission made by parents, Reg and Marylyn Goodhue.

My oral submission will extend on my written submission and cover three areas:

1. Our association with Waihi Beach
 2. Effects of the existing seawall structures
 3. Proposed seawall
-
1. My association with Waihi beach extends to my entire life. As a child my family summer holidays were spent at Waihi Beach, through rented accommodation in the northern area of Waihi beach.
 2. My parent's association with Waihi Beach extends back to the 1970's when my grandparents moved to a farm on the outskirts of Waihi; through the 1970's and 80's my parents visited and rented baches for summer holidays in Waihi Beach.
 3. In the late 1980's my grandparents purchased a bach adjacent to Brighton Reserve which our extended family used extensively throughout the year as a holiday house until 2007 when it was sold.
 4. My parents then built a bach in Seafoam Place in 2011 which my family (Jess, myself and children) use extensively. My parents (now retired) split their time between their Hamilton home and Waihi Beach.
 5. Given the location of Seafoam Place, we make extensive use of the beach accessways at Ayr Street and Three-mile Creek for a range of beach- and water-related recreational activities. For us, the biggest asset of Waihi Beach is the beach itself.
 6. As part of my career as an environmental scientist, I have been involved in assessing erosion and inundation potential of parts of New Zealand's coastlines. I acknowledge the complexity of coastal erosion management and the challenges facing many soft and hard shore coastlines in NZ today, as well as the difficulty to resolve the conflict between protecting private and public infrastructure and maintaining the coastal areas and our beaches as places for current and future generations to use unrestricted. I hold the opinion that public access and public use of our coastlines must be retained and this view is upheld by NZ's legislation, in particular through the Coastal Policy Statement.

Effects of the existing seawalls

7. I would like to make note of the existing consented seawall that is situated along the front of Shaw Road and the Loop which was consented in 2008 and is still in place today. I am aware of the complicated history of dune and property protection in this area.
8. These seawalls have caused a number of detrimental effects to the coastal environment that I and many other submitters referenced in their submissions. This has included loss of useable beach space for parts of the tide cycle, loss of walking access through this section of the beach at higher tides, negative aesthetic values and a disconnection of ecological and coastal processes above and below the seawall.
9. Our family are fortunate that from Ayr St, where we access the beach, an area of backshore currently exists, however based on sea level rise and due to the presence of the hard rock structures south of the accessway this area will become inundated in the foreseeable future leaving no accessible backshore for a proportion of the tide.
10. In our view the loss of public use of the beach that is already occurring, and will be exacerbated due to sea-level rise, is a significant adverse effect.

The proposed seawall

11. It is evident from the application and supporting technical assessments that the proposed buried rock wall is intended to be incorporated within the Coastal Marine Area (CMA) over its lifetime. The technical assessment prepared by Davis Coastal Consultants has placed this time frame at ~30 years.
12. In my view, once this erosion has occurred, the seawall will function just like the existing seawalls I discussed earlier whereby there will be loss of accessible use of the beach by the public during parts of the tidal cycle. This will lead to a similar level of adverse effects as is occurring with the current seawalls.

Cumulative effects

13. The cumulative effects of the proposed sea wall in my opinion must be considered alongside the existing seawalls which form part of the existing environment. The granting of this consent would result in cumulative effects of restricting public access and use of the beach. To put this into perspective, I calculate that between the northern extent of the existing seawall and the southern extent of the proposed sea wall, 2/3 of the beach would be subject to a seawall and resulting loss of public use.

Inconsistencies with planning framework

14. As I outlined in my submission, the application is highly inconsistent with the Policy and Objectives of the relevant Policy Statements and lower order Regional/District Plans.
15. In our view the applicant's original application, legal submission and the planning evidence dismisses the actual reality of the seawall becoming incorporated into the Coastal Marine Area. Instead, the evidence has focussed on having obtained the necessary construction-related consents from BOPRC and the land use consent being undertaken outside of the CMA. I don't agree with this approach and support the approach and conclusion in the Section 42A report in finding the activity inconsistent with the directly relevant Policies and Plans of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement and Bay of Plenty Regional Policy Statement.

Use of Council Reserve

16. Lastly, the seawall is intended to be constructed within a Council Reserve. This has been described as a 'strategic asset' by WBOPDC. The applicant's Planning evidence suggests that protecting the Reserve from erosion, through the proposed sea wall, is a positive effect (Paragraph 7.41 of the Applicant's Planning Evidence).
17. In our view a better use of this public reserve as a strategic asset is to continue to provide a natural backshore and dune system to buffer from coastal processes and maintain public access and use of the beach. This, coupled with soft structure protection (such as dune renourishment), would provide additional time until an appropriate long-term approach that actually aligns with the relevant Policy Statements can be found.

Summary

18. In summary, we consider that there are significant standalone and cumulative adverse effects that will occur as a result of this proposal. To grant consent for an activity that will have these intended adverse effects is not acceptable. The activity is also not supported by the relevant legislation and we request, that the application, in its current form be declined.

Thank you for your consideration of our submission.

Nigel Goodhue

Beach profile naming conventions

