

Introduction

We welcome your feedback and invite you to take part in shaping the future of our District. Let us know whether you support or oppose with what is proposed and why you hold that view.

The submission period is from 25 July to 04 September 2015. Submissions will be published and opened for further submissions from 18 September to 02 October 2015. Then there will be hearings by the Government-appointed independent hearings panel.

Privacy Statement

Privacy Act 1993

Submissions are public information. Information on this form including your name and contact details will be accessible to the public on the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP) or the Council websites and at Council service centres and libraries. The Council is required to make this information available under the provisions of the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014. Your contact details will only be used by the Council, IHP or IHP Secretariat for the purpose of the District Plan Review process (for example to contact you about hearings and decisions on your submission). The information will be held by the Council, IHP or IHP Secretariat. You have the right to access the information and request any correction.

Submitter Details

First Name: **Chris**

Last Name: **Doudney**

Organisation: **on behalf of the Redcliffs Residents Association**

On behalf of: **Redcliffs residents**

Street: **124 Beachville Road,**

Suburb: **Redcliffs**

City: **Christchurch**

Country: **New Zealand**

PostCode: **8081**

Daytime Phone: **03 384 2263**

Mobile: **027 221 9397**

eMail: **cm.doudney@xtra.co.nz**

Trade competition and adverse effects:

I could I could not

gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission

I am I am not

directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that :

a. adversely affects the environment, and

b. does not relate to the trade competition or the effects of trade competitions.

Wishes to be heard:

Yes

I do NOT wish to speak in support of my submission and ask that the following submission be fully considered.

Correspondence to:

Submitter

Agent

Both

Submission

Consultation Document Submissions

Chapter 5 Natural Hazards (part) > 5.11 Coastal erosion and coastal inundation rules

- Support
- Oppose
- Amend

Decision Requested

Change 5.11.1a and b from NC to Permitted Other ways of managing development and occupation within these zones need to be implemented, which can take into account the various and very different reasons why the zones were occupied in the first place, and why some occupants perceive the benefit to substantially outweigh the risks.

Reason for Decision Requested

There are many community facilities currently required to be built in the inundation and erosion zones, and there will probably be many more in the future. We are thankful that the Mt Pleasant Community Centre, the Redcliffs Supermarket and the Sumner Lifesaving building are already under way! They would not have been possible if the proposed rule was already in force. There are other projects at risk unless the ban on building is rescinded, eg Sumner library and community centre, Redcliffs library, and presumably any number of other small buildings such as public toilets, bus shelters, even pump stations. In short, the fact that building is to be 'non-compliant' in such a large area is not practicable, and there is not space in the adjacent streets for the relocation of essential community facilities. There are many reasons why continued building within the inundation and erosion zones should be a permitted activity; even, in certain circumstances, to be encouraged - an obvious example being replacement of yacht club facilities. Other ways of managing development and occupation within these zones need to be implemented, which can take into account the various and very different reasons why the zones were occupied in the first place, and why some occupants perceive the benefit to substantially outweigh the risks. It is appreciated that the Council may wish to avoid risks that could impact on the City as a whole, but the actual risk to the City would not be greatly different even if the currently defined inundation and erosion zones were completely devoid of building; adjacent suburban development would still require the current level of services, still installed more or less in their current locations. While resource consent for non-compliant activities might theoretically be possible, the cost and time implications make this avenue impossible for all but large commercial organisations or the City Council. The proposed district plan should be reducing as far as possible the need to obtain resource consents to carry out activities defined in the plan.

Attached Documents

File
No records to display.