

Bream Bay Coastal Care
Trust - David
EVIDENCE Hourie
TOPIC PC 113
RR26
SUB# 20
DATE 20 Nov 2013.

Bream Bay Coastal Care Trust
Submission for the Hearing 20th November 2013
on the Plan Change 113
Ruakaka Racecourse Equine Environment.

My name is David Hourie

I am appearing on behalf of the Bream Bay Coastal Care Trust.

I am also a member of Forest and Bird,

Waipu Residents and Ratepayers Association,
Waipu Civil Defence.

I have been involved in Waipu coastal predator trapping group and have assisted in monitoring and fencing nesting sites at Ruakaka.

I have a Degree in Horticultural Science.

I would like to acknowledge and pay respect to the traditional owners upon whose land we populate and prosper. I would like us to pause to reflect on the patience and tolerance of the traditional owners who over the generations have seen their lands and waters abused and degraded.

I will take it as given that the Bream Bay Coastal Care Trust submission, further submissions and evidence has been read.

I would like to draw attention to the introduction of our submission where we give our grounds for objecting to Plan Change 113.

This proposal is being objected to on several grounds outlined below.

It understates the vulnerability of the site to coastal hazards and understates environmental impacts. Particularly proximity to wildlife refuge, proximity to dune lake, human impacts on dunes, competition between horse training and other recreational beach activities, storm water disposal.

Under the RMA the District Plan must give effect to the Coastal Policy Statement.

The evidence presented will be further explained.

I would also like to emphasise that his proposal is no mere extensive subdivision it is a plan change. A racing club rewriting the district plan to fit their proposal that not only flies in the face of sound urban planning practices but defies logic and shows a lack of understanding of the forces and processes of nature and a disregard for environmental impact and human safety. I fear that this view of the world is becoming the 'new normal'.

Page one and two show photographs of vehicle tracks in the sand.

This provides evidence of the current situation. With the current population density and numbers human activity by way of driving vehicles on the beach and in the dunes are contravening the RMA by not giving effect to Section 75 Contents of District Plans of the Resource Management Act 1991

What it also shows is that there has been little or no attempt by the WDC or the NRC to give effect to the Coastal Policy Statement.

In Northland the pioneering spirit of plundering resources is still alive and well despite wide spread opposition by new comers and traditional owners alike. The bulk of the forests are gone, the wet lands drained, the kauri gumlands turned over, natural drainage systems converted to ditches and drains, that flow through overstocked farmland and into our rivers

that too have become glorified drains.

And now we plunder scenery. The plundering of scenery has become an extractive industry and with most forms of plunder, what we covet most is defiled or destroyed.

The personal possession of merchandised scenery destroys the very essence of what the purchasers are trying to escape from, urbanised over crowding. Covering scenery with urban infrastructure artefacts, buildings, lit buildings, street lights, destroys what is most attractive about this coastline.

Obviously what comes with urbanisation is more people.

So what will be the expectations of the people attracted to an urbanised rural racecourse by the seaside. Obviously they will want access to the beach.

A beach which has the legal status of a road. It is almost certain that vehicle traffic on the beach will considerably increase with an increase in beach front properties.

This will place the dune system and the wildlife refuge under increasing pressure.

The evidence provided by Mr Brian Jones demonstrates how little control there is over vehicles on the beach. This is supported by personal experiences of Ruakaka residents who responded to a petition to restrict the use of vehicles on Bream Bay beaches.

While collecting 200 signatures in two days going from door to door in Ruakaka and Waipu there were many many stories of near misses between vehicles and children, elderly, hearing and vision impaired and the able bodied.

Our commissioners may wish to note that the petition of 2000 signatures was not accepted by the council until after the Vehicles on Beaches by law was passed 2009. Such has been the contempt that the council has held for their constituents.

It is in this culture of cheque book democracy that we come before you today.

The photographs show vehicle tracks that disfigure the beach and that international tourist find incomprehensible. They come half way around the world to see what has been marketed to them as unspoilt beauty and Bream Bay beaches have the characteristics of a speedway track. How will increasing the numbers of residents directly behind the dune and adjoining the Wildlife Refuge help us give effect to Objectives One and Two of the Coastal Policy Statement.

Following the sequence of the evidence presented we would like our commissioners to consider the effect on the beach of increased horse traffic in view of the evidence provided by Mr Brian Jones. In terms of public safety, accelerated beach erosion, and effect on shore birds.

Something that has not received much attention is the effect that a large affluent population living behind the dunes may have. Bream Bay has a long standing practice of launching boats off the beach. The most illustrative effect on the beach from launching boats is seen at Langs Beach. Here you can see how the sand is churned up and how this activity precludes most other activities on the beach.

You can gauge for yourself the probability of dotterels successfully raising their young in this hostile environment.

Other threats to the survival of rare and endangered species of shorebirds are water sports in the wildlife refuge.

A percentage of people attracted to live by the coast will be attracted to the proximity to opportunities for water sports. Water sport generally cannot coexist with breeding shorebirds particularly in the wild life refuge.

Despite this pressure is being exerted to open up the wildlife refuge to kite boarding and the Northland Conservancy has buckled.

Unfortunately the pro development lobby has emasculated the Department of Conservation into being an official apologist for environmental vandals. This has increased

the burden of environmentalists who attempt to uphold the Conservation Act as the Department of Conservation attempts to allow 'co existence' even when eviction of wildlife or extinction is an inevitable result,. It is these attacks on natural systems by a pervasive free market ideology based on the Austrian School of Economics, with their Schumpeters 'Creative Destruction' pervading Act Party policy adopted by current government and permeating all the way out to regional local government. This is the source of the problem yet we can only deal with the effects as they relate to the consent processes.

To give effect to the Wildlife Act 1953 and the Conservation Act 1987 we can no longer look to the Department of Conservation for direction and must act independently.

The Departments accommodation of kite boarding high lights this.

The photographs show clearly that recreational activities in the wildlife refuge are evicting wildlife from the refuge. How can shorebirds roost and nest on sandspits and sandbars when sports people are walking over them.

An example, dotterels will leave their nests when people come within fifty to a hundred metres of them. What people see is dotterels apparently displaying normal behaviour, what people do not see is that these birds have already left their nests by the time people see them so many people are not even aware that these birds have been driven off their nests. So when kite boarders swear until they are blue in the face that they are not effecting wildlife they are speaking from a position of ignorance and self interest.

Coastal Erosion

If this plan change is adopted and consents granted for a major building project with a high capital value any threats from coastal erosion due to sea level rise or other causes will have to be addressed. When peoples properties are threatened they will demand protection and evidence shows they will take their own course of action.

In the evidence provided are examples of local hard structures to protect coastal development. The examples given are for the base of soft rock and sand stone cliffs. The type of protection used for sand dunes can included groynes as at Omaha. These detract from the natural character of the beach and are a haven for rats.

We also seen people desperate enough to build illegal structures on public land.

I suggest we adopt Waikato Regional Council Policy of Living with Natural Processes accept the inevitability of sea level rise and undertake urban development further up the hill.

To labour the point sand dunes are dynamic and as unconsolidated particles behave as a fluid. Sand dunes are as easily eroded as they are deposited. During a time of sea level rise it would be most unwise to change a district plan to allow urban development in the path of the destructive forces of nature.

Dune ecology destruction from garden escapee plants is almost a given unless strict adherence was kept to plant native dune species.

Effect of horse urine on the aquifer.

There will be current effects of horse urine on the aquifer and the dune lake.

To increase the number of horse will only exacerbate the situation.

The dune lake is non flushing so it does not make a very suitable toilet.

Sand has low absorptive, capacity high drainage capacity,. This site has a high water table and short distance to the dune lake. This will create nutrification problems that will have to be avoided.

Increasing the number of horses exercising on the beach will increase the exposure of pathogens contained in horse dung to humans both eating on the beach and collecting shell fish.

Marketing of properties adjacent and adjoining wildlife refuges have shown remarkable lack of responsibility and have given purchasers a false perception of the activities that are allowed and acceptable in and around a wildlife refuge.

We have a report on the effects of human disturbance in wildlife refuges and how declines in the successful breeding of shore birds has been reduced with an increase in human disturbances.

Following that there is a photographic record of activities that people engage in with total disregard for where they are or the effect they are having on the wildlife in pursuit of self interest.

Public Safety

Tsunami Hazards

We can see the review of the tsunami hazard by Civil Defence

Areas where the hazard is higher are the North Island's east-facing coasts

<http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/tsunamis/page-2>

Tsunamis have been a danger in New Zealand as long as people have lived there. Archaeological studies have shown that during the mid-15th century, many Māori moved their settlements from low-lying coastal sites to hilltops and inland sites. A number of the abandoned coastal settlements show clear evidence of tsunami inundation.

Tsunamis are also recorded in Māori oral tradition. For example, a wave that caused widespread death and damage on the western side of D'Urville Island in Tasman Bay may have been a tsunami:

Unfortunately the community at Moawhiti was eventually wiped out when a massive tidal wave called Tapu-arero-utuutu swept into the harbour and drowned almost everyone, tumbling their bodies into the sand dunes which were piled up by the force of the waves ... Traditions do not record whether the tidal wave affected other communities on Rangitoto (D'Urville Island) or the mainland across Te Aumiti (French Pass), but even today kōiwi (human remains) and artefacts are frequently eroded from the dunes at Moawhiti, especially after stormy conditions or exceptionally high tides. ¹

Wairarapa earthquake tsunamis, 1855

On 23 January 1855, a magnitude 8.1–8.2 earthquake, the most powerful to strike New Zealand since European settlement, shook the lower North Island. It generated not one, but several types of tsunami.

During the earthquake, the entire region west of the Wairarapa fault lurched abruptly north-east. Like soup in a bowl that is jostled, the water of Wellington Harbour slopped onto the adjacent land. The next movement of water occurred because the entire Wellington region had tilted – the eastern side of the harbour was now about 80 centimetres higher than the western side. The harbour waters ponderously moved off downhill, towards central Wellington. Houses and shops were flooded along Lambton Quay, which at that time was along the shore.

The greatest tsunami, however, was generated in Cook Strait. The Rimutaka Range rose as much as 6 metres, and part of the floor of the strait was probably uplifted. The tsunami destroyed sheds more than 8 metres above the sea at Te Kopi, on the southern Wairarapa coast. It moved along the strait and up the Kapiti coast – stranding fish as far north as Ōtaki – and spread across to the South Island.

Many turns of the tide

The sloop *Pandora* was anchored in Wellington Harbour at the time of the 1855 earthquake. Her

commander, Byron Drury, reported: 'For eight hours subsequent to the first and great shock, the tide approached and receded from the shore every 20 minutes, rising from eight to ten feet and receding four feet lower than at spring tides. One ship, I heard, was aground at her anchorage four times.'²

About 20 minutes after the earthquake, tsunami waves surged into Wellington Harbour through its narrow entrance, then for many hours bounced repeatedly back and forth, reflected off the harbour sides. Water also flooded into Lyall Bay from Cook Strait and Evans Bay from Wellington Harbour, putting the low isthmus between them (the site of Wellington Airport) under nearly a metre of water.

Peru–Chile tsunami, 1868

In August 1868, an earthquake of about magnitude 9.0 offshore from the Peru–Chile border generated a devastating tsunami. The earthquake and tsunami killed thousands of people along the South American coast. Spreading across the Pacific, it became the largest recorded distant tsunami to strike New Zealand, affecting many ports and causing substantial damage on the Chatham Islands and Banks Peninsula.

The tsunami reached the Chatham Islands around 1 a.m. on 15 August, about 15 hours after the earthquake. Māori at the village of Tupurangi were woken by water surging into their houses and fled to higher ground. Subsequently two larger waves totally destroyed the village and the houses of several European settlers. One Māori drowned, carried out to sea while trying to retrieve a boat that had come adrift. The tsunami also damaged buildings at Waitangi.

A tsunami reconstructed

After the devastating Peru–Chile tsunami of 1868, Ferdinand von Hochstetter, an Austrian geologist who had visited New Zealand in 1859–60, described the effects in Peru, Chile, New Zealand and other Pacific locations. He charted the progress of the tsunami across the Pacific and determined wave speeds and the ocean depth along several paths. Hochstetter's work is the first detailed scientific analysis of a major tsunami.

Several hours later, on Banks Peninsula in the South Island, a night watchman discovered the ships at Lyttelton's wharves sitting on the mud bottom – the water had drained from the harbour area. Around 4 a.m. a foaming wall of water surged into the harbour, and the water rose by over 7 metres. Ships' hawsers snapped, and the ships were dashed against the wharves and each other, causing heavy damage. The sea gradually receded, but more big waves rolled in at intervals of several hours, and water levels rose and fell erratically over several days. In smaller bays around the peninsula, tsunami waves penetrated far inland along valleys, damaging homes and carrying away bridges and fences.

Could the Grandstand be used as residents tsunami refuge. Does it have the height or the structural engineering to withstand a tsunami.

For the above reasons we consider that in the interests of public safety and species survival that this Plan Change 113 be declined.