



## Resource Management Act 1991 Submission on a Publicly Notified Plan Change To The Wanganui District Plan



In accordance with Form 5-RM (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003

| TO: Wanganui District Council, PO Box 637, Wanganui  |
|--|
| Name: (print in full) LHEISTOPHER LEY HEYWOOD  |
| This is a submission on Plan Change No. 38   |
| <ol> <li>(a) I could/could not* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. (*please delete one).</li> </ol>   |
| (b) I am/am not* directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment; and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition (*please delete one).   |
| 2. The specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to:  PROPOSED SIZE PROTECTION ZONE - ZESUROR LB.   |
| Use additional pages if required   |
| 3. My submission is that (Please state in summary the nature of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support  |
| or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made. Please give your reasons):  |
| 1 OPPOSE THE PROVISIONS MADE-THESE CHANGES   |
| WILL LEDUCE PROPERTY VALUE AND INCREAS INSURANCE   |
| COSS UNBULY THE RESERREH BY THE AUSHOR'S OWN   |
| ABMISSION IS UNDER LESOURCED (SEELESTER ASTACHED   |
| Use additional pages if required   |
| 4. I seek the following decision from the Council (Give clear details stating what amendments you wish to see  |
| made to the Plan Change, and your reasons):  |
| HERDLINE WORDING LESS ALARMING   |
| Lemove LEFERENCE TO LSA AZEA A   |
| AN EXPLANASION DE INCONSISENCY OF LEPORS   |
| (SEE ASTACHED DOCUMENSS) Use additional pages if required  |
| 5. I do/denot* wish to be heard in support of this submission (*please delete one).  |
| 6. If others make a similar submission I would/would not* be prepared to consider presenting a joint case  |
| with them at any hearing (*please delete one).   |
| 7. Address for service:  |
| 26 TUROR LOAD  |
| Signature:   |
| (Person making submission or person authorised to sign on  |
| 3 CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF T |
| Day time phone No: 3493/36 behalf of person making submission)  Email: Chris 2 KIWIORIGINAL CONDITION Date: 08/10/2014   |

08 October 2014

Chief Executive Wanganui District Council P.O. Box 637 Wanganui 4500

## Submission: Proposed Slip Protection Zone, 26 Turoa Rd, Wanganui East

This letter is in response to the Council's letter of 10th September 2014 advising of Council's intention to include a Slip Protection Zone over many properties in the Wanganui East area at the back of Bastia Hill, including ours at 26 Turoa Road.

While we do not oppose the intent of the proposed zone, expert advice we have sort suggests the lack of sophistication taken by Council compared to what is at stake would cause Council embarrassment should we decide to contest the proposed zone.

In support of our opposition to the proposed zone, we wish to make the following comments:

- a) We understand why it is prudent for Council to take steps to limit its future liability and be transparent for future property owners concerning sites of additional risk to the norm. However, Council did issue building consents for the houses affected and in respect to our residence, obviously an extremely important factor we took into account in deciding on its purchase. So, as well as future owners, the Council has a duty of care to the existing owners.
- b) The house was built in 1963 (51 years old) and shows no sign of settlement, which would suggest the site foundation is stable, which is not as implied by the proposed zone Area A having a risk of failure period of 10-50 years. During this period our house and the hill have weathered many storms with no signs of any adverse effect.
- c) Prospective purchasers and Insurance Companies react to headline information and the wording as proposed in the zone paints a more severe picture than what seems to be intended when speaking with Council representatives. The headline information will have a negative impact on the value and saleability of our property as had I been aware of this intention in June when I purchased the property I would never have purchased here. Like most New Zealanders, a large chunk of our personal savings is wrapped up in our residence.
- d) While we appreciate the expertise of the people involved in deciding on the makeup and boundaries of the proposed zone, Council is the representative of this community and so has a legal duty of care in exercising its powers. The method to assess the risk of slippage to our property (i.e. inspecting soil maps and aerial photos and a drive by (when our property is hidden from sight) is actually seriously inadequate for what is at stake and this has been acknowledged by Opus in their report and is backed up by one of council's officials when he acknowledged that some owners had already successfully contested the zoning and been successful. (Reported in the Wanganui Chronicle.)
- e) Our property has had a house on it without any reported landslides or slips since 1963, we have walked across the entire property and have not seen evidence of any concern relating to either excessive erosion through water runoff or evidence of erosion, we have recently completed our due diligence on this property and have come to the conclusion that we are not in imminent danger of a landslide occurring unless under extreme conditions more extreme than the past 51 years have dished up.
- g) By their own admission OPUS have acknowledged that this investigation was not sufficiently funded and that without inspecting (OPUS plan 5w1IOO12 figure 2) going through the middle of our house is unsubstantiated and Council is not undertaking its RMA role with the required duty of care.

## We therefore ask the Council to:

- 1. Make the headline wording of the proposed slip protection zone far less scary and reflect the intent as has been verbally explained.
- Remove the proposed zone A keeping zone B until a comprehensive study can be carried out, by undertaking a desk study it is clear that this study is under resourced and inconclusive. We do accept that for any work to be carried out on this property would require the services of skilled engineers.
- 3. Explain to us why the hill on the opposite side to our house (see map below) which has no houses and limited vegetation is Zoned B? And therefore at a lesser risk of erosion than the identically similar hill on which our house is built. We know that that hill (zoned B) is prone to slips and erosion caused by insufficient vegetation and excessive run-off, as this is clearly visible and used by Opus as an example when assessing the risk to our property which is well built with solid retaining walls, good levels of managed vegetation, good drainage and no evidence of subsidence or even strain on the retaining walls? The answer we believe is not to upgrade that zoning on that hill to A, but removing the A zoning on our property.

| Yours | faithfully |
|-------|------------|
|       |            |

Chris Heywood





