

# Kapiti Coast District Council

## Coastal Environment Hearing

Statement of Frank Boffa in relation to  
5 September 2016 Expert Conferencing

### **Overriding Question (a)**

I agree with what the Isthmus plan defines as the Coastal Environment incorporating what is referred to by the experts as the “dominant coastal environment”, and that inland of this line, coastal values may also exist.

A point I wish to make, however, is that all reference to the Coastal Environment line in the District Plan, need not and indeed should not include the word “dominant”.

The Coastal Environment referred to in RMA terms is what it is, and therefore it is unhelpful to suggest or imply that there may be a secondary or less dominant Coastal Environment incorporating “other coastal values”, further inland of the defined Coastal Environment line.

In regard to the extent and characteristics of the Coastal Environment, the NZCPS (Policy 1(2) (c)) refers specifically to “areas where coastal processes, influences or qualities are significant...”. Accordingly, the so called area of “dominance” should include only those areas where coastal processes, influences or qualities, where they exist are significant.

### **Supplementary Question (b)**

I agree with (i), the general response to this question, however I disagree with (ii), the specific response, namely:

- The reference to a wider coastal environment and the statement suggesting that this is a “significant area of the District”.
- I also disagree with the general statement that the wider Coastal Environment on the Kapiti Coast “has more influences, processes or qualities from the perspective of the Coastal Environment than the east coast of New Zealand”. This is an unsubstantiated assertion.

- To avoid unnecessary confusion, and in terms of the RMA and the NZCPS, there is only one Coastal Environment and the District Plan should avoid any reference to a “Wider Coastal Environment”.

### **Supplementary Question (c)**

I agree option c (iii) is how the Coastal Environment should be provided for in the District Plan. I also agree that this indicative line would provide a measure of certainty.

I also agree that what has been mapped as the Coastal Environment (and expressed as the dominant Coastal Environment) supported by appropriate and explanatory policy is the best way to give effect to the RPS and the NZCPS.

With respect to the Definitions and Policy 4.1 – Identifying Coast Environment Extent, I will comment verbally on points raised by the experts which I consider may benefit from further discussion and consideration.

### **Supplementary Question (d)**

Again, I would prefer to address this question verbally as I consider there is potential for a great deal of confusion in the terminology used, and that the terms “dominant coastal environment line”, “coastal dominance zone”, and “coastal significance zone” all essentially refer to the same area, namely, and in RMA/NZCPS terms, the Coastal environment. In my opinion any reference to a “wider coastal environment” should not be referenced as such and if needed or relevant should perhaps be referred to as the coastal context or terrestrial coastal setting which is more geographic and/or descriptive with no particular RMA or NZCPS implications.

With regard to the alignment of the Coastal Environment with adjoining local authorities, I do not entirely agree with the expert’s view that this “depends on the policy context and rule framework of each plan”. In my opinion, it would be more a question of the coastal characteristics which would inform and influence the line. For example, I would expect there would in general be a greater alignment of the Coastal Environment line with the Horowhenua District compared to Porirua City.

**Frank Boffa**

16 September 2016