

Name: B. Mander
Mobile: 021 2178 703
E-mail: base@zell.nz

I acknowledge that the information above and all other information provided in this submission will be made publicly available. (I acknowledge, but do not believe personal contact details should be public in todays environment)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? (I do not)

If others make a similar submission would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing? (I would)

Submission on Stage Four rule changes.

I have been attempting to follow the possible plan changes through the various stages without a great deal of success. I was unable to attend the airport webinar since it was during working hours and my work frequently takes me out of reception.

I did attend the public meeting and gained some information from that. On the other hand from the comments from various speakers on different issues where they had made submissions and/or been promised to be contacted in the past I did not gain a lot of confidence in the process.

Despite this I decided I would put in a submission: however this turned out to be a survey format, and one where I had to pack as much as possible into each question since I could not be sure what would be covered.

When it was announced the proposals had been finalised I duly attempted to be an involved citizen and look at the plan. I found myself chasing my tail, with about 30 tabs open, and still none the wiser. I have tried again several times with the same result.

General consensus seems to be that this is intentional and while I dislike such theories, I find it hard to disagree with them. I intend to consult with one of the several organisations that champion local democracy for their opinion on these procedures.

One issue I do have some clarity on is in Plan Change 28 – Hazards and Risks. At the meeting this was brushed over (as was the whole matter of the airport in general) with the comment that an evacuation plan would solve the whole problem.

While I accept the risk is considered to be extremely low, just about every major structure failure has been preceded by glib reassurances from authorities that it was completely safe, so you will pardon me if I don't take that as gospel.

It seems generally accepted that advice of this risk should be on LIM reports. In which case, two points apply:

- this should include background information clarifying that the risk is low
- if there is enough risk to justify adding to LIM reports, it is also enough to justify mitigation work.

Firstly the risk however low is Meridians responsibility, and therefore I believe they should be obliged to build a bund. This would offer protection to residents, businesses and airport structure itself (especially important in event of a major quake). It would also increase safety of Twizel itself – although not within indicated flood zone, if the suggested 2+ metres of water arrived like a tsunami rather than an incoming tide the surge could carry much higher.

Note also direct earthquake damage is not the only threat. Many years back a friend was involved in disaster research in local lakes and I gather the risk of seiche was quite high (Ruataniwha the worst if I recall correctly).

Council is also liable. It has a responsibility to protect the airport as an essential asset. Had the council informed potential landowners prior to purchase, their land and assets would be their responsibility and no obligation would rest on the council. But that is not the case.

It would appear that council has deliberately avoided passing on the information from Meridian. My LIM from 2019 states categorically that there are no KNOWN hazards, yet I gather it is documented that council has known since at least 2015. My lawyer raised concerns about all the airport covenants and I had to reassure him that I was aware of and quite happy about those. Had there been even a hint of hazards I know he would have recommended against the purchase. I am also quite sure when I inform him of present situation he would advocate legal action.

There is a risk that land value and resale could drop as a result of this, also that insurance might jump or even be denied. I would take action to recover any such loss from the council, given that they concealed this information.

Changes to permitted use, floor heights etc are also not acceptable. Land was purchased on basis of what usage was allowed. Alterations to these conditions after the fact makes the property not fit for purpose and again I would refer this to my lawyer.

I would also note that evacuation is not an acceptable solution. Agreed that having such a plan is never a bad idea. However it is probable any quake capable of damaging the spillway will have already rendered the highway bridge over the Twizel river unusable, and it is likely stranded motorists will have blocked the approaches either side to the extent that even a competent driver in a 4x4 will be unable to get close enough to ford the river.

The main point though is that evacuating means saving my skin and nothing else, which I reject when the situation is not of my making.

1. LIM report must include full explanation of likelihood.
2. Council must take a stand to force remediation work by Meridian, possibly assisting to ensure protection of their asset.
3. No changes to existing regulations on properties.
4. For absolute worst-case scenarios, council must plan, mark and advise of alternative evacuation routes.