

From: salima <spadamsey@yahoo.com>

To: Mayor K. Gurnathan <k.gurnathan@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Councillor James Cootes <james.cootes@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Angela Buswell <angela.buswell@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Councillor Gwynn Compton <gwynn.compton@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Martin Halliday <martin.halliday@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Councillor Bernie Randall <bernie.randall@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Councillor Jackie Elliott <jackie.elliott@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Councillor Robert McCann <robert.mccann@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; jocelyn.prvanov@kapiticoast.govt.nz <jocelyn.prvanov@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Councillor Sophie Handford <sophie.handford@kapiticoast.govt.nz>; Janet Holborow <janet.holborow@kapiticoast.govt.nz>

Sent: Friday, 13 August 2021, 11:17:07 GMT+12

Subject: CRU's Technical Review - Response

Mayor Guru and Councillors

Thanks for your reply of 5 August.

CRU will continue to communicate directly with you, our elected representatives. There are several reasons for this.

1. Although CRU would prefer to work with Council officers and consultants, this has not been possible. Relevant Council managers have consistently and deliberately 'gone slow' on requests for information, including mislaying requests and simply ignoring LGOIMA time limits. They also make derogatory and dismissive comments about CRU both to elected members and to each other. CRU knows this because there are good people within the Council who have shared first-hand knowledge of it. It is unfortunate, but this behaviour is a long way short of the professional standards that both community members and elected members are entitled to expect. Mr Maxwell has consistently refused to discuss CRU's concerns.
2. Direct communication with you, the Councillors, is, therefore, the only viable channel. Of course, whether you choose to read the information, and/or do anything about it is beyond CRU's control. But the fact is that you will have received the information, and you will be accountable for what you do or don't do with it. If Council management continues to tell you that you must filter out anything received from the community outside the straight jacket of process, that is simply wrong. As the Auditor General has said on many occasions, a primary responsibility of any elected member is to self-inform and to ask questions. Ignorance is a personal choice. If the only permissible source of information is what is filtered through management, then we only need one elected member, armed with a rubber stamp.
3. The Takutai Kāpiti process is described by Council as 'community led'. This sounds good but is far from the truth. In reality, the CAP membership is entirely within the 'gift' of the Mayor and his Deputy. The information which CAP will receive is what Council gives it, and what ability or inclination CAP has to actually engage with the communities is unclear and doubtful. There is really no sense in which the community is entrusted with *any* leadership role. A number of highly qualified people who are affiliated with CRU were summarily rejected for membership of CAP. It is a pity that the attributes of experience and expertise seem to be an automatic disqualification for CAP. The only appointment announced is that of Mr Bolger, a long-retired politician who does not live in the coastal area has no record of community involvement in Kāpiti, and has no record of involvement in or expertise with environmental issues. Despite the application process, CRU is aware of Council 'shoulder tapping' people it obviously believes can be relied on to follow its lead.
4. Please remember that there are some 1,800 properties affected by this messy closed-loop process that the Council is pushing. Many of the owners are CRU members, and all owners will be kept informed by CRU about what Council is doing, and where individual Councillors stand. Owners are rightly concerned about the possibility that, because of Council, their properties may become devalued, uninsurable, and unserved. Most of all, they do not trust a group of bureaucrats and selected 'experts' to have any understanding of the consequences of what they are doing. Council's previous debacle in 2012 has not been forgotten (except perhaps within Council). None of you was on the Council at that stage, but the similarities in approach are concerning. In 2012 Councillors rubber-stamped management's proposals based on bad science, bad law, and indifference to their impact on affected communities. At the next election the Mayor, her Deputy and most Councillors were voted out. Management, who had assured Councillors that their proposals were scientifically and legally robust (neither was the case of course), simply carried on.
5. There are many good examples of community-led processes around the country, involving Tangata Whenua, residents, community groups and businesses. The council should have the courage to follow some of these good examples. Where we are heading now was well described by then Councillor Guru 7 years ago: ***We have blown buckets of ratepayer money, alienated good people and caused the suffering of many. We have shown the rest of New Zealand how coastal management should NOT be done.***

Kind Regards,

Salima Padamsey

Chair - Coastal Ratepayers United