

James Blackburn (Coastal Hazards) Plan Change 85 - Mangawhai East

Summary Statement

My name is James Blackburn. I am a chartered professional engineer in the field of civil engineering. I have prepared evidence on behalf of Kaipara District Council in relation to coastal hazards.

I have prepared three pieces of evidence for this hearing:

- Statement of Evidence – 1 December 2025
- Supplementary Statement of Evidence – 23 January 2026
- Rebuttal Evidence – 9 February 2026

Main Points

In my evidence I have considered the professional reporting and evidence on matters of Coastal Hazards by Davis Coastal Consultants (Craig Davis) in relation to the KDC Engineering Standards, Guidelines from Ministry of Environment in respect of Climate Change, relevant reporting by NIWA (now Earth Sciences New Zealand), ORCAS Consulting and Tonkin & Taylor consultants in relation to coastal erosion, coastal flooding including future sea level rise and tsunami inundation. I have also prepared supplementary evidence in relation to the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards, which came into effect in January 2026, which considered further the proposal in relation to the risk matrices and policies of that NPS.

The proposal by the applicant intends to mitigate the effects of coastal inundation by ensuring all areas of land intended for residential development are to be raised above the future coastal inundation level (including storm surge and climate change effects). The applicant has also proposed to mitigate coastal erosion risk along the Mangawhai estuary frontage by providing for a significant setback from the estuary facing shoreline (30m) and a reduced setback for Black Swamp Road causeway (10m – lower exposure).

My Position

The applicant's expert and I are almost fully in agreement over matters relating to coastal hazards and in terms of the risk matrix assessment under the 2026 NPS-NH.

There is a minor disparity between Mr Craig Davis' and my opinion over intended fill levels to mitigate fully the future coastal inundation risk, and it is my view that for plan change purposes the higher levels should be used noting that future modelling and data may allow / require adjustment of the figure up or down, as set out in my rebuttal evidence.

Broadly, however, matters relating to coastal hazards have been satisfactorily addressed for the purposes of a plan-change decision.

Opportunity for review using the latest data will present itself at future detailed subdivision application stages, with these to be incorporated at that stage (resource and building consent stages).

On this basis, from a coastal hazards perspective, I consider the extents of the PPC85 land suitable for the proposed rezoning.