

My name is David Ayre. I have lived in Nelson for the last 38 years, and in the Maitai / Maitahi Valley for the last 25 years.

Thankyou for the opportunity to speak to you today. I appreciate your time.

The decision I seek is that Private Plan Change 28 is rejected.

The reason is that our civilisation is in ecological overshoot on Earth, which is producing many existential threats to ourselves and every other form of life here. This PPC shows no sign of treating this overshoot as the existential threat that it is, and therefore needs to be totally rethought.

Detail :

- 1) It is very important to see ourselves in context. Start by zooming out. We know there are billions of planets in the universe. Earth was formed about 4,500 million years ago. Life evolved about 3,800 million years ago. We evolved about 7 million years ago. If the lifetime of the Earth was a day, the whole of the last 50,000 years of our life here corresponds to 1 second to midnight.
- 2) All species try to expand and use all available resources; those that didn't were eliminated by evolutionary pressure long ago. We're intelligent, and we're social, so we learn, and we share what we have learnt with our social group. We try to use our abilities to extend our available resources. We have successfully done that, become the apex intelligent species on our planet, and gone into overshoot. In the last two hundred years we have grown very rapidly, powered by the very easily available energy in fossil fuels. At the moment our civilisation is using resources and producing waste at a rate much higher than the Earth can sustain. We have a materials economy that takes resources, creates products, uses them for a short time, and then throws them "away" to landfill. This produces many environmental disasters, of which climate change is the most recent and most important, because runaway climate change threatens all life on Earth. There isn't an "away". There's just here, us, our world.
- 3) That is where we are today. The transition from planet-dominating growth to sustainability is vital and also very difficult. It is the major pinch point for our species, with everything in play, for all life on Earth. This collision with limits must have happened before on many planets. Some civilisations will have survived, some not. What happens here is up to us. Our challenge is to recognise that we have reached the limits of our planet, and learn to live sustainably, not just in a greenwash sense by putting labels that say "sustainably" on things for marketing. We need to live within the energy supplies we have. We need to live in a circular economy, so that all resources are recovered. All this and much more. New thinking. In a short description, "Living Well with Enough". The world we can build from that can be wonderful, if we can learn to do it.
- 4) Instead, where we are now, we are still trying to use the same behaviour from our younger days as a species that brought us to this point. Always trying to grow. Always more. We are beyond the limits of more. We have to evolve new behaviours and learn to live in balance with the world, not just for us but equally for all the other living

things we share our planet with. This is one aspect of what we mean by "finite planet". Sustainability doesn't mean until the next quarter, or the next Council triennium. It means thousands of years into the future.

- 5) If the PPC28 development showed any real understanding of these things, it might be worth losing another piece of land to endless expansion, because it would be trying, but it isn't. It is just trying to continue with Business As Usual, when the near future in the next 10, 30 and 100 years is going to be nothing like usual. In doing that it adds some apparent nods to environmental issues to show that it is a little better than the last time we built a subdivision. We need something much better. Stop changing our forests to farmland. Stop changing our farmland to houses. We don't need to use this beautiful valley for houses. We can easily grow much more slowly in existing housing areas with intensification while we work out how to live sustainably. I think this is the reason that many people are objecting to this development. They feel deeply the loss of the natural world, and the continuous expansion of our towns and cities, and they want to live more in balance.
- 6) With very good environmental design standards, something that really shows we are trying to build a better world, some small developments in some green field places may be worth doing. Not in this case. This is an example of large profit-hungry low density urban sprawl.

Thankyou for your time.