

## Te Tai o Poutini Plan Proposed Plan

# Submission form

Te Tai o  
Poutini Plan  
Proposed  
Plan

Have  
your  
say!

We need your feedback. We want to hear from you on the proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan. What do you support and what would you like changed? And why? It is just as important to understand what you like in the Proposed Plan as what you don't. Understanding everyone's perspectives is essential for developing a balanced plan.

## Your details:

First name:

Surname:

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?

Individual

Organisation

Organisation (if applicable):

Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?

Yes

No

If you **could** gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

I am  /am not  directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Postal address:

Email:

Phone:

Signature:



Date:

## Your submission:

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

- |                                                         |                                                              |                                            |
|---------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strategic Direction            | <input type="checkbox"/> Energy Infrastructure and Transport | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards and Risks |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Historical and Cultural Values | <input type="checkbox"/> Natural Environment Values          | <input type="checkbox"/> Subdivision       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> General District Wide Matters  | <input type="checkbox"/> Zones                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Schedules         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Appendices                     | <input type="checkbox"/> General feedback                    |                                            |

All submitters have the opportunity to present their feedback to Commissioners during the hearings process. Hearings are anticipated to be held in the middle of 2023. Please indicate your preferred option below:

I wish to speak to my submission

I do not wish to speak to my submission

If others make a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing?

Yes, I would consider presenting a joint case

No, I would not consider presenting a joint case

**Public information** - all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. The content provided in your submission form will be published to the Te Tai o Poutini Plan website and available to the public. It is your responsibility to ensure that your submission does not include any personal information that you do not want published.

Want to know more?

[www.tppp.nz](http://www.tppp.nz)

0508 800 118



Te Tai o Poutini  
PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast



12 October 2022

West Coast Regional Council  
Attention: Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan Submission

Via email: [info@tppp.nz](mailto:info@tppp.nz)

**WESTLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO TE TAI O POUTINI PLAN**

Please find attached the Westland District Council's submission on the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan.

In the main part, Westland District Council is in support of the Policies, Objectives, Standards and Rules, along with designations and zoning. There are however several rules that Westland District Council would like to see amended or included as laid out in the following.

Regards



**Simon Bastion**  
**Chief Executive**  
**Westland District Council**

WDC Submission to TTPP

Energy Objectives, Policies and Rules	1. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Infrastructure Objectives, Policies and Rules	2. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Transport Objectives, Policies and Rules	3. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Contaminated Land Objectives, Policies and Rules	4. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Natural Hazard Objectives, Policies and Rules	<p>5. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies</p> <p><b>Westland District Council opposes the following Rules:</b></p> <p>6. <b>NH- R1 Reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in all Natural Hazard Overlays</b>          Notwithstanding existing use rights which exist due a building being lawfully established at the time of notification of the plan. Westland District Council does not support NH-R1-4. Which states that reconstruction or replacement of a destroyed/damaged building is permitted if it is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in all other natural hazard overlays.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are concerns that with volatile waterways, unexpected landslips and potential for flooding that not only could the site become unsuitable to rebuild with no consideration for mitigation against the natural hazard that destroyed it in the first instance, but also within a period of 5 years from the time a building was destroyed the hazardscape could change and intensify drastically. Creating this permitted rule takes away Council’s ability to assess risk and require mitigation against further natural hazard threats.</li> <li>- It is considered that existing use rights provisions under s10 of the RMA 1991 may cause difficulty enough if a site is considered to no longer be suitable for rebuilding or replacement of a dwelling. With no ability under the West Coast RPS to extinguish existing use rights Council may be forced to allow a member of public to rebuild in an unsuitable site subjecting them to further emotional and financial effects if it becomes an issue again. For example if a dwelling owner rebuilds where a creek has jumped out of its bed and gone through the building the Plan (even if this risk has increased) up to 5 years later gives can still rebuild. Effectively setting the dwelling up to fail.</li> </ul> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Remove NH-R1 4 or make it restricted discretionary to reconstruct or replace beyond the 12 months allowed for under s10 if the RMA. Restrictions being the demonstration of natural hazard mitigation.</li> </ul> <p>7. <b>NH – R2 Maintenance and Operation of any Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structure</b>          Council supports the maintenance and operation of any existing natural hazard mitigation structure being a permitted activity where the provisions of this rule are met. Council particularly supports the requirement to maintain public access.</p> <p><b>Council seek to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Retain this rule</li> </ul>

**8. NH – R3 Upgrades to Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures**

Council considers that requirement under NH R3 – 3 should be, that the activity is permitted if public access is provided for. At present even in an upgrade situation the rule only requires that public access is no worse than status quo. It is considered that at the time of an upgrade if public access is limited or nil that this should be a consideration of the upgrade and should not be considered permitted if public access is not provided for.

**Council seeks to:**

- Replace NH – R3 3 *‘There is no reduction in public access’* with: *‘Practical public access is provided for’*

Council supports the requirement in NH – R3 5, confirming that the natural hazard mitigation structure does not increase the natural hazard risk to other properties or any other lawfully established natural hazard mitigation structure. This sets a clear requirement for applicants and gives clear direction to staff when considering potential risk from upgrade of structures.

**Council seeks to:**

- Keep this provision (NH – R3 5).

**9. NH - R4 New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structure**

Council considers that requirement under NH R4 – 3 should be, that the activity is permitted if public access is provided for. In its current form, a new natural hazard mitigation structure only requires that public access is no worse than status quo. Therefore if there is no public access for example due to coastal erosion causing a large escarpment, then a new structure would not have to consider public access as it would be no worse than what existed. It is considered that at the time of a new build, if public access is limited or nil the provision of and improvement of public access should be a consideration. A new build should not be a permitted activity if public access is not provided for.

**Council seeks to:**

- Replace NH – R4 3 *‘There is no reduction in public access’* with: *‘Practical public access is provided for’*

**10. NH – R7 New Unoccupied Buildings in the Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility Overlays**

Council has concerns regarding making any unoccupied building permitted in the Severe Flood Zone. It would be deemed inappropriate to allow high levels of investment within Severe Flood overlays just because they are unoccupied buildings. It is considered that Councils should not be encouraging investment in assets in known high hazard areas, allowing damage to property. At the least this should be a Controlled activity to allow for mitigation of destruction of property and potentially consider the risk and level of investment being put at risk.

**Council seeks to:**

- Change the status for New Unoccupied Buildings in the Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility Overlays to a Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity with controls or restrictions including:
  - Assessment of risk to building
  - Consideration of mitigation measures to reduce/manage flood hazard
  - Consideration of likelihood or potential of complete loss of the building in a flood situation

	<p><b>11. NH – R38 Reconstruction, Repairs and Maintenance to Existing Buildings in the Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlays</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding existing use rights which exist due a building being lawfully established at the time of notification of the plan. Westland District Council does not support NH-R38-2. Which states that reconstruction or replacement of a destroyed/damaged building is permitted if it is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years within the Coastal Severe Overlay.</p> <p>There are concerns that through increasing storm surges and ongoing coastal erosion the site could become unsuitable to rebuild with no consideration for mitigation against the natural hazard that destroyed it in the first instance, but also within a period of up to 5 years from the time a building was destroyed the hazardscape could change and intensify drastically. Creating this permitted rule takes away Council’s ability to assess risk and require mitigation against further natural hazard threats.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is considered that existing use rights provisions under s10 of the RMA 1991 may cause difficulty enough if a site is considered to no longer be suitable for rebuilding or replacement of a dwelling. With no ability under the West Coast RPS to extinguish existing use rights Council may be forced to allow a member of public to rebuild in an unsuitable site subjecting them to further emotional and financial effects if it becomes an issue again. For example if a dwelling owner rebuilds where a storm surge has caused the sea to have gone through the building, the Plan (even if this risk has increased) up to 5 years later gives the owner the ability to still rebuild. Furthermore insurance companies will insist on like for like even if it is in extreme danger of the exact same hazard as the District Plan permits it. Effectively setting the dwelling owner up to fail.</li> </ul> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where a building has not been re-established under the 12 months allowed under existing use rights, change the activity status for Reconstruction, Repairs and Maintenance to Existing Buildings in the Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlays to Discretionary.</li> </ul> <p><b>12. NH - R39 New Unoccupied Buildings and Structures in the Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlays</b></p> <p>Council has concerns regarding making any unoccupied building permitted in the Coastal Severe Overlay. It would be deemed inappropriate to allow high levels of investment within Severe Coastal overlays just because they are unoccupied buildings. It is considered that Councils should not be encouraging investment in assets in known high hazard areas, allowing damage to property. At the least this should be a Controlled activity to allow for mitigation of destruction of property and potentially consider the risk and level of investment being put at risk.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change the status for New Unoccupied Buildings in the Coastal Severe Overlay to a Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity with controls or restrictions including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assessment of risk to building</li> <li>- Consideration of mitigation measures to reduce/manage potential surge of coastal erosion</li> <li>- Consideration of likelihood or potential of complete loss of the building in a surge or coastal erosion situation</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Historical and Cultural Values Objectives, Policies and Rules</p>	<p>13. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules</p>

Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Objectives, Policies and Rules	14. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules 15. Westland District Council will undertake the required SNA review.
Natural Features and Landscapes Objectives, Policies and Rules	16. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Public Access Objective	17. Council supports the Public Access Objective to maintain and enhance public access along the coastal marine area, waterbodies and public resources.
Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies Objectives, Policies and Rules	18. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Financial Contributions Objectives, Policies and Rules	<p>19. Westland District Council supports these Objectives and Policies but opposes parts of the rules as outlined below:</p> <p><b>20. FC - R1 Financial Contributions as Conditions of Consent</b> Council has concerns with the wording ‘A condition <u>may</u> be imposed’ ... Use of the word ‘may’ becomes less of a rule and more of a voluntary policy. This will create an issue for staff trying to direct the payment of a contribution as there is immediate room for an applicant to argue that Council does not have to impose the contribution, therefore it should not be imposed. There has also been a lot of feedback from developers over the years that they would like more certainty regarding what their development is likely to cost, where this wording creates a lot of ambiguity. Furthermore if/when Council stands its ground on imposing a contribution it has been proven many times that such matters become political. Staff then struggle to justify the requirement as the rule is not actually a rule but a mere suggestion.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change the wording from ‘A condition <i>may</i> be imposed’ to ‘A condition <i>shall</i> be imposed on a subdivision or land use consent to require the applicant, including network utility operators and/or requiring authorities, to make a financial contribution for the following purposes (unless determined otherwise by Council)’.</li> </ul> <p><b>21. FC – R5 1., FC - R6 1., FC – R8 1., FC – R9 1. and FC – 10 1</b> Council has concerns with the wording ‘Financial contributions <u>may</u> be imposed’ ... As above, use of the word ‘may’ becomes less of a rule and more of a voluntary policy. This will create an issue for staff trying to direct the payment of a contribution as there is immediate room for an applicant to argue that Council does not have to impose the contribution, therefore it should not be imposed. There has also been a lot of feedback from developers over the years that they would like more certainty regarding what their development is likely to cost, where this wording creates a lot of ambiguity. Furthermore if/when Council stands its ground on imposing a contribution it has been proven many times that such matters become political. Staff then struggle to justify the requirement as the rule is not actually a rule but a mere suggestion.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change the wording from ‘Financial contributions may be imposed’ to something to the effect of ‘Financial Contributions <i>shall</i> be required (unless determined otherwise by Council)’. This would need to be altered to the relevance of each rule.</li> </ul> <p><b>22. FC – R3 1., FC – R7 2., FC – R8 2., FC – R9 2., FC – R11 1.</b></p>

	<p>Council has concerns with setting a maximum contribution and not a standard minimum. It is agreed that Council should be able to seek up to 100% financial contribution for infrastructure, however there is concern without a standard minimum there is a lot of room to contest how much should be applied. As above it is preferred by developers and staff to have a better understanding of what the standard minimum to be applied would be. It would be deemed appropriate to have a standard minimum of 50% contribution with a maximum of 100% allowing any other arrangement at the discretion of the Council.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change wording from <i>'The maximum contribution required for the development and upgrading of ... that serve a subdivision, land use or development shall be 100% of the estimated cost.'</i> to <i>'The maximum contribution required for the development and upgrading of ... that serve a subdivision, land use or development shall be 100% of the estimated cost with a minimum contribution of 50% (unless determined otherwise by Council)</i></li> </ul>
Subdivision Objectives, Policies, Rules and Standards	23. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies, Rules and Standards
Activities on the Surface of Water Objective, Policies and Rules	24. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Coastal Environment Objective, Policies and Rules	<p>25. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies but opposes parts of the rules as outlined below:</p> <p><b>26. CE – R6 3. Maintenance, Alteration, Repair and Reconstruction of Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures and associated earthworks in the Coastal Environment within the High Coastal Natural Character Overlay identified in Schedule Seven</b></p> <p>Council considers that requirement under CE – R6 3. should be, that the activity is permitted if public access is provided for. At present even in a reconstruction situation the rule only requires that public access is no worse than status quo. It is considered that at the time of an upgrade if public access is limited or nil that this should be a consideration of the upgrade and should not be considered permitted if public access is not provided for.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace CE – R6 3. <i>'There is no reduction in public access'</i> with, <i>'Practical public access is provided for'</i></li> </ul> <p><b>27. CE – R9 3. Maintenance, Alteration, Repair and Reconstruction of Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures within the Outstanding Coastal Environment Area</b></p> <p>As per CE- R6 3. Above, Council considers that requirement under CE – R9 3. should be, that the activity is permitted if public access is provided for. At present even in a reconstruction situation the rule only requires that public access is no worse than status quo. It is considered that at the time of an upgrade if public access is limited or nil that this should be a consideration of the upgrade and should not be considered permitted if public access is not provided for.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace CE – R9 3. <i>'There is no reduction in public access'</i> with, <i>'Practical public access is provided for'</i></li> </ul>
Earthworks Objectives, Policies and Rules	28. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Light Objectives, Policies and Rules	29. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules



Noise Objectives, Policies and Rules	30. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Signs Objectives, Policies and Rules	31. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Temporary Activities Objectives, Policies and Rules	32. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Open Space and Recreation Zones Objectives, Policies and Rules	33. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Commercial and Mixed Use Zones Objectives, Policies and Rules	34. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Industrial Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	35. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
General Residential Zones Objectives, Policies and Rules	<p>36. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies but opposes parts of the rules as outlined below:</p> <p><b>37. GRZ – R6 Residential Visitor Accommodation</b> Westland District Council agrees with Buller District Council’s approach that residential visitor accommodation should only be permitted where the accommodation is a homestay with a permanent resident living on site. Given the noise, traffic and amenity affects caused by night to night accommodation in the residential zone, it is considered that a Restricted Discretionary approach should be taken when considering the appropriateness of such activity.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change wording in GRZ – R6 7. to read <i>‘In the Westland and Buller Districts the accommodation is homestay accommodation with a permanent resident living on site’</i>.</li> <li>- Advice note wording changed to <i>‘In the Westland and Buller Districts, where residential visitor accommodation has been lawfully established under the Westland or Buller District Plan provisions, then existing use rights apply.</i></li> </ul>
Large Lot Residential Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	38. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Medium Density Zone, Objectives, Policies and Rules	<p>39. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies but opposes parts of the rules as outlined below:</p> <p><b>40. MRZ – R6 Residential Visitor Accommodation</b> As above in the General Residential Zone, Westland District Council agrees with Buller District Council’s approach that residential visitor accommodation should only be permitted where the accommodation is a homestay with a permanent resident living on site. Given the noise, traffic and amenity affects caused by night to night accommodation in the residential zone, it is considered that a Restricted Discretionary approach should be taken when considering the appropriateness of such activity.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change wording in MRZ – R6 7. to read <i>‘In the Westland and Buller Districts the accommodation is homestay accommodation with a permanent resident living on site’</i>.</li> <li>- Advice note wording changed to <i>‘In the Westland and Buller Districts, where residential visitor accommodation has been lawfully established under the Westland or Buller District Plan provisions, then existing use rights apply.</i></li> </ul>

<p>Rural Zones Objectives, Policies and Rules</p>	<p><u>General Rural Zone</u></p> <p><b>41. GRUZ – R8 Residential Visitor Accommodation</b> Council wishes to clarify that while it supports the need for the activity night to night accommodation to require consideration for the Residential Zones it believes that the affects in General Rural Zone setting will be minor. Given the large land area and general distance between properties in this environment it is considered that visual, noise, amenity and traffic effects would be minimal. <b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support visitor accommodation in the General Rural Zone being a Permitted Activity without requiring a permanent resident to live on site.</li> </ul> <p><b>42. GRUZ – R11 Mineral Prospecting and Mineral Exploration</b> Council supports prospecting and exploration in the General Rural Zone. <b>Council seeks to:</b> Support prospecting and exploration in the General Rural Zone.</p> <p><b>43. GRUZ – R12 Mineral Extraction</b> Council supports mineral extraction in the General Rural Zone. <b>Council seeks to:</b> Support mineral extraction in the General Rural Zone.</p> <p><u>Rural Lifestyle Zone</u></p> <p><b>44. RLZ – R9 Residential Visitor Accommodation</b> As above in the General Residential and Medium Density Zones, Westland District Council agrees with Buller District Council’s approach that residential visitor accommodation should only be permitted where the accommodation is a homestay with a permanent resident living on site. Given the noise, traffic and amenity affects caused by night to night accommodation in the residential zone, it is considered that a Restricted Discretionary approach should be taken when considering the appropriateness of such activity. <b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change wording in RLZ – R9 7. to read <i>‘In the Westland and Buller Districts the accommodation is homestay accommodation with a permanent resident living on site’</i>.</li> </ul> <p><b>45. RLZ – R11 Mineral Prospecting and Mineral Exploration</b> Council supports prospecting and exploration in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. <b>Council seeks to:</b> Support prospecting and exploration in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.</p> <p><b>46. RLZ – R15 Mineral Prospecting and Exploration not Meeting Permitted Activity Standards and Mineral Extraction Activities</b> Council supports prospecting and exploration in the Rural Lifestyle Zone as a Restricted Discretionary Activity where it does not meet Permitted Standards. <b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support prospecting and exploration in the Rural Lifestyle Zone as a Restricted Discretionary Activity where it does not meet Permitted Activity standards.</li> </ul> <p><u>Settlement Zone</u></p> <p><b>47. SETZ – R10 Residential Visitor Accommodation Zone</b></p>
---------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>As above in the General Residential, Medium Density and Rural Lifestyle Zones above, Westland District Council agrees with Buller District Council's approach that residential visitor accommodation should only be permitted where the accommodation is a homestay with a permanent resident living on site. Given the noise, traffic and amenity affects caused by night to night accommodation in the settlement zone, it is considered that a Restricted Discretionary approach should be taken when considering the appropriateness of such activity.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Change wording in SETZ – R10 7. to read '<i>In the Westland and Buller Districts the accommodation is homestay accommodation with a permanent resident living on site</i>'.</li> <li>- Advice note wording changed to '<i>In the Westland and Buller Districts, where residential visitor accommodation has been lawfully established under the Westland or Buller District Plan provisions, then existing use rights apply</i>'.</li> </ul> <p><b>48. SETZ – R11 Visitor Accommodation in the Settlement Centre Precinct</b> Council supports permitting night to night visitor accommodation in the Settlement Centre Precinct.</p>
<p>Airport Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules</p>	<p>49. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies but opposes parts of the rules as outlined below:</p> <p><b>50. AIRPZ – R2 Grazing, cropping, moss collection and beekeeping Activities</b> Council and the Airport on behalf of Council have concerns with including cropping as a permitted activity in the Airport Zone. Crops can attract birds especially when ploughing the ground to sow crops. Aircraft are at increased risk of bird strike during ploughing and some trigger needs to be included so that the Council and Airport are aware of timeframes for intended ploughing.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Allow cropping to be considered a permitted activity but introduce a permitted standard stating that Council shall be provided proof of Airport management approval no less than 10 days in advance of ploughing.</li> </ul> <p><b>51. AIRPZ – R9 Visitor Accommodation at Hokitika and Westport Airport or Greymouth or Karamea Aerodrome</b> Council has concerns with allowing visitor accommodation as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in the Airport Zone, due to the potential impact on Hokitika Town Centre. A specific Visitor Accommodation Zone has been created in Hokitika to encourage visitors to be staying within walking distance of retail opportunities. As such Council opposes visitor accommodation in the Airport Zone being a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exclude Hokitika from AIRPZ-R9 making it Discretionary.</li> </ul> <p>52. Council on behalf of Hokitika Airport would like to raise concerns with laser light use within the Hokitika aircraft flight path.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introduce laser light displays reaching more than 50m, to be considered a permitted activity, but introduce a permitted standard stating that Council shall be provided proof of Airport management approval no less than 10 days in advance of the display.</li> </ul>

Future Urban Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	53. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Hospital Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	54. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Mineral Extraction Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	55. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Maori Purpose Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	56. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Port Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	57. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Stadium Zone Objectives, Policies and Rules	58. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Scenic Visitor Zone Westland Objectives, Policies and Rules	59. Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules
Development Areas	60. Westland District Council supports the Kumara Junction Development Area
<b>Designations</b>	<p><u>Franz Josef Oxidation Pond</u></p> <p>61. The Franz Josef Oxidation Pond is shown as Lot 1 DP 2170 in the table of Designations, however this is held together with Lot 4 DP 419200 to enable growth of the treatment plant. The ponds are built close to the Waiho River bed and any further capacity whether by way of further ponds, plant or rapid infiltration beds would ideally be further from the river bed.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include Lot 4 DP 419200 with Lot 1 DP 2170 as the Franz Josef Oxidation Pond designation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Hokitika Airport</u></p> <p>62. Hokitika Airport Designation is listed as RS 5472, however the Airport includes Part RS 5472 LOTS 5, 7, 11 and Part 12 DP 2393 and LOT 2 DP 2702 held together for Airport Purposes.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include LOTS 5, 7, 11 and Part 12 DP 2393 and LOT 2 DP 2702 as the Hokitika Airport Designation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Franz Josef Aerodrome</u></p> <p>63. Franz Josef Aerodrome Designation is listed as RS 1804, however the Aerodrome includes Part Reserves 2101 and 2102 held together for Aerodrome purposes. Furthermore the Aerodrome Activities are also included on Part Reserve 1015 being Local Purpose Reserve.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include Part Reserves 2101 and 2102 and Part Reserve 1015 as the Franz Josef Aerodrome Designation</li> </ul> <p><u>Water Supply Storage and Treatment</u></p> <p>64. Hokitika Water Supply and Treatment Facility is described as RS 3697, 3698, 3699 and 1210 Part RS 1130, SO 6625 which encompasses the pump station and plant at Cement Lead Road while the Shallow Rush Road water storage and treatment being Lot 1 DP 462988 is not included in the designation.</p> <p><b>Council seeks to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include Lot 1 DP 462988 as Water Supply Storage and Treatment Designation</li> </ul> <p><u>Hokitika Transfer Station</u></p>

	<p>65. Hokitika Transfer station described as Part Reserve 452 on Hau Hau Road has operated as both a landfill site until approximately 2001 and a transfer station since that time and given its level of important to the District should be a designated site to allow transfer station activities and improvements to continue without further consent.</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------