

Name: Margaret Montgomery

Address – 37 Domett Street

Phone 027 433 6016

Email: [westportholidaypark@xtra.co.nz](mailto:westportholidaypark@xtra.co.nz)

I am making this submission as an individual, who owns the below business.

I would like to be heard in support of my submission, in person.

If others make a similar submission I will not consider presenting a joint case and wish to be heard independently at a hearing.

Through this submission I can not gain an advantage in trade competition.

-----  
I am submitting on behalf of the Westport Kiwi Holiday Park & Motels, located at 37 Domett Street, Westport.

I have been living in Westport as the owner of my own business, for almost 30 years, during which time I have been a district councillor for 12 years.

I am submitting with regard to the above property and in the instance of a hearing, I wish to be heard to speak on the new proposed District Plan. I have included below a table of my thoughts with regard to the new provisions to be included within the plan, which I believe seeks to stifle development both in Westport and across the West Coast, under the guise of natural hazard prevention.

### Strategic Direction

Provision	Response	Argument
Commitment to, and articulation of the Councils' partnership with Poutini Ngāi Tahu;	Agree in full	N/A
Alignment with the communities' aspirations for development while maintaining environmental quality across the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini;	Agree in Part	Having read through the TTPP, the focus has strongly been on environmental quality while stifling development opportunities for communities, with several smaller communities which have adapted in response to the environment are now including provisions which would inhibit future growth, notably including Westport. As well as Franz Josef, Wairoa and other townships which have been included with flood zoning. I also note here that Hokitika has not been included within this zoning despite heavy investment in flood protection which is anticipated to fail based on future modelling. I note that the District Plan includes a number

		of provisions for towns or areas inclusive of flood zoning where new development is non-complying and in theory consent can be sought, however this is at the discretion of the local council and employees. I believe that in the instance that there is concerns around environmental quality the matter should be restricted discretionary with restriction solely limited to the underlying failure, as this provides clear policy direction as to the intended outcome or allows for clear oversight of the RMA process.
Integrated management through the grouping of environmental considerations which combine to achieve strategic outcomes; and avoiding strategic objectives becoming isolated within various chapters of Te Tai o Poutini Plan;	Agree in part	As identified above the environmental focus throughout the plan is a behemoth oversight of the actual environment on the West Coast, whereby large portions of land are either owned by Ngai Tahu forest, DOC or some form of crown entity, with very little undeveloped land held in private ownership. The above entities have a crown duty to protect this land and the council intervention in private ownership of land particularly with regard to vegetation clearance, and use of land is considered egregious. The relevant rules across the chapters should be amended to restricted discretionary to allow for relevant rules to focus on the specific matters, while allowing private land owners the chance to apply for resource consent where appropriate.
Fostering the use and development of natural and physical resources whilst protecting the natural values that have been elevated to matters of national importance by the Resource Management Act 1991 and those matters of national and regional significance by National and Regional Policy Statements;	Agree in full	N/A
A prosperous economy through	Agree in full	N/A

enabling a wide range of appropriate business activities;		
Operation and maintenance of critical infrastructure;	Agree in full	N/A
The management of urban growth integrating existing and future infrastructure, providing sufficient land, or opportunity to meet growth demands for housing and business.	Agree in full	N/A

### **Contaminated Land Use**

Agree in Full

### **Hazardous substances**

The rule does not reference the HSNO Act outside of the blurb, consideration should be given to amending the writing so that the plan includes a direct reference to this standard.

### **Natural Hazards**

Provision	Response	Argument
Identify in natural hazard overlays areas at significant risk from natural hazards.	Agree in full	N/A
Where a natural hazard has been identified and the natural hazard risk to people and communities is unquantified but evidence suggests that the risk is potentially significant, apply a precautionary approach to allowing development or use of the area.	Disagree	Council should proceed with calculations and natural hazard identification to fully address the areas of concern, not proceed based on a guess based approach. Further this should be quantified. The current policy puts this on developers to disprove which is a egregious mistake on councils behalf which should be enticing development within the West Coast not allowing for pseudo guessing games within the policy directives of the underlying zoning principles and development in areas.
When managing natural hazards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Promote the use of natural features and appropriate risk management approaches in preference to hard engineering solutions in mitigating natural hazard risks; and</li> <li>b) Avoid increasing risk to people, property and the environment; while</li> <li>c) Recognising that in some circumstances hard engineering solutions may be the only practical means of protecting existing communities and critical</li> </ul>	Disagree	Hard engineering solutions are still appropriate measures in addressing natural hazards with often greater success than natural solutions, and where not resulting in adverse effects upon the neighbours would be appropriate, the wording of this policy should be changed to reflect that the whole of New Zealand is a hazard prone country due to the ocean locked nature and therefore consideration in development,

infrastructure.		should consider engineering solutions (general) that mitigate risk.
<p>Natural hazard assessment, managed retreat locations and resource consent applications will consider the impacts of climate change. In particular the following matters will be considered:</p> <p>Change in sea level;          Altering of coastal processes;          Increased inundation of low lying areas;          Changes in local temperatures;          Changes in rainfall patterns; and          Increase in cyclonic storms.</p>	Disagree	<p>Council should have this information and it should not be upon the applicant to provide analysis that the development or future activity is able to meet this policy, particularly when a number of matters are under scientific dispute with regard to the potential intensity. The policy is considered to restrictive when considering the coastal environment of the West Coast, as this would inhibit development.</p> <p><b>Suggestion: removal of this policy</b></p>
<p>When assessing areas suitable for managed retreat, the following matters will be considered:</p> <p>That the natural hazard risk of the area is less than the existing location, and          The potential future need to protect the community and associated infrastructure by hazard mitigation works.</p>	Disagree	<p>Managed retreat is to be informed by the upcoming rework of the RMA and at this time there are no provisions for managed retreat under the RMA. While it is acknowledged that development could be at risk, it should be at the discretion of the land owner as to withdrawing from these areas and the plan should be informed by higher level planning documents. It is also recommended that specific provisions for height should be determined at the time of the development.</p> <p><b>Suggestion: removal or significant amendment of this policy</b></p>
<p>In the Earthquake Hazard Overlay avoid:</p> <p>Development of critical response facilities;          Community facilities, educational facilities and health facilities within 150m of the fault-line;          Commercial and industrial buildings within 100m of the fault-line; and          Residential activities within 50m of the fault-line.</p>	Agree in full	<p>I also mention that the provisions surrounding earthquakes in contrast to other natural hazards are significantly more lax despite the potential for damage is considerably higher, therefore I would suggest that the other natural hazard provisions adopt regulations that are relaxed or allow for building code provisions e.g. with regard to raised floor levels to mitigate against flooding.</p>
Allow unoccupied structures and buildings within the Earthquake Hazard Overlay.	Agree in full	

Avoid locating critical response facilities within the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay.	Agree in full	
Restrict further development of sensitive activities in the Lake Tsunami Hazard overlay.	Disagree	The above policies allow for buildings and residential buildings within close proximity to fault lines, which would be required for a lake tsunami and therefore a similar level standard should be adopted, I doubt after a high level magnitude earthquake, the concern would be around having wet feet.
<p>Avoid development of sensitive activities within the Coastal Severe Hazard and Flood Severe Hazard overlays unless it can be demonstrated that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The activity has an operational and functional need to locate within the hazard area; and</li> <li>b. That the activity incorporates mitigation of risk to life, property and the environment, and there is significant public or environmental benefit in doing so.</li> </ul>	Disagree	<p>Policy aspect b is too restrictive and is based on a significant public or environmental benefit while the majority of land which can be developed is held in private ownership, this policy essentially restricts all development outside of council initiated development.</p> <p>Suggestion: this should be amended so that where an activity incorporates mitigation to risk to life, the development is appropriate.</p> <p>Restricted discretionary provisions should also be included to this effect, particularly in consideration of development in Westport, in which the majority of the town has been zoned to prevent future development after a 1 in 60 year flood, considering that houses can be raised and development in other parts of the country do not have rules that are this intense (refer to south Dunedin, Lower Hutt etc.)</p>
<p>Allow development in the Land Instability Alert, Coastal Alert and Flood Susceptibility overlays where:</p> <p>Mitigation measures avoid risk to life and minimise risk to property and the environment; and</p> <p>The risk to adjacent properties, activities and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.</p>	Agree in full	A note can be included which identifies some form of mitigation measures.
<p>When assessing the effects of activities in natural hazard overlays consider:</p> <p>The effects of natural hazards on people,</p>		

<p>property and the environment;          Technological and engineering mitigation measures and other non-engineered options;          The location and design of proposed sites, buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk;          The clearance or retention of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk;          The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk;          The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site.;          The functional or operational need to locate in these areas; and          Any significant adverse effects on the environment of any proposed mitigation measures.</p>		
<p>Allow subdivision, use and development within the Westport Hazard Overlay where:           1% annual exceedance probability flood event is mitigated; and          1% annual recurrence interval plus 1m sea level rise coastal event are mitigated; and          Where mitigation is not achieved, further subdivision, use and development is avoided.</p>	<p>Disagree in part</p>	<p>Council should be required to provide specific floor height measurements as determined by the datum or have some form of online reference – the rule is not supported by current determination in the plan or through a council provided service to my knowledge. This is at undue cost to the applicant. My disagreement is therefore not about the rule itself but about the process in determination for this standard and the actuality of carrying out this process for developers.</p> <p>I also disagree where the 1m sea level rise coastal event is based on. As well as the use of avoided, as mitigation measures are further possible e.g. two storey dwellings with conditions around what can go in the bottom story – e.g. garage/storage no habitual areas. The use of the word avoid gives little flexibility for real world practice.</p>
<p>Allow subdivision, use and development within the Hokitika Coastal Hazard Overlay where 1% annual recurrence interval plus 1m sea level rise coastal event risks are mitigated; and where mitigation is not achieved, further</p>	<p>Not applicable to Westport.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

subdivision, use and development is avoided.		

With regard to the following rules, I have paraphrased these for the following section, however I note as a general note the rules are vague and offer very little insight for either practitioners or developers. The open ended nature of these standards should be addressed in depth and rules should be given set value restrictions. Please use reference material from councils which have undergone a plan change, particularly in reference to rules which address urban environments.

### Rules - All Natural Hazard Overlays

Rule	Response	Argument
Reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in all Natural Hazard Overlays	Agree in full	This is an extension of s.10 of the RMA which is more permissive.
Repairs, Maintenance and Operation of any Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structure	Agree in Full	
Upgrades to Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures	Agree in full	
New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structure	Agree in full	
Repairs, Maintenance, Operation, Upgrade of Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures and New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures not meeting Permitted Activity Standards	Agree in full	

### Rules - Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay

Rule	Response	Provision
Repairs and Maintenance of Existing Buildings in the Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility Overlays	Disagree in part	The use of the word sensitive activities within this rule is not linked to the definition, particularly when the definition basically includes the majority of activities that would be located in existing residential townships, particularly where the failure is non-complying the provision is to strong. The failure should be restricted discretionary with clear direction from council as to the matters of concern/control.
New Unoccupied Buildings in the Flood Severe and Flood	Disagree in part	

Susceptibility Overlays		
Additions and Alterations to Existing Buildings for Critical Response Facilities, and New Buildings and Additions and Alterations to Existing Buildings for Commercial and Industrial Activities in the Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility Overlays	Agree in full	
Flood Severe Overlay - Additions and Alterations to Existing Buildings used for Sensitive Activities	Disagree in full	Should be restricted discretionary, as the non-complying status is considered incredibly restrictive considering the fanciful mapping that has been used which has been based on estimations as identified above in the strategic direction, and is not informed by engineering calculations. The restricted discretionary matters could be limited to natural hazards, further resource consent processing is informed by provisions in the act (s.106) for natural hazards the restrictions on titles proposed by this standard is inconsistent with objectives and policies throughout the plan to allow for growth within towns, particularly when the mapping for Hokitika is not indicative of sea level rise, however the mapping of Westport is basically prohibitive of all development.
Flood Susceptibility Overlay - New Buildings used for Sensitive Activities and Additions and Alterations to Existing Buildings used for Sensitive Activities	Disagree in part	Should be restricted discretionary limited to floor heights, discretionary allows for too much scope for such a narrow failure which is limited to overland flow paths for water.
New Critical Response Facilities and Additions and Alterations to Existing Critical Response Facilities not meeting Permitted Activity Standards in the Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility Overlays	Disagree in part	Some of the conditions are vague, such as minimise risk to human life, there is no measure for a number or provisions, - could say something to the effect of ensure
New Commercial and Industrial	Disagree in part	Same as above.



Buildings and Additions and Alterations to Existing Commercial and Industrial Buildings not meeting Permitted Activity Standards in the Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility Overlays		
Flood Susceptibility Overlay - Additions and Alterations to Existing Buildings used for Sensitive Activities not meeting Permitted Activity standards and New Buildings used for Sensitive Activities not meeting Permitted Activity standards	Disagree in part	This standard essentially prevents additions to any houses, however some consideration should be given for engineering solutions with the standard where not being met should be restricted discretionary in line with the above restricted discretionary standards.
Flood Severe Overlay - Additions and Alterations to Existing Buildings used for Sensitive Activities not meeting Permitted Activity standards and New Buildings used for Sensitive Activities	Disagree in full	New buildings for sensitive activities should be amended.

## Earthquakes

Not relevant to Westport.

I would note that the provision for 50m allows for new residential buildings provided a hazard risk assessment is provided. Similar considerations should be undertaken for Westport with regard to the proposed district plan whereby the risk/probability of an earthquake is the same as the probability of a flood based on some of the recent modelling and timing since the southern alps fault line was active. Therefore considerations should be around for how water will actually flow through the town which should be mapped by council including where primary/secondary overland flow paths areas of inundation etc. a layer of mapping should also include lidar based mapping which accounts for the topography of the area, such that future developers should easily be able to calculate raised floor heights.

## Rules - Land Instability Overlay

N/A to Westport

## Coastal Setback Overlay

Rule	Response	Argument
<b>New Buildings for Sensitive Activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay</b>	Disagree in part.	A natural hazard risk assessment should have been undertaken by council in the determination of these areas and should not be put back onto applicants.

		<p>The location gives council to much discretion and should be informed by set distances.</p> <p>Modification or retention of vegetation gives council to wide a scope with regard to landscaping matters.</p> <p>Agree with the other matters in full. I do however believe that set volumes or numbers should be applied, and while I acknowledge that this approach is limited based on the underlying zoning there should be some form of consideration for where these are appropriate, as the current measures are increasingly restrictive or require in-depth analysis from builders, planners etc. with nearly all development requiring resource consent.</p>
<b>New Buildings for Sensitive Activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay not meeting Restricted Activity Standards</b>		

### Coastal Tsunami Overlay

Rule	Response	Argument
<b>Repairs, Maintenance, Additions and Alterations to Existing Buildings within the Coastal Tsunami Overlay</b>	Disagree in part	This is a continuation of s.10 of the RMA and therefore the rule is stating a right that all landowners have.

### Overall for the hazard zone.

Considering the restrictive scope coupled with the large swathes of land which have been included within these locations, based on estimations, with the real modelling not presented to council - it should be reassessed and mapped going forward. I would also note that in a number of situations around the township of Westport further development is not viable without subdivision and intensification as informed by the NPS-UD which should be encouraged. I would also note that in a number of these situations that s.106 of the RMA has more relevance than the above provisions and would allow for conditions of consent or considerations of similar standards in terms of raised height etc. Overall I believe that the provisions should either be looser utilising more restricted discretionary matters, to inform developers about the scope of consideration rather than non-complying which gives far to much scope to the council to decline or control development throughout the region, where based on the preference of staff could stifle development through the township.



## Subdivision

Provision	Response	Argument
SUB - P1	Agree in Full	N/A
SUB - P2	Disagree in part	<p>A - Rule a. is disagreed to in part, as the rule requires developers to upgrade the network as required, however in areas of anticipated development financial and development contributions are expected to cover this, and therefore additional costs, unless for large scale developments should not be required until networks are at capacity as this propagates a first come first serve basis for development.</p> <p>C/D – This is a repeat of s.106 of the RMA in which it is required.</p> <p>E – the rule is vague in terms of what can be considered – provisions should be around allotment design and engineering matters, with provisions for outdoor and open spaces to be a requirement of the proposed land use.</p> <p>N – should include a note about vesting of services in council upon completion/certification</p>
SUB - P3	Agree in full	N/A
SUB - P4	Disagree in part	<p>C – the wording building platform contradicts A as the wording does not imply that piles would be appropriate and needs a raised foundation, however this would have the effect of potentially shifting/diverting overland flow paths. Consideration should be for the wording and should not specifically refer to foundation, but flood free options based on raised FFL based on the datum and flood data.</p>
SUB - P5	Disagree in Part	<p>This standard seems to restrict development, particularly if the developer has financial limitations with regard to the development as this gives council a lot of discretion over the subdivision outcomes.</p>

SUB - P6	Disagree in part	<p>A - The terminology is vague in terms of density and part of the consideration should allow for rural subdivision and density standards, particularly in instances where rural lifestyle developments are becoming more prevalent due to limited residential areas along the coast.</p> <p>F - is also vague, as significant natural hazard has not been quantified in the Plan, further considerations for engineering interventions were mentioned in the natural hazards chapter, which can mitigate this risk, but have not been addressed within this provision. The plan should allow for adaption and not be wholeheartedly focused on avoidance. The RMA gives consideration for mitigate, remedy or avoid the other two options should play a larger part in consideration in the policy framework which will be assessed in each consent report.</p>
SUB - P7	Disagree in part	The policy is appropriate, however consideration should include a provision that where the subdivision is controlled or it can be demonstrated that a permitted land use is allowable, that the subdivision standards may be waived.
SUB - P8	Disagree in part	Encourages staged development
SUB - P9	Agree in Full	Required by esplanade sections of RMA

The above provisions often give to much provision in the scope of the council with regard to subdivision, particularly around development scope and what can be considered. The rules should be realistic and grounded around the matters of concern around subdivision.

### Subdivision Rules

General Residential Zone and General Rural Zone - Boundary adjustments	Disagree in Part	<p>The rule is in breach of the RMA, as it does not specify that it allows for additional allotments.</p> <p>How can you have a permitted subdivision as it would still require a s.223/224 certification</p>
--	------------------	---

		to confirm the title – confusing provision which should be clarified further.
All Zones - Subdivision for a Network Utility or Critical Infrastructure	Agree in Full	N/A
All Zones and All Overlays - Boundary Adjustments	Agree in Full Question part F	I know that this rule is based around designations, but as a large amount of this mapping is incomplete it is difficult to understand the full scope of this section. If this has been completed where in the plan is this information available. Also it should be significant natural features and landform otherwise it provides a lot of scope for decline or intensive conditions.
All Zones and All Overlays - Subdivision for a Network Utilities, Critical Infrastructure, Access or Reserves	Agree in Full	N/A
Subdivision to create allotment(s) in all RESZ - Residential Zones, CMUZ - Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, INZ - Industrial Zones, SVZ - Scenic Visitor Zone or PORTZ - Port Zones	Agree in full	As a note there are better ways to present this information rather than the cluster within this condition at the moment
Subdivision to create allotment(s) in any RURZ - Rural Zone or MPZ - Maori Purpose Zone	Agree in full	
<b>Restricted Discretionary Activities</b>		
Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB – R7	Confused	Does this section mean that council has the discretion to decide if land is of significant indigenous biodiversity// can a council planner randomly decide that the vegetation is indigenous. I ask as it seems it would be beneficial for any land to be cleared prior to the plan coming into effect if possible rather than dealing with the restrictions associated with this. Direction – more clarity as to planners scope with determining an ecological assessment is viable.

Subdivision of land to create allotment(s) within the FUZ - Future Urban Zone	Confused	The provision of this zone is around areas of intensification for future development, however the provisions requiring three waters, would be difficult if this work has not been completed, or is in the process of being completed, or it would have the effect of restricting subdivision. Direction – greater direction should be provided by the plan.
Subdivision to create allotment(s) in the Flood Susceptibility, Flood Plain, Land Instability, Coastal Alert, Coastal Setback, Lake Tsunami and Coastal Tsunami Overlays	Disagree in part	<p>The subdivision rule is worded well, however two amendments should be - that the proposal should include a provision with relation to the size of an allotment, that where the subdivision does not result in land use non-compliance, council has the ability to waive the minimum allotment standard. This is solely as Townhouse/Higher Density is becoming more prevalent due to the prohibitive costs of standalone dwellings in larger scale developments</p> <p>Second d and e as matters of discretion again give council to much scope as realistically what subdivision is not going to give rise to one of these activities... further council could debate the intended use. S.106 should capture the natural hazard effects, and while the rule should be acknowledged, the scope should be more accurately defined to the natural hazards of interest primarily tsunami, flooding, inundation, with considerations for coastal protection, public mitigation works and emergency evacuation routes. This should be more accurately defined in the Plan with in regards to natural hazards so that it offers potential solutions or guidance for applicants.</p>
<b>Discretionary Activities</b>		
Subdivision of Land within the Coastal Environment to create allotments where there is a	Disagree in Part	The wording of the rule means that even if they are engaged they still need to be notified – I bring this up as it can be difficult for

Historic Heritage site or area identified in Schedule One or a Site and Areas of Significance to Maori identified in Schedule Three		large organisations to provide affected party approval which is a blanket approval and often the correct approach is for the organisation to agree in principal with the applicant volunteering conditions which allow for ongoing engagement with Iwi. Direction – Change the wording.
Subdivision of Land in the Westport Hazard Overlay	Needs Fixing - Not completed	You haven't completed this section or given council any scope over the matters of discretion – please amend immediately this is laughable.
Subdivision within the Coastal Severe and Flood Severe Natural Hazard Overlays	Needs Fixing - Not completed	As per the above comment this has not been completed – some form of scope should be provided as to the matters of control – e.g. natural hazards.
Subdivision within the Airport Noise Control Overlay	Needs Fixing - Not completed	Considering pretty much all townships are within the airport noise control and flight path overlay the subdivision under these areas is ridiculous – you could simply say that it is controlled. With a matter of control being the insulation of the dwelling to a standard which appropriately manages noise. Building height needs to be corrected in this zone.
Subdivision to create Allotments in the Flood Susceptibility, Flood Plain, Land Instability, Coastal Alert, Coastal Setback, Lake Tsunami and Coastal Tsunami Overlays not meeting Restricted Discretionary Activity Standards	Needs Fixing - Not completed	This section also has not been completed, or some form of control – matters of consideration should be included with the description otherwise the scope for proposals is too wide, particularly when the rule is there to manage natural hazards and based on the above standard there are approaches which may be appropriate – bottom level garage
<b>Non-complying Activities</b>		
Subdivision to Create Allotments in the Earthquake Hazard Overlay: 50m, 100m, 150m or 200m Buffers	Needs wider Consideration	Seems weird that you can build in these setbacks, but cannot subdivide – e.g. Franz township you could theoretically build a house every 1000sqm but then subdivision would be restricted – seems like this could get flipped via the permitted baseline argument for development. Direction – suggest you consider



		this possibility.
<b>Subdivision Standards</b>		
Minimum Lot Sizes for each allotment	Disagree in part	Should have a note that if the proposal does not generate new land use non-compliance's or that where this can be demonstrated that council can waive this standard.
Requirements for building platforms for each allotment	Odd	Don't bring the building act into resource consents – the processes are separate for a reason and developments will have to comply with these standards anyway.
Water Supply		The proposal should state approximate sizes for self potable water based on the size of the dwelling rather than referencing other reports – just makes it more difficult for laymen to understand the plan.
Stormwater		Could just make the first note a land use condition for all new dwellings in urban zones that a water tank is provided.
Wastewater		The standard mentions demonstrate sanitary disposal, this is typically a building act matter and would be useless to consider at the planning stage.
Transport and Access	Agree in full	
Energy Supply	Agree in full	
Telecommunications		Note 2 should be an advice note rather than a standard – as the wording holds no legal weight.
Requirement for Esplanade Reserves or Esplanade Strips	Agree in full	
Easements for Any Purpose	Agree in full	
Point Strips	Confused	What is the purpose of a point strip? I cannot find a reference in the RMA – is this supposed to be an access strip?

**Overall:** The wording of the rules in this section is chaotic and difficult to understand with poor direction provided. The plan is supposed to be viable for someone to be able to understand and submit an application, without requiring professional help, however I would say that this is border line impossible, based on the current matters which could be required by council and the vast scope provided gives council a large range of matters to restrict development; particularly considering that NZ is undergoing a period of rapid urbanization and growth coupled with the three waters reform, which could give additional growth opportunities to the West Coast region. Having rules which restrict/delay development or make this process seem more difficult seems contradictory to the national direction for supporting development.

<b>General Rules</b>		
Earthworks	Disagree in part	<p>EW – R1 The standard requiring clean fill material could be difficult for some activities – or if the proposal is a redistribution of material across the site to create a level platform.</p> <p>The standard with the exception of vertical alteration contains no other rules – for example you could remove 1.5m across 10ha – some controls could include area or volume.</p> <p>Standard 1 should also include an exemption for piles for earthworks considering that basically all development is required to be raised significantly. EW – R2 – 2e Most swimming pools will fail the vertical alteration standard... EW – R2 – 2f Same as above the depth of a grave is usually beyond 1.5m</p> <p>EW-R4 – 4. If you meet the permitted standards – do you require a code of compliance for this standard/ how would you monitor this standard... 4c – is inconsistent with EW-R1 vertical alteration.</p> <p>Agree to the restricted discretionary matters.</p>
Light	Agree in full	
Noise	Disagree in part	<p>Noise-R3 This standard for setbacks is restrictive for development, considering the setbacks which would require a large distance setback for development – particularly those in settlements which have looser speed limits, e.g. Charleston &amp; the outskirts of Greymouth – this should be amended</p> <p>Noise – R12 How do you measure noise</p>

		effects on wildlife and habitat...
Signs	Disagree in part/ confusing	Comment - this section is incredibly confusing.

The general rules are confusing, over worded and partially confounding, particularly when the rules are pretty consistent with the existing or national standards, yet the formatting of information and display make the plan difficult to understand. The plan is supposed to be easy to understand, however unless the council pre-app advice is comprehensive, the plan would be difficult to interpret – further some of the rules are contradictory or are difficult to determine compliance with.

### General Residential Zone - Te Takiwā Noho Whānui

Residential Activities and Residential Units		<p>Could just follow national direction and say that you can have 3 dwellings per site...</p> <p>Could also have rules around where no additional non-compliance are generated and then this standard can be waived.</p> <p>The 4.5m setback is also not consistent with the existing rules in the regions, or the historic development forms</p>
Minor Structures	Agree in full	
Fences, Walls and Retaining Walls	Agree in full	
Relocated Buildings	Agree in full	
Home Business	Agree in full	
Residential Visitor Accommodation	Disagree in part	<p>There should be additional standards considering the rampant use of Airbnb on the coast which has made renting difficult</p> <p>There should be some consideration for noise. Further how will council be alerted that a dwelling is being utilised as a rental and who will monitor rule 4. and 5. of this section.</p> <p>It seems that most people will not declare – further there should be a limit (number of nights per 12 month period) to the time frame in which dwellings can be rented out as the plan does not provide this</p>

		guidance, (particularly due to the problems which short term rentals have caused on the rental market across the coast.)
Community Facilities and Educational Facilities	Agree in full	
Retirement Homes and Supported Residential Accommodation	Agree in full	
Papakāinga Developments	Agree in full	Comment – there should be some allowance for developers to develop in a similar matter as papakainga developments.
Commercial Visitor Accommodation Within the Hokitika Visitor Accommodation Area	Agree in full	
<b>Controlled Activities</b>		
Minor Structures not meeting Permitted Activity Standards	Agree in full	
Relocated Buildings not meeting Permitted Activity Standards	Agree in full	
<b>Restricted Discretionary Activities</b>		
Buildings not meeting Rule GRZ-R1	Disagree in part	There should be an allowance for party walls or where it is related to a subdivision, failing internal boundary standards that these are not applicable.
Residential Visitor Accommodation not meeting Rule GRZ - R6	Disagree in part	Rules should be more restrictive for short term temporary accommodation, further there are design standards which motels etc have to meet with regard to accesses, fire standards etc which could be considered.
Community Facilities and Educational Facilities not meeting Rule GRZ - R7, Retirement Homes and Supported Residential Accommodation not meeting Rule GRZ - R8 and Retirement Villages	Agree in full	
Development of Medium Density Housing	Disagree in part	The density standard should be able to be waived if there are no other failures, as multi storey developments are more compact developments and are more prevalent forms of development across the rest of the country.
Papakāinga Developments not meeting Permitted Activity Standards	Disagree in part	It would make sense for them to have the same standards as medium density – why is the plan

		making a special exemption for this group – also what happens if the name of the organisation changes... this rule would in theory become invalid.
Commercial Visitor Accommodation within the Hokitika Visitor Accommodation Area not meeting Permitted Activity Standards	Agree in full	
<b>Discretionary Activities</b>		
Residential Activity, Residential Units, Papakāinga developments, Fences, Walls and Minor Structures and Relocated Buildings not meeting Permitted, Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity Standards.	Agree in full	
Home Business not meeting Permitted Activity Standards	Agree in full	
Residential and Commercial Visitor Accommodation not meeting the Permitted or Restricted Discretionary Activity Standards	Agree in full	There needs to be additional controls around residential visitor accommodation or some form of restriction upon time limits for renting of dwellings, as across the coast there is issues with rentals which is restricting population growth, particularly as tourism becomes more popular again.
Commercial Activities and Emergency Service Activities	Agree in full	
<b>Non-Complying</b>		
Industrial Activities	Agree in full	
Any Activity not provided for by another Rule in the zone	Agree in full	

The rules are quite straightforward and appropriate. I would mention that some of the standards could include amendments or scope for council to waive standards if no additional non-compliance's are generated or consideration for how these rules interact with subdivisions.

With regard to visitor accommodation what is the tariffs mentioned by the definition. Further there needs to be greater controls/restrictions upon the development of short-term rental accommodation due to the negative effects of this across the region. Along with requiring registration with council there should be controls relating to the number of days dwellings can be rented out, as well as the number of people accommodated in each dwelling and a record that can be supplied to council every quarter for continued consent. There could also be some form of first come first served with regard to registering – at some point in 2019 there was over 130 Airbnb's registered in Westport, while Facebook groups were flooded with people begging for rental opportunities.

## **Overall**

I strongly believe that for Westport, this plan stifles growth and puts extremely arduous requirements on ratepayers and developers, who want to develop, alter or enhance their properties.

Further I don't believe that the principles of "Natural Justice" have been applied in relation to hazards - for example there are little or no restrictions in relation to development near identified fault-lines, but there are severe restrictions in relation to future supposed flooding, simply due to the recent flooding activity, even though both hazards have a similar possible return period.

The plan - is restrictive in terms of adaptability options - ie limited to earthworks instead of considering alternatives - like pile foundations or 2 story buildings, with non-habitable areas on the new ground floor.

S.17 Avoid, Remedy or Mitigate are the fundamentals of the RMA - Options for implementing these are very limited in this document and over all, it only seems to consider avoiding development.

For the continued growth of the West Coast, development is essential, rather than stifling communities, which this plan seems to endorse.

Lastly I believe that the TTP Plan requires significant alterations and clarification to make the plan more usable and functional, for both planners and the general public.