

### **SUBMITTER DETAILS**

First name	William
Last name	McLaughlin
Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?	Individual
Organisation (if applicable)	N/A
Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission?	No
Postal address	<a href="#">PO Box 204 Westport 7866</a>
Email	<a href="mailto:wejmclaughlin@gmail.com">wejmclaughlin@gmail.com</a>
Phone	02102674385

### **OUR SUBMISSION**

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strategic Direction</li><li>• Energy Infrastructure and Transport</li><li>• Hazards and Risks</li><li>• Natural Environment Values</li><li>• Subdivision</li><li>• General District Wide Matters</li><li>• Zones</li><li>• Schedules</li><li>• Appendices</li><li>• General feedback</li></ul>
Do you wish to speak your submission?	Yes
Would you consider presenting a joint case?	Yes

## William McLaughlin - Submission on Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan

---

Our submission explicitly extends to include any other related provisions in the plan touched on in our submission and/or concerning our submission or relevant to the matters raised in our submission. We wish to speak to our submission. We will consider presenting a joint case if others make a similar submission. We would not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Those of us who live on the West Coast do so in large part because of the region’s natural environmental values and because of our communities. The environment and biodiversity values are important for their own sake. It is a challenge to find the “sweet spot” of protecting natural values while sufficiently providing for the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of our communities. We believe that the objectives and policies that have shaped the rules are, for the most part, appropriate. However, some rules do – we believe – need amending to provide for the livelihood of the people who live in the region and allow them to financially support themselves, their families and their communities.

### **GENERAL FEEDBACK**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Standards	Oppose in part	Where the rules require compliance with standards (e.g. permitted activity standards or performance standards), we believe that pre-existing non-compliance with those standards should be accommodated in the rules. Non-compliance should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule if non-compliance is not exacerbated.	Amend all references to compliance with standards (e.g. permitted activity standards or performance standards) to accommodate pre-existing non-compliance that is not being exacerbated by the proposed activity.

<p>Rules related to Relocated Buildings</p> <p>For example: COMZ – R4, R7 and R8 R7, MUZ – R8, NCZ – R4, R7 and R12, TCZ – R13, GRZ – R4, R12, R19,</p> <p>LLRZ - R4 and R11, MRZ - R4, R10, R15, GRUZ – R7, R17, R28, RLZ – R7, R13, R19, SETZ – R8, R18, R24, FUZ – R6, R11, R18, SVZ – R4, R7</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>These are unnecessary and too restrictive.</p>	<p>Delete rules related to relocated buildings and/or the references to relocated buildings.</p>
<p>Non-complying and Prohibited activity rules that include the wording “not provided for in another rule”, “not provided for by another rule”, “not provided for within another rule” or similar.</p> <p>For example: NOSZ – R15, NOSZ – R17, SARZ – R18, RLZ - R25, BCZ - R7, FUZ - R21, MINZ - R10, PORTZ - R12, STADZ - R8 and SVZ - R9, MUZ – R14, NCZ – R14, TCZ - R21, GIZ - R15, LIZ - R15, GRZ - R24, LLRZ - R22, MRZ - R21, GRUZ - R35 (except for Rifle Range Protection Areas), SETZ - R28 and FUZ - R24, OSZ – R26.</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>These rules are unnecessarily limiting and could have unforeseen, restrictive consequences.</p>	<p>Delete these rules or make them Discretionary activities.</p>

## PART 1 – INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL PROVISIONS

### INTERPRETATION

#### Definitions

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
Boundary adjustment	Oppose in part	<p>The plan does not appropriately provide for subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.</p> <p>This action could be provided here by extending the definition of boundary adjustment or through the explicit extension of the various boundary adjustment rules to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.</p>	Amend the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision or through the explicit extension of the various boundary adjustment rules to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
Building	Oppose in part	The definition for “building” needs to be amended so that caravans are not captured.	<p>Amend as definition to:</p> <p><i>Means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable physical construction that is:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. partially or fully roofed, and</i></li> <li><i>b. is fixed or located on or in land;</i></li> </ul> <p><i>but excludes any motorised vehicle or other mode of transport that could be moved under its own power <u>and non-motorised caravan.</u></i></p>
Building	Oppose in part	The definition for “building” should be amended so that “tiny homes” on trailers with wheels are not captured.	<p>Amend as definition to:</p> <p><i>Means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable physical construction that is:</i></p>

			<p>a. <i>partially or fully roofed, and</i>  b. <i>is fixed or located on or in land;</i></p> <p><i>but excludes any motorised vehicle or other mode of transport that could be moved under its own power <u>and non-motorised caravan and tiny homes built on trailers.</u></i></p>
Functional need	Support	We support this definition	Retain as notified.
Intensive Indoor Primary Production	Support in part	<p>We believe that this definition could inadvertently capture herd homes and wintering barns (where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment). We believe this should be amended so as to be clear that the use of herd homes and wintering barns is not included within the definition of Intensive Indoor Primary Production.</p> <p>Free range poultry and egg farms should also be excluded.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for a specified time period) or poultry. <u>The use of herd homes and wintering barns where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment is not included in this definition. Free range poultry and free-range egg farming is not included in this definition.</u></i></p>
New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for “tiny homes built on trailers” that would be excluded from the definition of “building”	Develop a definition for “tiny homes built on trailers”.
New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for “woodlot”.	Develop a definition for “woodlot”.
New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for “shelterbelt”.	Develop a definition for “shelterbelt”.

New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for “offensive industries”.	Develop a definition for “offensive industries”.
New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for “hazardous facilities”.	Develop a definition for “hazardous facilities”.
New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for “further measurable loss”.	Develop a definition for “further measurable loss”.
New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for “reasonably measurable reduction in the local population”.	Develop a definition for “reasonably measurable reduction in the local population”.
New definition	-	We believe that there needs to be a reasonable definition for “artificial outdoor lighting”.	Develop a definition for “artificial outdoor lighting”.

## **PART 2 – DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS**

### **STRATEGIC DIRECTION**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Strategic Directions Overview	Support	We support the Strategic Directions Overview.	Retain as notified
AG – O1-O2	Support	We support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain as notified
CR – O1-O4			
MIN – O1-O6			
NENV – O1-O4			

POU – O1-O4			
POU – P1-P10			
TRM – O1			
UFD – O1			

## EIT - ENERGY, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND TRANSPORT

### ENG - Energy

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
ENG – O1-O4	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
ENG – P1-P9	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
ENG – R1-R20	Oppose	We support Buller Electricity Ltd’s submission regarding these rules.	Amend as sought by Buller Electricity Ltd.

### INF - Infrastructure

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
INF – O1-O5	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
INF – P1-P6	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
INF – R1-R4	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
INF – R6	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
INF – R7-11	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
INF – R12	Oppose in part	This rule needs to be more enabling and clearer.	Amend to be more enabling and provide clarity.

INF – R13-15	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
INF – R16	Support in principle.	We support this rule in principle.	Retain as notified.
INF – R22-R28	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.

### **TRN – Transport**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
TRN – O1-O5	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
TRN – P1-P9	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
TRN – R1	Support in part	We support these rules in principle but note there are errors.  We also oppose the Transport Performance Standards (see below).	Correct errors.  Amend Transport Performance Standards.
TRN – R2	Support in part	We support this rule in principle but note that we oppose the Transport Performance Standards (see below).	Retain as notified.
TRN – R3	Oppose in part	This activity should also be permitted if the RCA gives consent.	Amend as follows:  <i>Where:</i>  <i>1. All performance standards in Rule TRN - R1 are complied with; and</i>  <i>2. The works are undertaken:</i>  <i>i. By, or on behalf of, a road controlling authority; or</i>  <i>ii. In accordance with a subdivision consent; or</i>



			<p>iii. <i>By a requiring authority in accordance with a designation listing in this Plan; <u>or</u></i></p> <p>iv. <i><u>With the written consent of the road controlling authority.</u></i></p>
TRN – R4	Oppose in part	This activity should also be able to be undertaken on behalf of the RCA or with written consent.	<p>Amend to read:</p> <p>1. This is undertaken by a requiring authority or on their behalf or with written consent of the requiring authority in accordance with a designation listed in this Plan.</p>
TRN – R6	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
TRN – R7-R11	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
TRN – R13	Oppose in part	We do not believe that application should always be notified.	Delete Notification advice note.
TRN – R14	Oppose in part	We do not believe these should always publicly notified. This should be deleted from the rule.	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><del>Notification: Applications will always be publicly notified.</del></p>
Transport Performance Standards	Oppose in part	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex. There also appear to be potential errors in the table. The qualifiers are not consistent, and this makes the table difficult to use.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.

## HAZ - HAZARDS AND RISKS

### CL - Contaminated Land

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
CL – O1	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
CL – P1-P2	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.

### HS - Hazardous Substances

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
HS – O1	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
HS – P1-P4	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.

### NH - Natural Hazards

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
Flood Plain Overlay	Support in part	We support that there are no land use rules for the flood plain overlay and this overlay relates only to the subdivision rules.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
New Objective	-	Similarly to NH – O4, the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: <i>To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rockwalls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.</i>
NH – O1-O6	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified

NH – P1-P9	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
NH – P10	Oppose in part	The wording of this policy is too restrictive and precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions where the hazard could be substantially mitigated using technical solutions.	Include wording that allows technical solutions or differing expert opinion to support resource consent applications for development. The wording of NH – P11 is more appropriate for severe overlays than the current wording.  Delete “and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so”.
NH – P11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
NH – P12	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
NH – P13	Oppose in part	The wording of this policy is too restrictive and precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions where the hazard could be substantially mitigated using technical solutions.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
NH – R1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in <u>all overlays</u> .
NH – R2	Oppose	The intent of this rule is appropriate but it is too constraining.	Amend as follows:  <i>Activity Status Permitted</i>  <i>Where:</i>  <i>1. The structure has been lawfully established; and</i> <i>2. <u>There is no significant change to the size, scale and nature of the structure.</u></i>  <del><i>Earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity;</i></del>

			<p><del>There is no change to the design, texture, or form of the structure;</del></p> <p><del>The materials used are the same as the original, or most significant material, or the closest equivalent provided that only cleanfill is used where fill materials are part of the structure; and</del></p> <p><del>There is no reduction in public access.</del></p>
NH – R3	Support in part	We support this rule in principle but believe it should be more enabling of upgrades.	Amend to be more enabling of upgrades.
NH – R4	Support in part	New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures are important and should predominate over the Overlay rules.	Delete point 1. Retain other points.
NH – R5	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
NH – R6	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Flood Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for all overlays.
NH – R7	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
NH – R8	Oppose in part	The rule is too restrictive for additions and alterations to existing buildings. Overlays should not be bundled together.	Amend to be more enabling. Separate overlays into different rules.
NH – R9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
NH – R10	Oppose in part	The rule is too restrictive for additions and alterations to existing buildings.	Amend to be more enabling.
NH – R11	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.

NH – R12	Support in part	Discretion should be restricted to the same matters listed in NH – R11	Amend matters to which discretion is restricted to the same matters listed in NH – R11
NH – R13	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
NH – R14	Oppose	We believe this rule is too restrictive and does not allow council to consider possible solutions or differing expert opinion.	Delete this rule and. Refer to decision sought for NH – R13.
NH – R33	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
NH – R34	Oppose	This is too restrictive. Further information should be able to be considered.	Amend to being a Discretionary Activity.
NH – R38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in <u>all overlays</u> .
NH – R39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
NH – R40	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
NH – R41	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
NH – R42	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
NH – R43	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
NH – R44	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete or amend to be more enabling.
NH – R45	Support in part	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
NH – R46	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete or amend to be more enabling.
NH – R47-R49	Support	We support the rules.	Retain as notified.
NH – R52	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
NH – R53	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.

Westport Hazard Overlay and associated Natural Hazard and Subdivision objectives, policies and rules.	Oppose in part	This overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend overlay and amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Flood Hazard Severe Overlay and associated Natural Hazard and Subdivision objectives, policies and rules.	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that this overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Oppose any extension from what has been notified that would include our properties.  Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Flood Hazard Susceptibility Overlay and associated Natural Hazard and Subdivision objectives, policies and rules.	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that this overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Oppose any extension from what has been notified that would include our properties.  Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Coastal Hazard Alert Overlay and associated Natural Hazard and Subdivision objectives,	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that this overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Oppose any extension from what has been notified that would include our properties.  Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.

policies and rules.			
Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay and associated Natural Hazard and Subdivision objectives, policies and rules.	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that this overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Oppose any extension from what has been notified that would include our properties.  Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.

## HCV – HISTORIC AND CULTURAL VALUES

### HH - Historic Heritage

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
HH – O1-O4	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
HH – P1-P9	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.

### TREE - Notable Trees

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
TREE – O1-O3	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
TREE – P1-P6	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
TREE – R1-R8	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.

### **SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
SASM – O1-O3	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
SASM – P1-P6	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
SASM – P14-P15	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
SASM – R1	Support	We support this rule	Retain as notified.
SASM – R12	Oppose in part	We believe that this rule incorrectly references SASM – R14 when it should be SASM – R15.	Correct as noted.
SASM – R16	Oppose in part	We believe this rule is too restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity.  We support that the application for activities on sites and areas of significance to Māori will always be limited notified to the relevant Poutini Ngāi Tahu rūnanga.	Amend status to Discretionary.
SASM – R17	Oppose in part	We believe this rule is too restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity.  We support that the application for activities on sites and areas of significance to Māori will always be limited notified to the relevant Poutini Ngāi Tahu rūnanga.	Amend status to Discretionary.



## NATURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES

### ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
ECO – O1-04	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
ECO – P1	Oppose in part	<p>We support that areas of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna habitat will be identified through the resource consent process until such time as district wide identification and mapping of significant natural areas is undertaken in an appropriate and consultative way and that a formal Plan Change occurs after that time.</p> <p>We believe that a June 2027 deadline is too ambitious to undertake the work in a way that sufficiently involves landowners.</p>	Delete “and completed by June 2027” from point 2. iii.
ECO – P2	Oppose in part	The term “functional need” does not go far enough in recognising that some activities are required to operate in certain areas.	<p>Amend point d. as follows:</p> <p><i>The activity has a functional, <u>technical</u>, operational or locational need to be located in the area;</i></p>
ECO – P3	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
ECO – P4	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
ECO – P5	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
ECO – P6	Support in part	We believe that some of the terms used in this policy need defining. Biodiversity offsetting or compensation should be provided for.	<p>Define the technical ecological terms used in this policy.</p> <p>Provide for biodiversity offsetting or compensation.</p>

ECO – P7	Support in part	<p>We support that this policy provides for consideration of “the appropriateness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation in accordance with Policy 9 to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied.”</p> <p>However, there could be significant adverse effects as a result of SNA mapping if the fixed location of mineral deposits is not provided for in the policy and the temporary nature of mining is not recognised.</p>	<p>Retain point h.</p> <p>Amend to recognise that, in some instances, vegetation clearance is unavoidable (e.g. in the case of accessing mineral resource) but that these effects can be temporary due so subsequent restoration processes.</p>
ECO – P8-10	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
ECO – R1-R3	Oppose in part	<p>We believe this is too restrictive.</p> <p>We request that provision is made for low-level clearance for building sites within areas of significant indigenous biodiversity (including for future/not yet approved subdivisions). Providing for these types of living options can actually facilitate predator and pest management and control and is an important lifestyle option for the region.</p>	<p>Amend to be more enabling of development.</p> <p>Amend wording to provide for building sites.</p>
ECO – R4/ SUB – R7	-	Refer to SUB – R7 below.	-
ECO – R5	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
ECO - R6/ SUB - R9	-	Refer to SUB – R9 below.	-
ECO – R7	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.

ECO - R8/SUB - R15	-	Refer to SUB – R15 below.	-
ECO - R9/SUB - R27	-	Refer to SUB – R27 below.	-
ECO – R10-R11	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.

### **NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
NFL – P1	Oppose in part	Residential activities must be provided for.	Amend to include residential activities.
NFL – P2-P7	Support	We support these polices.	Retain as notified.
NFL – R1-R7	Support in part	We support these rules in principle but they are very restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
NFL – R8	Oppose in part	Dwellings and ancillary buildings should be provided for in this rule.	Amend rule to include residential dwellings and ancillary buildings at appropriate scale.
NFL – R9-R15	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.

### **PA - Public Access**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Pre-objective discussion	Support	We support the discussion in the PA chapter preceding the objective.	Retain as notified.
PA – O1	Support	We support this single objective	Retain as notified.

### NC - Natural Character and the Margins of Waterbodies

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
NC – O1-O3	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
NC – P1-P5	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
NC – R1	Oppose in part	It is unnecessarily restrictive to restrict the rule for natural hazard mitigation structures that are constructed by a statutory agency or on their behalf in the district plan.  Additionally, the activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Delete point 1. j. and 5.  If this is not accepted, amend status when compliance is not achieved for natural hazard mitigation structures to controlled.  Amend status when compliance is not achieved for remaining activities to Restricted Discretionary which requires a new rule.
NC – R2	Oppose in part	It is unnecessarily restrictive to include only natural hazard mitigation structures that are constructed by a statutory agency or on their behalf in the district plan.  Additionally, the activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Delete point 1. e.  If this is not accepted, amend status when compliance is not achieved for natural hazard mitigation structures to controlled.
NC – R3 #1	Oppose in part	This rule replicates NC – R2. It should be amended so that it does not only include natural hazard mitigation structures that are constructed by a statutory agency or on their behalf in the district plan. If the amendment to NC – R2 is adopted, this rule could be deleted altogether.  Additionally, the activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Delete point 1.  If this is not accepted, amend status when compliance is not achieved to controlled.

NC – R3 #2	Support	We support this objective. We note the numbering error.	Retain as notified with numbering error corrected.
NC – R4	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
NC – R5	Oppose	We do not support this activity being a Discretionary Activity.	This should be permitted. If not permitted, it should be a Controlled Activity.

## SUBDIVISION

### FC - Financial Contributions

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
New definition	-	We believe that the term “development” requires a definition for this chapter as present in the Operative Buller District Plan.	Add appropriate definition.
FC – O1	Oppose in part	The objective is too absolute and has a duplication error.	Amend as follows: <i>Through the use of Financial Contributions the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini’s infrastructure is able to meet the demands generated by subdivision, land use and development so that <del>it does not adversely affect</del> <u>adverse effects</u> on natural and physical resources, or <del>compromise</del> the quality of service provided to existing users, is remedied or mitigated <del>through the use of financial contributions.</del></i>
FC – O2	Support	We support this objective.	Retain as notified.

FC – P1	Support in principle	We propose an amendment.	Amend as follows: <i>To require financial contributions as a condition of subdivision, development and land use consents to remedy or mitigate adverse effects created by the need to create, extend or upgrade public infrastructure, reserves and community facilities as a result of the subdivision, <u>land</u> use or development.</i>
FC – P2	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
FC – P3	Support in part	We propose an amendment. There needs to be avenues for an applicant to appeal unsatisfactory decisions. This policy may be the most appropriate place to specify how these disputes can be resolved.	Amend as follows: <i>Financial contributions may be taken in the form of cash, land, works or a combination of these in discussion with the applicant <del>but at the final discretion of the Council.</del></i>
FC – P4	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
FC – P5	Support in part	We support the policy in principle and propose amendments.	Amend as follows: <i>To use financial contributions in money to provide additional capacity, and to meet the need for community infrastructure and facilities that arise from the activity. This <del>shall</del> <u>can</u> include roading, streetscape improvements, shared pathways, vehicle parking, EV charging spaces, service lanes, water supply, wastewater, stormwater, parks, reserves, recreation facilities and <u>or</u> community facilities.</i>

FC – P6	Support in part	We support the policy in principle and propose an amendment.	Amend as follows:  <i>To provide for the use of financial contributions for managing adverse environmental effects, including those on significant indigenous biodiversity and outstanding natural landscapes where these cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated and the activities have specific spatial location requirements or functional and operational needs such as <u>but not limited to</u> mineral extraction, renewable electricity generation activities and critical infrastructure.</i>
FC – P7	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
FC – R1	Oppose in part	We believe this rule needs amending.  Long Term Plans can change and be amended and there is no certainty provided to an applicant through this part of the rule, particularly point 3. v.	Amend point 2 to extend beyond boundary adjustment (as presently defined) to include subdivisions where the subdivision results in a reduction in the total number of allotments (or record of titles).  Point 3 needs to be rewritten to be fairer to applicants and provide some certainty.
FC – R2	Oppose in part	We believe this rule needs amending. Point 4.a. is too broad.  We support the reference to “a registered valuer”.	Amend point 4 as follows:  <i>4. Where a financial contribution is, or includes land, the relevant District Council may specify any one or more of the following in the conditions of the resource consent:</i>  <i>a. The location and area of the land <u>within the land being subdivided or under application</u>;</i> <i>b. The state the land is to be in before vesting in or transferring to the Council; and</i>

			<i>c. The purpose of the land if it is to be classified under the Reserves Act 1977, or the general purpose of the land.</i>
FC – R3	Oppose in part	We are concerned that the present wording of this rule can empower the Council to require an applicant to bear the full cost of upgrading a road that is significantly below an appropriate level of service.	Amend to ensure that Council cannot require an applicant to bear the full cost of upgrading a road that is significantly below an appropriate level of service.
FC – R4	Support	We support this rule and support that no roads have yet been identified in the plan.	Retain as notified.
FC – R5	Oppose in part	We believe that the rule requires some amending.  There also needs to be greater clarity, transparency and certainty over how the costs are calculated.	Amend the final sentence of point 1 before the formula to be as follows:  <i>The financial contribution will be charged based on the following formula for each accessible, trailer/boat park or EV charging site <del>and</del> or for every 5 bicycle parks not provided.</i>  Amend so there is greater clarity, transparency and certainty over how the costs are calculated.
FC – R6	Oppose in part	We believe that the wording of this rule can be improved. It is not clear. The term “development” is used when “land use” may be a better term.	Amend to be clearer.
FC – R7	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but believe that point 4 requires amending so that there is fairness, transparency and certainty to an applicant.	Amend to ensure fairness, transparency and certainty to an applicant. Amend to ensure an applicant is protected from bearing the cost of an upgrade that is due to Council not adequately undertaking its responsibilities.



FC – R8	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but believe that point 4 requires amending so that there is fairness, transparency and certainty to an applicant.	Amend to ensure fairness, transparency and certainty to an applicant. Amend to ensure an applicant is protected from bearing the cost of an upgrade that is due to Council not adequately undertaking its responsibilities.
FC – R9	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but believe that point 4 requires amending so that there is fairness, transparency and certainty to an applicant.	Amend to ensure fairness, transparency and certainty to an applicant. Amend to ensure an applicant is protected from bearing the cost of an upgrade that is due to Council not adequately undertaking its responsibilities.
FC – R10	Oppose in part	<p>Part of this rule is not clear and uses terminology not used elsewhere in the plan.</p> <p>The term “and” is used where we believe the term “or is more appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Financial contributions may be required to provide for open space, recreational and community facilities to address the need for these facilities created by subdivision and development in the locality where new allotments or residential units are created.</i></li> <li>2. <i>The maximum contribution shall be required as follows:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <i>7.5% of the additional allotments at the time of subdivision consent (either in cash or land equivalent, at Council's discretion) except that in the case of subdivisions where allotments are greater than 4000 m2, the value of the rural allotment for this purpose shall be the proportional value of a house site of 1,000m2 within each allotment; <u>or</u></i></li> <li>ii. <i>Cash equivalent of the value of 20m2 of land for each additional residential unit created, at the time of building consent, less any contribution made at the time of previous</i></li> </ol> </li> </ol>

			<p><i>subdivision within the preceding five years;</i>  <del><i>and-or</i></del>  iii. <i>Cash equivalent of the value of 4m2 of land for each additional 100m2 of net, non-residential building floor area created, at the time of building consent, less any contribution made at the time of previous subdivision within the preceding five years.</i></p>
FC – R11	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but are concerned that an applicant may be required to upgrade a footpath, walkway or cycleway beyond what is fair if the level of service before an application is inadequate.	Amend to ensure fairness, transparency and certainty to an applicant. Amend to ensure an applicant is protected from bearing the cost of upgrading footpath, walkway or cycleway that have an inadequate level of service before making an application or undertaking an activity that triggers a financial contribution.
FC – R12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
New Advice Note	-	<p>As noted above in relation to FC – P3, it is not clear how any disputes regarding financial contributions can be resolved unless it is via legal action.</p> <p>An advice note that lays out a mediation process would be helpful.</p>	Include an advice note that outlines how a mediation process could be used to resolve disputes regarding financial contributions.

## **SUB – Subdivision**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
SUB – O1-O4	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
SUB – O5	Oppose in part	We believe this objective needs amending and it overreaches.	Amend objective to reflect only the purpose of esplanade reserves and strips as set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values.
SUB – O6	Support	We support this objective.	Retain as notified.
SUB – P1	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
SUB – P2	Oppose in part	<p>We support much of this policy.</p> <p>However, the exact meaning of “planned infrastructure” is unclear and requires a definition.</p> <p>The phrasing “deemed reasonable by Council” used in point k. is unnecessary and introduces uncertainty.</p> <p>Point m. is too strict in its direction and too broad in its application.</p> <p>Point o. would benefit from providing more detail about how this is achieved.</p>	<p>Provide a suitable definition of “planned infrastructure” that ensures a robust, and consultative process determined the planned infrastructure that also minimises uncertainty.</p> <p>Deleted “deemed reasonable” from point k.</p> <p>Delete point m.</p> <p>Develop more detail regarding how point o. is achieved.</p>
SUB – P3	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
SUB – P4	Support in part.	We support this policy in principle but do not agree with the wording as it is too restrictive.	Amend point c. to recognise that a house can be raised/constructed above flood levels using piles or other building methods that do not involve raising the platform.

SUB – P5	Oppose in part.	<p>We support this policy in principle though it could create uncertainty and, counterproductively, stymie development in the FUZ.</p> <p>Point b. will be very difficult to achieve on the West Coast without significantly impacting future development in these areas that have, ironically, been identified as being appropriate for future residential and urban development.</p> <p>In the absence of detailed plans (which we understand to be the case), the policy may lead to perverse outcomes.</p> <p>Point c. will be very difficult to evidence.</p> <p>Point f. will be very difficult to determine.</p>	<p>Delete point b. altogether.</p> <p>This policy should be reworked to have different wording for when plans are in place and when they are not to limit uncertainty and perverse outcomes.</p>
SUB – P6	Oppose in part	We support parts of this policy but believe some aspects are too prescriptive.	<p>Delete points a., c., e. and f.</p> <p>Retain point d.</p>
SUB – P7	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
New policy	-	We believe there should be new policy that is similar to SUB – P7 that applies to RURZ – Rural Zones	<p>Insert a new rule that reads as follows:</p> <p><i>Allow subdivision in the RURZ – Rural Zones that does not comply with the minimum lot design and parameters when:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. The site size and configuration is appropriate for development intended by the zone;</i></li> <li><i>b. The subdivision design maintains rural character and amenity;</i></li> </ul>

			<p>c. <i>The increased density does not create adverse effects on critical infrastructure; and</i></p> <p>d. <i>It can be demonstrated that it is consistent with the quality and types of development envisaged by RURZ - Rural Zone Objectives and Policies.</i></p>
SUB – P8	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
SUB – P9	Oppose in part	<p>We support the inclusion of policy related to esplanade reserves and strips. However, the purpose as notified is too extensive.</p> <p>It is inappropriate that the policy provides for esplanade strips/reserves wider than 20m.</p> <p>The way in which esplanade strips and reserves are provided for in the Operative Buller District Plan is more appropriate than the wording in the proposed plan.</p>	Delete the wording of this policy and reformulate to reflect the wording of the operative Buller District Plan. The purposes of esplanade reserves and strips to be only those set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values. All reference to the width of esplanade reserves and strips being wider than 20m should be deleted.
SUB – R1	Oppose in part	We support the principle of the rule. However, there are parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 3 and 5. Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
SUB – R2	Oppose in part	We support the principle of the rule. However, there are parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
SUB – R3	Oppose in part	“Boundary adjustment” should apply more broadly than currently proposed and there are parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions

			<p>where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.</p> <p>Retain points 1 and 3.</p> <p>Delete point 2 (and thus delete the escalation to Discretionary Activity if compliance is not achieved).</p> <p>Amend wording “design and layout of allotments” under point a. of “matters of control” to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.</p>
SUB – R4	Support in part	We support the rule in principle. However, parts of the rules are excessive given its purpose.	Delete point c. under “matters of control”.
SUB – R5	Support in part.	<p>The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.</p> <p>However, the term “development plan” in point 8 is not defined. The point is excessive and introduces uncertainty into the rule.</p> <p>Parts of the rules are excessive. The rule requires amending to provide greater clarity and certainty.</p> <p>Temporary effects of development and construction should be managed via other parts of the plan.</p>	<p>Retain as notified.</p> <p>Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.</p> <p>Delete point 8.</p> <p><u>Matters of control:</u></p> <p>Amend wording “design and layout of allotments” under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.</p> <p>Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to f.)</p> <p>Delete point j.</p>

			<p>Delete “and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created” from point l.</p> <p>Delete o.</p> <p>Consequent amendments to “activity status when compliance not achieved”.</p>
SUB – R6	Oppose in part	<p>For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.</p> <p>Parts of the rules are excessive. The rule requires amending to provide greater clarity and certainty.</p> <p>Temporary effects of development and construction should be managed via other parts of the plan.</p>	<p>Activity status where compliance is not achieved should be Discretionary for all points. There should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.</p> <p><u>Matters of control:</u></p> <p>Amend wording “size, design and layout of allotments” under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.</p> <p>Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to e.)</p> <p>Points d. and k. requires amending to provide certainty and clarity.</p> <p>Delete “and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created” from point j.</p> <p>Delete l.</p>
SUB – R7/ ECO – R4	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but believe significant amendments are necessary to be less restrictive and more enabling.	Amend the rule to be less restrictive, more enabling and provide more clarity.

		<p>The provision heading is unclear given areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are yet to be mapped.</p> <p>It is not necessary for an area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment for many reasons. A landowner may be more likely to purchase and commit to taking care of an area of significant indigenous biodiversity they own (e.g. undertaking trapping etc.) if it is a manageable size. Area of significant indigenous biodiversity can provide a landowner with restorative and enjoyable experiences, and it is not sensible that they should only be held in extremely large parcels.</p> <p>Biodiversity offsetting or environmental compensation should be able to be considered as a way to mitigate the effects of buildings and accessways. We should provide opportunities for living closer to nature (e.g. “bush living”) and this rule is currently counter to that goal.</p> <p>It is unclear what “parent title” means in this rule.</p> <p>It is not necessary for the covenanted area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be through a covenant with an authorised agency.</p>	
SUB – R8	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but believe significant amendments are necessary to be less restrictive, more enabling and clearer.	Amend the rule to be less restrictive, more enabling and provide significantly more clarity.



SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	<p>The provision heading is unclear given areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are yet to be mapped.</p> <p>It is not necessary for an area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment for many reasons. A landowner may be more likely to purchase and commit to taking care of an area of significant indigenous biodiversity they own (e.g. undertaking trapping etc.) if it is a manageable size. Area of significant indigenous biodiversity can provide a landowner with restorative and enjoyable experiences, and it is not sensible that they should only be held in extremely large parcels.</p> <p>Biodiversity offsetting or environmental compensation should be able to be considered as a way to mitigate the effects of buildings and accessways. We should provide opportunities for living closer to nature (e.g. “bush living”) and this rule is currently counter to that goal.</p> <p>It is unclear what “parent title” means in this rule.</p> <p>It is not necessary for the covenanted area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be through a covenant with an authorised agency.</p>	<p>Amend the rule to be less restrictive, more enabling and provide more clarity.</p> <p>Retain matters to which discretion is restricted.</p>
SUB – R10	Oppose in part	<p>We support the rule in principle but there is some uncertainty that we oppose.</p>	<p>Amend wording “size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments” under point e. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.</p>

			Delete “and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created” from point j.
SUB – R11	Oppose in part	We support the rule in principle but there is some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording “size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments” under point b. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.  Delete “and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created” from point f.
SUB – R12	Oppose in part	We support the rule in principle but believe that the rule should not apply unless there is a development/concept plan in place that has gone through robust public consultation. Until that time, there is insufficient certainty around points a. The escalation to a Non-complying status if compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend so that the rule does not apply until a robust development or concept plan is approved.  Delete “and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created” from point h.  Delete point i.  Activity status where there is non-compliance should be Discretionary not Non-Complying status.
SUB – R13	Support in part	We support the provision but believe the rule can be improved.  We submit a requested deletion given consideration will be given to this matter under the assessment required by point 2.	Delete “sensitive activities” from point d.

SUB – R14	Support	We support the rule in principle but believe more certainty is required.	Provide a robust definition for “development plan”.
SUB R15/ECO – R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
SUB – R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
SUB – R17	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
SUB – R18	Oppose in part	This rule contains an error (references itself – perhaps should be SUB – R16) and is unclear.  This rule is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.  Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status (except for point 3 mana whenua support the escalation for this point).
SUB – R19	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
SUB – R20	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
SUB – R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying.	Amend to: <i>Activity status where compliance not achieved:</i> <del>Non-complying</del> N/A.

		This activity would require a subdivision site suitability report and this is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	
SUB – R22	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
SUB – R23	Support	We support this rule.	Retain.
SUB – R24	Oppose.	The rule is too restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity rule	Delete.
SUB – R25	Oppose.	The rule is too restrictive and does not provide for situations not foreseen by the plan.	Delete.
SUB – R26	Oppose in part	We support the principle of the rule. However, if only part of a parcel is located within the specified hazard overlay this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
SUB - R27/ ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete.
SUB – R28	Oppose in part	We support the principle of the rule. However, if only part of a parcel is located within the specified hazard overlay this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
SUB – S1	Oppose in part	We oppose the minimum lot sizes for each allotment for certain zones. For rural zones, minimum lot sizes	Amend as follows: <i>1. Each allotment, including the balance allotment must meet the following minimum lot</i>

		<p>should be smaller to provide for a range of lifestyle options.</p>	<p><u>size and contain a 15m x 15m building platform:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. General Residential Zone 350m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>b. Large Lot Residential Zone 1000m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>c. Medium Density Residential Zone 200m<sup>2</sup>; and</li> <li>d. Neighbourhood Centre Zone 350m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>e. Settlement Zone, Settlement Zone – Coastal Settlement Precinct and Settlement Zone – Settlement Centre Precinct 1000m<sup>2</sup> in unsewered areas and 500m<sup>2</sup> in sewerred areas;</li> <li>f. Settlement Zone – Rural Residential Precinct 4000m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>g. Rural Lifestyle Zone <del>1 hectare</del> 5000m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>h. General Rural Zone <del>4 hectares</del> 1 hectare, except that it is 10 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; and</li> <li>i. Future Urban Zone 4 hectares.</li> </ul> <p>We oppose that the land between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road <u>south</u> of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14694, Part Section 2 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 3 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 4 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 5 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 42 Blk II Steeples SD and Section 71 Blk II Steeples SD). We submit that this should be zoned Rural Residential Precinct. If this decision is not made then we submit that the “Minimum</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>Lot Sizes for each allotment” for the General Rural Zone specified in SUB – S1 should be as follows:</p> <p><i>g. Rural Lifestyle Zone <del>1 hectare</del> 4000m<sup>2</sup>;</i>  <i>h. General Rural Zone <del>4 hectares</del> 5000m<sup>2</sup>, except that it is 10 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; and</i></p>
SUB – S2	Support.	We support the standard.	Retain as notified.
SUB – S3	Support in part	We support the standard in principle but note that system capacity must be considered. An applicant should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
SUB – S4	Support in part	We support the standard in principle but note that system capacity must be considered. An applicant should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered. Delete Advice Note 2.
SUB – S5	Support in part	We support the standard in principle but note that system capacity must be considered. An applicant should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.  Point 4. should allow for consideration to be given to body corporate ownership.
SUB – S6	Support in part	We support this standard in principle but note our concerns regarding the referenced Transport Performance Standards.	Retain as notified.
SUB – S7	Support in part	We support this standard in principle.	Retain as notified.
SUB – S8	Support in part	We support this standard in principle.	Retain as notified.

SUB – S9	Oppose	We believe the current wording of the operative Buller District Plan regarding this matter is superior to the proposed standard.	<p>Delete standard and amend to match rules 7.9.6.1.1-7.9.6.1.3 in the operative Buller District Plan related to Esplanade Strips and Esplanade Reserves (with numbering adjusted as necessary) i.e.</p> <p><i>7.9.6.1. Rules</i></p> <p><i>7.9.6.1.1. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area is subdivided, other than as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be set aside in the new lot along the mark of Mean High Water Spring of the sea and along the bank of any river or margin of any lake.</i></p> <p><i>7.9.6.1.2. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land is subdivided, other than applies under 7.9.6.1.1. above, or as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be created from that allotment along the bank of any river or margin of any lake. This requirement for an esplanade strip does not apply where a legal road (formed or not) provides adequate access to the water body. This rule only applies to lakes and rivers as defined in section 230(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.</i></p> <p><i>7.9.6.1.3. An esplanade strip required under 7.9.6.1.1. or 7.9.6.1.2. above may on application be reduced in width or dispensed</i></p>
----------	--------	--	--

			<i>with altogether. In considering any such application the Council shall take into account the matters listed in 7.9.6.3. below.</i>
SUB – S10	Support in part	We support the standard in principle but provision for centre line easements should be deleted.	Delete references to centre line easements.
SUB – S11	Oppose in part	This standard is unclear.	Amend the standard to provide more clarity and certainty.
Standards	Oppose in part	Where the rules refer to standards, we believe that pre-existing non-compliance with those standards should be accommodated in the rules should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule if non-compliance is not exacerbated.	Amend all references to compliance with standards to accommodate pre-existing non-compliance that is not being exacerbated by the proposed activity.

## GENERAL DISTRICT-WIDE MATTERS

### ASW - Activities on the surface of water

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
ASW – O1	Support	We support this objective.	Retain as notified.
ASW – P1-P3	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
ASW – R1-R7	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.

### CE - Coastal Environment

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
----------------	----------------	---------	-----------------



Coastal Environment Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is far too extensive. The extent inland that overlay covers is inappropriate and will unduly restrict development.	Amend and reduce the inland extent of the Coastal Environment Overlay especially in areas where there is settlement and agricultural use.
CE – O1-O2	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
CE – O3	Support in part	The term “functional need” does not go far enough in recognising that some activities are required to operate in the coastal environment e.g. due to the location of mineral deposits. Elsewhere in the plan terms have been used additional to “functional” and this should be the case here.	Amend as follows: <i>To provide for activities which have a <u>functional, technical, operational or locational</u> need to locate in the coastal environment in such a way that the impacts on natural character, landscape, natural features, access and biodiversity values are minimised.</i>
CE – P1	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
CE – P3	Support in part	We support this policy in part.	Retain as notified.
CE – P4	Support in part.	We support this policy in principle but believe this policy needs amending.	Include a point c. that provides for activities which <i>have a functional, technical, operational or locational need to locate in the coastal environment.</i>
CE – P5	Support in part.	We support this policy in principle but believe this policy needs amending.	Amend point d. as follows: <i>Have a <u>functional, technical, locational or operational</u> need to locate within the coastal environment.</i>
CE – P6	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
CE – R1-R3	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.

CE – R4	Oppose in part	The maximum height limit of buildings and structures should be that specified for the particular zone.  The gross ground floor area is too restrictive and should revert to zone rules.	Delete point 2. a. i.  Delete point 2. a. iii.
CE – R5-R12	Oppose in part	We believe these are too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
CE – R14-R21	Oppose in part	We believe these are too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.

### **EW – Earthworks**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
EW – O1	Support	We support the objective.	Retain as notified.
EW – P1-P4	Support	We support the policies.	Retain as notified.
EW – R1	Support	We support the rules.	Retain as notified.
EW – R2-3	Oppose in part	Earthworks rules are difficult to understand in the way they are currently structured.  We believe these rules are too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development and provide more clarity.
EW – R6-R8	Support	We support the rules.	Retain as notified.

### **LIGHT – Light**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
LIGHT – O1	Support	We support the objective.	Retain as notified.

LIGHT – P1	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
LIGHT – P2	Support in part	We believe that this policy should extend to appropriate lighting of outdoor commercial/industrial activities.	Amend to include the enabling of artificial outdoor lighting that allows safe commercial and industrial activities.
LIGHT – P3	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
LIGHT – R1-R4	Oppose	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
LIGHT – R5-R6	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
LIGHT – R6	Oppose in part	This is very restrictive for existing activities in this area that may need to alter their lighting patterns.	Amend to be more enabling when in relation to existing users.

### **NOISE – Noise**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
NOISE – O1-O3	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
NOISE – P1, P2 and P4	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
NOISE – R1-R2	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
NOISE – R3	Oppose	This rule is very restrictive and onerous particular in relation to the State Highway.	Delete.
NOISE – R5, R6 and R11	Oppose	Timeframes for noise emissions are too restrictive.	Amend timeframes to be more enabling of noise generating activities.
NOISE – R11	Oppose	Correct the error where a Mineral Extraction Zone is referred to as “MEZ”.	Correct “MEZ” error.

NOISE – R12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
NOISE – R13	Oppose	This rule is very restrictive and onerous particular in relation to the State Highway.	Delete.

### **PART 3 – AREA-SPECIFIC MATTERS**

#### **ZONES**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Standards (permitted activity standards and performance standards)	Oppose in part	Where the rules require compliance with standards (e.g. permitted activity standards or performance standards), we believe that pre-existing non-compliance with those standards should be accommodated in the rules. Non-compliance should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule if non-compliance is not exacerbated.	Amend all references to compliance with standards (e.g. permitted activity standards or performance standards) to accommodate pre-existing non-compliance that is not being exacerbated by the proposed activity.
Rules related to Relocated Buildings  For example: COMZ – R4, R7 and R8 R7, MUZ – R8, NCZ – R4, R7 and R12, TCZ – R13, GRZ – R4, R12, R19,  LLRZ - R4 and R11, MRZ - R4, R10, R15, GRUZ – R7, R17, R28, RLZ – R7, R13, R19, SETZ – R8, R18, R24, FUZ – R6, R11, R18, SVZ – R4, R7	Oppose	These are unnecessary and too restrictive.	Delete rules related to relocated buildings and/or the references to relocated buildings.

<p>Non-complying and Prohibited activity rules that include the wording “not provided for in another rule”, “not provided for by another rule”, “not provided for within another rule” or similar.</p> <p>For example: NOSZ – R15, NOSZ – R17, SARZ – R18, RLZ - R25, BCZ - R7, FUZ - R21, MINZ - R10, PORTZ - R12, STADZ - R8 and SVZ - R9, MUZ – R14, NCZ – R14, TCZ - R21, GIZ - R15, LIZ - R15, GRZ - R24, LLRZ - R22, MRZ - R21, GRUZ - R35 (except for Rifle Range Protection Areas), SETZ - R28 and FUZ - R24, OSZ – R26.</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>These rules are unnecessarily limiting and could have unforeseen, restrictive consequences.</p>	<p>Delete these rules or make them Discretionary activities.</p>
--	---------------	--	--

## **OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION ZONES**

### **OSRZ – Open Space and Recreation Zones**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
OSRZ – O1-O2	Support	We support the objectives.	Retain as notified.
OSRZ – P1-P20	Support	We support the policies.	Retain as notified.

**OSZ – Open Space Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Open Space Zone	Support	We support the extent of the Open Space Zone	Retain as notified.
Open Space Zone		We support that the Westport rifle range is presently zoned Open Space Zone in the proposed plan and that the Rifle Range is provided for via the Rifle Range Protection Area.	Retain as notified.
OSZ – R1-R20	Support in part	We support these rules in principle though believe pre-existing non-compliance should be accommodated when applying performance standards.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance is accommodated when applying performance standards.
New rules for OSZ	-	GRUZ – R2, GRUZ – R3, GRUZ – R4, GRUZ – R5, GRUZ – R6, GRUZ – R23 and GRUZ – R33 are all rules that relate to the Rifle Range Protection Area. We support these. In the case of the Westport Rifle Range, part of the Rifle Range Protection Area is zoned Open Space Zone and these rules are not duplicated appropriately for this zone. We request that these rules are duplicated. For clarity, it is particularly important that GRUZ – R2 2. Is replicated within OSZ – R2 with the aforementioned deletion of ‘Target’ (i.e. “within the Rifle Range Protection Areas, Recreation Activities are restricted to Recreational Firearms Shooting”).	Created rules as noted.

## COMMERCIAL AND MIXED USE ZONES

### CMUZ – Commercial and Mixed Use Zones – Objectives and Policies

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
CMUZ – O1-O3	Support	We support the objectives.	Retain as notified.
CMUZ – P2-P3	Support	We support the policy.	Retain as notified.
CMUZ – P4	Oppose	These provisions are too restrictive in their scope. They do not adequately recognize that to be functional and provide services the community wants and needs.	Deleted points a. – d.
CMUZ – P13	Oppose in part	<p>These provisions are too restrictive in their scope. They do not adequately recognize that to be functional and provide services the community wants and needs.</p> <p>The commercial zone should not be constrained by such an emphasis on traditional “amenity values”.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p><i>Activities in the COMZ - Commercial, MUZ - Mixed-Use and NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zones should:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>a. Meet performance standards on development and land use that <del>maintain or enhance the amenity of the commercial areas and</del> do not create adverse effects beyond the boundaries of these areas, particularly in respect of residential areas;</i></li> <li><i>b. Provide safe urban design (including pedestrian and vehicle safety); and</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Avoid the fragmentation of town centres.</i></p>

**COMZ – Commercial Zone**

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
Commercial Zone	Oppose in part	We believe that 34 Russell Street (Lot 1 DP 16517), 7 Pakington Street (Part Section 104 Town of Westport/Lot 2 A 444), 8 Pakington Street and 34 Russell Street (Lot 1 DP 475753) should be zoned commercial.	Amend zoning to include 34 Russell Street (Lot 1 DP 16517), 7 Pakington Street (Part Section 104 Town of Westport/Lot 2 A 444), 8 Pakington Street and 34 Russell Street (Lot 1 DP 475753).
Commercial Zone	Support in part	Other than the zoning noted immediate above, we support the extent of the Commercial Zone.	Retain extent of the Commercial Zone as proposed apart from amendment sought immediately above.
COMZ – R1	Support in part	We support the rule in principle but believe that it is too onerous especially with regards to landscaping and building height.	Amend to landscaping provisions to be less onerous.  Amend points 1 as follows:  <i>The maximum height above ground level is <del>12</del> <u>15</u> metres except that this standard does not apply to hose drying towers at Emergency Service Facilities;</i>
COMZ – R2	Oppose in part	We do not support point 1. It is unnecessary and onerous.	Delete point 1.
COMZ – R3	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
COMZ – R4	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.
COMZ – R5	Oppose	The rule is too complex and onerous.	Amend to be less complex and less onerous.



COMZ – R6	Support in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with COMZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule COMZ - R1 other than those that relate to External Storage and Recession Planes are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule COMZ – R1;</u></i>
COMZ – R7	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.
COMZ – R8	Support in part	There should be no conditions included as part of this rule. It is appropriate that all activities listed in the rule be considered as part of a Discretionary Activity application.	Delete condition 1 – 3. Amend as follows: <i>Activity status where compliance not achieved:</i> <del><i>Non-complying N/A.</i></del>
COMZ – R9	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
COMZ – R10	Oppose	This is too onerous and should be a Discretionary Activity.	Amend status to Discretionary.
COMZ – R11	Oppose	We do not support this rule.	Delete.

## INDUSTRIAL ZONES

### GIZ – General Industrial Zone

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
GIZ – R1	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
GIZ – R2	Support in part	GIZ – R1 performance standards are unnecessary.	Delete point 1.
GIZ – R3	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
GIZ – R4-R5	Oppose in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with GIZ – R1. Activity status where compliance not achieved is too onerous.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule GIZ - R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule GIZ – R1</u>;</i> Amend “Activity status where compliance not achieved” to “Discretionary”.
GIZ – R6-R8	Oppose in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with GIZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule GIZ - R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule GIZ – R1</u>;</i>
GIZ – R9	Support in part	Point 2 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with GIZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>2. All other performance standards for Rule GIZ – R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule GIZ – R1</u>;</i>

GIZ – R10-14	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
GIZ – R15	Oppose	We do not support this rule.	Amend this rule to be Discretionary.

### **LIZ – Light Industrial Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
LIZ – R1	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
LIZ – R2	Support in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with LIZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule LIZ - R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule LIZ – R1</u>;</i>
LIZ – R3	Support in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with LIZ – R1.  Activity status where compliance not achieved is too onerous.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule LIZ - R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule LIZ – R1</u>;</i>  “Activity status where compliance not achieved” to “Discretionary”.
LIZ – R4	Support in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with LIZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule LIZ - R1 are complied with except that hose drying towers associated with an Emergency Service Facility are exempt from height standards <u>or the activity does</u></i>

			<i>not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule LIZ – R1;</i>
LIZ – R5	Support in part	GIZ – R1 performance standards are unnecessary.	Delete point 1.
LIZ – R6	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
LIZ – R7	Support in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with LIZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule LIZ - R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule LIZ – R1</u></i>
LIZ – R8	Support in part	Point 1 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with LIZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All performance standards for Rule LIZ - R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule LIZ – R1</u></i>
LIZ – R9	Support in part	Point 2 for these rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance with LIZ – R1.	Amend as follows: <i>1. All other performance standards for Rule LIZ - R1 are complied with <u>or the activity does not increase extent of existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule LIZ – R1</u></i>
LIZ – R10-R14	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
LIZ – R15	Oppose	We do not support this rule.	Amend this rule to be Discretionary.

## **RESIDENTIAL ZONES**

### **RESZ – Residential Zones – Objectives and Policies**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
RESZ – O1-O3	Support	We support the objectives.	Retain as notified.
RESZ – P1-P17	Support	We support the policies.	Retain as notified

### **GRZ – General Residential Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
General Residential Zone	Support in part	We support the proposed zonings of 105 Derby Street and 19 Brougham Street Westport.	Retain as notified.
General Residential Zone	Oppose in part	We oppose the entire enclave of General Residential Zoning at Alma Road. We believe this should be Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Amend General Residential Zoning in the Alma Road area to a lower density zone such as Rural Lifestyle Zone.
GRZ – R1	Support in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission).  The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.
GRZ – R2	Support in part	We support this rule in principle. The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rule to accommodate for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.
GRZ – R3	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
GRZ – R4	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete

GRZ – R5-R8	Support in part	We support these rules in principle. The rules should allow for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rules to accommodate for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.
GRZ – R11	Support in part	We support this rule in principle. The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rule to accommodate for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.
GRZ – R12	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete
GRZ – R13	Support in part.	We support this rule in principle. The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.  Consideration should also be given if a building is projecting into the recession plane due to the application of natural hazards rules.	Amend rule to accommodate for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.  Amend matters of discretion to include consideration if a building is projecting into the recession plane due to the application of natural hazards rules.
GRZ – R14	Support in part	We support this rule in principle. The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rule to accommodate for existing, legal non-compliance GRZ – R1 performance standards.  Delete reference to acoustic insulation requirements.
GRZ – R15	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
GRZ – R16	Support in part	We support the principle of this rule but it is not clear for plan users.	Amend the rule to provide more clarity.
GRZ – R19-R22	Support	We support the rules.	Retain as notified.
GRZ – R23	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.

GRZ – R24	Oppose	We do not support this rule.	Amend this rule to be Discretionary.
-----------	--------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------

### **LLRZ – Large Lot Residential Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
LLRZ – R1	Support in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). We note that NOISE – R3 is not mentioned in any other LLRZ zone rules and we support that.  The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.
LLRZ – R2	Support in part	The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rule to allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.
LLRZ – R3	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
LLRZ – R4	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete
LLRZ – R5-R8	Support in part	The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rule to allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.
LLRZ – R10	Support in part	The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rule to allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.
LLRZ – R11	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete
LLRZ – R12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
LLRZ – R13	Support in part	The rule should allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.	Amend rule to allow for existing, legal non-compliance LLRZ – R1 performance standards.

LLRZ – R15-R17	Support in part.	We support these rules but believe point 1 should be deleted.	Delete point 1. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
LLRZ – R19-R21	Oppose	These rules are too restrictive and should be Discretionary Activities.	Amend status to Discretionary (or merge with appropriate Discretionary Activities).
LLRZ – R22	Oppose	This rule is not appropriate.	Delete.

### **MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
MRZ – R1	Support in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). We note that NOISE – R3 is not mentioned in any other MRZ zone rules and we support that.  The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.
MRZ – R2	Support in part	The rule should allow for existing non-compliance with noted performance standards.	Amend rule to allow for existing non-compliance with noted performance standards.
MRZ – R3	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
MRZ – R4	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete
MRZ – R5-R9	Support in part	These rules should allow for existing non-compliance with performance standards.	Amend rules to allow for existing non-compliance with performance standards.
MRZ – R4	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete
MRZ – R11	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.



MRZ – R12-R13	Support	We support the rules.	Retain as notified.
MRZ – R14	Support in part	The rule should allow for existing non-compliance with performance standards.	Amend rule to allow for existing non-compliance with performance standards.
MRZ – R15	Oppose in part	Rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
MRZ – R16	Oppose in part	Rule is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
MRZ – R17	Oppose in part	Rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
MRZ – R18-19	Oppose	These rules are too restrictive and should be Discretionary Activities.	Amend status to Discretionary.
MRZ – R21	Oppose	This rule is not appropriate.	Delete.

## **RURAL ZONES**

### **RURZ – Rural Zones – Objectives and Policies**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
RURZ O1-O6	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
RURZ P1 – P12	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
RURZ - P13	Oppose	We do not support this policy.	Delete.
RURZ - P14	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
RURZ P15 – P28	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
GRUZ - PREC1 - P1	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
SETZ - PREC2 - P2	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
SETZ - PREC3- P3	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
SETZ - PREC4 - P4	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
GRUZ - PREC5 - P5	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.

## GRUZ – General Rural Zone

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
General Rural Zone	Support in part	We support that Lot 1 DP 17338 (8677 State Highway 6) and Sections 36, 37 and 45 Blk V Waitakere SD are zoned General Rural Zone. However if the SUB – S1 minimum allotment sizes are not amended as sought, we would seek for Lot 1 DP 17338 (8677 State Highway 6) to become Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Amend if necessary.
General Rural Zone	Support in part	We support that the land at 107 Alma Road is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Lot 4 DP 15375, PT Lot 2 DP 7181, Section 1 SO 14701 and Section 2 SO 14701).	Retain as notified.
General Rural Zone	Support in part	We support that Lot 1 DP 17523 is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. part of 103 Alma Road). The quarry is extremely important to the district. It would suffer from inevitable reverse sensitivity issues if adjacent land was zoned for urban/residential use. We support the proposed buffering areas to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on the operation from surrounding land use and housing density changes.	Retain as notified.
General Rural Zone	Support in part	We support that Lot 2 DP 404550, Lot 2 DP 418652 and Pt Section 24 Blk VII Kawatiri SD are zoned General Rural Zone. We support the proposed buffering area between the quarry and rifle range and proposed residential area to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as notified.
General Rural Zone	Support in part	We support that the land between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road <u>north</u> of State Highway 67A is zoned	Retain as notified.

		General Rural Zone (i.e. Sections 26 and 27 Blk II Steeples SD).	
General Rural Zone	Oppose in part	We oppose that the land between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road <u>south</u> of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14694, Part Section 2 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 3 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 4 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 5 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 42 Blk II Steeples SD and Section 71 Blk II Steeples SD). We submit that this should be zoned Rural Residential Precinct. Advice has been sought from landscape, ecological and engineering professionals that supports this is an appropriate area for intensification.	Amend to <b>Rural Residential Precinct</b> . If this decision is not made then we submit that the “Minimum Lot Sizes for each allotment” for the General Rural Zone specified in SUB – S1 be changed to 5000m <sup>2</sup> .
General Rural Zone	Oppose in part	We oppose that Lot 1 DP 483059 has been zoned GRUZ. This parcel should be zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.	Amend so that Lot 1 DP 483059 is zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.
General Rural Zone	Support in part	We support the way that land to the north, west and south of the quarry area (including quarried land and permitted land) has been zoned General Rural Zone. We support that all land to the south of Lot 1 DP 483059, Section 1 SO 15488 and Section 50 Blk IX Oparara SD should be General Rural Zone right up to the area that is presently zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone. This will minimise reverse sensitivity impacts on the quarry.	Retain the General Rural Zone as discussed in under “Reasons”.
General Rural Zone	Oppose in part	We oppose that Section 2 SO 11712, Section 3 SO 11712, Lot 1 DP 315 and Pt Lot 2 DP 315 have been zoned General Rural Zone. These parcels should be zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.	Amend so that parcels owned by Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd are zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.

GRUZ – R1	Oppose in part	<p>We support this rule in principle but believe that setbacks are too restrictive.</p> <p>Airport Approach Path overlay is too extensive near Westport Airport.</p> <p>The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.</p>	<p>Reduce setback distances.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.</p>
GRUZ – R2	Support in part	<p>Not all Recreational Firearms Shooting is at targets.</p> <p>We support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule GRUZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p>	<p>Delete “Target” from point 2.</p> <p>Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.</p>
GRUZ – R3	Support in part	<p>We support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards Rule GRUZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p> <p>We do not agree with NOISE – R3.</p>	<p>Retain point 2.</p> <p>Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.</p> <p>Delete reference to NOISE – R3</p>
GRUZ – R5	Support in part	<p>We support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule GRUZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p>	<p>Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.</p>
GRUZ – R6	Support	<p>We support this rule.</p>	<p>Retain as notified.</p>
GRUZ – R7	Oppose	<p>This rule is unnecessary.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>
GRUZ – R8	Support in part	<p>We support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ – R1 should be</p>	<p>Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.</p>

		<p>recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p> <p>We do not agree with NOISE – R3.</p>	Delete reference to NOISE – R3
GRUZ – R9-R10	Support in part	<p>We support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p>	Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
GRUZ – R11	Oppose in part	<p>Not all prospecting or exploration is required to have a permit from NZPAM e.g. some minerals are privately owned. Amend accordingly.</p> <p>We believe the rule is also too restrictive.</p>	<p>Amend point 1 as follows:</p> <p><i>This is authorised under a prospecting or exploration permit from NZPAM <u>where legally required</u>;</i></p> <p>Delete point 3 or extend the timeframe until a period after cessation of mining activity.</p>
GRUZ – R12	Oppose in part	<p>We support this rule in principle but believe that Transport Performance Standards and rules relating to light need to be amended before this rule is acceptable.</p> <p>We believe the rule is also too restrictive.</p>	<p>Improve the Transport Performance Standards and rules relating to light that connect to this rule.</p> <p>Amend to be more enabling of development.</p>
GRUZ – R13	Support in part	<p>We support this rule but note the minor error.</p>	Retain as notified with minor timing error being corrected (i.e. 12pm).
GRUZ – R14-R15	Support	<p>We support these rules.</p>	Retain as notified.
GRUZ – R16	Support in part	<p>We support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ – R1 should be</p>	Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.

		recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	
GRUZ – R17	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.
GRUZ – R18	Support in principle	We support in principle.	Retain as notified.
GRUZ – R19-R22	Support in part	We support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
GRUZ – R24	Support in part	This rule is restrictive. Pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Delete point 1. Amend so that existing non-compliance with GRUZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
GRUZ – R25-R27	Support in part.	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
GRUZ – R28	Oppose in part	Reference to relocated buildings is unnecessary.	Remove reference to relocated buildings.
GRUZ – R29	Support in part.	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
GRUZ – R30	Oppose in part	We believe this rule is too restrictive and unclear.	Amend with more clearly defined terms. Delete points 1 and 2. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
GRUZ – R31	Oppose in part	We believe this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1 and amend heading.

			Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
GRUZ – R32-R33	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
GRUZ – R34	Oppose	This rule is unnecessarily restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity.	Amend to a Discretionary Activity.
GRUZ – R35	Oppose	This rule is not appropriate.	Delete.

### **RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Rural Lifestyle Zone	Oppose in part	We support that Lot 1 DP 17338 (8677 State Highway 6) is zoned General Rural Zone. However if the SUB – S1 minimum allotment sizes are not amended as sought, we would seek for Lot 1 DP 17338 (8677 State Highway 6) to become Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Amend if necessary.
Rural Lifestyle Zone	Support in part	We support 180 Caledonian Road Westport (Lot 3 DP 480883) being zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone.	Retain 180 Caledonian Road Westport as being zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone.
RLZ – R1	Support in part	We support the principle but believe that free range poultry and free-range egg farming needs to be explicitly provided for.  The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.	Amend the rule to explicitly provide for range poultry and free-range egg farming.  Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.



RLZ – R2	Support in part	We support the rule in principle. Pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
RLZ – R3	Oppose in part	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.  Amend so that point 2. reads only as <i>“Residential unit density is no more than one unit per 1ha net site area”</i> .
RLZ – R5	Support in part	We support the rule in principle. Pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
RLZ – R6	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
RLZ – R7	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.
RLZ – R8	Oppose in part	This rule is too restrictive.  Pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
RLZ – R9	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). Pre-existing non-compliance with	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.

		Rule RLZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
RLZ – R10	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). Pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
RLZ – R11	Oppose in part	Not all prospecting or exploration is required to have a permit from NZPAM e.g. some minerals are privately owned. Amend accordingly.  We believe the rule is also too restrictive.	Amend point 1 as follows:  <i>This is authorised under a prospecting or exploration permit from NZPAM <u>where legally required</u>;</i>  Delete point 3 or extend the timeframe until a period after cessation of mining activity.
RLZ – R12	Oppose in part	This rule is restrictive. Pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ – R5 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R5 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
RLZ – R13	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.
RLZ – R14	Oppose in part	This rule is restrictive. Pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with RLZ – R1 performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
RLZ – R15	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
RLZ – R16	Oppose in part	We believe the rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1 altogether.

			Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
RLZ – R17	Oppose in part	We believe the rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1 altogether. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
RLZ – R18	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
RLZ – R19	Oppose in part	Remove reference to relocated buildings.	Remove reference to relocated buildings.
RLZ – R20-R22	Support	We support the rules.	Retain as notified.
RLZ – R23	Oppose	This rule is unnecessarily restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity.	Amend to a Discretionary Activity.
RLZ – R24	Oppose	This rule is unnecessarily restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity.	Amend to a Discretionary Activity.
RLZ – R25	Oppose	This rule is not appropriate.	Delete.

### **SETZ - Settlement Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Settlement Zone	Support	We support that 95 Snodgrass Road is zoned Settlement Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14107 and Section 14 Town of Orowaiti).	Retain as notified.
SETZ – R1	Support in part	We support the standard in principle but note that system capacity must be considered. An applicant should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.  The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.  Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.

SETZ – R2	Support in part	<p>We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission).</p> <p>The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.</p>	<p>Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.</p>
SETZ – R3	Oppose in part	<p>Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2-3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p> <p>Area sized are too restrictive.</p>	<p>Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2-3 does not preclude the application of this rule.</p> <p>Increase permissible ground floor areas.</p>
SETZ – R5	Oppose in part	<p>Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2-3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p>	<p>Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2-3 does not preclude the application of this rule.</p>
SETZ – R6	Support in part	<p>Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.</p>	<p>Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 does not preclude the application of this rule.</p>
SETZ – R7	Support	<p>We support the rule.</p>	<p>Retain as notified.</p>
SETZ – R8	Oppose	<p>This rule is unnecessary.</p>	<p>Delete.</p>

SETZ – R9	Oppose in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R1-3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R1-3 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R10	Oppose in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R1-3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R1-3 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R11	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R12	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R13	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2

			does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R14	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R15	Oppose in part	Not all prospecting or exploration is required to have a permit from NZPAM e.g. some minerals are privately owned. Amend accordingly.  We believe the rule is also too restrictive.	Amend point 1 as follows:  <i>This is authorised under a prospecting or exploration permit from NZPAM <u>where legally required</u>;</i>  Delete point 3 or extend the timeframe until a period after cessation of mining activity.
SETZ – R17	Support in part	This rule is too restrictive. Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 does not preclude the application of this rule.  Delete point 1.
SETZ – R18	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.

SETZ – R19	Support in part	This rule is restrictive. Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards for Rule SETZ – R2 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R20	Support in part	This rule is restrictive. Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards Rule SETZ – R1 and R2 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards Rule SETZ – R1 and R2 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SETZ – R21	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
SETZ – R22	Oppose in part	We believe the rule is too restrictive.	Delete points 1-3.
SETZ – R23	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
SETZ – R24	Oppose in part	Remove reference to relocated buildings. Include advice note that pre-existing non-compliance with the standards does not mean the rule does not apply.	Remove reference to relocated buildings. Add advice note.
SETZ – R25	Oppose in part	We believe the rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1 altogether. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
SETZ – R26	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
SETZ – R27	Oppose in part	We believe the rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1 altogether.

			Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
SETZ – R28	Oppose	This rule is not appropriate.	Delete.

### **FUZ - Future Urban Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
FUZ – O1-O4	Support	We support the objectives.	Retain as notified.
FUZ – P1-P5	Support	We support the policies.	Retain as notified.
FUZ – R1	Support in part	Pre-existing non-compliance should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule in advice note.  The escalation of non-compliance is too severe.	Add an advice note explaining that pre-existing non-compliance should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.  Activity status when compliance not achieved should be Controlled Activities.
FUZ – R2	Support in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with noted performance standards should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with noted performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R3	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of residential activities.
FUZ – R4	Oppose in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with noted performance standards should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with noted performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R5	Support	We support the rule.	Retain as notified.
FUZ – R6	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.



FUZ – R7	Oppose in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with noted performance standards should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with noted performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R8	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission). Pre-existing non-compliance with noted performance standards should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Amend so that existing non-compliance with noted performance standards does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R9	Oppose in part	Not all prospecting or exploration is required to have a permit from NZPAM e.g. some minerals are privately owned. Amend accordingly.  We believe the rule is also too restrictive.	Amend point 1 as follows:  <i>This is authorised under a prospecting or exploration permit from NZPAM <u>where legally required</u>;</i>  Delete point 3 or extend the timeframe until a period after cessation of mining activity.
FUZ – R10	Support in part	We support the rule in principle but believe a stronger definition of Structure Plan is necessary that ensure robust community consultation.	Amend the rule to give a clearer idea of what a Structure Plan is and to ensure that its formulation involves community consultation.
FUZ – R11	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.
FUZ – R12	Support in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 does not preclude the application of this rule.

FUZ – R13	Support in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R14	Support in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R15	Support in part	We support the rule in principle though point a. and b. do not provide sufficient certainty.	Provide advice note on how points a. and b. would be assessed.
FUZ – R16	Support in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R17	Support in part	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule FUZ – R1 and R3 does not preclude the application of this rule.
FUZ – R18	Oppose in part	Remove reference to relocated buildings. The rule is too restrictive in its application.	Remove reference to relocated buildings. Delete point 1. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.
FUZ – R19	Oppose in part	The rule is too restrictive in its application.	Delete point 1. Amend “Non-complying” to “N/A” under “Activity status where compliance not achieved”.

FUZ – R20-R24	Oppose	These rules are not appropriate. The rules are too restrictive in its application.	Delete.
---------------	--------	--	---------

### **MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Mineral Extraction Zone Overview	Support in part	We support the overview in part though note that authorisation regarding some effects of activities in the proposed MINZ derived from existing use rights.	Add a 4 <sup>th</sup> point to include “existing use rights”.
Mineral Extraction Zone	Support in part	We support that Section 1 SO 15488 and Section 50 Blk IX Oparara SD have been classed as MINZ.	Retain zoning as noted.
Mineral Extraction Zone	Oppose in part	We oppose that Lot 1 DP 483059 has been zoned GRUZ. This parcel should be zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.	Amend so that Lot 1 DP 483059 is zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.
Mineral Extraction Zone	Oppose in part	We oppose that Section 2 SO 11712, Section 3 SO 11712, Lot 1 DP 315 and Pt Lot 2 DP 315 have been zoned GRUZ. These parcels should be zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.  Adjoining land is zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone. Amending the zoning as submitted is also appropriate.	Amend so that parcels owned by Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd are zoned MINZ – Mineral Extraction Zone.
MINZ – O1-O2	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – P1-P8	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.

MINZ – R1	Support in part	We support the principle of this rule. However, point two is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete point 2.
MINZ – R2	Support	We support this rule in principle.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – R3	Support in part	We support the principle of this rule. However, point two is unnecessarily restrictive.  Existing non-compliance with the points noted should be recognised as being acceptable.	Delete point 2.  Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 2 and 3 does not preclude the application of this rule.
MINZ – R4	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – R5	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – R6	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – R7	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – R8	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – R9	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
MINZ – R10	Oppose	We oppose this rule.	Delete.

### **SVZ - Scenic Visitor Zone**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
SVZ – O1-O2	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
SVZ – P1-P3	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
SVZ – P4	Support in part	Staff/worker accommodation needs to be better recognised in the policy.	Amend to:  <i>Support the development of appropriate tourism and visitor businesses such as <u>visitor accommodation</u>, visitor</i>

			<i>attractions, worker accommodation and tourism support facilities that relate to the scenic environment in which they are located.</i>
SVZ – P5-7	Support	We support these policies.	Retain as notified.
SVZ – R1	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but do not support that the rule requires compliance with NOISE – R3 (objected to elsewhere the submission).  Aspects of this rule are far too onerous particularly those relating to external storage and waste management space and colour specifications.	Delete SVZ – R1 2. or, if compliance not achieved, this should default to a RDA not a DA.  Delete SVZ – R1 4.  Point 8 should be amended to accommodate projection beyond the recession plane building envelope if this is due to satisfying natural hazard related provisions.  Delete advice note regarding NOISE – R3 requirements.  Non-compliance should be lead to a Controlled Activity.
SVZ – R2-R3	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.
SVZ – R4	Oppose	This rule is unnecessary.	Delete.
SVZ – R5	Support	Pre-existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule SVZ – R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with performance standards in Rule SVZ – R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
SVZ – R6-R7	Support	We support these rules.	Retain as notified.

SVZ – R9	Oppose	We do not support this rule.	Delete.
----------	--------	------------------------------	---------

## DEVELOPMENT AREAS

### DESIGNATIONS

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
Waka Kotahi - New Zealand Transport Agency Designations	Support in part	We believe that these designations should not extend beyond the legal road boundary.	Amend where the designations extend beyond legal road boundary.

## PART 4 – APPENDICES

### SCHEDULES

#### Schedule Four: Significant Natural Areas

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons	Decision Sought
Schedule Four: Significant Natural Areas	Support in part	We support that areas of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna habitat will be identified through the resource consent process until such time as district wide identification and mapping of significant natural areas is undertaken in an appropriate and consultative way and that a full, formal Plan Change process occurs after that time.	Support in part

		We believe that a June 2027 deadline is too ambitious to undertake the work in a way that sufficiently involves landowners.	
--	--	---	--

#### **Schedule Five: Outstanding Natural Landscapes**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Schedule Five: Outstanding Natural Landscapes	Support in part	We support that Lot 1 DP 17338 (8677 State Highway 6) and Sections 36, 37 and 45 Blk V Waitakere SD are not included in the Schedule.	Listed parcels to remain excluded.

#### **Schedule Nine: Lawfully Established Mineral Extraction and Processing Areas**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Schedule Nine: Lawfully Established Mineral Extraction and Processing Areas	Support in part	We support that the Karamea Lime Quarry is listed in the schedule.	Retain Schedule as notified
Schedule Nine: Lawfully Established Mineral Extraction and Processing Areas	Oppose in part	We believe that the limestone quarry at Kowhitirangi should be listed in the schedule.	Amend Schedule to include Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd Limestone Quarry.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
Transport Performance Standards	Oppose in part	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex. There also appear to be potential errors in the table. The qualifiers are not consistent, and this makes the table difficult to use.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.

### Appendix Two: Recession Planes

Plan Provision	Support/Oppose	Reasons for the Submission	Decision Sought
Recession Plane Diagram B	Oppose in part	The Recession Plan Indicator (Diagram B) is too restrictive.	Amend the Recession Plane Indicator to match that shown in the Operative Buller District Plan.
New additional Recession Plane Diagram C	-	A more enabling Recession Plane Diagram should be included that applies when ground levels and/or building heights are required by natural hazard rules.	Add a new Recession Plane Diagram that is more enabling for those seeking to satisfy requirements related to natural hazard mitigation.
Rules related to Recession Planes	Oppose in part	If a more enabling Recession Plane Diagram as noted directly above is not adopted, then building envelopes defined by recession planes need to be changed to be more accommodating for buildings that will breach them due to meeting ground levels and/or building heights required by natural hazard rules.	Amend rules that relate to building envelopes defined by recession planes if a new Recession Plane Diagram is not adopted as noted immediately above.



### **Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support	We support the plan requirements.	Retain as notified.

### **Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Westport Airport Approach Paths Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive. The restrictions associated with it are far too extensive as no surface is specified.	Amend Westport Airport Approach Paths Overlay to be the same as provisions and extent as in the operative Buller District Plan.

## **OVERLAYS**

### **Rifle Range Protection Area**

<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Support/Oppose</b>	<b>Reasons for the Submission</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>
Rifle Range Protection Area	Support	Rifle shooting is an accepted recreational past time in New Zealand, whether it be hunting or target shooting on a range. The range contributes to the wellbeing of the community through its recreational use and the way that it supports an outdoor lifestyle (of which hunting and shooting is often an integral part) that is	Retain as notified.

		important to those who live in Buller and for attracting others to live here.	
New rules for OSZ	-	GRUZ – R2, GRUZ – R3, GRUZ – R4, GRUZ – R5, GRUZ – R6, GRUZ – R23 and GRUZ – R33 are all rules that relate to the Rifle Range Protection Area. We support these. In the case of the Westport Rifle Range, part of the Rifle Range Protection Area is zoned Open Space Zone and these rules are not duplicated appropriately for this zone. We request that these rules are duplicated. For clarity, it is particularly important that GRUZ – R2 2. is replicated within OSZ – R2 with the aforementioned deletion of ‘Target’ (i.e. “within the Rifle Range Protection Areas, Recreation Activities are restricted to Recreational Firearms Shooting”).	Created rules as noted.