



## Plan Sections: **APPENDICES**

**Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards**

**Appendix Two: Recession Planes**

**Appendix Three: Design Guidelines**

**Appendix Four: Accidental Discovery Protocols**

**Appendix Five: Statutory Acknowledgements**

**Appendix Six: Nohoanga Entitlements**

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

**Appendix Eight: Community Living Precinct Concept Plans**

**Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay**

**Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin**

This is a summary of decisions requested in submissions made on the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan. Note that this document may only contain a subset of decisions requested. Summaries of all decisions requested and details on how to make a further submission are available at [www.ttpn.nz](http://www.ttpn.nz)

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.845	PART 4 - APPENDICES	PART 4 - APPENDICES	Not Stated	It is recommended that the Transport Standards be included within this chapter rather than as an in Appendix One of the Plan. This would ensure that the Proposed Plan is consistent with the outcomes sought by the National Planning Standards. The Transport Standards should also be amended to ensure that vehicle designs based on use are appropriately included for both local roads and the state highway.	It is recommended that the Transport Standards be included within this chapter rather than as an in Appendix One of the Plan. This would ensure that the Proposed Plan is consistent with the outcomes sought by the National Planning Standards. The Transport Standards should also be amended to ensure that vehicle designs based on use are appropriately included for both local roads and the state highway.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.634	Appendices	Appendices	Support	Due to time constraints, with the exception of Recession Planes and Transport Performance Standards discussed in the Transport Chapter, Council staff have not reviewed all the Appendices in detail but generally support these.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.058	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Oppose in part	Transport Performance Standards are too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.333	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Not Stated		It is recommended that the Transport Standards be included within this chapter rather than as an in Appendix One of the Plan. This would ensure that the Proposed Plan is consistent with the outcomes sought by the National Planning Standards. The Transport Standards should also be amended to ensure that vehicle designs based on use are appropriately included for both local roads and the state highway. Alternatively, appropriate reference to Waka Kotahi standards when there is a new access or a change of land use utilising an existing access on the state highway network.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.336	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	A new standard should be included that states that any new or relocated vehicle crossing requires the approval of Waka Kotahi. This would be a similar standard to TRN-S1 that requires KiwiRail approval.	Include new Transport Standard for state highway vehicle crossings requiring the approval of Waka Kotahi.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.337	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	The standards do not currently provide for any vehicle crossing designs for either the state highway or local roading network. There is concern that this could cause confusion or poor vehicle crossing design outcomes within the roading network. Waka Kotahi generally requires that within the rural zone with speed limits of 70km/h or greater than either the Diagram C or Diagram E	Include a new standard to require either vehicle crossing design or refer to Waka Kotahi guidelines for vehicle crossings onto the state highway.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					vehicle crossings be required, which are sufficient for 0-30 or 30-100 vehicle movements per day, respectively. It is recommended that either these vehicle crossing designs be included or have the standard refer to Waka Kotahi vehicle crossing design guidelines for vehicle crossings onto the state highway.	
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.160	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.088	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Oppose in part	<p>Council has some concerns with the Transport Performance Standards as discussed below: TRN Figure 1 and TRN Table 1 - distance 'y' is defined in the table but not shown on Figure 1. Council suggests that distance 'y' should be from the middle of the driveway/accessway to the centerline of the nearest traffic lane on the intersection.</p> <p>TRN Table 4 and Table 5 - The first heading in the tables should refer to the fact that it is vehicle spaces that is the qualifying factor.</p> <p>TRN S7 - re-formatting of the last 3 bullet points is required as they appear to be a subset of the one immediately above.</p> <p>TRN S12 - the requirements for parking, loading and standing spaces in the Rural Zones/Future Urban Zones and Residential Zones appear to be around the wrong way. Council does not consider that rural zone parking</p>	<p>&lt;p&gt;Amend the Transport Performance Standards as follows:</p> <p>TRN Figure 1 - show distance 'y' on the figure. TRN Table 4 and 5 - amend the first heading of the tables to read: 'Total number of <b>vehicle</b> spaces provided'</p> <p>TRN S7 - re-format the last 3 bullet points.</p> <p>TRN S12 - amend the table as follows: All RURZ - Rural Zones and FUZ - Future Urban Zones , For sites with four or more vehicle parking/loading/standing spaces, the surface must be <b>metaled, formed, sealed</b></p> <p>&lt;p&gt;All RESZ - Residential Zones and MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone , For sites with four or more vehicle parking/loading/standing spaces, the surface must be <b>metaled-formed, sealed, marked</b> and drained to an all-weather standards, with a maximum gradient of 1:20.</p> <p>All CMUZ - Commercial and Mixed Use, INZ - Industrial, OSRZ - Open Space and Recreation, AIRPZ - Airport, HOSZ - Hospital, STADZ - Stadium and PORTZ - Port Zones , For sites with <b>less more</b> than four on-site vehicle parking/loading/standing</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>areas need to be necessarily sealed but would consider this applicable for residential zones. There is also an error in the table relating to Commercial, Mixed Use Zones etc where the reference to 'less' needs to be changed to 'more'. Table TRN 6 - Council considers that the threshold table for high trip generating activities is excessive for some activities and there are concerns that this could result in traffic generation that may compromise the safe and efficient operation of the transport network if not managed accordingly. Council's preference is that the specified activities are scaled back and that the threshold limit of 60 vehicle movements per day is used as this is what is in the current BDP and has proven a reliable trigger limit.</p> <p>Council also seeks the inclusion of statement which sets down the equivalent car movements in order for the number of vehicle movements to be determined when heavy vehicle movements are involved.</p> <p>As a general comment, Council notes that there are trip generation limits incorporated into the performance standards across the Plan e.g. Home Business, Community Facilities and Mining Activities in the Rural Zone all have vehicle movement limits. There is a need to review any trip generating standards in other chapters to ensure consistency with the Transport Performance Standards. TRN S14 -</p>	<p>spaces the surface must be formed....  Table TRN 6 - Amend the table as follows:  <del>High Trip Generation Activities - Activity, Qualifier</del>  <del>Childcare including preschool, kindergarten and play centre 25 Children</del>  <del>Education - Schools 30 students</del>  <del>Education - Tertiary 150 FTE students</del>  5,000m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area Mining and Quarrying , &gt;30 heavy vehicle movements per day  Warehousing and distribution 6,500m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area  Healthcare 300m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area  Office 2,000m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area  Retail - shops and supermarkets 250m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area  Retail - large format and bulk goods 500m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area  Service Stations 2 filling pumps  Mixed use or other activities not otherwise listed in this Table 60 vehicle movements per day  <b>Commercial</b>  , 200m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area 1 car trip (to or from the property) = 2 equivalent car movements 1 truck trip (to or from the property) = 6 equivalent car movements 1 truck and trailer trip (to or from the property) = 10 equivalent car movements  TRN S14 - Delete.</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Council requests that the High Trip Generating Activities Transport Assessment requirements are deleted as these are not expressed in the form of standards but as discretionary considerations. Council has suggested that these matters form the basis of the restricted discretionary matters for Rule 12.	
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.709	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.721	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Oppose	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.167	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex, also appear to be potential table.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.176	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.709	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.721	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Oppose	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.078	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Oppose	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.735	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.709	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.721	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Oppose	These unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.140	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.
WMS Group (HQ) Limited and WMS Land Co. Limited (S599)	S599.158	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	Support the 'Mining and Quarrying' High Trip Generating Activities being triggered by >30 heavy vmpd	Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.848	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	A new standard should be included that states that any new or relocated vehicle crossing requires the prior approval of Council. A Works Permit Approval is required to be obtained from Council's Engineering Department prior to work being undertaken in the road corridor. This would be a similar standard to TRN-S1 that requires KiwiRail approval.	Include new Transport Standard for local road vehicle crossings requiring the approval of Councils Engineering Department.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.849	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	The standards do not currently provide for any vehicle crossing designs for either the local roading network or state highways.  This has the potential to cause ad hoc and poor vehicle crossing design outcomes within the roading network. For consistency it is recommended that the vehicle crossing designs for State	Include a new standard to require either vehicle crossing design or refer to Grey District Council guidelines for vehicle crossings.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Highways be adopted for both local and state highway roads. These are located in the NZTA Planning Policy Manual, Appendix 5B - Access standards and guidelines.	
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.235	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	The qualifiers are not consistent, and this makes the table difficult to use.	Amend to be more consistent and correct errors.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.235	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	The qualifiers are not consistent, and this makes the table difficult to use.	Amend to be more consistent and correct errors.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.043	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	Public safety at level crossings is crucial, and protection of sight lines is a key means of ensuring this. KiwiRail therefore support the inclusion of a standard for sight triangles for railway level crossings. This standard would support policy TRN-P3 and TRN-P4 to maximise road user safety and provide for the safe and effective use of the functioning of the transport network. In order to protect sight lines at level crossings, a new rule is proposed. Compliance with the standard would provide for development as a permitted activity, with non-compliance requiring a restricted discretionary activity consent, with discretion restricted to the aspects provided in TRN-P3. KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of the full suite of sight lines at railway level crossings provisions as outlined in our relief sought.	Insert as follows: <b>TRN - RX : Sight lines at railway level crossings All zones Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with TRN-SX. TRN - RX : Sight lines at railway level crossings not meeting Permitted Activity Standards All zones Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: 1. Compliance is not achieved with TRN-SX. Discretion is restricted to: a. The potential for adverse effects on the safety an efficiency of the rail network. Section 88 information requirements for applications: 1. Applications under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, evidence of engagement with KiwiRail TRN - S(X): Level Crossing Sight Triangles Buildings, structures, planting or other visual obstructions must not be located within the restart or approach sightline areas of railway level crossings as shown in the shaded areas of Figure 1 - TRN: Restart Sightlines and Figure 2 - TRN: Approach Sightlines below. Figure 1: Approach Sight Triangles for Level Crossings with "Stop" or "Give Way" Signs [See original submission for requested diagram] Figure 2: Restart Sight</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<b>Triangles for all Level Crossings</b> [See original submission for requested diagram]
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.334	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Support	The vehicle access standards for the state highway regarding sight distance, vehicle access separation from intersections, and minimum spacing between vehicle accesses is generally consistent with the Waka Kotahi standards in the NZTA Planning Policy Manual - Appendix 5b.	Retain as proposed.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.233	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	Unnecessarily restrictive and complex	Amend to be less onerous
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.234	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	There also appear to be potential errors in the table	Amend to correct errors
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.233	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	Unnecessarily restrictive and complex	Amend to be less onerous
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.234	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	There also appear to be potential errors in the table	Amend to correct errors
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.846	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 2	Support	The vehicle access standard for vehicle access onto a local road, arterial or collector road in regard to sight distance, vehicle access points is supported	Retain as proposed
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.335	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 3	Support in part	The intent of the design standard is generally supported. However, it does not appear to align with the Waka Kotahi standards for a local road vehicle crossing from a state highway intersection as identified in the NZTA Policy Planning Manual - Appendix 5b (Table App5B/3). The Waka Kotahi	Amend the table or add a new table to recognise the local road accessway separations from a state highway.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					standard is based off posted speed limits rather than zones. For posted speeds of 50/60km/h, 70/80km/h, and 90/100km/h the local road accessway separation from an intersection should be 20m, 45m and 60m, respectively.	
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.847	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 3	Support in part	Table 3 does not appear to align with the Grey District Council Standards for a local road vehicle crossing from a state highway intersection as identified in the NZTA Policy Planning Manual - Appendix 5b (Table App5B/3)	Amend the table or add a new table to recognise the local road accessway separation from state highway.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.042	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS1	Support	KiwiRail support the requirement for vehicle crossings to be setback a minimum of 30m from a railway level crossing as specified in clause TRN-S1. KiwiRail further support the requirement for KiwiRail approval for all new vehicle access points that intersect the rail corridor.	Retain as proposed
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.850	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS2	Support	Support the inclusion of this standard.	Retain as proposed.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.012	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS3	Oppose in part	Fire and Emergency oppose in part the minimum driveway width of 3m with a preference for minimum driveway width to be 3.5m to sufficiently cater for the fire appliance.	Amendment sought: For all zones the minimum driveway width is <del>3m</del> <b>3.5m</b> , and maximum gradient is 1:5.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.013	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS3	Amend	Vehicular roading and access widths, surface and gradients should support the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency appliances. Fire and Emergency supports the amendment TRAN-S3 to the extent that it requires vehicle access standards that help ensure access design is a minimum width of 4m, and a maximum gradient of 1:5.	New rule sought: TRAN-S15 - Firefighting access

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					However, Fire and Emergency vehicles have a maximum hose run distance of 75m. To effectively respond to a fire, it is vital that Fire and Emergency can access all parts of a building within the 75m hose run distance. As such, Fire and Emergency seek a new rule to apply to any access to a site that has a greater length than 50 metres, providing a distance of 25 metres that will allow the hose run to reach the entirety of buildings located onsite.	
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.851	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS3	Support	In General support of this standard.	Retain as proposed.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.338	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNFigure 1	Support	The sight line calculations appear to be consistent with the Safe Intersection Sight Distances approach which is used by Waka Kotahi in the NZTA Planning Policy Manual - Appendix 5b.	Retain as proposed.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S456)	S456.012	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS6	Support in part	<p>The Ministry acknowledges that Education Facilities can result in high volumes of traffic, however the qualifiers specified in Table TRN-6 are low comparatively.</p> <p>The Ministry supports the inclusion of education facilities within TRN-6 however requests that the qualifiers are raised, particularly given the number of students is not an accurate reflection of traffic movements.</p> <p>The qualifiers proposed are consistent with other District Plans within Te Waipounamu.</p>	<p>&lt;p&gt;The Ministry requests that the qualifier for 'Education - Schools' is increased. Based on the data included in the Waka Kotahi 'Research Report 453 Trips and parking related to land use', 30 students would only result in 96 daily and 42 peak hour vehicle trips. The aforementioned traffic movements are based on the presumption that every pupil is driven to school in a vehicle carrying one student only. In reality, schools are often accessible by various transport modes including bicycle, bus, and walking. This combined with multiple students travelling in the same vehicle further reduces the traffic movements. As such, the Ministry requests that the qualifier for 'Education - Schools' is 100 students.</p> <p>&lt;p&gt;</p> <p>Amend as follows: Activity, Qualifier</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>Childcare including preschool, kindergarten and play centre, 25 children</p> <p>Education - Schools, <del>30 students</del> <b>100 students</b></p> <p>Education - Tertiary, 150 FTE students</p> <p>Industrial , 5,000m2 Gross Floor Area</p> <p>Mining and Quarrying, &gt;30 heavy vehicle movements per day</p> <p>Warehousing and distribution , 6,500m2 Gross Floor Area</p> <p>Healthcare, 300m2 Gross Floor Area</p> <p>Office, 2,000m2 Gross Floor Area</p> <p>Residential , 20 residential sites / units</p> <p>Retail - Shops and supermarkets, 250m2 Gross Floor Area</p> <p>Retail - Large Format and Bulk Goods, 500m2 Gross Floor Area</p> <p>Service Stations, 2 filling pumps</p> <p>Mixed use or other activities not otherwise listed in this Table, 60 vehicle movements</p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.339	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS10	Support	The standard is supported as it requires minimum onsite manoeuvring provision where a site is accessed from a state highway.	Retain as proposed.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.340	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TableTRN6	Support in part	<p>Generally the use of the table is supported, and provides guidance to determine when an activity qualifies as a high trip generating activity. However, the table does not include drive-thrus, which are very high trip generating activities, and may be below 250m2. The threshold for mining and quarrying is very high, at 30 heavy vehicle movements per day.</p> <p>In addition, in terms of traffic effects, there is a considerable difference between heavy vehicle movements and light vehicle movements. The generic</p>	<p>Amend the table to include drive-thrus (any drive thru should be considered a high trip generator);</p> <p>Amend the final line of the table to:</p> <p>Mixed use or other activities not otherwise listed in this Table, <del>630 vehicle</del> <b>equivalent car</b> movements per day</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					60 vehicle movements per day does not distinguish between them. It is considered appropriate for the trigger to be 30 equivalent car movements per day (where a truck and trailer unit is 5 equivalent car movements and a nonarticulated truck is 3 equivalent car movements).	
David Moore (S65)	S65.055	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend		Expand and(Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards) to explicitly consider the cumulative effects of heavy mineral concentrate truck movements (or any other extraction-associated large bulk carrier vehicle movements) from mine site to port in relation to cumulative mining truck movements all the way to the port and the potential effects on businesses and communities en route.
SOPHIA ALLAN (S82)	S82.001	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	There can be a significant conflict between heavy transport values and other uses of the same road such as tourism. Heavy transport can impact on tourism businesses. For example the Coast Highway is one of the "great Drives of the World' according to Lonely Planet.	There should be a daily maximum volume of truck movements established, not just for each mine application but for all heavy industry transportation. This should apply not only where the activity is taking place but should take into account the cumulative effects of all mines or heavy industry trucking to and from source and destination. For example to and from Greymouth and Westport ports, quarries, mines, dairy etc The allowable movements of heavy trucks should be between 11pm and 6am (as currently for milk tankers).
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.017	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	The standard does not adequately consider cumulative effects of heavy traffic movements that could arise from Heavy mineral concentrate (HMC) mining, with multiple sites trucking HMC along the coast to no more than 2 ports (Westport and Greymouth). [refer submission for more detail]	Expand and change #3 and #4 in TRNS14 to explicitly consider the cumulative effects of heavy mineral concentrate truck movements (or any other extraction-associated large bulk carrier vehicle movements) from mine site to port in relation to cumulative mining truck movements all the way to the port and the potential effects on businesses and communities en route.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jan Fraser (S129)	S129.004	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	<p>TRN S14 #3 States "consideration of cumulative effects with other activities in the vicinity". This needs to be changed to reflect the potentially high impact of heavy mineral concentrate trucking from multiple sites along the coast to no more than 2 ports (Westport and Greymouth). Thus the consideration of cumulative effects needs to be in relation to the entire length of the specified journey from mine to port. It should also consider all HMC truck movements from existing mining consents, including the potential impact of several HMC trucking operations converging at the port. The impact of HMC transport movements on established businesses along the routes from mine to port should be considered as not less than minor effects requiring the notification of affected businesses along the route and their submissions taken into account in making consenting decisions. [e.g. the effects of HMC trucks on tourist and hospitality businesses in and around Punakaiki from the proposed sand mining site on the Barrytown Flats].</p> <p>TRN S14 #4 States "Whether there are any effects from the anticipated trip generation and how they are to be mitigated where activities will generate more than 250hvm/d." The provision for 250 hvm/d is arbitrary and excessive. This provision needs to be removed and replaced with an explicit</p>	Expand and change #3 and #4 in TRNS14 (Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards) to explicitly consider the cumulative effects of heavy mineral concentrate truck movements (or any other extraction-associated large bulk carrier vehicle movements) from mine site to port in relation to cumulative mining truck movements all the way to the port and the potential effects on businesses and communities en route.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					process that evaluates the impact of the proposed additional trucking on existing businesses and communities where effects associated with the activity are likely to be at least minor along the entire route from mine to port in relation to existing vehicle movements and resulting traffic increases and associated issues with noise, dust and amenity values.	
Lindy Mason (S355)	S355.007	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	This road and the points of convergence at ports are geographically constrained. There are few passing bays available, houses are by necessity often close to the road, there is not a cycle trail or similar alternative route to separate heavy traffic from bicycle and horse road users. Stock is sometimes moved by road, and all such uses need to be given consideration before allowing articulated sand trucks to proliferate.	points 3 and 4 to explicitly address cumulative transport movements from extraction site to port and effect on businesses and communities on entire route
Dean Mason (S356)	S356.003	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	Currently rules deal with individual activities but don't recognize multiple small industrial activities will have a combined effect on reading infrastructure, natural amenity and ability of residents to exercise their right to peaceful enjoyment of their homes and environment	amend TRNS14 to acknowledge and mitigate cumulative effects of transport movements.
Trevor Hayes (S377)	S377.013	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	The standard does not sufficiently recognise cumulative effects of truck movements TRN S14 #3 States "consideration of cumulative effects with other activities in the vicinity". This needs to be changed to reflect the potentially high impact of heavy mineral concentrate	Decision sought: Expand and change #3 and #4 in TRNS14 (Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards) to explicitly consider the cumulative effects of t extraction-associated large bulk carrier vehicle movements from mine site to port in relation to cumulative mining truck movements all the way to the port and the potential effects on businesses and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					trucking from multiple sites along the coast to no more than 2 ports . Thus the consideration of cumulative effects needs to be in relation to the entire length of the specified journey from mine to port. It should also consider all HMC truck movements from existing mining consents, including the potential impact of several HMC trucking operations converging at the ports. TRN S14 #4 States "Whether there are any effects from the anticipated trip generation and how they are to be mitigated where activities will generate more than 250hvm/d." The provision for 250 hvm/d in TRN S14 #4 is arbitrary and excessive. This provision needs to be removed and replaced with an explicit process that evaluates the impact of the proposed additional trucking on existing businesses and communities where effects associated with the activity are likely to be at least minor along the entire route from mine to port in relation to existing vehicle movements and resulting traffic increases and associated issues with noise, dust and amenity values.	communities en route.
Suzanne Hills (S443)	S443.018	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	The threshold in TRN S14 #4 of 250hvm/day is arbitrary and excessive; it should be considerably lower and explicitly state that it is cumulative of all heavy vehicle movements.	Reduce the number of heavy vehicle movements/day provided for in this standard. Explicitly identify in the standard that this is cumulative of all heavy vehicle movements on the road.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.341	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Support in part	aka Kotahi supports the criteria set out here for assessing high trip generating activities. However, these assessment criteria should be elevated as policies. It is unclear what hvm/d means in 4. It	Elevate the assessment criteria to form a new policy for the assessment of high trip-generating activities. Clarify the meaning of hvm/d. If it refers to heavy vehicle movements per day, delete 4. as follows: 4- <del>Whether there are any effects from the anticipated</del>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					appears to only allow for mitigation of adverse effects for activities generating more than 250 heavy vehicle movements per day	<del>trip generation and how they are to be mitigated where activities will generate more than 250hvm/d.</del> 54. Whether the transport assessment...
Rocky Mining Limited (S474)	S474.024	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Support		Retain as notified
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.635	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Support in part	Council seeks the addition of a statement to the Appendix which clarifies how recession boundaries are determined with respect to site boundaries.	Add the following statement to Appendix Two: <b>The level of site boundaries shall be measured from filled ground level except where there is an existing building at a lower level on the other side of a common boundary, where that lower level shall be adopted. For the purpose of measuring recession planes only internal boundaries shall be taken as site boundaries.</b> Council also seeks that consideration is given to removing the exclusions to recession planes e.g. road boundaries, antennas, solar panels etc from the respective zone rules to sit in this appendix given the commonality to all zones.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.710	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	The Recession Plan Indicator (Diagram B) is too restrictive.	Amend the Recession Plane Indicator to match that shown in the Operative Buller District Plan.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.711	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	New additional Diagram, applies when 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.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.710	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	The Recession Plan Indicator (Diagram B) is too restrictive.	Amend the Recession Plane Indicator to match that shown in the Operative Buller District Plan.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.711	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	New additional Diagram, applies when 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.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.736	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	The Recession Plan Indicator (Diagram B) is too restrictive.	Amend the Recession Plane Indicator to match that shown in the Operative Buller District Plan.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.737	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	New additional Diagram, applies when 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.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.710	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	The Recession Plan Indicator (Diagram B) is too restrictive.	Amend the Recession Plane Indicator to match that shown in the Operative Buller District Plan.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.711	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Amend	New additional Diagram, applies when 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.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.1264	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Appendix Two: Recession Planes	Support in part	For additional clarity around recession planes add diagrams to the schedule	Add recession plane diagrams to the schedule similar to diagrams in CCC District Plan
Jan and Heward (S353)	S353.002	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Amend	<p>If this rule was in place prior to Mitre 10 being here, would the colour of their building be allowed under this plan? If a Bunnings now wanted to come to the Coast, would they be allowed under this plan? Would Mitre10 have reason to object and hold up or stop the development altogether due to the colour of their building.</p> <p>I can see where you are coming from to control some colours. The new Westland High School Hall and office with its black, bright green and blue cladding is a shocker, However, this is just my opinion. Nobody should be told that they need permission to use a certain colour regardless of how it may look to others.</p>	To limit the colour range of buildings should be removed altogether.
Richard Arlidge (S419)	S419.006	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Amend	The traditional heritage palette is a reflection of the limits of the colour palette of the last century and seeks to	Develop a Tai o Poutini/West Coast indigenous colour palette could be developed from colours within the natural environment and landscape. These could

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					limit us to the resources discovered up to the 1920's. The more we have dug and mined the more minerals and colours we have discovered. The original colours were very limited and like all technology has evolved over time. The colonial era had typically two-toned colour schemes and often attempted to imitate stone. On the West Coast rusted corrugated iron is one of the most common vernacular of the human landscape and should be celebrated. In dryer parts of the country corrugated Iron remains silver but on the West Coast rust rules.	include:  Whites:• Southern alps snow white• Clematis• Glacier blue-white - blue ice• Kotuku (White heron) Reds:• Rust • Lichen• Kākā beak flower• Sunset red• Torea (Oystercatcher) Beak• Tarapunga (Red billed gull) red• Kanono berry red• Karamu berry red• Nikau flower red Oranges:• Porokaiwhiri (Pigeonwood) seed orange • Sunset orange Blues:• Distant mountain blue • Clear sky sunny day blue • Poroporo flower dark blue Greens:• Every shade of green as observed in the natural landscape Greys:• Every shade of cloud from off white through grey to matt black. • Heron grey Yellows:• Gorse flower gold• Gold nugget• Sunset gold Browns:• Mawhera river in full flood• Dead punga leaf brown Blacks:• Shag black• Torea (Oyster catcher) black• Tāiko (Westland Petrel) black• Tui black with white hints• Makomako (Wineberry) berry black
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.003	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Amend	These guidelines do not recognise the functional and operational need of supermarkets to locate in townships. The guidelines also do not explicitly recognise the alternative urban design methods, as outlined in the submission, that achieve quality design outcomes and should. Foodstuffs supermarkets are also already established on the West Coast.	That supermarkets be exempt from the Town Centre Design Guidelines
The Proprietors of Mawhera Tiamana Mawhera Incorporation (S621)	S621.032	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Oppose	2.1 Context. Oppose Paragraphs 1, 2, & 4. 2.2 Guidelines: Oppose Paragraphs IW1, IW2, IW5, IW6, & IW7.	delete
Kirsty Dittmer (S412)	S412.001	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Greymouth/Māwhera Town Centre and Mixed Use	Amend	I disagree with some of the statements introducing the guidelines. The historic buildings that are left should be protected but I don't think they should	Amend the designation guidelines as follow: 2.1 Context - <del>"The core of Greymouth / Māwhera's town centre retains a coherent collection of nineteenth and early twentieth century buildings and</del>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
			Zone Urban Design Guidelines		<p>dictate future development or design in the CBD.</p> <p>Some aspects of the guidelines are unclear eg GC1, IW6, GF6</p> <p>Re GC2 - While views are important and a crucial part of design, this could conflict with other design decisions being made in a new building when the view of a neighbouring building is not as important for the new building owner as other parts of the design.</p> <p>Re BF1 - the division of the lower floor of larger buildings should be determined by the owner/potential tenant. Why specify that the ground floor needs to split up into smaller storefronts. This limits the options for owners.</p> <p>Re BF4 - Two storey buildings should not be the expected. It is very difficult to get tenants for upstairs tenancies and most greymouth upstairs spaces are empty. The general attitude from GDC from what has been put out to the public for years now that greymouth is shrinking and that the CBD needs to be more compact.</p> <p>Re GF1 - Why let the past dictate that future design needs to be symmetrical?</p> <p>Re GF2 - I Disagree. Solid glazing size will be dictated by the material properties of glass anyway. Lots of building use opaque films over glazing so they can use the ground floor as office spaces.</p> <p>GF3 - It is not always the best option for the whole shop frontage of buildings to be display space. Maybe this is feasible for Mackay St but not for the whole</p>	<p><del>architecture/building methods of this period. This represents an important part of the historic heritage resource of the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini."</del></p> <p><b>GC1 - New buildings/structures on neighbouring properties shall complement and support, rather than dominate these scheduled buildings and structures.</b></p> <p><b>GC2 - Take into account the wider surroundings, including natural features, such as views to other buildings, the mountains and the Māwhera/Grey River.</b></p> <p><b>IW6 - When a cultural narrative is being expressed</b></p> <p>Poutini Ngāi Tahu narratives are creatively reinscribed through architectural design and building, integrated artwork and Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae mandated design professionals and artists are appropriately engaged in such processes.</p> <p><del>BF1 - Where very wide buildings are proposed, their bulk and width shall be reduced by dividing the façade up by vertical divisions into several smaller "storefronts" - something commonly used in the existing Greymouth/Māwhera building stock.</del></p> <p><b>BF4 - New buildings should ideally be at least two storeys in height, but at a minimum, shall appear similar in height to the existing neighbouring buildings.</b></p> <p><b>GF1 - Buildings are to have windows on all street facades with minimum glazing as specified in the relevant rules. Symmetrically located windows are required above ground level, and main doors at ground level are to be oriented to the street (i.e., not at the side or the back). Entrances shall be wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs and pushchairs. Buildings that have more than one frontage (i.e., corner) are to include windows and doors on both facades if there is sufficient length of frontage. The design of side and back elevations that are visible from the street or any other public space should be consistent with the design of the main</b></p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>CBD.</p> <p>GF5 - Upper Area - disagree symmetry should be a compliance point.</p> <p>GF6 - Need allow for the camber of the road and the fact that campervans regularly hit verandahs.</p> <p>GF8 - disagree that colour should be included in district plan at all. Building designers and occupiers should be able to have freedom to paint and sign-write their building in whatever way suits their business and the overall design of the building. Bright colours should not be discouraged. The biggest criticism of Greymouth is that the main street is boring and dull. The images shown don't match with the wording. Making a set colour pallete for the town discourages creativity and charactor in the CBD. This clause directly negates the introduction where it says we want the CBD to be visually interesting.</p> <p>GL1 - Preferably new buildings are modern. The riverfront position is different now that there is a floodwall as the river connection is lost.</p>	<p>building frontage.</p> <p>GF2 - The ground floor window of buildings (including glazed doors) in Main Street Frontages must be no less than 50% of the frontage in the Town Centre Zone and on Façade Control Streets in the Mixed Use Zone must have a minimum 20% glazing. <del>On all facades, fully glazed facades will not be permitted unless there are vertical solid breaks at frequent intervals. The glazing is not to be blocked out with opaque or reflective film, or other treatment that obscures the visual connection from the outside into the building.</del></p> <p>GF3 - where the ground floor is used for offices/commercial activity in Main Street Frontage Streets, the display area immediately behind the windows should be designed as reception and waiting areas <b>where feasible</b>.</p> <p>GF5 - <i>Upper Area</i> - symmetrical placement of windows <b>is preferred</b></p> <p>GF6 - Verandahs are a requirement in Main Street Frontage Streets and Façade Control Streets and are subject to performance standards in the rules. Verandahs should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complement the building style of the building to which they are attached</li> <li>• Extend over the footpath and full width of the building frontage. <b>Allow space at edge of footpath to allow for road camber</b></li> <li>• Take cues from neighbouring verandahs in terms of height, proportion and style, whilst allowing for variation in design features</li> <li>• Be fully cantilevered with no decorative poles or obstructions of the footpath</li> <li>• <del>Not obscure windows or architectural details</del></li> </ul>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verandahs on corner buildings should wrap around the building and extend the full width of both frontages (even if only one frontage is classed as a Main Street Frontage or Façade Control Street).</li> </ul> <p>GF8 - delete clause</p> <p>GL1 - delete clause</p>
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.483	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Greymouth/Māwhera Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Amend	Imposing guidelines around colors for buildings may be construed as regulation, or a step towards regulation.	Remove all references to control of colors to be used.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.385	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Greymouth/Māwhera Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Support	Will help to bring balance to the representation of both the colonial and Ngāi Tahu history to the community.	Retain as worded particularly Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural Landscapes and section 2.2 Guidelines.
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.053	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Hokitika Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines	Amend	The precise requirements set out in the design guidelines are not readily compatible with the functional and operational need of supermarkets. Supermarkets achieve good quality design outcomes through other measures, as suggested in the proposed text.	<b>These guidelines are not intended to apply to activities such as supermarkets, which have specific functional and operational requirements. Good quality design is achieved by introducing architectural/design elements to achieve an attractive, engaging and pedestrian-scale interface with public areas. Elements may include building recesses, material/colour variation or landscaping.</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.386	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Hokitika Town Centre Urban Design Guidelines	Support	Will help to bring balance to the representation of both the colonial and Ngāi Tahu history to the community.	Retain as worded particularly context, and section 2.2 Guidelines.
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.054	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Reefton Heritage Town Design Guidelines	Amend	As above.	<b>These guidelines are not intended to apply to activities such as supermarkets, which have specific functional and operational requirements. Good quality design is achieved by introducing architectural/design elements to achieve an attractive, engaging and pedestrian-scale interface with public areas. Elements may include building recesses, material/colour variation or landscaping.</b>
Joanne and Ken Dixon (S213)	S213.002	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Westport/ Kawatiri Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Oppose	We disagree with businesses being told what colours they can apply to the exterior of their building. This is a ridiculous and over the top controlling rule and using Mitre 10 colours as an example of what not to do is crazy, they are a national franchise found in almost every town/city of New Zealand.	We disagree with businesses being told what colours they can apply to the exterior of their buildings and this should be removed from the plan.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.008	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Westport/ Kawatiri Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Oppose	building owners should be able to determine their own colour of a building.	remove colour guidelines
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.055	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Westport/ Kawatiri Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Amend	As above.	<b>These guidelines are not intended to apply to activities such as supermarkets, which have specific functional and operational requirements. Good quality design is achieved by introducing architectural/design elements to achieve an attractive, engaging and pedestrian-scale interface with public areas. Elements may include building recesses, material/colour variation or</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						landscaping.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.002	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Westport/ Kawatiri Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Oppose	We are not sure of the relevance of this statement, the building referred to is outside of the Town Centre Zone which is one of the reasons we built there,	Remove the following statement and photo from the guidelines: "This long low building shape should be avoided. This building also lacks windows and has limited design features and detail to add interest to the building. The building colours are also very out of character with other buildings in the vicinity and are part of a sign to brand the building."
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.387	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Westport/ Kawatiri Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Support	Will help to bring balance to the representation of both the colonial and Ngāi Tahu history to the community.	Retain as worded particularly Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural Landscapes and section 2.2 Guidelines.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S140)	S140.079	Appendix Four: Accidental Discovery Protocols	Appendix Four: Accidental Discovery Protocols	Support in part	HNZPT supports the principle of inclusion of an Accidental Discovery Protocol (ADP) in Appendix four, but consider the wording provided does not cover all requirements. We therefore request the wording of the HNZPT ADP be used.	HNZPT requests the wording of the HNZPTADP, attached in Appendix 3 of this submission, be used. <b>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeological Discovery Protocol</b> <b>In the event that an unidentified archaeological site is located during works, the following applies;</b> <b>1. Work shall cease immediately at that place and within 20m around the site.</b> <b>2. The contractor must shut down all machinery, secure the area, and advise the Site Manager.</b> <b>3. The Site Manager shall secure the site and notify the Heritage New Zealand Archaeologist.</b> <b>Further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.</b> <b>4 If the site is of Maori origin, the Site Manager shall notify the Heritage New Zealand Archaeologist and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative of the discovery, and ensure site access to enable appropriate cultural procedures and tikanga to be undertaken, as long as all statutory requirements under legislation are met (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, Protected Objects Act).</b> <b>5. If</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>human remains (koiwi) are uncovered, the Site Manager shall advise the Heritage New Zealand Archaeologist, NZ Police and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative and the above process under 4 shall apply. Remains are not to be moved until such time as iwi, NZ Police and Heritage New Zealand have responded.6. Works affecting the archaeological site and any human remains (koiwi) shall not resume until Heritage New Zealand gives written approval for work to continue. Further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.7. Where iwi so request, any information recorded as the result of the find such as a description of location and content, is to be provided for their records.8. Heritage New Zealand will advise if an archaeological authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 is required for works to continue. It is an offence under S87 of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 to modify or destroy an archaeological site without an authority from Heritage New Zealand irrespective of whether the works are permitted, or a consent has been issued under the Resource Management Act. Heritage New Zealand Archaeologists contact details: Frank van der Heijden Gwen Hoopmann Senior Archaeologist Archaeologist Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga 64 Gloucester Street, Christchurch 64 Gloucester Street, Christchurch PO Box 4403, Christchurch 8140 PO Box 4403, Christchurch 8140 Phone (03) 363 1884 (03) 363 1893 Email ArchaeologistCW@heritage.org.nz AsstArchaeologistCW@heritage.org.nz</p>
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga	S620.388	Appendix Four:	Appendix Four:	Amend	The plan provisions, other than SASM - P3 do not distinguish between kōiwi	Replace the notified accidental discovery protocol with wording similar to that provided in Appendix



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)		Accidental Discovery Protocols	Accidental Discovery Protocols		and taonga when an Accidental discovery protocol is required.	Seven and/or work with Poutini Ngāi Tahu on one specific for Te Tai o Poutini.
The Proprietors of Mawhera Tiamana Mawhera Incorporation (S621)	S621.033	Appendix Four: Accidental Discovery Protocols	Appendix Four: Accidental Discovery Protocols	Oppose	If Koiwi is accidentally discovered on Mawhera owned and managed lands then Mawhera Inc. will decide who is contacted	delete
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.389	Appendix Five: Statutory Acknowledgements	Appendix Five: Statutory Acknowledgements	Amend	Amend to enable the user of the plan to understand how the NTCSA fits within this plan and the provisions within the RMA.	Retain with the following amendments: Section 208 of that act requires that local authorities have regard to these statutory acknowledgements in resource consent processing under <del>sections 93 to 94C</del> <b>the notification provisions</b> of the Resource Management Act 1991 (Notification of resource consents). ..... Section 220 of the NTCS Act requires that all regional policy statements, district plans and regional plans have information recording those statutory acknowledgements for areas covered by the policy statement or plan attached to them. <del>This is for the purpose of public information only and does not form part of the policy statement or plan.</del>
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.390	Appendix Six: Nohoanga Entitlements	Appendix Six: Nohoanga Entitlements	Amend	The Nohoanga entitlement at the Pororari River is missing and should be included.	retain with the following inclusion (note we have included the table headings for clarification): <b>Waterbody: Pororari River Site: Pororari River Site Legal Description/Allocation Plan: 1 hectare, approximately, being Part Seabed. Subject to survey, as shown on Allocation Plan MN 185 (SO 15491).</b>
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.713	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support		Retain
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New	S560.408	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction	Oppose	Mineral Extraction Management Plans only feature in the BCZ chapter, in one rule. As we have sought the deletion of	Delete.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)		Management Plan Requirements	Management Plan Requirements		the BCZ, we also seek the deletion of this appendix. A management Plan is not an appropriate replacement for rules.	
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.168	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support		Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.177	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support	support the plan requirements.	Retain as notified.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.713	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.739	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.713	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.141	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management	Support	We support the plan requirements.	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Plan Requirements	Plan Requirements			
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.236	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support	support the plan requirements.	Retain as notified.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.236	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support	support the plan requirements.	Retain as notified.
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited (S493)	S493.129	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan	Amend	Requirements are presented in a confusing manner, not all matters listed may be required.	Amend: 1. ... 3. Management of Environmental Effects i. ... ii. Landscape <b>values and Amenity</b> (address all that are relevant) a. Landscape values b. Neighbouring landuses iii. Management of hazardous substances iv. Acid mine management v. Dust vi. Noise vii. Erosion and Sediment Control viii. Traffic ix. Lighting x. Archaeological and cultural values xi. Weed and pest management xii. Site rehabilitation and mine closure Appendices: Specific Management Plans (if required) 4. Key issues to be managed i. Heritage and Culture (address all that are relevant) a. Any archaeological or historic heritage values b. Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural landscape values ii. Acid Mine Drainage Management (where relevant) a. Prevention and minimisation measures b. Treatment and Control measures c. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iii. Erosion and Sediment Control a. Drawings and specifications of erosion control measures b. Sizing and location of sediment controls (eg diversions, silt fences etc) c. Management of sediment retention ponds (where relevant) d. Decommissioning of sediment control structures e. Chemical treatment programme for sediment laden water (where relevant) f. Monitoring,

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>maintenance and contingency programme iv. Waste Rock/Overburden Management a. Waste rock placement methods and procedures b. Slope stability c. Monitoring and maintenance 5. Specific Management Plans i. Hazardous Substances &amp; Spill Contingency Management Plan ii. Dust Management Plan iii. Noise Management Plan iv. Traffic Management Plan v. Lighting Management Plan vi. Fire Management Plan vii. Archaeological Management Plan viii. Annual Monitoring Plan ix. Site Rehabilitation Management Plan x. Weed and Pest Management Plan xi. Mine Closure Plan</p>
Straterra (S536)	S536.023	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan	Support	A Mineral Extraction Management Plan is required for many of the permitted and controlled activities, rather than a resource consent (if certain thresholds are met). We think this approach has merit, but the plan's requirements, as set out in Appendix Seven, duplicate the requirements of many of the other regulatory plans that are required (work and safety, transport, wildlife authorities etc.). For simplicity and to reduce compliance costs this duplication should be reduced and the requirements should only need to be provided once.	Amend the requirements so they do not duplicate other regulatory plans,
WMS Group (HQ) Limited and WMS Land Co. Limited (S599)	S599.159	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan	Amend	Requirements are presented in a confusing manner, and not all matters listed in the outline may be required for each site.	<p>Amend Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan as follows:</p> <p>1. Introduction</p> <p>...</p> <p>ii. Landscape <b>values</b> and Amenity (address all that are relevant)a. Landscape valuesb. Neighbouring landusesiii. Management of hazardous substancesiv. Acid mine management v. Dust vi. Noise vii. Erosion and Sediment Control viii. Trafficix.</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>Lightingx. — Archaeological and cultural valuesxi. — Weed and pest managementxii. — Site rehabilitation and mine closure Appendices: Specific Management Plans (if required)4. — Key issues to be managedi. — Heritage and Culture (address all that are relevant)a. — Any archaeological or historic heritage valuesb. — Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural landscape valuesii. — Acid Mine Drainage Management (where relevant)a. — Prevention and minimisation measuresb. — Treatment and Control measuresc. — Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programmeiii. Erosion and Sediment Controla. — Drawings and specifications of erosion control measuresb. — Sizing and location of sediment controls (eg diversions, silt fences etc)c. — Management of sediment retention ponds (where relevant)d. — Decommissioning of sediment control structurese. — Chemical treatment programme for sediment laden water (where relevant)f. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programmeiv. Waste Rock/Overburden Managementa. — Waste rock placement methods and proceduresb. Slope stabilityc. — Monitoring and maintenance5. — Specific Management Plans: — Hazardous Substances &amp; Spill Contingency Management Planii. — Dust Management Planiii. — Noise Management Planiv. Traffic Management Planv. — Lighting Management Planvi. — Fire Management Planvii. — Archaeological Management Planviii. — Annual Monitoring Planix. — Site Rehabilitation Management Planx. — Weed and Pest Management Planxi. — Mine Closure Plan</p>
Birchfield Coal Mines Ltd (S601)	S601.118	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction	Amend	Requirements are presented in a confusing manner, and not all matters listed in the outline may be required.	Amend Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan as follows: 1.... 3. Management of Environmental Effects i. Terrestrial Ecology (address all that are relevant) a. Native vegetation b. Native fauna c. Significant

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Plan Requirements	Management Plan			<p>natural areas d. Key species e. Key risks to be managed f. Any specific species or ecosystem management plans ii. Landscape <b>values</b> and <b>Amenity</b> (address all that are relevant) a. Landscape values b. Neighbouring landuses iii. Management of hazardous substances iv. Acid mine management v. Dust vi. Noise vii. Erosion and Sediment Control viii. Traffic ix. Lighting x. Archaeological and cultural values xi. Weed and pest management xii. Site rehabilitation and mine closure Appendices: Specific Management Plans (if required) 4. Key issues to be managed i. Heritage and Culture (address all that are relevant) a. Any archaeological or historic heritage values b. Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural landscape values ii. Acid Mine Drainage Management (where relevant) a. Prevention and minimisation measures b. Treatment and Control measures c. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iii. Erosion and Sediment Control a. Drawings and specifications of erosion control measures b. Sizing and location of sediment controls (eg diversions, silt fences etc) c. Management of sediment retention ponds (where relevant) d. Decommissioning of sediment control structures e. Chemical treatment programme for sediment laden water (where relevant) f. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iv. Waste Rock/Overburden Management a. Waste rock placement methods and procedures b. Slope stability c. Monitoring and maintenance 5. Specific Management Plans i. Hazardous Substances &amp; Spill Contingency Management Plan ii. Dust Management Plan iii. Noise Management Plan iv. Traffic Management Plan v. Lighting Management Plan vi. Fire Management Plan vii. Archaeological Management Plan viii. Annual Monitoring Plan ix. Site Rehabilitation Management Plan x. Weed and Pest Management Plan xi. Mine Closure Plan</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
BRM Developments Limited (S603)	S603.068	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan	Amend	Presented in a confusing manner, and not all matters listed in the outline may be required	Amend Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan as follows: 1. ... 3. Management of Environmental Effects i. Terrestrial Ecology (address all that are relevant) a. Native vegetation b. Native fauna c. Significant natural areas d. Key species e. Key risks to be managed f. Any specific species or ecosystem management plans ii. Landscape <b>values and Amenity</b> (address all that are relevant) a. Landscape values b. Neighbouring landuses iii. Management of hazardous substances iv. Acid mine management v. Dust vi. Noise vii. Erosion and Sediment Control viii. Traffic ix. Lighting x. Archaeological and cultural values xi. Weed and pest management xii. Site rehabilitation and mine closure Appendices: Specific Management Plans (if required) 4. Key issues to be managed i. Heritage and Culture (address all that are relevant) a. Any archaeological or historic heritage values b. Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural landscape values ii. Acid Mine Drainage Management (where relevant) a. Prevention and minimisation measures b. Treatment and Control measures c. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iii. Erosion and Sediment Control a. Drawings and specifications of erosion control measures b. Sizing and location of sediment controls (eg diversions, silt fences etc) c. Management of sediment retention ponds (where relevant) d. Decommissioning of sediment control structures e. Chemical treatment programme for sediment laden water (where relevant) f. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iv. Waste Rock/Overburden Management a. Waste rock placement methods and procedures b. Slope stability c. Monitoring and maintenance 5. Specific Management Plans i. Hazardous Substances & Spill Contingency Management Plan ii. Dust Management Plan iii. Noise Management Plan iv. Traffic Management Plan v. Lighting Management Plan vi.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Fire Management Plan vii. Archaeological Management Plan viii. Annual Monitoring Plan ix. Site Rehabilitation Management Plan x. Weed and Pest Management Plan xi. Mine Closure Plan
Birchfield Ross Mining Limited (S604)	S604.108	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan	Amend	Amendments are proposed for consistency and clarity.	Amend Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan as follows: 1. Introduction i. Statutory Approvals - status ii. Location iii. Overview of the mineral extraction operations 2. Receiving Environment (address all that are relevant) i. Climate ii. Geology iii. Hydrology - including presence of lakes, wetlands and waterways iv. Terrestrial ecology including key species v. Landscape context vi. Neighbouring land uses vii. Coastal environment 3. Management of Environmental Effects i. Terrestrial Ecology (address all that are relevant) a. Native vegetation b. Native fauna c. Significant natural areas d. Key species e. Key risks to be managed f. Any specific species or ecosystem management plans ii. Landscape values and Amenity (address all that are relevant) a. Landscape values b. Neighbouring landuses iii. Management of hazardous substances iv. Acid mine management v. Dust vi. Noise vii. Erosion and Sediment Control viii. Traffic ix. Lighting x. Archaeological and cultural values xi. Weed and pest management xii. Site rehabilitation and mine closure Appendices: Specific Management Plans (if required) 4. Key issues to be managed i. Heritage and Culture (address all that are relevant) a. Any archaeological or historic heritage values b. Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural landscape values ii. Acid Mine Drainage Management (where relevant) a. Prevention and minimisation measures b. Treatment and Control measures c. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iii. Erosion and Sediment Control a. Drawings and specifications of erosion control measures b. Sizing and location of sediment controls (eg diversions, silt fences etc) c.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Management of sediment retention ponds (where relevant) d. Decommissioning of sediment control structures e. Chemical treatment programme for sediment laden water (where relevant) f. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iv. Waste Rock/Overburden Management a. Waste rock placement methods and procedures b. Slope stability e. Monitoring and maintenance 5. Specific Management Plans i. Hazardous Substances & Spill Contingency Management Plan ii. Dust Management Plan iii. Noise Management Plan iv. Traffic Management Plan v. Lighting Management Plan vi. Fire Management Plan vii. Archaeological Management Plan viii. Annual Monitoring Plan ix. Site Rehabilitation Management Plan x. Weed and Pest Management Plan xi. Mine Closure Plan
Phoenix Minerals Limited (S606)	S606.091	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan	Oppose in part	Presented in a confusing manner, and not all matters listed in the outline may be required	Amend Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan as follows: 1. Introduction i. ... 3. Management of Environmental Effects i. Terrestrial Ecology (address all that are relevant) a. Native vegetation b. Native fauna c. Significant natural areas d. Key species e. Key risks to be managed f. Any specific species or ecosystem management plans ii. Landscape values and Amenity (address all that are relevant) a. Landscape values b. Neighbouring landuses iii. Management of hazardous substances iv. Acid mine management v. Dust vi. Noise vii. Erosion and Sediment Control viii. Traffic ix. Lighting x. Archaeological and cultural values xi. Weed and pest management xii. Site rehabilitation and mine closure Appendices: Specific Management Plans (if required) 4. Key issues to be managed i. Heritage and Culture (address all that are relevant) a. Any archaeological or historic heritage values b. Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural landscape values ii. Acid Mine Drainage Management (where relevant) a. Prevention and minimisation measures b.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Treatment and Control measures c. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iii. Erosion and Sediment Control a. Drawings and specifications of erosion control measures b. Sizing and location of sediment controls (eg diversions, silt fences etc) c. Management of sediment retention ponds (where relevant) d. Decommissioning of sediment control structures e. Chemical treatment programme for sediment laden water (where relevant) f. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iv. Waste Rock/Overburden Management a. Waste rock placement methods and procedures b. Slope stability c. Monitoring and maintenance 5. Specific Management Plans i. Hazardous Substances & Spill Contingency Management Plan ii. Dust Management Plan iii. Noise Management Plan iv. Traffic Management Plan v. Lighting Management Plan vi. Fire Management Plan vii. Archaeological Management Plan viii. Annual Monitoring Plan ix. Site Rehabilitation Management Plan x. Weed and Pest Management Plan xi. Mine Closure Plan
Whyte Gold Limited (S607)	S607.092	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan	Amend	Presented in a confusing manner, and not all matters listed in the outline may be required for each specific mineral extraction site	Amend Outline of Content Requirements for a Mineral Extraction Management Plan as follows: 1. Introduction i. ...f. Any specific species or ecosystem management plans ii. Landscape <b>values</b> and Amenity (address all that are relevant) a. Landscape values b. Neighbouring landuses iii. Management of hazardous substances iv. Acid mine management v. Dust vi. Noise vii. Erosion and Sediment Control viii. Traffic ix. Lighting x. Archaeological and cultural values xi. Weed and pest management xii. Site rehabilitation and mine closure Appendices: Specific Management Plans (if required) 4. Key issues to be managed i. Heritage and Culture (address all that are relevant) a. Any archaeological or historic heritage values b. Poutini Ngāi Tahu Cultural landscape values ii. Acid Mine Drainage Management (where

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						relevant) a. Prevention and minimisation measures b. Treatment and Control measures c. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iii. Erosion and Sediment Control a. Drawings and specifications of erosion control measures b. Sizing and location of sediment controls (eg diversions, silt fences etc) c. Management of sediment retention ponds (where relevant) d. Decommissioning of sediment control structures e. Chemical treatment programme for sediment laden water (where relevant) f. Monitoring, maintenance and contingency programme iv. Waste Rock/Overburden Management a. Waste rock placement methods and procedures b. Slope stability c. Monitoring and maintenance 5. Specific Management Plans i. Hazardous Substances & Spill Contingency Management Plan ii. Dust Management Plan iii. Noise Management Plan iv. Traffic Management Plan v. Lighting Management Plan vi. Fire Management Plan vii. Archaeological Management Plan viii. Annual Monitoring Plan ix. Site Rehabilitation Management Plan x. Weed and Pest Management Plan xi. Mine Closure Plan
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.581	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Oppose	The Westport Airport Approach Path overlay is extensive and takes in Carters Beach and a large area of rural land south of Cape Foulwind Road. Council queries whether the extent of the overlay is a mistake? The overlay has significant consequences for land use as AIRPZ R1.2 restricts the height of any building, structure or tree to 1.2m. Council considers the overlay should remain as identified in the operative BDP unless there are clear safety reasons for extending the pathway protection area.	Amend the Airport Approach Path overlay to accord with that shown in the operative BDP maps.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.715	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Amend	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.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.715	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Amend	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.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.740	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Amend	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.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.715	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Amend	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.
Kelsey Mundy (S41)	S41.001	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Westport Airport and Karamea Aerodrome	Oppose	<p>The Westport Airport approach paths extend over several kilometres over Carters Beach and Cape Foulwind, including over the built up township part of Carters Beach.</p> <p>The proposed maximum height for any building, structure or tree that extends into this path is 1.2m. There is no reason this height limit needs to be this low. There is already significant buildings/houses/sheds and habitation/trees which are much higher than 1.2m so having a maximum height of 1.2m for future buildings etc is useless when that height is dwarfed by existing structures.</p> <p>The maximum height needs to be in line with the majority of the structures already in existence to have any purpose.</p>	Remove the restriction on heights for any building, structure or tree that extends into the Westport Airport flight path OR increase the height to something more reasonable.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lyndal Watson (S42)	S42.001	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Westport Airport and Karamea Aerodrome	Oppose	<p>Restricting 1.2m as a maximum height restriction for this residential area when there is already substantial buildings/trees in this zone is ridiculous. We are currently in the process of building a home in this zone and it seems silly that we will need to file for a resource consent to plant a tree or build a fence or garden shed when the neighboring houses are taller than 1.2m. I am taller than 1.2m. There is no practical reasoning for this low height restriction.</p> <p>The maximum height needs to seriously be reconsidered to at least reflect the height of the building already in place.</p>	Height Restrictions - 1.2m height for any building, structure or tree that extends into the Westport Airport or Karamea Aerodrome Airport Flight Path as shown on the planning maps.
Neil Hateley (S139)	S139.001	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Westport Airport and Karamea Aerodrome	Oppose in part	<p>My property is at the edge of the airport flight path as shown on the layer maps. Requiring a consent to build anything over 1.2m in height at this distance is wrong. This will affect normal operation on the farm. It will cause issues for infrastructure utility providers like power. The heights do not correspond with any expected distances from CAA operational limits for drone licenses or pilots licenses.</p> <p>Why is Westport and Karamea airports any different to Hokitika or Greymouth when operations are equivalent?</p> <p>Parts of my property are effectively at seal level and others are 15m higher yet the wording would apply to both ground levels yet one would protrude much further into the available space for airport operations.</p> <p>If a height limit is deemed necessary then could be scaled somehow. For</p>	Adjust the height for Westport and Karamea flight paths to be a realistic value. Recommend limit equal to or greater than 20 metres rather than the current 1.2m.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					example within 1km of airport up to 10m , 1-2km up to 15m, 2-4km up to 20m.	
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.207	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Amend	location descriptions included, whether it be street or place name or lat/long co-ordinates.	Include location descriptions in table
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.207	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Amend	Site location descriptions included, whether it be street or place name or lat/long co-ordinates.	Include location descriptions in table
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.210	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Support	It is important that any known sites are recorded.	Record all known sites in Schedule 1 and Appendix 10
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.391	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Appendix Ten: New Zealand Archaeological Association Sites of Māori Origin	Amend	Provide awareness to plan users of the increased likelihood of discovering archaeological material of Māori origin in the vicinity and would enable appropriate caution and consideration.	Retain the list of sites in Appendix 10 as noted and include them as an alert layer within the planning maps. Ensure list of sites includes all NZAA of Māori origin within and outside of mapped SASM.