



Plan Sections: **HAZ – Hazards and Risks, Contaminated Land, Hazardous Substances, Natural Hazards**

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

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.013	HAZ - Hazards and Risks	HAZ - Hazards and Risks	Support	Support the following Objectives and Policies: Contaminated Land Hazardous Substances	Retain
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.004	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land	Support	Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies and Rules	Retain the objectives, policies and rules
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.008	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land	Support		Retain the provisions
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.045	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land	Support		retain
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.045	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land	Support		retain
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.184	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land	Amend	Ensure that risks to the environment includes risks to native species and their habitat	Amend Objectives, polices and rules so environment explicitly includes risks to native species and their habitat
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.089	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Objective	Support	Council supports the objective and policies for Contaminated Land which supports implementation of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.091	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Objective	Support	Council supports the objective and policies for Contaminated Land which supports implementation of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.	Retain as notified.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.006	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Objective	Support		Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.143	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support	We strongly support this objective which refers to human health.	Retain objective.
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.011	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support in part	Silver Fern Farms supports the broad direction of this objective but considers that when managing adverse effects on the environment from contaminated land this objective should also allow for "remedies" to avoid potentially be overly restrictive for land uses within industrial areas. Silver Fern Farms recommends amending this to remove unintentional constraints for development within the GIZ.	Amend as follows: To ensure that contaminated land is used, subdivided, developed or managed in a way that avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on the environment and manages the risk to human health to a level that is appropriate for the intended use.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.733	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support		Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.009	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Amend	We support these objectives.	Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.733	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.090	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.733	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.009	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support	support these objectives.	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.007	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Amend	Changes are sought to focus solely on human health effects,	Amend Objective CL-O1 as follows: To ensure that Contaminated land is used, subdivided, developed or managed in a way that avoids or mitigates manages adverse effects on the environment and human health to an acceptable level.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.144	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Amend	We support the policies in this section and recommend an additional policy to reduce the risk of contaminated land, particularly existing and closed landfills, having adverse effects on the environment and human health. Additionally, Te Mana Ora notes that recent weather events have affected closed landfills and we therefore recommend that new and future landfills be developed in locations that have a lower risk of being affected by natural hazards.	We recommend the following policy is added: CL-P3 - Protect the environment and population health from adverse effects of contaminated land, particularly used and closed landfills by: 1). Taking a precautionary approach to subdivision, development, or activities within the margins of a used or closed landfill; 2). Ensuring that new and future landfill sites are developed in areas that have lower risk of being impacted by natural hazards, including flooding.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.090	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support	Council supports the objective and policies for Contaminated Land which supports implementation of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.734	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support		Retain
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.007	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support		Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.010	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support	We support these policies.	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.734	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.091	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.734	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.010	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support	support these policies.	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.145	Contaminated Land	CL - P1	Support	We support this policy.	Retain policy.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.022	Contaminated Land	CL - P1	Support in part	The policy should be clear that sites are identified using the criteria in the NESCS regulations. A change of productive land use to an alternative form of productive land use should not trigger the policy.	Amend CL-P2 as follows: At the time of subdivision, change of use or development, if required by the Resource management (National Environmental Standard for assessing and Managing contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 , identify sites that may be subject to potential contamination as a result of historical land use and activities and investigate the risks to human health and the environment.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.146	Contaminated Land	CL - P2	Support	We strongly support this policy which refers to human health.	Retain policy.
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.008	Contaminated Land	CL - P2	Amend	Changes are sought to the relevant objectives and policies to focus solely on human health effects	Amend Policy CL-P2 as follows: Ensure that when contaminated land is used, subdivided and/or developed, the land is managed or remediated in a way that avoids or mitigates adverse effects on the environment and manages the risk to

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						human health to a level that is appropriate for the intended use.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.147	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Rules	Support	We support reference to the rules from the Resource Management (National Standard for Assessing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011.	Retain rules.
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.012	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances	Support	Silver Fern Farms supports the approach taken in the Draft Plan to avoid duplication of the HSNO Act requirements in the Plan and which acknowledges the primary role of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act in managing the storage, use, transport and disposal of hazardous substances.	Retain as notified
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.009	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances	Amend	The rule does not reference the HSNO Act outside of the blurb, consideration should be given to amending the writing so that the plan includes a direct reference to this standard.	Amend provisions to directly refer to the HSNO Act.
Rocky Mining Limited (S474)	S474.029	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances	Amend		Provide specific recognition of hazardous substance facilities associated with mining
Papahaua Resources Limited (S500)	S500.018	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances	Support		Provide specific recognition of hazardous substance facilities associated with mining
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.185	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances	Amend	Ensure that risks to the environment includes risks to native species and their habitat	Amend Objectives, policies and rules so environment explicitly includes risks to native species and their habitat
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.004	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances	Amend	Fire and Emergency support the inclusion of the definition of 'Hazardous Substances' and it to be consistent with 'Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996'.	Hazardous Substances has the same meaning as in section 2 of the RMA: includes, but is not limited to, any substance defined

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>in section 2 of the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 as a hazardous substance. The Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 defines hazardous substances as meaning, unless expressly provided otherwise by regulations or an EPA notice, any substance--</p> <p>a) with 1 or more of the following intrinsic properties: i. explosiveness: ii. flammability: iii. a capacity to oxidise: iv. corrosiveness: v. toxicity (including chronic toxicity): vi. ecotoxicity, with or without bioaccumulation; or which on contact with air or water (other than air or water where the temperature or pressure has been artificially increased or decreased) generates a substance with any 1 or more of the properties specified in paragraph (a).</p>
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.005	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances	Support	Fire and Emergency supports the definition of natural hazard being consistent with section 2 of the RMA.	<p>Natural Hazard has the meaning as in section 2 of the RMA: means</p> <p>any atmospheric or earth or water related occurrence (including earthquake, tsunami, erosion, volcanic and geothermal activity, landslip, subsidence, sedimentation, wind, drought, fire, or flooding) the</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						action of which adversely affects or may adversely affect human life, property, or other aspects of the environment.
Manawa Energy Limited (Manawa Energy) (S438)	S438.059	Hazardous Substances	Overview	Support	A number of policy provisions relating to hazardous substances apply to 'major hazard facilities'. This term is not defined in the Plan. Manawa considers that the definition of such a term is required to provide clarity to Plan users, and has requested the inclusion of such a term in the Interpretation section of the Plan.	Cross reference to new definition of the term 'major hazard facility' requested.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.092	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Objectives	Support	Council supports the objective and policies for Hazardous Substances which provide overarching direction. This approach is considered appropriate given the principal legislation for regulating hazardous substances is the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act.	Retain as notified.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.047	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Objectives	Support	consistent with 4.11.5.1 of the Buller District Plan	Add O2 To encourage and promote the safe and efficient handling and disposal of hazardous substances throughout the District.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.008	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Objectives	Support		Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.149	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support	We strongly support this objective which addresses health and safety of people and communities.	Retain objective.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.023	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support	The approach to hazardous substances is supported, with a focus on major hazard facilities.	Retain HS-O1

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.039	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support	The approach to hazardous substances is supported, with a focus on major hazard facilities.	Retain HS-O1
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.046	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Amend	Holistic approach to the use of hazardous substances in any conceivable situation.	HS - O1 The benefits associated with the use of hazardous substances are recognised while ensuring that risks to the environment and human health arising from subdivision use and development or any other activities involving hazardous substances are minimised.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.046	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Amend	There must be a holistic approach to the use of hazardous substances.	Amend The benefits associated with the use of hazardous substances are recognised while ensuring that risks to the environment and human health arising from subdivision use and development or any other activities involving hazardous substances are minimised.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.047	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support	consistent with 4.11.5.1 of the Buller District Plan.	Amend: To encourage and promote the safe and efficient handling and disposal of hazardous substances throughout the District.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.735	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.011	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.735	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.092	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.735	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.002	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Amend	Consider that Objective HS-01 and Policy HS-P1 should specifically refer to hazardous facilities, rather than to hazardous substances.	Amend Objective HS-O1 as follows: The benefits associated with the use of hazardous substances are recognised while ensuring that risks to the environment and human health arising from subdivision use and development activities involving hazardous substances at major hazard facilities are minimised.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.025	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.025	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.093	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support	Council supports the objective and policies for Hazardous Substances which provide overarching direction. This approach is considered appropriate given the principal legislation for regulating hazardous substances is the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act.	Retain as notified.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.048	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Amend	consistent with 4.11.6.1 of the Buller District Plan.	P5 Compliance with approved codes of practice and national guidelines and standards shall be required for all activities involving the use, storage and transport of hazardous substances.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.048	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Amend	consistent with 4.11.6.1 of the Buller District Plan.	Add: Compliance with approved codes of practice and national guidelines and standards shall be required for all activities involving the use, storage and transport of hazardous substances.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.736	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support		Retain
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.009	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.012	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.736	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.093	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.736	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support		Retain
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.005	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Support	Address matters in relation to major hazardous facilities, proximity to overlay areas and natural hazards, providing for major hazard facilities	Retain Policies HS-P2, HS-P3, HS-P4 as notified
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.006	Hazardous Substances	Hazardous Substances Policies	Amend	Recognise the role that other legislation plays in controlling hazardous substances	Introduce a new policy (Policy HS-P5) as follows: Avoid any unnecessary duplication of regulation between the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996, the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 and relevant regulations, and the Plan.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.150	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Support	We strongly support this policy which addresses the safety of people and communities.	Retain policy.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.049	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Support	There is no excuse for even residual risk to people or environment	HS - P1 Activities and facilities involving the use and storage of hazardous substances shall be designed, located, constructed and operated so as to avoid minimise residual risk to people and the environment
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.049	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Amend	No excuse for even residual risk to people or environment, there has to be NO risk.	HS - P1 Activities and facilities involving the use and storage of hazardous substances shall be designed, located, constructed and operated so as to avoid

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						minimise residual risk to people and the environment
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.004	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Amend	Consider that these provisions need to be reworked to ensure that they are consistent with the Hazardous Substances and Contaminated Land Section 32 report	Amend Policy HS - P1 as follows: Activities and facilities involving the use and storage of hazardous substances at major hazard facilities shall be designed, located, constructed and operated so as to minimise manage residual risk to people and the environment.
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.015	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Support	Consider 'minimise' to be problematic, and inconsistent with the advice provided in the Section 32 report	Amend Policy HS - P1 as follows: Activities and facilities involving the use and storage of hazardous substances at major hazard facilities shall be designed, located, constructed and operated so as to minimise manage residual risk to people and the environment.
Fuel Companies (S613)	S613.016	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Support	consider the word minimise to be problematic, and inconsistent with the advice provided in the Section 32 report, para 9.	Amend Policy HS - P1 as follows: Activities and facilities involving the use and storage of hazardous substances at major hazard facilities shall be designed, located, constructed and operated so as to minimise manage residual risk to people and the environment.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.026	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.026	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Support		Retain
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S140)	S140.013	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Support	HNZPT supports policy HS-P2 which seeks to ensure that new or expanded major hazard facilities are located away from natural, historic and cultural overlay areas.	Retain policy as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.151	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to locate major hazard facilities away from significant natural hazards.	Retain policy.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.024	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Support in part	Major hazard facilities is not defined and it needs to be clear what are considered to be such facilities. The Health and Safety at Work Major Hazardous Facilities Regulations 2016 provide a framework for assessing such facilities.	Include a definition for major hazard facilities: Any facility deemed a Major Hazardous Facility under the Health and Safety at Work Major Hazardous Facilities Regulations 2016
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.040	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Support in part	Major hazard facilities is not defined and it needs to be clear what are considered to be such facilities. The Health and Safety at Work Major hazardous facilities Regulations 2016 provide a framework for assessing such facilities.	Include a definition for major hazard facilities: Any facility deemed a Major Hazardous Facility under the Health and Safety at Work Major Hazardous Facilities Regulations 2016
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.020	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Amend	It is our opinion that other (i.e. less than major) hazardous facilities should also be located away from areas at risk of natural hazards	Include hazardous facilities within the policy, and define what constitutes a significant natural hazard
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.027	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.027	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Support		Retain
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.097	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Amend	Major Hazard facilities should be located away from surface water	Amend the policy wording as follows: Ensure that new or expanded major hazard facilities are located away from natural, historic and cultural overlay areas, surface water and away from locations that are subject to significant natural hazards, where practicable, taking into account the operational and functional needs of activities to locate in these areas.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S140)	S140.014	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Support	HNZPT supports policy HS-P3 which seeks to ensure that the establishment or expansion of significant hazardous facilities maintain adequate separation distances from sensitive activities and valued natural, cultural and historic heritage features.	Retain policy as proposed
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.152	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to have adequate buffering between major hazard facilities and sensitive activities and land uses, especially residential zones.	Retain policy.
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.013	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Support in part	Silver Fern Farm supports the policy to provide for the establishment and expansions of major hazard facilities within the Industrial Zones where adequate distances are maintained from sensitive activities and valued natural, cultural and historic heritage features. However, Silver Fern Farms requests that this should be amended to reflect existing sensitive activities so as to not unduly restrict the activities within the industrial zone through reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend as follows: Provide for the establishment and expansion of major hazard facilities within the Industrial, Port and General Rural Zones, where adequate separation distances are maintained from existing sensitive activities and valued natural, cultural and historic heritage features.
TiGa Minerals and Metals Limited (S493)	S493.031	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Amend	Does not reference the Minerals Extraction Zones.	Amend: Provide for the establishment and expansion of major hazard facilities within the Industrial, Port, Minerals Extraction and General Rural Zones, where adequate separation distances are maintained from sensitive activities and valued natural, cultural and historic heritage features.
Straterra (S536)	S536.065	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Amend	Recognition of hazardous substances needed at mining operations.	Add, "at mining operations".
WMS Group (HQ) Limited and WMS	S599.035	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Amend	Recognises that hazardous substances occur and reference the Minerals Extraction Zones.	Amend HS - P3 as follows: Provide for the establishment and expansion of major hazard facilities within

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Land Co. Limited (S599)						the Industrial, Port, Minerals Extraction and General Rural Zones, where adequate separation distances are maintained from sensitive activities and valued natural, cultural and historic heritage features.
Birchfield Coal Mines Ltd (S601)	S601.029	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Amend	Does not reference the Minerals Extraction Zones.	Amend HS - P3 as follows: "Provide for the establishment and expansion of major hazard facilities within the Industrial, Port, Minerals Extraction and General Rural Zones, where adequate separation distances are maintained from sensitive activities and valued natural, cultural and historic heritage features."
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.028	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.028	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Support		Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.153	Hazardous Substances	HS - P4	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to have adequate buffering between major hazard facilities and sensitive activities and land uses, especially residential zones, to minimise reverse sensitivity.	Retain policy.
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.014	Hazardous Substances	HS - P4	Support	Silver Fern Farm supports this policy but notes that policy HS - P4 conflicts with the proposal to rezone the land adjacent to the Silver Fern Farms Plant to GRUZ and GRZ, which will contain sensitive activities. Silver Ferns Farms also notes that this policy should be supported by a definition of a major hazard facilities to assist with interpretation of the policy.	Retain as notified.
Ministry of Education Te	S456.014	Hazardous Substances	HS - P4	Support	The Ministry supports that sensitive activities such as educational facilities	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S456)					should not be located adjacent to significant hazardous facilities. The Ministry's feedback on the draft provision has been adopted, changing the original wording from ' in proximity' to 'adjacent'	
Straterra (S536)	S536.066	Hazardous Substances	HS - P4	Amend	"Avoid" means avoid in a prohibitive sense. This may prohibit any such activity in every case.	Delete "avoided" and replace with "remedied", "mitigated" or "offset".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.029	Hazardous Substances	HS - P4	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.029	Hazardous Substances	HS - P4	Support		Retain
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.037	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Amend the policies, and matters of discretion to include the consideration of alternatives, and to require the consideration of alternatives for hard protection structures.	Natural Hazards
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.155	Natural Hazards	NH - O1	Support	We strongly support this objective, particularly the intention to take a regionally consistent, risk-based approach to natural hazard management.	Retain objective.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.041	HAZ - Hazards and Risks	NH - O1	Support in part	The West Coast is a very diverse landscape and environment, and we question whether it is possible to have a "regionally consistent" approach. We support the risk-based approach however our members advise that an approach in Hokitika will not be relevant down in Haast and therefore the approach should be risk based and be designed for that specific environment.	Reword NH-O1: A risk based approach for managing natural hazard risk is used for new subdivision, use and development.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.156	Natural Hazards	NH - O2	Support	We strongly support this objective which addresses the safety of people and communities.	Retain objective.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.001	Natural Hazards	NH - O3	Oppose in part	Regarding NH-03, it appears the approach taken by the council is to take the current status quo and define rules for any future changes. I am opposed to this approach, as it would leave the community still vulnerable to currently existing risks. an example, it is understood the fuel station in Franz Josef is located very close to the alpine fault. In case of a seismic event, this is likely to result in direct and indirect health effects, cause material and environmental damage, obstruct rescue operations (leakage and hazardous vapours), as well as cause a loss of resilience when compared to a fuel storage located away from a major fault.	Require the removal of existing hazardous activities from locations of high risk - for example the fuel station in Franz Josef that is located on the Alpine Fault.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.157	Natural Hazards	NH - O3	Support	We strongly support this objective and we agree that it is important to locate critical infrastructure away from significant natural hazards unless there is no reasonable alternative.	Retain objective.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.158	Natural Hazards	NH - O4	Support	We support this objective	Retain objective.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.159	Natural Hazards	NH - O5	Support	We strongly support this objective which recognises and provides for the effects of climate change and its influence on the frequency and severity of natural hazards. Climate change has considerable impacts on health and wellbeing of communities, as highlighted by the Royal Society, including displacement from flooding, damage to critical infrastructure from flooding and fires, and extreme temperatures resulting	Retain objective.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					in significant risks to health, especially for those who work outside.	
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.160	Natural Hazards	NH - O6	Support	We strongly support this objective. We agree that the measures taken to mitigate natural hazards should not create further adverse effects on the natural environment, or on people, property or other infrastructure.	Retain objective.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.161	Natural Hazards	NH - P1	Support	We strongly support this policy that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety from natural hazards.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.162	Natural Hazards	NH - P2	Support	We strongly support this policy that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety from natural hazards.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.163	Natural Hazards	NH - P3	Support	We strongly support this policy that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety from natural hazards.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.164	Natural Hazards	NH - P4	Support	We strongly support this policy that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety from natural hazards through the provision of natural hazard assessment.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.165	Natural Hazards	NH - P5	Support	We strongly support this policy that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety from natural hazards.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.166	Natural Hazards	NH - P6	Support	We strongly support the increases in distances for the Earthquake Hazard Overlay from what was in the Exposure Draft Plan, to NH-P6(c) commercial and industrial buildings 100m and NH-P6(d) residential activities 50m.	Retain policy.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.167	Natural Hazards	NH - P7	Support	We support this policy.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.168	Natural Hazards	NH - P8	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to locate critical response facilities away from the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.169	Natural Hazards	NH - P9	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to restrict sensitive activities e.g. residential development away from the Lake Tsunami Hazard overlay.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.170	Natural Hazards	NH - P10	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to limit development of sensitive activities e.g. residential away the Coastal Severe Hazard and Flood Severe Hazard overlays. We strongly support the new wording in this policy from the wording that was in the Exposure Draft Plan, to: Avoid development of sensitive activities...	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.171	Natural Hazards	NH - P11	Support	We strongly support this policy that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety from natural hazards.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.172	Natural Hazards	NH - P12	Support	We strongly support this policy that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety from natural hazards.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the	S190.173	Natural Hazards	NH - P13	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to limit development of sensitive activities e.g.	Retain policy.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)					residential within the Westport Hazard Overlays.	
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.174	Natural Hazards	NH - P14	Support	We strongly support this policy and we agree that it is important to limit development of sensitive activities e.g. residential within the Hokitika Coastal Hazard overlays.	Retain policy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.175	Natural Hazards	NH - R1	Support in part	We are concerned that this rule may encourage rebuilding/ replacement of buildings in areas that are unsafe. However, we also recognise that communities and residents may be attached to a location and wish to stay together. Therefore, rebuilding may be the only practicable option. Having options, for example, the Future Urban Zone (FUZ) alternatives, should be considered if the exposure to the natural hazard is ongoing and may continue to harm people and damage property. We recognise that there may be an increase in natural hazard events that damage buildings due to climate change.	Retain rule. However, we note that changing insurance processes and possibly changing legislation may mean that it is difficult for owners of buildings to rebuild on land that has continuous exposure to natural hazards.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.176	Natural Hazards	NH - R2	Support	We strongly support this rule that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety by permitting repairs and maintenance of existing natural hazard mitigation structures.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.177	Natural Hazards	NH - R3	Support	We strongly support this rule that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety by permitting upgrades to existing natural hazard mitigation structures.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.178	Natural Hazards	NH - R4	Support	We strongly support this rule that seeks to minimise risks to human health and community safety by permitting new natural hazard mitigation structures.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.179	Natural Hazards	NH - R5	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.181	Natural Hazards	NH - R6	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.182	Natural Hazards	NH - R7	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.183	Natural Hazards	NH - R8	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.184	Natural Hazards	NH - R9	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.185	Natural Hazards	NH - R10	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S456)	S456.016	Natural Hazards	NH - R10	Support	The Ministry acknowledges the risk that flooding poses to their assets and considers the setting of a minimum finished floor level will mitigate potential and actual effects on the Ministry's assets in flooding events.	Retain as proposed.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the	S190.186	Natural Hazards	NH - R11	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.187	Natural Hazards	NH - R12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.188	Natural Hazards	NH - R13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.189	Natural Hazards	NH - R14	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.190	Natural Hazards	NH - R15	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.191	Natural Hazards	NH - R16	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.192	Natural Hazards	NH - R17	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.193	Natural Hazards	NH - R18	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and	S190.194	Natural Hazards	NH - R19	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.195	Natural Hazards	NH - R20	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.196	Natural Hazards	NH - R21	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.197	Natural Hazards	NH - R22	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.198	Natural Hazards	NH - R23	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.199	Natural Hazards	NH - R24	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.200	Natural Hazards	NH - R25	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.201	Natural Hazards	NH - R26	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.202	Natural Hazards	NH - R27	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.203	Natural Hazards	NH - R28	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.204	Natural Hazards	NH - R29	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.205	Natural Hazards	NH - R30	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.206	Natural Hazards	NH - R31	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.207	Natural Hazards	NH - R32	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.208	Natural Hazards	NH - R33	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the	S190.209	Natural Hazards	NH - R34	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.210	Natural Hazards	NH - R35	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.211	Natural Hazards	NH - R36	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.212	Natural Hazards	NH - R37	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.213	Natural Hazards	NH - R38	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.214	Natural Hazards	NH - R39	Support in part	We support this rule. However, we note that there may be increased risk of damage to these unoccupied buildings due to the impacts of climate change.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.215	Natural Hazards	NH - R40	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.216	Natural Hazards	NH - R41	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.217	Natural Hazards	NH - R42	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.218	Natural Hazards	NH - R43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.219	Natural Hazards	NH - R44	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.220	Natural Hazards	NH - R45	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.075	Natural Hazards	NH - R45	Support	Support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards.	REtain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.221	Natural Hazards	NH - R46	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.222	Natural Hazards	NH - R47	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.223	Natural Hazards	NH - R48	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the	S190.224	Natural Hazards	NH - R49	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.225	Natural Hazards	NH - R50	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.226	Natural Hazards	NH - R51	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.227	Natural Hazards	NH - R52	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.228	Natural Hazards	NH - R53	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Bruce Dowrick (S51)	S51.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	I believe that it is unreasonable for landowners rights to be arbitrarily removed. It is reasonable for the council to flag hazards and risk to property and to require some degree of mitigation of risk of personal harm in extreme cases. But it should be the right of the owner as to risk of personal property. Placing impossible restrictions and requirements on building or activities on established residential sections effectively is red zoning and will render the land worthless.	That hazard zones should not reduce the existing rights of landowners to build and that established resource consent for land use should not be retrospectively rescinded without compensation. (The council should have the right to control or restrict subdivision or grant new rights of use in respect to identified hazards)
Richard Wallis (S97)	S97.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	We would like to see Council create a guideline booklet for landowners to help negotiate and understand these changes. [more information in original submission]	Add a method into the Plan that sees the development of information for landowners about natural hazards and their management.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Tim Penlington, Katie Deans, Karl and Brenda Feyen, Catherine Woods, Richard Wallis (S137)	S137.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	<p>We would like to see Council create a guideline booklet for landowners to help negotiate and understand these changes.</p> <p>Some suggested titles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. resource consent applications and deadlines b. flood protection advice c. economical building solution and recommended structures d. council policy to buy back land that is unworkable e. insurance recommendation f. strategy for generational ownership and development g. council strategy for flood mitigation 	Provide non-regulatory material to support landowners negotiate and understand natural hazard overlays and their implications.
Ruth Henschel (S150)	S150.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	In general we agree that there is a need for Te Tai o Poutini Plan but disagree on: the extreme level of risk management proposed; the lack of inclusion of likely future planning changes due to ongoing scientific assessment of risk also due to climate change; and central government action; the lack of specificity in identification of risk/s from across individual property titles; and how it affects the property and ourselves as occupiers and kaitiaki of the property 4456B Karamea Highway Karamea.	Amend the plan so that it takes a less extreme approach to risk management and takes into account likely future planning changes and provides more specific analysis based on risks to individual property titles.
Misato Nomura (S151)	S151.007	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	There are currently too many overlay layers that makes the plan harder to read. Some of the overlays are similar and it is not clear if it is necessary to have them separated	To combine or delete some of the overlays present.
Will Harvey (S157)	S157.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	It is hard to work out what applies to an individual property	Provide a plain English summary so that landowners understand how they are affected and what they can do.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support	Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies	Retain the objectives and policies
Richard Henschel (S285)	S285.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	In general we agree that there is a need for Te Tai o Poutini Plan but disagree on: the extreme level of risk management proposed; the lack of inclusion of likely future planning changes due to ongoing scientific assessment of risk also due to climate change; and central government action; the lack of specificity in identification of risk/s across individual property titles; and how it affects the property and ourselves as occupiers and kaitiaki of the property 4456B Karamea Highway Karamea.	Provide more scientifically robust proposals with regards to natural hazards. Take a less extreme approach to managing risk rather than this 'worst case scenario', generalised planning. We would like to see a more measured and measurable approach to the hazard planning for individual properties.
Grant Marshall (S311)	S311.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Map 65 relates to Lake Poerua and surrounds. This area of Lake Poerua at 2382 Lake Brunner Road, Inchbonnie has been extensively researched with a consent granted for a 12 section subdivision by the commissioner of the NZ Environmental Court in November 2011. Section 221 for this development was issued by the GDC on 9th August 2018. At time of writing two dwellings have been completed with another undergoing a build and two more consented buildings planned. We are concerned with inaccuracies of the Faultline in Map 65. There is an omission of a GNS report dated 2008 pertaining to the subdivision at Lake Poerua which has not been included in the technical reports available on the TTPP. This report supersedes those on the TTPP.	I would like the inclusion of the GNS report on Lake Poerua dated January 2008 to the technical info in the TTPP.
Lynette Heine (S354)	S354.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	The base of the Arnold River Bridge on S Hwy 7 is at 18m RL. The submitter's house sits on a terrace level of 39m RL	The delineation of the 'Flood Plain' boundaries looks to have used a straight line technique - it does not follow contours.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and the property rises another 10m onto a further terrace. Concerns about the risk of higher insurance premiums and potential diminished capital value due to the current mapping of the 'Flood Plain'.	Request for a revision of the Flood Plain overlay covering the property, Sec 42 672 BLK X Mawheranui SD. While Sec 42 could be considered as flood plain, R.S 672 includes land that rises significantly as series of stepped river terraces.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Using a term such as "Coastal Hazard Severe" may negatively affect property values and their ability to gain insurance. Also, this has been used as a generic term without looking at what measures have been used to protect individual properties or communities.	the use of the term "Coastal Hazard Severe" to be removed.
Shaun and Carissa du Plessis (S402)	S402.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support	To ensure natural hazard overlays are justified. The overlays are extensive in many areas. A review of all natural hazard overlays is needed. The overlays should be supported with evidence to justify their extent. All overlays should be supported with a relevant technical report that has been prepared by a suitably qualified person.	Review the number and extent of natural hazard overlays ensuring all are justified and supported with a relevant technical report that has been prepared by a suitably qualified person.
Betty Harris (S405)	S405.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Need to ensure that natural hazard overlays are justified and supported with evidence.	Ensure all overlays are supported with a relevant technical report that has been prepared by a suitably qualified person.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.022	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	I think the council should find a way to funnel a government fund to support all rebuilding to meet the agreed AEP level. This will be a cheaper resilience measure than moving people to completely new subdivisions.	Seek government support to fund rebuilding to agreed AEP level
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S456)	S456.015	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support	The Ministry acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose a potential risk to the safety of children and to their assets, however recognises that at times there is a functional need to locate within these	Retain as proposed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					areas, particularly to serve existing communities.	
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The natural hazards overlays are not clear in their geographic application and relationship with other plan provisions, and are overly restrictive;	Review natural hazard overlays to enable tourism development at Punakaiki village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.017	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose		Specific provision should be made for the continued management and development of hazard mitigation structures for Punakaiki Village, recognising the existing investment in, and the character of, the present coastal defence wall.
Troy Scanlon (S468)	S468.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Six hazards mitigated by one scheme make a compelling argument	Progress implementation of the flood mitigation scheme at Westport.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.019	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Natural Hazard Section statements need to turn into policy or rules otherwise it is just misleading. It must be made perfectly clear what is intended considering the future and climate disruption.	Amend natural hazards policies and rules so that they implement the statements in the description and reflect the seriousness of future climate disruption.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.019	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	to ensure landowners do not have to engage expensive consultants to know how to achieve compliance.	Introduce a Council operated tool that generates the minimum floor levels required across the overlay when a protection scheme is not in place,
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.025	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Ought to be included within the flood defences offer by this solution.	amend to ensure property be fully included within the limits of future stop bank protection designed to service Westport.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.020	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The natural hazard overlay maps do not follow natural land contours. Maps need to be refined to exclude areas that are not subject to natural hazards, rather than relying on general studies. WCRC are concerned that the general natural hazard provisions are unduly restrictive	The Council seeks to be a party to the refinement of objectives, policies, rules and accompanying maps for Natural Hazards. That the Plan is refined to ensure there are no adverse effects on the social or economic wellbeing of West Coast people and communities, and no undue burden is placed on the West Coast Community from the proposed Plan

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					when flood hazard areas have not been refined in the flood maps.	provisions. WCRC are concerned that the general natural hazard provisions are unduly restrictive when flood hazard areas have not been refined in the flood maps.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.007	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	This creates negative emotional triggers	Remove any reference to a 'red zone" in TTPP
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.008	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend		Adopt a more realistic timeframe for assessment of coastal hazards than 100 years
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.009	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend		include a method to actively engage with community on mitigation strategies for specific local hazard threats. eg local rating fund or joint investment programme.
Bert Hofmans (S504)	S504.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support		Support a risk based approach to natural hazards.
Lindy Millar (S505)	S505.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support		Support a risk based approach to natural hazards.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.044	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	There should be provision for unoccupied farm buildings in natural hazard areas as these have a lower risk than occupied buildings	There should be provision for unoccupied farm buildings in natural hazard areas as these have a lower risk than occupied buildings
Lee Cummings (S554)	S554.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support	Support the proposals which have resulted in our property no longer being caught in the requirements for hazard assessment.	Retain the approach to natural hazards
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New	S560.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	From 1 December 2022, councils when making and amending regional policies, and regional and district plans, must have	Amend the Plan to have regard to emissions reduction plan and national adaptation plan.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)					regard to emissions reduction plans and national adaptation plans.	
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	While the Natural Hazards and Risks chapter is rightfully focussed on protecting people and infrastructure, we are concerned that does not explicitly consider at-risk and threatened native species, or biodiversity more broadly, that may be displaced by climate change related extreme weather events or sea level rise.	Amend the Plan so areas that contain threatened and at-risk native species and indigenous biodiversity more broadly are considered in the Natural Hazards and Risks chapter and provision is made for their range expansion in response to climate related displacement.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.186	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Include in the rule framework, new objective, policy, and rules to ensure that habitat for indigenous biodiversity generally is protected, and that native species have somewhere to retreat to in the event their habitat is reduced or lost due to the impact of climate change.	Add: Incorporate space for indigenous biodiversity values to be retained and enhanced;
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.038	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	there are existing controls in place in relation to the section.	Delete
Anthony Eden (S578)	S578.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	the model on which future planning rules and limitations have been applied to Okuru may be incorrect	The effects of climate change on the Okuru lagoon are reassessed taking into account both the GNS and NIWA reports, and a practical reassessment of what has actually been happening there over the past 22 years since the Okuru flood wall was constructed.
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.007	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	to ensure landowners do not have to engage expensive consultants to know how to achieve compliance.	Introduce a Council operated tool that generates the minimum floor levels required across the overlay when a protection scheme is not in place,
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.013	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Ought to be included within the flood defences offer by this solution.	amend to ensure property be fully included within the limits of future stop bank protection designed to service Westport.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.051	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Neutral	DOC is neutral as these do not affect priority conservation values, biodiversity values, or DOC's interests.	NA
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.038	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support	Support the thorough consideration of all aspects and impacts of natural hazard risk	No Change
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.122	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Support	The preferred nomenclature for flood hazard is using %AEP (annual exceedance probability)	Retain %AEP (annual exceedance probability)
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.020	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Landslide risk to Franz Josef Town has not been adequately included in plan	Rule framework to prohibit all development in landslide risk area to Franz Josef Township
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.142	Contaminated Land	Overview		Te Mana Ora supports the objective and policies in this section to protect the environment and human health from the potential adverse effects of contaminated land.	
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.148	Natural Hazards	Overview	Support	Te Mana Ora supports the objective and policies in this section. We endorse the objective to minimise the impact of the adverse effects of hazardous substances on the environment and human health.	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.154	Natural Hazards	Overview	Support	We agree with the objectives and policies in this section, particularly the intention to take a regionally consistent, risk-based approach to natural hazard management and to recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its influence on the frequency and severity of natural hazards. Climate change has considerable impacts on health and wellbeing of communities, as highlighted by the Royal Society, including displacement from flooding, damage to critical infrastructure from flooding and fires, and extreme temperatures resulting in significant risks to health, especially for those who work outside. Te Mana Ora	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					supports the identification and development of natural hazard overlays to reduce the health impacts of climate change to the population. Additionally, we support the continued natural hazard assessment of and response to natural hazard risks. Regarding reconstruction on sites subject to natural hazards, we submit that there may be a public health risk to the occupants via exposure to repeat natural hazard events. Having the options including Future Urban Zone (FUZ) alternatives should also be considered if the exposure to the natural hazard is ongoing and may continue to harm people and damage property.	
Inger Perkins (S462)	S462.006	Natural Hazards	Overview	Amend	<p>The first line of the introduction to the Natural Hazards chapter needs to include storms themselves as we can expect increased storm intensity along with increased frequency of extremely windy days, as well as the resulting hazards, and it needs to state that the impact of these natural hazards will be exacerbated by climate change.</p> <p>The West Coast is expected to become wetter with winter rainfall increasing by up to 29% by 2090.4 Stating that the impact "is likely to be exacerbated by climate change" is denying the evidence and misrepresenting and understating the risk</p>	Amend overview to specifically identify increased storm intensity and frequency as issues and increased frequency of extremely windy days and the resulting hazards. Specifically state that the impact of these natural hazards will be exacerbated by climate change. Refer to and include the information from climate change projections for the west coast.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.005	Natural Hazards	Overview	Support	Support the definition of the Westport Hazard Overlay - applying to the area where the West Coast Regional Council LTP identified for flood protection and including Orowaiti Road and Wakefield Road but amendment is needed to reflect	Amend the notified definition of the Westport Hazard Overlay to read "This applies to the area certified by the WCRC as protected noting the impacts of climate change have been included in the design, development and implementation of the Westport Flood and Coastal erosion

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					that the WCRC LTP protection works are sufficient to protect the area.	protection Scheme".
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.121	Natural Hazards	Overview	Amend	Additional comments need to be included to reference the network of energy activities.	Amend paragraph 3: The risks associated with natural hazards ... are considerably greater - hence risk is higher. There is a considerable network of energy activities and infrastructure, including critical infrastructure, on the West Coast that services the communities spread throughout the region and into neighbouring regions. Such activities have been, and will continue to be, developed taking into account the local conditions. This includes consideration of, and design for, natural hazard occurrence. Given the topography and conditions on the West Coast practical risk management solutions are required to ensure maintenance and enhancement of the energy supply to the communities. A risk-based approach ...".
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.552	Natural Hazards	Overview	Support in part	Remove hyperlink of Land use activity definition after the reference to "geothermal activity" as it creates confusion and is not part of the original RMA definition.	Remove hyperlink from "geothermal activity" in the second paragraph of the overview.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.117	Natural Hazards	Other Relevant Provisions	Amend	It should be noted that lake seiche can occur with ground shaking alone, and lake tsunamis can be generated by landslides falling into lake not just fault	Investigate hazards to all lakes
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.118	Natural Hazards	Other Relevant Provisions	Support	Some areas are subject to multiple hazards	Amend to add a framework for appropriate management method for areas subject to multiple hazards includetheir identification and and then managing them by taking a multi-hazard,precautionary approach limiting future development or sensitive/ post

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						emergencyresponse activities within the area.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	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 protectives structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.</i>
Te Tumu Paeroa - The office of the Māori Trustee (S440)	S440.012	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Support in part	The Māori Trustee is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Hazards' objectives in this chapter. However, the Māori Trustee considers that managed retreat should be expressly addressed in the objectives of this chapter. This will align with policies NH P4 and P5.	The Māori Trustee considers the following objective should be inserted in this chapter. Amendments NH - O7 To work with Poutini Ngāi Tahu and landowners to identify areas suitable for managed retreat.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.015	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	Set out the District Council's role to ensure the flood protection scheme provides protection for all land	Amend Objectives to set out the District Council's role in ensuring flood protection scheme provides protection for all land occurs
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	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: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protectives structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	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: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protectives structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	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: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	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: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	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: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	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: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	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: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.008	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Support		Retain
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	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: 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

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.094	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Support	Support objectives as notified.	Retain as notified.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	Similarly to NH -- 04, the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stop banks is recognised and protected
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.122	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	To recognise that energy activities may require location within areas of hazard.	Add a new objective: To recognise and provide for the constraints imposed by the locational, technical, functional and operational requirements of energy activities, including energy aspects of infrastructure and critical infrastructure, with regard to natural hazards.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.738	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	The role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised.	Add a new objective: 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.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.739	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	We support these objectives.	Retain
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.011	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	To recognise the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation.	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.014	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.738	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	The role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised.	Add a new objective: 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.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.739	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	We support these objectives.	Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.095	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	The role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised.	Add a new objective: 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.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.096	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	We support these objectives.	Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.738	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	The role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised.	Add a new objective: 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.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.739	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	We support these objectives.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.012	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	the role that protective structures play in mitigation needs to be recognised	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	Set out the District Council's role to ensure the flood protection scheme provides protection for all land	Amend Objectives to set out the District Council's role in ensuring flood protection scheme provides protection for all land occurs
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.038	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	Support the natural hazard policies and introduce an additional policy which requires that subdivision, use and development does not create or exacerbate natural hazards so that these provisions give effect to the NZCPS and sections 31(b) and 106 of the Act.	Add new objective: NH-07 Subdivision, use and development does not create or exacerbate adverse natural hazard effects on other people, property, infrastructure and the environment.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	Similarly, to NH - O4, the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protectives structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.031	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protectives structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.031	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protectives structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.009	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	The objectives be amended for site-specific circumstances of their properties	Amend for site-specific allowance such that the site specific circumstances of their properties can be accommodated as per the submission on policies and rules below.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.014	Natural Hazards	NHO1	Amend	An unmodelled and broad brush approach has been used for the flood plane overlay.	Amend to read: To apply use a regionally consistent, risk-based and modelled approach to natural hazard management.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.553	Natural Hazards	NHO1	Support	Support without alteration.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.022	Natural Hazards	NHO1	Support	We support a regionally consistent, risk-based approach to natural hazard management for the West Coast Region	No Change
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.554	Natural Hazards	NHO2	Support	Support without alteration.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.023	Natural Hazards	NHO2	Support	The reduction of risk from natural hazards and promoting community resilience and wellbeing.	No Change
Manawa Energy Limited (Manawa Energy) (S438)	S438.060	Natural Hazards	NHO3	Support in part	Manawa considers that the objective could be more appropriately worded to better recognise that some renewable electricity generation activities are functionally and operationally required to be within or adjacent to water. As a consequential change of other submission points, Manawa also seek that the term 'critical infrastructure' is replaced with 'regionally significant infrastructure'.	Amend NH - O3 as follows: To encourage: Only 1. The locate-location of critical regionally significant infrastructure within outside areas of significant natural hazard risk, except where there is no reasonable alternative, or where there is a functional or operational need to locate in these areas; and 2. to The design of regionally significant infrastructure is resilient to hazard events so as and will not to exacerbate natural hazard risk to people and property.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.044	Natural Hazards	NHO3	Support	Rail infrastructure is linear and is not easily relocated. KiwiRail supports the objective that recognises that in some instances, critical infrastructure is required to be located within areas of hazard risk.	Retain as proposed
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.061	Natural Hazards	NHO3	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the objective as it allows for consideration of critical infrastructure to be located in natural hazard risk areas where there are no reasonable alternatives.	Retain as proposed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.042	Natural Hazards	NHO3	Amend	There needs to be a requirement for new critical infrastructure with regard to design and its durability to ensure its durability in an event	Amend NH-O3 To only locate critical infrastructure within areas of significant natural hazard risk where there is no reasonable alternative, and to design infrastructure so as not to exacerbate natural hazard risk to people and property and is designed to maintain integrity and ongoing function during and after natural hazards
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.555	Natural Hazards	NHO3	Support	Support without alteration.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.024	Natural Hazards	NHO3	Neutral	Define the level of hazard deemed "significant" by the TTPP	Define what constitutes a significant natural hazard
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.018	Natural Hazards	NHO4	Support		Retain as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.025	Natural Hazards	NHO4	Support	We support the protection of natural features which reduce the impact of natural hazards on communities.	No Change
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.098	Natural Hazards	NHO4	Amend	Supported but as notified it is difficult to read and understand.	Amend the objective as follows: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by natural features in hazard mitigation that minimises the impact of hazards, including wetland and dunes, is recognised and protected.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.556	Natural Hazards	NHO5	Support in part	Could use rewording to ensure clarity.	Reword objective to ensure intention is clear.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.026	Natural Hazards	NHO5	Support	It is important to factor in the current and future impacts of climate change on natural hazard risk.	No Change
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.045	Natural Hazards	NHO6	Support	KiwiRail supports the objective to protect infrastructure from natural hazard mitigation measures.	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.062	Natural Hazards	NHO6	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the objective as it provides protection of infrastructure from other activities.	Retain as proposed.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.123	Natural Hazards	NHO6	Amend	The plan has split energy activities from infrastructure in terms of management.	Amend: Measures taken to ... other people, property, energy activities and infrastructure, including critical infrastructure , and the environment.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.557	Natural Hazards	NHO6	Support	Support without alteration.	Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.558	Natural Hazards	NHO6	Support	Support without alteration.	REtain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.027	Natural Hazards	NHO6	Support	Ensure that natural hazard risk reduction measures do not increase risk or cause negative effects	No Change
Ruth Henschel (S150)	S150.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Oppose in part	The degree of risk management proposed is extreme - there is a lack of inclusion of likely future planning changes due to ongoing scientific assessment of risk also due to climate change; and central government action; the lack of specificity in identification of risk/s across individual property titles; and how it affects the property and ourselves as occupiers and kaitiaki of the property. Natural hazard policies which we believe affect the property disproportionately by being poorly quantified and too extreme towards risk averse are: Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert. We don't find the process of identifying for Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert being robust but rather, a 'worst case scenario' to mitigate risks. This impacts the usability, insurability, and value of the property as well as the well-being of the owner of the property. The risk management proposed is also too extreme for a time scale that	Amend the Natural hazard policies and risk management approach in relation to Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert hazards so they are less risk averse.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					reflects only current knowledge of climate change and its mitigation.	
Te Tumu Paeroa - The office of the Māori Trustee (S440)	S440.013	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support	The Māori Trustee is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Hazards' policies in this chapter.	Retain
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.016	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	Set out the District Council's role to ensure the flood protection scheme provides protection for all land	Amend Policies to set out the District Council's role in ensuring flood protection scheme provides protection for all land occurs
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.009	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support		Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.095	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support	Support policies, however request revised policy wording for P10 - b. as this deals with sensitive activities but also mentions public good. Add flexibility for a residential activity where the hazard can be mitigated.	Insert flexibility within Policy P10 - b. Residential activities shouldn't need to be linked to a public good but need to ensure the hazard can be mitigated.
Anthony Eden (S578)	S578.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	Clear and concise policy on who should be funding the cost of flood and disaster mitigation	New policy on who should be funding the cost of flood and disaster mitigation on individual communities, and ensure this is fair and consistent across the region.
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.016	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	In applying Policies NH-P1 & P2, there has been over precautionary approach taken	Further consultation to better understand any historical and future potential flood risks.
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.017	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Support	P9 & P12 will correctly restrict further expansion of the temporary sewage collection tanks for Iveagh Bay	Retain
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	Set out the District Council's role to ensure the flood protection scheme provides protection for all land	Amend Policies to set out the District Council's role in ensuring flood protection scheme provides protection for all land occurs
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.010	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Policies	Amend	The policies for natural hazards are supported subject to the amendments specified for Policy NH--P13 specified below.	Retain Policies NH-P1 - NHP13 subject to the specific amendments to Policy NH-P13 set out in the submission below.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.010	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support	Support the approach of identifying hazard areas in overlays.	Retain approach of identifying hazard areas in overlays.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.740	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.740	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.097	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.740	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.559	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support in part	Reword this provision for clarity to the following: "Identify with in natural hazard overlays the areas at significant risk from natural hazards."	Alter the provision to provide clarity.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.028	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support in part	It is important to define the level of hazard deemed "significant" by the TTPP	Define what constitutes a significant natural hazard
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.015	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Oppose	Silver Fern Farms are of the position that NH - P2 should be less restrictive in terms of locations for developments and recognise that in some instances operational need and/or functional needs will require development in a particular location.	Amend as follows: NH - P2 Where a natural hazard has been identified and the natural hazard risk to people and communities is unquantified but evidence suggests that the risk is potentially significant, apply a precautionary approach to allowing development or use of the area unless operational and/or functional needs require a particular location.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.011	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Oppose	Council should proceed with calculations and natural hazard identification to fully address the areas of concern, not proceed based on a guess based approach. Further this should be quantified. The current policy puts this on developers to disprove.	Oppose a precautionary approach.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.063	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Support in part	It is unclear when this policy should apply and how it will be implemented. It is recommended that the policy be reworded to provide clarity.	Amend the policy to provide clarity on how this will be implemented.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.124	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Amend	Linking this policy with others by referring to managing natural hazard risk.	Amend: Where a natural hazard ... significant, apply a precautionary approach to managing natural hazard risk .
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.741	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.741	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.098	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.741	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.560	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Support in part	It is unclear as to how natural hazards are being identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant, leading it to be unclear as to how the policy will be applied.	Alter the policy to provide clarity on how natural hazards are being identified, how the risk is being quantified, and what evidence is acceptable to suggest the risk is significant.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.029	Natural Hazards	NHP2	Amend	It is important to define the level of hazard deemed "significant" by the TTPP	Define what constitutes a significant natural hazard
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.019	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support	Particularly support P3a - use of natural features and risk management.	Retain as notified
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.046	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support	KiwiRail supports policy which recognises that, in some instances, hard engineering measures are necessary to reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to property or infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.012	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Oppose	Hard engineering solutions are still appropriate measures in addressing natural hazards with often greater success than natural solutions, and where not resulting in adverse effects	The wording of this policy should be changed to reflect that the whole of New Zealand is a hazard prone country due to the ocean locked nature and therefore consideration in development, should

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					upon the neighbours would be appropriate,	consider engineering solutions (general) that mitigate risk.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.064	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support	The policy recognises that in some circumstances hard engineering solutions are the only practical means of protecting critical infrastructure	Retain as proposed
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.002	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Oppose in part	Inclusion of the word "existing" in this policy unduly limits future development, even where risk from natural hazard is low or could be substantially mitigated using technical solutions is obstructed.	Amend to: When managing natural hazards: a. Promote the use of natural features and appropriate risk management approaches in preference to hard engineering solutions in mitigating natural hazard risks; and b. Avoid increasing risk to people, property and the environment; while c. Recognising that in some circumstances hard engineering solutions may be the only practical means of protecting existing communities and critical infrastructure.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.007	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Oppose in part	Inclusion of the word "existing" in this policy unduly limits future development, even where risk from natural hazard is low or could be substantially mitigated using technical solutions is obstructed	Amend as follows: When managing natural hazards: a, Promote the use of natural features and appropriate risk management approaches in preference to hard engineering solutions in mitigating natural hazard risks; and b. Avoid increasing risk to people, property and the environment; while c. Recognising that in some circumstances hard engineering solutions may be the only practical means of protecting communities and critical infrastructure
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.125	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Amend	The general intent of the policy is supported however it is submitted that, (1) The wording between items "b." and	(1) Amend item c., "c. Recognising and providing for circumstances where hard engineering solutions may be the only practical means of

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					"c." and (2) A new item "d." is required. These amendments are to provide for energy activities, both existing and new, and to ensure consistency of wording and approach for energy activity matters throughout the plan.	protecting existing communities, energy activities and infrastructure, including critical infrastructure; or. (2) Add a new item d., "d. recognising and providing for the locational, technical, functional and operational constraints and requirements of energy activities, including energy aspects of infrastructure and critical infrastructure."
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.742	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.742	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.099	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.742	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.561	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support	Support without alteration.	Retain
Suzanne Hills (S443)	S443.019	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Amend		Amend policy to include additional point of seawater incursion into groundwater.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.013	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Oppose	Council should have this information and it should not be upon the applicant to provide analysis that the development or future activity is able to meet this policy, particularly when a number of matters are under scientific dispute with regard to the potential intensity. The policy is considered to restrictive when considering the coastal environment of the West Coast, as this would inhibit development.	Delete the policy.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.011	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.011	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.100	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Support		Retain
Brian Anderson (S576)	S576.011	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Support	The West Coast is also extremely vulnerable to climate change	Retain
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.039	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Amend	Amend Policy NH-P4 to ensure that the effects of changes to severe weather events are considered when assessing the effects of climate change.	Amend Policy NH-P4: Natural hazard assessment, ... a. ... g. Changes to the magnitude, frequency and duration of severe weather events.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.030	Natural Hazards	NHP4	Support	Consideration of climate change and changing environmental conditions in management of natural hazard risk	No change
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.003	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Oppose	Concern that communities and people will be forced off their land for reasons determined by a government entity such as Council. NH-P5 talks about managed retreat, clearly there is an intent to force people off their property.	Provide be detail given around what managed retreat looks like and does the affected communities and individuals have a choice in this or is it forced removal that is being referred to.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.014	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Oppose	Managed retreat is to be informed by the upcoming rework of the RMA and at this time there are no provisions for managed retreat under the RMA. While it is acknowledged that development could be at risk, it should be at the discretion of the land owner as to withdrawing from these areas and the plan should be informed by higher level planning documents.	Delete or significantly amend the policy to reflect submitter concerns.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.012	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.012	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.101	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Support		Retain
Brian Anderson (S576)	S576.012	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Support	the provisions regarding the increasing natural hazards from climate change are sound,	REtain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.031	Natural Hazards	NHP5	Support	The consideration of managed retreat in minimising the risk posed to communities	No Change
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.002	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Amend	Under NH-P6 it is noted explained various types of activities should be avoided within certain distances from the Faultline, however this does not specifically state that existing activities with high risk (such as a fuel station) should be removed to outside the Faultline zone. Relocation of this fuel facility (and any similar other high-risk items) would be highly recommended and should in my view be included as a policy objective under the umbrella of resilience to natural hazards. A situation where in this example a fuel station / hazardous storage facility has been allowed in the past, likely based on an incomplete understanding of earthquake risks, should not be a reason for the regional council to allow this dangerous situation to continue.	Amend so that existing activities within natural hazard areas that pose a high risk are relocated away from such risks
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.015	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Support	I agree in full.	Retain the policy.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.128	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Amend	Should advise that it is the dam being referred to and not other buildings and structures.	Amend NH-P6 a. Development of critical response facilities (note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to.)".
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.129	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Amend	A location is required due to the constraints or requirements of an activity.	Amend item a. Development of critical response facilities, except where it is

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						demonstrated that a site is needed due to the technical, locational, operational or functional constraints or requirements of an activity and earthquake hazard risk has been appropriately managed;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.013	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.013	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.102	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.562	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Support	Provided the Earthquake Hazard Overlay is accurately located this policy is supported.	N/A
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.032	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Amend	Suggest the Earthquake Hazard overlay be extended	Amend policy to extend if avoidance zones around faults to include areas of distributed and off-fault deformation, areas between fault strands and splays, and areas where the fault trace is uncertain.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.016	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support	Agree in full	Retain the policy.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.043	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support	Policy NH-P7 provides for unoccupied structures and buildings within the Earthquake Hazard Overlay. Farms often have unoccupied buildings and structures that do not pose as high a risk as occupied buildings.	Retain NH-P7 as notified
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.130	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support	The intent of the policy is supported	Retain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.014	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.014	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.103	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.563	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support	Provided the Earthquake Hazard Overlay is accurately located this policy is supported.	N/A
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.033	Natural Hazards	NHP7	Support	Appropriate for unoccupied structures to be built in the Earthquake Hazard	No Change
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.017	Natural Hazards	NHP8	Support	Agree in full.	Retain the policy.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.131	Natural Hazards	NHP8	Amend	Should advise that it is the dam being referred to and not other buildings and structures.	Amend: Avoid locating critical facilities within the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay (note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to).
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.015	Natural Hazards	NHP8	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.015	Natural Hazards	NHP8	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.104	Natural Hazards	NHP8	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.564	Natural Hazards	NHP8	Support	Provided the Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay is accurately located this policy is supported.	N/A
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.034	Natural Hazards	NHP8	Support	The avoidance of critical response, health, community, educational, and hazardous facilities within the Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay	No Change
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.018	Natural Hazards	NHP9	Oppose	The above policies allow for buildings and residential buildings within close proximity to fault lines, which would be required for a lake tsunami and therefore a similar level standard should be adopted, I doubt after a high level	Amend the policy so that Lake Tsunami have a similar standard to that of Earthquake Hazards and Coastal Tsunami.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					magnitude earthquake, the concern would be around having wet feet.	
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.016	Natural Hazards	NHP9	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.016	Natural Hazards	NHP9	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.105	Natural Hazards	NHP9	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.565	Natural Hazards	NHP9	Support	For consistency recommend revising the use of Restrict to Avoid. Otherwise support this policy provided the Lake Tsunami Hazard overlay is accurately located.	Reword policy to use the word Avoid instead of Restrict.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.035	Natural Hazards	NHP9	Support	Restricting development of sensitive activities within areas at risk from natural hazards.	No Change
Northern Buller Communities Society Incorporated (S142)	S142.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Support	We understand and accept the objective and policies of the coastal severe overlays proposed	None stated
Erin Stagg (S314)	S314.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	Are feasible options to mitigate risks through design and location.	That Policy NH - P10 be amended as follows Avoid development of sensitive activities within the Coastal Severe Hazard and Flood Severe Hazard overlays unless it can be demonstrated that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The activity has an operational and functional need to locate within the hazard area; and/or That the activity incorporates mitigation of risk to life, property and the environment; and there is significant public or environmental benefit in doing so.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The risk to adjacent properties, activities and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding
John Brazil (S360)	S360.003	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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 " <i>and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so</i> ".
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.019	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Oppose	Policy aspect b is too restrictive and is based on a significant public or environmental benefit while the majority of land which can be developed is held in private ownership, this policy essentially restricts all development outside of council initiated development.	this should be amended so that where an activity incorporates mitigation to risk to life, the development is appropriate.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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 " <i>and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so</i> ".
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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 " <i>and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so</i> ".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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".
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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".
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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".
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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".
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	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

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						significant public or environmental benefit from doing so".
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.003	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Oppose in part	The wording of this policy is too restrictive and precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions there 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.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.037	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Oppose	The Flood Hazard Severe overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the policy to be more enabling
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.017	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	The wording of this policy is too restrictive	Include wording that allows technical solutions or differing expert opinion to support resource consent applications for development.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.018	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	The wording of NH - P11 is more appropriate for severe overlays than the current wording.	Amend to read as in P11
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.019	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend		Delete ...and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.017	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	The wording of this policy is too restrictive	Include wording that allows technical solutions or differing expert opinion to support resource consent applications for development.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.018	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	The wording of NH - P11 is more appropriate for severe overlays than the current wording.	Amend to read as in P11
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.019	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend		Delete ...and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.106	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	The wording of this policy is too restrictive	Include wording that allows technical solutions or differing expert opinion to support resource consent applications for

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						development.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.107	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	The wording of NH - P11 is more appropriate for severe overlays than the current wording.	Amend to read as in P11
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.108	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend		Delete ... and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.040	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	Strengthen Policy NH-P10 to ensure that development of sensitive activities in these hazard overlays avoids significant natural hazard risk.	Amend Policy NH-P10: Avoid development of sensitive activities within the Coastal Severe Hazard and Flood Severe Hazard overlays unless it can be demonstrated that: a. The activity has an operational and functional need to locate within the hazard area; and b. There is no significant risks from natural hazards; and c. That the activity incorporates mitigation of risk to life, property and the environment, and there is significant public or environmental benefit in doing so.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.004	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	Provide for people's individual economic and social wellbeing by allowing development where the risk is sufficiently mitigated.	Amend NH - P10 as follows: Avoid development of sensitive activities within the Coastal Severe Hazard and Flood Severe Hazard overlays unless it can be demonstrated that: a. The activity has an operational and functional need to locate within the hazard area; and or b. That the activity incorporates mitigation of risk to life, property and the environment, and there is significant public or environmental benefit in doing so.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay,	S605.039	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Oppose	should take an approach which provides for development which appropriate mitigation which may include buildings	Delete part b.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)					being relocatable or able to be re-piled to a higher level in future	
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.566	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Support	Provided the Coastal Severe and Flood Severe Hazard Overlays are accurately located this policy is supported.	N/A
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Amend	The wording is too restrictive and precludes seeking other expert input or utilising 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
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.036	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Support	We support restricting development of sensitive activities within areas at risk from natural hazards.	No Change
John Brazil (S360)	S360.004	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	I support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.021	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support		A note can be included which identifies some form of mitigation measures.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.065	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support in part	Waka Kotahi generally supports the rule. However, there is concern over the term 'minimise' and the potential for onerous requirements resulting from this. It is suggested that any development in these areas do not increase risk to property and the environment.	Amend the rule as follows: a. Mitigation measures avoid risk to life and minimise risk to while not increasing risk to property and the environment.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.038	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Oppose	The Flood Hazard Susceptibility overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the policy to be more enabling
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.133	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	The policy is appropriate.	Retain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.022	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.022	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.110	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support		Retain
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.041	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Amend	Strengthen Policy NH-P11 to ensure that development in these hazard overlays avoids significant natural hazard risk to adjoining property and people.	Amend Policy NH-P11: Allow development in the Land Instability Alert, Coastal Alert and Flood Susceptibility overlays where: a. Mitigation measures avoid risk to life and minimise risk to property and the environment; and b. The risk to adjacent properties, activities and people is not significant, and is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.567	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support in part	Remove hyperlink from the Land part of Land Instability Alert overlay for clarity. There is concern with the word 'minimise' within this policy, how do you quantify minimise? There is a risk that onerous requirements could be introduced.	Alter the policy to remove the hyperlink from Land. Reword a) of this policy to remove 'minimise'

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Otherwise support this policy provided the Land Instability Alert, Coastal Alert and Flood Susceptibility overlays are accurately located.	
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.037	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	Restricting development of sensitive activities within areas at risk from natural hazards.	No Change
John Brazil (S360)	S360.005	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support	I support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Manawa Energy Limited (Manawa Energy) (S438)	S438.061	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support	Manawa supports the recognition given in the policy to the functional and operational needs of activities.	Retain NH - P12(g) as notified.
Bert Hofmans (S504)	S504.003	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Amend	Not an RMA consideration that applies to the submitter's property, discretion should be limited to whether effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated, functional need is a subjective assessment.	Remove clause g. "the functional and operational need to locate in these areas".
Lindy Millar (S505)	S505.003	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Amend	Not an RMA consideration that applies to the submitter's property, discretion should be limited to whether effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated, functional need is a subjective assessment.	Remove clause g. "the functional and operational need to locate in these areas".
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.134	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Amend	Minor amendment to item "g." for consistency of wording throughout the plan.	Amend g. The locational, technical, functional and operational need constraints and requirements of activities needing to locate in these areas; and ...
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.020	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support		Retain
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.012	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support	we support this policy	Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.015	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.020	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.109	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.013	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support	support this policy.	Retain
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.042	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Amend	Strengthen Policy NH-P12 to discourage hard protection in accordance with the NZCPS and to protect building and structures from the adverse effects of natural hazards.	Amend Policy NH-P12: When assessing the effects of activities in natural hazard overlays consider: a. The effects of natural hazards on people, property and the environment; b. technological and engineering mitigation measures and other non-engineered options; c. Discouraging hard protection structures and avoiding hard protection structures in the Coastal Environment; d. The location and design of proposed sites, buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk; e. The clearance or retention of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						f. The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk; g. The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site; h. The functional or operational need to locate in these areas; and i. Any significant adverse effects on the environment of any proposed mitigation measures.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.005	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support	Allowing for the development within the coastal alert area as long as mitigation measures are in place	Retain as notified.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.568	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support in part	Clarify what effects this policy is requiring be considered (adverse, potential, actual?). Clarify whether provision b. is existing mitigation measures, potential measures or proposed ones. Include a definition of natural hazard risk that is referred to in this provision.	Clarify in the policy which effects are being assessed and whether provision b. of the policy is for existing or proposed mitigation (if any is proposed). Include a definition of natural hazard risk.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Amend	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain b. Technological and engineering mitigation measures and other nonengineered options; Delete g. The functional or operational need to locate in these areas; and
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.032	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.032	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support		Retain
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.004	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Support	We have recently, and purposefully, rebuilt our house on piles at a height above the Karamea Highway.	I support such provisions as the advice note 3 for NH P 13 which suggests increasing the finished floor levels.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.022	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Oppose in part	Council should be required to provide specific floor height measurements as determined by the datum or have some form of online reference - the rule is not supported by current determination in the plan or through a council provided service to my knowledge. This is at undue cost to the applicant. I also disagree where the 1m sea level rise coastal event is based on. As well as the use of avoided, as mitigation measures are further possible e.g. two storey dwellings with conditions around what can go in the bottom story - e.g. garage/storage no areas. The use of the word avoid gives little flexibility for real world practice.	Amend policy to place more responsibility on the Council providing the necessary information, to remove the reference to the 1m seal level rise coastal event and delete the word avoid.
The O'Conor Institute Trust Board (S466)	S466.010	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	The relationship of this policy with the protection to be provided by the WCRC Long Term Plan (via the Westport Hazard Overlay), and with Policy NH - R52, is unclear. It is assumed that the planning framework would require new development to mitigate against the Westport (flood) Hazard in advance of the protection provided by the WCRC being completed / certified. However once the LTP protection is certified, it is also expected that no such mitigation would be required. As such, the relevant policies and rules should clearly set out	Clauses a, b and c within Policy NH - P13 should be deleted, or at least remove any uncertainty as to whether the planned LTP works will provide the stated level of protection.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					those expectations, while also providing for ease of administration and interpretation. It is submitted that the current provisions will not lead to this outcome.	
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.009	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	The relationship of this policy with the protection to be provided by the WCRC Long Term Plan (via the Westport Hazard Overlay) and with Policy NH-R52 is unclear. It is assumed that the planning framework would require new development to mitigate against the Westport flood Hazard in advance of the protection provided by the WCRC being completed/certified. However once it is certified it is expected that no such mitigation would be required.	That the policies be amended to explain the expectations when the Westport flood scheme is completed. Delete clauses a, b, and c - or at least remove any uncertainty as to whether the planned LTP works will provide the stated level of protection.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.053	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	The relationship of this policy with the protection to be provided by the WCRC Long Term Plan (via the Westport Hazard Overlay), and with Policy NH - R52, is unclear. It is assumed that the planning framework would require new development to mitigate against the Westport (flood) Hazard in advance of the protection provided by the WCRC being completed / certified. However once the LTP protection is certified, it is also expected that no such mitigation would be required. As such, the relevant policies and rules should clearly set out those expectations, while also providing for ease of administration and interpretation. It is submitted that the current provisions will not lead to this outcome.	Clauses a, b and c within Policy NH - P13 should be deleted, or at least remove any uncertainty as to whether the planned LTP works will provide the stated level of protection.
Bert Hofmans (S504)	S504.005	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	Discretionary activity broadens Councils considerations beyond natural hazard matters. Restricted Discretionary Status	Amend to Restricted Discretionary where compliance not achieved.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					is necessary to give effect to policies NH P11 and NH P12.	
Lindy Millar (S505)	S505.005	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	Discretionary activity broadens Councils considerations beyond natural hazard matters. Restricted Discretionary Status is necessary to give effect to policies NH P11 and NH P12.	Amend to Restricted Discretionary where compliance not achieved.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.028	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Oppose	The Westport Hazard overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	amend to be more enabling
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.023	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	Precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.023	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	Precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.111	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	Precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.039	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Oppose	Consider that further restrictions on subdivision, use and development within the Westport Hazard Overlay are appropriate.	Further limit subdivision, use, and development within the Westport Hazard Overlay
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.011	Natural Hazards	NHP13	Amend	Seek explicit policy direction that subdivision, use and development on their properties also be allowed in circumstances where rules not met	Include additional provisions in Policy NH-P13 insofar as they apply to the Snodgrass Road submitters properties, which direct that ...subdivision, use and development on Snodgrass Road properties be allowed in circumstances where the specified minimum floor levels are not achieved but: a. It involves: i. Construction of buildings which do not house people; or ii. Reconstruction of existing dwellings which are damaged or destroyed; or iii. The extension of the floor area of a dwelling by 25 - 50 m² over any

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						continuous 10 year period without meeting the finished floor area standards set out above (the intent being to allow for addition of a bedroom or similar); or b. It includes: i. Mitigation measures avoid risk to life and minimise risk to property and the environment; and ii. The risk to adjacent properties, activities and people is not increased as a result of the activity proceeding.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.040	Natural Hazards	NHP14	Oppose	Consider that further restrictions on subdivision, use and development within the Hokitika Coastal Hazard Overlay are appropriate	Further limit subdivision, use, and development within the Hokitika Coastal Hazard Overlay
Freehold Properties (Investments) LLP (FP) (S73)	S73.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The Top 10 Holiday Park site is located within the proposed Flood Hazard Severe Overlay. The submitter requests some provision within the Natural Hazard chapter to provide for addition and alterations to the existing commercial buildings currently on the site.	Amend the relevant Natural Hazard chapter provisions to provide for additions and alterations to the existing commercial buildings currently on the Top 10 Holiday Park site. [Flood Severe Overlay] and any consequential amendments to the plan
Joanne and Ken Dixon (S213)	S213.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Most properties in Snodgrass are different in terms of topography and susceptibility to flooding, with only 14 of 34 dwellings being flooded and some told that a 1/100 year flood would not affect them, this must be taken into consideration.	Amend the rules for natural hazards to allow for site specific assessments to demonstrate compliance for permitted activities as opposed to a blanket approach in the Snodgrass area.
Griffen & Smith Ltd (S253)	S253.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support	It is noted that in all natural hazard overlay areas, existing buildings can be replaced if destroyed or damaged by fire, natural disaster or Act of God (Rule NH - R1)	Retain approach to replacement of existing buildings in Rule NZ - R1 rules taking into consideration that the 1% AEP level may change over time.
Griffen & Smith Ltd (S253)	S253.013	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support	We support the rules that new unoccupied buildings or additions/alterations for buildings for commercial/industrial activities can be	Retain provisions in Rules NH - R7, NH-R8, NH-R39 and NH-R40 in relation to new unoccupied buildings and additions/alterations for commercial and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					constructed as a permitted activity in the Flood Susceptibility and Coastal Alert overlays providing finished floor levels are 300mm above a 1% AEP flood event (Rules NH - R7, R8, R39 and R40).	industrial buildings
Gail Dickson (S407)	S407.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose in part	There are no permitted rules for the land instability zone. This is contradictory to the rest of the plan where each "section" has at least something permitted, even in other hazard areas. Permitted activities should at least be outbuildings, or as you call unoccupied buildings, internal alterations to existing dwellings, at least make it in line with other hazard areas	Include Permitted Rules for the Land Instability Zone. Permitted activities should at least be outbuildings, or as you call unoccupied buildings, internal alterations to existing dwellings, at least make it in line with other hazard areas
Paul Finlay (S408)	S408.007	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Avoidance of Coastal climate change effects. .	Require More rigid foundation for buildings of liquefaction sites of lower Hokitika
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.020	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support in part	In general I support recognition of the danger to life and property of living in areas susceptible to natural hazards. I support prohibition of further development in hazardous areas as this will become a liability to the council that approved it. However, there needs to be a transition, and this plan is making a good attempt at transitioning. As always the poorer are most constrained by the rules, for example, to rebuild with a certain timeframe. So that the people do not become isolated and abandoned, the coastal settlements need community wide consultation on the way forward. This includes without having to write.	Undertake further community wide consultation with coastal settlements on the way forward.
Te Tumu Paeroa - The office of the Māori Trustee (S440)	S440.014	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support in part	The Māori Trustee is generally comfortable with the 'Natural Hazards' rules in this chapter. However, the Māori Trustee considers	The Māori Trustee considers a footnote should accompany NH R1(3) to provide exceptions for circumstances outside landowners control that may delay the reconstruction or replacement of a building

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that NH R1(3) does not sufficiently account for circumstances outside landowners control that may delay the reconstruction or replacement of a building within the 2 year timeframe. These could include (but are not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Backlog of insurance claims; Supply shortages; Unresolved litigation; Labour shortages; Delays to the repairing of key infrastructure (i.e. roads). <p>However, if reconstruction or replacement works are not completed within a 5 year timeframe the status of this activity should no longer be permitted. This aligns with NH R1(4).</p>	<p>within the 2 year timeframe.</p> <p>However, if reconstruction or replacement works are not completed within a 5 year timeframe the status of this activity should no longer be permitted. This aligns with NH R1(4).</p>
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support in part	<p>The focus has been on environmental quality while stifling development opportunities for communities, with several smaller communities which have adapted in response to the environment are now including provisions which would inhibit future growth, due to flood zoning. With non-complying activities in theory consent can be sought, however this is at the discretion of the local council and employees.</p>	Amend Non-complying Activity rules for flooding to Restricted Discretionary
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.023	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	<p>The rules are vague and offer very little insight for either practitioners or developers. The open ended nature of these standards should be addressed in depth and rules should be given set value restrictions. Please use reference material from councils which have undergone a plan change, particularly in reference to rules which address urban environments.</p>	Amend the rules to be clearer and more prescriptive with reference to standards in depth and set value restrictions.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.037	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The provisions for Earthquake Hazard Overlays allows for new residential buildings provided a hazard risk assessment is provided. Similar considerations should be undertaken for Westport with regard to the proposed district plan whereby the risk/probability of an earthquake is the same as the probability of a flood based on some of the recent modelling and timing since the southern alps fault line was active. Therefore considerations should be around for how water will actually flow through the town such that future developers should easily be able to calculate raised floor heights.	Amend the flood rules for Westport to take on board a similar approach to the Earthquake Hazard overlay whereby new residential buildings are allowed provided a hazard risk assessment is provided. The town should be mapped by council including where primary/secondary overland flow paths areas of inundation etc. a layer of mapping should also include lidar based mapping which accounts for the topography of the area,
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.040	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose in part	The overlay should be reassessed and mapped going forward. In a number of situations around the township of Westport further development is not viable without subdivision and intensification as informed by the NPS-UD which should be encouraged. In a number of these situations that s.106 of the RMA has more relevance than the above provisions and would allow for conditions of consent or considerations of similar standards in terms of raised height etc. Overall I believe, where based on the preference of staff could stifle development through the township.	That the provisions should either be looser utilising more restricted discretionary matters, to inform developers about the scope of consideration rather than non-complying which gives far too much scope to the council to decline or control development throughout the region
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.109	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose	I don't believe that the principles of "Natural Justice" have been applied in relation to hazards - for example there are little or no restrictions in relation to development near identified fault-lines, but there are severe restrictions in relation to future supposed flooding, simply due to to the recent flooding	Amend the rules to be less restrictive in terms of adaptability options - ie considering alternatives - like pile foundations or 2 story buildings, with non-habitable areas on the new ground floor

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					activity, even through both hazards have a similar possible return period. S.17 Avoid, Remedy or Mitigate are the fundamentals of the RMA - Options for implementing these are very limited in this document and over all, it only seems to consider avoiding development	
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.017	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The NZCPS places an obligation on Councils to protect natural defences such as sand dunes. Villages such as Hannah's Clearing have been well served by such defences. Damage to the defences has been undertaken in recent times by the electricity company around the old tip site - resulting in significant erosion of the beach.	Amend the plan to make it clear that destruction of natural beach front defences, particularly in the Hannah's Clearing area, is not a Permitted Activity.
Troy Scanlon (S468)	S468.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose	Provisions are too restrictive and overlays are too extensive.	Amend provisions and overlay extents to be more enabling of building and development and recognise existing investments.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.018	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	An example of Natural Hazard is in Policy 1 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement being about coastal processes impacting on the land, and there is an excellent list. But the TTPP One Plan has created only very small coastal areas for protection. This is totally insufficient in protecting indigenous biodiversity and avoiding adverse effects on threatened species.	The Plan needs to incentivize where subdivisions should be so that adaptive and progressive moving of residential areas is away from Coastal Hazard zones.
Scenic Hotel Group (S483)	S483.011	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose	The rules are unnecessary, unduly restrictive and may affect the funding of development as well as the insurability of property.	Remove natural hazards provisions from the plan where they affect existing lawfully established activities.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The rules will severely impact on the community of Okuru. Amending the rules would provide a way to allow the	Introduce more certainty into the rules by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing for alternative and acceptable building models eg

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					residents to stay in a community they enjoy.	<p>foundations on poles with set height limits such as 1.2m</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allow for removable dwellings in the event of erosion • Engage professional engineers to design an acceptable solution for dwellings to be raised 1.2m • waive HIRB constraints. • allow for expansion of services to the dwelling within a set area.
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Natural hazards forecasts are inherently uncertain.	Amend the rules so that planners have discretion in applying the hazard zones to take into account nuanced situations of specific sites.
Kevin Scanlon (S503)	S503.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The Rules are too restrictive.	Amend the flood hazard rules to be more enabling of building and development and to recognise established investment.
Rosalie Sampson (S539)	S539.008	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	I don't believe that the principles of "Natural Justice" have been applied in relation to hazards - for example there are little or no restrictions in relation to development near identified fault-lines, but there are severe restrictions in relation to future supposed flooding, simply due to the recent flooding activity, even though both hazards have a similar possible return period.	Ensure that hazards of a similar level of risk are treated similarly within the rules.
Rosalie Sampson (S539)	S539.009	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	S.17 Avoid, Remedy or Mitigate are the fundamentals of the RMA - Options for implementing these are very limited in this document and over all, it only seems to consider avoiding development, which in an ocean locked country on a fault line is border line impossible, and we should	Provide for more options within the rules to remedy or mitigate against the risks of natural hazards rather than pursuing "avoid" approaches

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					instead be focused on adaptability to the environment, as ultimately people need a place to live	
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.050	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Not sure 300mm above 1% annual flood exceedance is high enough.	Amend R8 and all NH rules with higher flood annual flood exceedance
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.010	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support	that there are no land use rules for the flood plain overlay.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.011	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support	support that there are no land use rules for the flood plain overlay.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.045	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Introduce a new rule to enable the demolition and removal of buildings and structures as a permitted activity	Insert new Rule: NH - RX Demolition and Removal of a Natural Hazard Mitigation Structure within all zones and Overlay Areas Activity Status Permitted Advice Note: Where structures are identified as Historic Heritage Items in Schedule One, then the Historic Heritage Rules apply Activity status where compliance not achieved: N/A
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.569	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support in part	Advice note 2 refers to the diversion of water, with the word water being a hyperlink. The definition of water brings up that water within a pipe is not included in the definition. Recommend removing the hyperlink from the word water in this instance.	Remove hyperlink from the word Water in the second advice note.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.116	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support	National guidelines regarding how to treat ground or design foundations to mitigate	Set rules for building on liquefiable land that are consistent with MBIE guidance on liquefiable land.
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.018	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	There are no controls for areas at risk of tsunamis or areas affected by coastal erosion vulnerable to storm surge	New sensitive activities are prohibited within the Coastal Severe Overlay
Elley Group Ltd (S164)	S164.002	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	The inclusion of a Tsunami Zone appears to be more based on the feeling we should have one, than the actual	Remove the tsunami hazard zone and associated provisions.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					necessity This whole tsunami zone needs to be removed and replaced with an acknowledgement of inherent but extremely unlikely natural events which may occur at an indeterminable time.	
Elley Group Ltd (S164)	S164.003	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Oppose	The inclusion of many of the natural hazard zones in their current suggested state, suggests a gross over-reaction to what is, at most, a potential worst-cased based scenario, with very little actual occurrence of most possible situations. The proposed restrictions are draconian, in relation to actual proven risk and ignore the time and investment of the existing ratepayers, all of which can be destroyed at the stroke of a risk-averse planner's pen.	The hazards need to be managed and not based on a false sense of total risk reduction - there is no such thing. Put some realism back into the planning sector - Plan for real and measurable risks and leave the rest to nature.
Garry Gaasbeek (S398)	S398.004	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	The current mapping is putting a lot of stress on local communities.	Request for some more accurate mapping.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.737	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	No land use rules for the flood plain overlay and relates only to the subdivision rules.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.013	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Support	support that there are no land use rules for the flood plain overlay	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.737	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	No land use rules for the flood plain overlay and relates only to the subdivision rules.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.094	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	No land use rules for the flood plain overlay and relates only to the subdivision rules.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.737	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	No land use rules for the flood plain overlay and relates only to the subdivision rules.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.019	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	Landslide risk to Franz Josef Town has not been adequately included	Include an additional overlay and associated maps for landslide risk to Franz Josef Township

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chorus NZ Ltd, Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Vodafone NZ Ltd (S663)	S663.035	Natural Hazards	All Natural Hazard Overlays	Amend	There is no specific reference to telecommunications infrastructure in the rules. Therefore it is unclear if this is because telecommunications infrastructure is not regulated by the rules of this section, or is intended to be caught by catch all rules. A permitted activity rule for telecommunications infrastructure in all hazard overlays is requested for the avoidance of doubt.	Add a new rule applying to all hazard overlays that critical infrastructure, or in the alternative telecommunications infrastructure, is a permitted activity in all natural hazard overlays See additional submission points on natural hazards in the HAZ chapter at the end of this table as the template will not expand out the NH provisions of the HAZ chapter"
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.535	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Some permitted rules for specified activities include earthworks while others do not.	Amend: There is one permitted activity rule for maintenance and repair of natural hazard mitigation structures including earthworks
Northern Buller Communities Society Incorporated (S142)	S142.006	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Support	This rule enables us to reconstruct or replace our buildings within the timeframes provided and we consider both of them lawfully established	In favour
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.005	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	Notwithstanding existing use rights which exist due a building being lawfully established at the time of notification of the plan. Westland District Council does not support NH-R1-4. Which states that reconstruction or replacement of a destroyed/damaged building is permitted if it is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in all other natural hazard overlays. - There are concerns that with volatile waterways, unexpected landslips and potential for flooding that not only could the site become unsuitable to rebuild with no consideration for mitigation against the natural hazard that destroyed it in the first	Remove NH-R1 4 or make it restricted discretionary to reconstruct or replace beyond the 12 months allowed for under s10 if the RMA. Restrictions being the demonstration of natural hazard mitigation.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>instance, but also within a period of 5 years from the time a building was destroyed</p> <p>the hazardscape could change and intensify drastically. Creating this permitted rule takes away Council's ability to assess risk and require mitigation against further natural hazard threats.</p> <p>- It is considered that existing use rights provisions under s10 of the RMA 1991 may cause difficulty enough if a site is considered to no longer be suitable for rebuilding or replacement of a dwelling. With no ability under the West Coast RPS to extinguish existing use rights Council may be forced to allow a member of public to rebuild in an unsuitable site subjecting them to further emotional and financial effects if it becomes an issue again. For example if a dwelling owner rebuilds where a creek has jumped out of its bed and gone through the building the Plan (even if this risk has increased) up to 5 years later gives can still rebuild. Effectively setting the dwelling up to fail.</p>	
John Brazil (S360)	S360.006	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten-year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.024	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Support	This is an extension of s.10 of the RMA which is more permissive.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.016	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two years is unrealistic for a building to be replaced, should be 5 years regardless of location,	Amend the rule so that in all hazard overlays the rebuild period is 5 years. Clarify that this applies to all buildings legally established (ie built before and after plan notification).
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.066	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the permitted activity status for the reconstruction and replacement of lawfully established building in all Natural Hazard Overlays where the buildings are located fully within their property boundary. It is recommended the rule be amended to ensure that any reconstruction or replacement of a building are not within the roading corridor.	Propose an additional clause: 6. The reconstructed /replaced building is fully within the property boundaries to which the building relates, with no part of the building being within the roading corridor (formed or unformed).
The O'Connor Institute Trust Board (S466)	S466.011	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	The 2-year timeframe imposed within clause 3 of this policy is opposed. Two years is a very short timeframe for all design, consenting and construction to be completed.	That clause 3 be deleted and integrated into what is currently clause 4.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.021	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	The approach to natural hazards as it applies to Punakaiki Village are inappropriate. They do not allow for the reasonable use of land and buildings within the Village, and will ultimately result in stagnation of the Village through planning blight.	Exclude Punakaiki Village from this rule or if the rule is retained: a. delete condition 2 b. align condition 5 with the SVZ permitted activity rules
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.010	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	The 2 year timeframe in clause 3 is opposed. It is a very short timeframe for all design, consenting and construction to be completed.	That clause 3 be deleted and integrated into what is currently clause 4 with a timeframe of 10 years.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.054	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	The 2-year timeframe imposed within clause 3 of this policy is opposed. Two years is a very short timeframe for all design, consenting and construction to be completed.	That clause 3 be deleted and integrated into what is currently clause 4.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.004	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.096	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Support	Support.	Retain as notified.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and	S543.029	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	The Westport Hazard overlay is inappropriate.	amend to be more enabling

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)					Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.135	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Unclear whether this rule is intended to be more restrictive than other natural hazard rules.	Amend this rule to ensure that it does not conflict with, or restrict, building activity that can occur under permitted activity rules elsewhere in the Natural Hazards Section.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.136	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	It is unclear whether this rule is intended to be more restrictive than other natural hazard rules that permit certain building activities. Whilst it is accepted that this is the only rule relating to "reconstruction and replacement" there are numerous rules providing for new buildings, particularly unoccupied buildings, or repairs and maintenance that appear to allow for increased floor areas for certain buildings. The "Activity status where compliance not achieved" section refers plan readers to the specific natural hazard overlay rules however there are no rules for "reconstruction or replacement" in any of those overlay rules.	It is not possible to make a submission in regard to the activity status for activities that do not comply with permitted standards "1.-5." As it is not known what the intent is in that regard.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.024	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	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 all overlays.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.013	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.016	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						all overlays or delete time limit.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.024	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	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 all overlays.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.112	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	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 all overlays.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.014	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Delete time limit.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.015	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.570	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Support	When compliance is not achieved the reader is directed to specific Natural Hazard Overlays Rules. Clarity is required as to where these can be found. Provision 2. of the rule refers to an Act of God and natural disaster. Clarity is required on what an Act of God is vs. a natural disaster.	Clarity on which Natural Hazard Overlay rules apply if compliance of the rule is not achieved, and what activity status is if provision NH - R1 is not complied with. Clarity on what an Act of God is vs. a natural disaster.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.041	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	It is not appropriate to rebuild structures used for sensitive activities	Amend NH-R1 to prohibit reconstruction of buildings used for sensitive activities within the Flood Severe and Earthquake 20m zone
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.119	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Amend	Prohibit reconstruction of buildings used for

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						critical response, health, community, education or hazardous facilities within any natural hazard overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.120	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend		Require buildingsreconstructed within the Flood Susceptibility Overlay to have the same finishedfloor level above the 1% AEP flood level as a new building in the same category.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.033	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.033	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.011	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	NH-R1(1-5) means that landowners will be forced to rebuild in the same spot as opposed to relocated to a more suitable location	Delete rule NH-R1(1-5)
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.012	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Not practical to reconstruct or replace a damaged home within a 2 year timeframe.	Amend Rule NH-R1 so reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in the Westport Hazard Overlay is permitted within a 5 year timeframe.
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.007	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support	Council supports the maintenance and operation of any existing natural hazard mitigation structure being a permitted activity where the provisions of this rule are met. Council particularly supports the requirement to maintain public access	Retain this rule
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.025	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support	Agree in full.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.067	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intention of the permitted activity status of this rule for repairs, maintenance, and operation of existing Natural Hazard Mitigation structures. However, it requires that the earthworks are the 'minimum' required to undertake the activity. It is considered that the term 'minimum' to be relatively open without being measurable or quantifiable, which could lead to multiple interpretations of the rule. It is recommended that the word 'minimum' be replaced with a measurable or quantifiable figure.	Amend the word 'minimum' and replace it with measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.022	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support		Retain as notified
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.097	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support	Recognise the need to be able to undertake repairs, maintenance, and operation of existing natural hazard mitigation structures, upgrades to existing Natural Hazard Mitigation structures and New Natural Hazard mitigation structures that meet the permitted criteria.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.025	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Amend	The intent of this rule is appropriate but it is too constraining.	Amend as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where: 1. The structure has been lawfully established; and 2. There is no significant change to the size, scale and nature of the structure. Earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity; There is no change to the design, texture, or form of the structure;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>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</p> <p>There is no reduction in public access.</p>
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.025	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Amend	The intent of this rule is appropriate but it is too constraining.	<p>Amend as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure has been lawfully established; and 2. There is no significant change to the size, scale and nature of the structure. <p>Earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity;</p> <p>There is no change to the design, texture, or form of the structure;</p> <p>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</p> <p>There is no reduction in public access.</p>
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.113	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Amend	The intent of this rule is appropriate but it is too constraining.	<p>Amend as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where:</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>1. The structure has been lawfully established; and</p> <p>2. There is no significant change to the size, scale and nature of the structure.</p> <p>Earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity;</p> <p>There is no change to the design, texture, or form of the structure;</p> <p>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</p> <p>There is no reduction in public access.</p>
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.043	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support	Amend Rule NH- R2 so that the earthworks rule is less ambiguous and is measurable.	<p>Amend Rule NH- R2: Activity Status Permitted Where: The structure has been lawfully established; Earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity contained wholly within the footprint of the mitigation structure; There is no change to the design, texture, or form of the structure; 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</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						There is no reduction in public access....
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.571	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support in part	It seems unduly onerous to require resource consent for the continued operation of any existing natural hazard mitigation structure. Provision 3. requires that there is no change to the design, texture or form of the structure, however this would prevent the permitted activity of maintenance or repair from being undertaken.	Remove the reference to operation from the title of NH - R2. Reword provision 3. to the following: "3. There is no significant change to the design, texture, or form of the structure;" OR align with NH - R3: "3. There is no change to more than 10% of the overall dimensions, orientation or outline the design, texture, or form of the structure; Specify that the provisions in this permitted activity standard are isolated from the provisions for earthworks in the other overlay chapters to prevent this being unduly onerous. Replace the word 'minimum' with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.013	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support	Repair and maintenance of any mitigation structure which protects a property or properties can occur without the need for a resource consent	Retain Rule NH-R2.
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.008	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Amend	Council considers that requirement under NH R3 - 3 should be, that the activity is permitted if public access is provided for. At present even in an upgrade situation the rule only requires that public access is no worse than status quo. It is considered that at the time of an upgrade if public access is limited or nil that this should be a consideration of the upgrade and should not be considered permitted if public access is not provided for.	Replace NH - R3 3 'There is no reduction in public access' with: 'Practical public access is provided for' Council supports the requirement in NH - R3 5, confirming that the natural hazard mitigation structure does not increase the natural hazard risk to other properties or any other lawfully established natural hazard mitigation structure. This sets a clear requirement for applicants and gives clear direction to staff when considering potential risk from upgrade of structures. Keep this provision (NH - R3 5).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.003	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Amend	Our current property on the western side borders the fringe of the Otumahana Estuary and has had a sea wall to protect it from sea surges for many years prior to us purchasing the property. The frontage is about 400 metres. Over time, we have continued to enhance the wall to protect against rising tides. We have also constructed access roads at the northern and southern end of the property to connect the main Karamea Highway with the sea wall, at the same height as the sea wall. We are therefore surrounded by a wall which consists of the main road and three other structures.	I urge the decision makers to allow as permitted activities, the improvement of protective barriers such as seawalls which already exist. I also request that reasonable provision be made for the possibility of subdivision and land improvement and development on suitably protected land.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.026	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.068	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intention of the permitted activity status of this rule for upgrades to Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures. However, it requires that the earthworks are the 'minimum' required to undertake the activity. It is considered that the term 'minimum' to be relatively open without being measurable or quantifiable, which could lead to multiple interpretations of the rule. It is recommended that the word 'minimum' be replaced with a measurable or quantifiable figure.	Amend the word 'minimum' and replace it with measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.023	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Oppose in part		Delete condition 4
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.098	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Support	Recognise the need to be able to undertake repairs, maintenance, and operation of existing natural hazard mitigation structures, upgrades to existing Natural Hazard Mitigation structures and	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					New Natural Hazard mitigation structures that meet the permitted criteria.	
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.026	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Amend	We support this rule in principle but believe it should be more enabling of upgrades.	Amend to be more enabling of upgrades.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.037	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Oppose	there are existing controls in place in relation to the section.	Delete
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.026	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Amend	We support this rule in principle but believe it should be more enabling of upgrades.	Amend to be more enabling of upgrades.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.114	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Amend	We support this rule in principle but believe it should be more enabling of upgrades.	Amend to be more enabling of upgrades.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.044	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Amend	Amend Rule NH- R3 so that the earthworks rule is less ambiguous and is measurable, and enables an appropriate level of earthworks to be undertaken as a permitted activity, given this will relate to areas subject to natural hazards where the release of silt and sediment is a higher risk during natural hazard events.	Amend Rule NH- R3: Activity Status Permitted Where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure has been lawfully established; 2. Earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity wholly contained within the footprint of the structure, or is otherwise no more than 100m3 and 200m2 in area in any 12 month period; 3.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.572	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Support in part	Remove the reference to "originally consented structure" from provision 4. as not all lawfully established structures are lawfully established with consent. Provision 2. of NH - R2 is made redundant if the required earthworks or land disturbance is restricted by a rule in another overlay chapter as referred to by the advice note. The restrictions make this permitted activity standard unduly	Reword provision 4. of NH - R3 to the following: "4. There is no change to more than 10% to the overall dimensions, orientation or outline of structure from the that originally lawfully established consented structure; and" Specify that the provisions in this permitted activity standard are isolated from the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					trying to use. R2 requires the 'minimum' earthworks and land disturbance to undertake the activity. The term 'minimum' is open to interpretation and is not measurable or quantifiable which will lead to multiple interpretations of the rule. It is therefore recommended that the word 'minimum' be replaced.	provisions for earthworks in the other overlay chapters to prevent this being unduly onerous. Replace the word 'minimum' with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.014	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Support	It is important that upgrade of any mitigation structure can occur without the need for a resource consent	Retain Rule NH-R3.
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.009	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Amend	Council considers that requirement under NH R4 - 3 should be, that the activity is permitted if public access is provided for. In its current form, a new natural hazard mitigation structure only requires that public access is no worse than status quo. Therefore if there is no public access for example due to coastal erosion causing a large escarpment, then a new structure would not have to consider public access as it would be no worse than what existed. It is considered that at the time of a new build, if public access is limited or nil the provision of and improvement of public access should be a consideration. A new build should not be a permitted activity if public access is not provided for.	Replace NH - R4 3 'There is no reduction in public access' with: 'Practical public access is provided for'
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.027	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.069	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intention of the permitted activity status of this rule for New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures. However, it requires that the earthworks are the 'minimum' required to undertake the activity. It is considered	Amend the word 'minimum' and replace it with measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					that the term 'minimum' to be relatively open without being measurable or quantifiable, which could lead to multiple interpretations of the rule. It is recommended that the word 'minimum' be replaced with a measurable or quantifiable figure.	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.099	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Support	Recognise the need to be able to undertake repairs, maintenance, and operation of existing natural hazard mitigation structures, upgrades to existing Natural Hazard Mitigation structures and New Natural Hazard mitigation structures that meet the permitted criteria.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.027	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Amend	New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures are important and should predominate over the Overlay rules.	Delete point 1. Retain other points.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.027	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Amend	New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures are important and should predominate over the Overlay rules.	Delete point 1. Retain other points.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.115	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Amend	New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures are important and should predominate over the Overlay rules.	Delete point 1. Retain other points.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.046	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Amend	Oppose the permitted activity status for new Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures as these structures can have adverse environmental effects that should be assessed through a resource consent.	Amend Rule NH- R4: Activity Status Permitted -Restricted Discretionary Where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The structure is located outside of any Overlay Chapter area identified in Schedules 1-8; 2. Earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity; 3. There is no reduction in public access; 4. It is accompanied by an assessment undertaken by a Chartered Professional Engineer confirming that the natural hazard

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>mitigation structure does not increase the natural hazard risk to other properties or any other lawfully established natural hazard mitigation structure, and this assessment is provided to the relevant District Council 10 working days prior to works commencing...</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The effects of natural hazards on people and property; 2. Considering whether the proposed earthworks and land disturbance is the minimum required to undertake the activity; 3. Technological and engineering mitigation measures and other non-engineered options; 4. Discouraging hard protection structures; 5. The location and design of the natural hazard mitigation structure; 6. Any freeboard requirements to be included; 7. The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk; 8. The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to the natural hazard structure; 9. Adverse effects on ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity; 10. Any other adverse effects on the environment of the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						proposed natural hazard mitigation structure; and 11. Alternative methods to avoid or mitigate the identified hazard risks....
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.573	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Support in part	Appears unduly convoluted to require any new natural hazard mitigation structure to be subject to all provisions of the Overlay Chapters when the intention of the Natural Hazard chapter is to provide for this (NH - O2). Replace the word 'minimum' with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity	Request that the provisions to create new natural hazard mitigation structures simplified to reduce confusion and undue convolution. Replace the word 'minimum' with a measurable or quantifiable wording to provide clarity
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.012	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Oppose	Protection works can reshape the natural environment and processes which can compromise natural character and amenity	NH-R4 moved to full discretionary activity status
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.015	Natural Hazards	NHR4	Support	It is appropriate that new mitigation structures constructed to protect a property or properties in Snodgrass Road without the need for a resource consent	Retain Rule NH-R4.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.100	Natural Hazards	NHR5	Support	Discretionary activity status considered appropriate.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.028	Natural Hazards	NHR5	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.028	Natural Hazards	NHR5	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.116	Natural Hazards	NHR5	Support		Retain
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.047	Natural Hazards	NHR5	Amend	Support Rule NH-R5, but amend the rule title as a consequential amendment to the changes proposed to Rule NH-R4.	Amend: Repairs, Maintenance, Operation, Upgrade of Existing Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures and New Natural Hazard Mitigation Structures not meeting Permitted or Restricted Discretionary

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Activity Standards
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.574	Natural Hazards	NHR5	Amend	Appears unduly convoluted to require any repairs, maintenance, operation or upgrade of any existing or new natural hazard mitigation structure to be subject to all provisions of the Overlay Chapters when the intention of the Natural Hazard chapter is to provide for this (NH- O2).	Request that the provisions to create new natural hazard mitigation structures simplified to reduce confusion and undue convolution.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.016	Natural Hazards	NHR5	Support	Discretionary activity status is appropriate for any natural hazard mitigation structure which does not meet permitted activity rules.	Retain Rule NH-R5.
Graeme Kellaway (S53)	S53.001	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend		Remove the Flood Hazard Susceptibility overlay from the property at 47 River Road Hector.
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.008	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend	Breaches of the Flood Susceptibility Overlay provisions should be non-notified if it does not have off-site effects on the environment;	Include a non-notification clause in relation to the flood susceptibility overlay where there are no off-site effects on the environment.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.034	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Oppose	The Flood Hazard Severe overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the rules to be more enabling
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.035	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Oppose	The Flood Hazard Susceptibility overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the rules to be more enabling
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.060	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	retain extent of overlay as notified

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.061	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.060	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	retain extent of overlay as notified
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.061	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.145	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	retain extent of overlay as notified
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.146	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.090	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Support	Do not support our properties being included in this overlay	Oppose any extension from what has been notified that would include our properties.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.042	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend	That the highest flood risk category includes all areas which are expected to have >1m flood depths in a 1% AEP flood	<p>Amend Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility to include all areas which are expected to have >1m flood depths in a 1% AEP flood
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.121	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend	The lower-risk flood hazard category in the TTPP is poorly defined and not well explained.	Amend to distinguish between flood ponding areas and flood stream/overland flow paths for lower and higher flood hazard, respectively
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.030	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	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.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.030	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	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.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.003	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Oppose	Seek that the flood hazard zoning be removed from their properties	Remove Westport Flood Hazard zoning
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.004	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Oppose	It is unclear why this area is subject to this overlay. 2/75 Snodgrass Road	That the Flood Hazard Susceptibility Overlay be removed in its entirety from this property
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.055	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood Susceptibility Overlay	Amend	The objectives, policies and rules which apply to these properties be amended	Amend
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.028	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Oppose in part	The use of the word sensitive activities within this rule is not linked to the definition, particularly when the definition basically includes the majority of activities that would be located in existing residential townships, particularly where the failure is non-complying the provision is too strong. The failure should be restricted discretionary with clear direction from council as to the matters of concern/control.	Amend so that the rule escalates to Restricted Discretionary with clear direction as to the matters of concern/control.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.101	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Support	Ability for repair and maintenance is supported.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.137	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Support	The intent of the rule is supported.	Retain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.029	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Support	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for all overlays.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.029	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Support	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for all overlays.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.117	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Support	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for all overlays.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.575	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Support in part	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings. It is implied in this standard that the repair/ maintenance of existing buildings in the Flood Susceptibility Overlay or Flood Severe Overlay when the building is unoccupied is permitted, however it is not clear. It is considered that this should be permitted given NH - R7 allows for the construction of new unoccupied buildings in these overlays as a permitted activity.	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings as this is what the rule is providing for. Clarify whether NH - R6 provides for the repair/maintenance of existing buildings when the buildings are unoccupied.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.017	Natural Hazards	NHR6	Support	This rule applies to 2/75 Snodgrass Road (front building). It is important the Proposed Plan permit the repair and maintenance of this building.	Retain Rule NH-R6.
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.010	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Oppose	Council has concerns regarding making any unoccupied building permitted in the Severe Flood Zone. It would be deemed inappropriate to allow high levels of investment within Severe Flood overlays just because they are unoccupied buildings. It is considered that Councils should not be encouraging investment in assets in known high hazard areas, allowing damage to property. At the least this should be a Controlled activity to allow for mitigation of destruction of property and potentially consider the risk and level of investment being put at risk.	Change the status for New Unoccupied Buildings in the Flood Severe and Flood Susceptibility Overlays to a Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity with controls or restrictions including:- Assessment of risk to building- Consideration of mitigation measures to reduce/manage flood hazard- Consideration of likelihood or potential of complete loss of the building in a flood situation
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.029	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Oppose in part		Not stated

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.102	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Support	Support that unoccupied buildings do not trigger a resource consent requirement	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.138	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Support	The intent of the rule is supported.	Retain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.030	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.030	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.118	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.576	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Support	Support without alteration.	Retain
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.013	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Amend	Allows for continued investment in areas where natural hazards can impact property and people	Amend to state unoccupied buildings of no more than 50m2
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.018	Natural Hazards	NHR7	Support	There is no reason to limit the establishment of new unoccupied buildings in these overlays.	Retain Rule NH-R7.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.030	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.103	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Support	Recognise the need to reflect freeboard requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS4404:2010.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.139	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	That major dams should be excluded from control by the rule.	Add Note: With reference to Critical Response Facilities this rule does not apply to major dams.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.050	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	BCG is not sure 300mm above 1% annual flood exceedance is high enough.	Amend R8 and all NH rules with higher flood annual flood exceedance
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.031	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Support	The rule is too restrictive for additions and alterations to existing buildings.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.033	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	Overlays should not be bundled together.	Separate overlays into different rules.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.031	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Support	The rule is too restrictive for additions and alterations to existing buildings.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.033	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	Overlays should not be bundled together.	Separate overlays into different rules.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.119	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Support	The rule is too restrictive for additions and alterations to existing buildings.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.120	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	Overlays should not be bundled together.	Separate overlays into different rules.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.577	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Support in part	Change the wording of NH - R8 provision 1. to clarify that it is any building used for sensitive activities, not a specific building.	Reword NH - R8 provision 1. to the following: "1. There is are no increases in the net floor area of any the building used for sensitive activities; and
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive	Delete 2. Any new buildings or additions and alterations have a finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) flood event.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.043	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	Permitting commercial and industrial activities puts people in danger in their workplaces	Amend activity status for new commercial and industrial buildings and additions and alterations to existing buildings for critical

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						response facilities in the flood severe overlay
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.123	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	Flood early warning systems and evacuation plans are mandated for all occupied buildings in the Flood Severe overlay	Add a new condition: 3. Flood early warning systems and evacuation plans are mandated for all occupied buildings.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.124	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Amend	Relocate critical response facilities out of flood areas	Add a condition: 4. All critical response facilities to be relocated out of the flood severe area and preferably the flood susceptibility area, unless their location is a critical part of their purpose/function
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.031	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose	The escalation should be to a restricted discretionary, as the non-complying status is considered incredibly restrictive considering the fanciful mapping that has been used which has been based on estimations as identified above in the strategic direction, and is not informed by engineering calculations.	Amend so that where Permitted Activity standard not met escalates to Restricted Discretionary Activity
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.104	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Support in part	Switch the order of R 9 and 10 to be consistent - Flood susceptibility and then severe rules. Ensure difference between severe and susceptibility overlays are justifiable and supported with evidence.	Ensure overlays are supported with evidence and defined correctly. Further work may be required in regard to identification of overlays and the extent they cover.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.034	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.034	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.121	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.578	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Support in part	Change the wording of NH - R9 provision 1. to clarify it is net floor area of buildings and for consistency with NH - R8.	Reword NH - R9 provision 1. to the following: "1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for sensitive activities."
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.005	Natural Hazards	NHR10	Support in part	I probably support rules such as NH R 10 and R 38 although I have not seen any report or data which identifies land in the Karamea area, and our property in particular, which is already 500 mm above the 1% AEP flood event.	Retain NH R10.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.032	Natural Hazards	NHR10	Oppose in part	Should escalate to restricted discretionary limited to floor heights, discretionary allows for too much scope for such a narrow failure which is limited to overland flow paths for water.	Should escalate to restricted discretionary limited to floor heights, discretionary allows for too much scope for such a narrow failure which is limited to overland flow paths for water.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.105	Natural Hazards	NHR10	Support	Recognise the need to reflect New Zealand Standard NZS4404:2010 - 4.3.5.2.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.044	Natural Hazards	NHR10	Support	The requirement of a finished floor level of 500mm above the 1% AEP flood event	No Change
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.014	Natural Hazards	NHR10	Oppose	Rule is too permissive	Move NH-R10 to controlled activity status
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.015	Natural Hazards	NHR10	Amend	Rule is too permissive	Amend to read: Any new buildings or additions and alteration have a finished floor level a minimum of 500mm above the 1%AEP flood event
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.019	Natural Hazards	NHR10	Amend	Allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m ² over any continuous 10-year period without meeting the finished floor area standards.	Amend Rule NH-R10 to allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road submitters' properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m ² over any continuous 10-year period without meeting the finished floor area standards set out in Rule NH-R10(1).
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.033	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Oppose in part	Some of the conditions are vague, such as minimise risk to human life, there is no measure for a number or provisions,	Make matters of discretion clearer and more measurable.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.106	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Support	Matters of discretion cover a range of considerations that are appropriate.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.140	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Amend	a note should be added that this rule does not apply to major dams	Add Note: With reference to Critical Response Facilities this rule does not apply to major dams.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.141	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Amend	Regarding the constraints and requirements of certain activities.	Amend: a. Whether there is a locational, technical, functional or operational need constraint or requirement for the facility needing to be located locate in a flood ...
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.035	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.035	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.122	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.579	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Support	Support without alteration.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.045	Natural Hazards	NHR11	Support	Critical response facilities situated at risk from natural hazards	Retain
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.034	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Oppose in part	Some of the conditions are vague, such as minimise risk to human life, there is no measure for a number or provisions.	Make matters of discretion clearer and more measurable
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.043	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Amend	Public or limited notification is not necessary or appropriate for an assessment of whether the natural hazard mitigation is effective.	Discretion is restricted to: The effects of natural hazards on people and property; The location and design of proposed sites, buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk; Any freeboard requirements to be included; The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk; The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk; The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site; The functional or operational need to locate in these areas; and Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed natural hazard mitigation measures. Any application arising from this rule shall be non-notified.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.107	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support in part	Matters of discretion are considered appropriate. Also suggest including matter h from R11 as this seems applicable.	Insert h from R 11 into matters of discretion for R12.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.036	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	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
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.014	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.017	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.036	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	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
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.123	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	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
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.016	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	Support this rule	Retain
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.046	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Oppose in part	Commercial and industrial activities should be avoided within the Flood Severe Overlay	Amend activity status for new commercial and industrial buildings within the flood severe overlay to non-complying or

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						prohibited.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.125	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Amend	Buildings located within the Flood Severe overlay require flood early warning systems and evacuation plans	Add matter for discretion: h. The installation of flood early warning systems and implemenatation of evacuation plans.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.034	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.034	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support		Retain
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.035	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Oppose in part	This standard essentially prevents additions to any houses, however some consideration should be given for engineering solutions with the standard where not being met should be restricted discretionary in line with the above restricted discretionary standards.	Make rule Restricted Discretionary with clear measurable matters of discretion.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.108	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	Discretionary activity status considered appropriate.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.142	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Amend	Check double up with non-complying activity NH-R14	Resolve duplication with non-complying activity NH-R14

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.037	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.015	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.018	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.037	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.124	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.017	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	support this rule.	Retain
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.035	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.035	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support		Retain
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.020	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	It is important the Proposed Plan allow a resource consent application be made for an activity which does not meet permitted activity rules.	Retain provision
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.036	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose		New buildings for sensitive activities should be amended.
Totally Tourism Limited (S449)	S449.011	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Support	it is important to maintain a commercial presence along the State Highway to draw people into the Township and to maintain the existing commercial investments in this area provided that the existing risk is 'tolerable' and not exacerbated.	Retain the Permitted Activity provisions for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Repairs and maintenance of existing occupied and unoccupied buildings. New unoccupied buildings. Reconstruction and replacement of lawfully established buildings

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						destroyed by natural disaster or act of god.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.109	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Support	Activity status considered appropriate.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.143	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Amend	Check double up with non-complying activity NH-R13	Resolve duplication with non-complying activity NH-R13
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.038	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	We believe this rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.039	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Amend	Does not allow council to consider possible solutions or differing expert opinion.	Refer to decision sought for NH - R13.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.038	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	We believe this rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.039	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Amend	Does not allow council to consider possible solutions or differing expert opinion.	Refer to decision sought for NH - R13.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.125	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	We believe this rule is too restrictive.	Delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.126	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Amend	Does not allow council to consider possible solutions or differing expert opinion.	Refer to decision sought for NH - R13.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.047	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Support	The avoidance of sensitive activities within the flood severe overlay	Retain
Totally Tourism Limited (S449)	S449.012	Natural Hazards	Earthquake Hazard Overlays - All	Support	It is important to maintain a commercial presence along the State Highway to draw people into the Township and to maintain the existing commercial investments in this area provided that the existing risk is 'tolerable' and not exacerbated.	Retain the proposed Restricted Discretionary and Discretionary consent pathways for additions and alterations to residential and commercial buildings within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays.
Scenic Hotel Group (S483)	S483.012	Natural Hazards	Earthquake Hazard Overlays - All	Oppose	Certain types of buildings are able to withstand earthquakes with little or moderate damage and do not represent a threat to life. The plan should permit people to build with these materials and techniques. Preventative work such as earthquake strengthening does not seem to be provided for in this plan.	Replace the rules with rules that permit modern buildings and techniques compliant with building codes and standards that can withstand earthquakes without risk to life or unacceptable damage.
Scenic Hotel Group (S483)	S483.018	Natural Hazards	Earthquake Hazard Overlays - All	Oppose		Should any of the changes that restrict development be adopted then financial assistance or compensation - in conjunction with central government agencies needs to be investigated as appropriate.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.110	Natural Hazards	NHR15	Support in part	For ease of interpretation, rules need to clearly identify that unoccupied buildings (where they are not for critical response facilities) in the buffers are permitted. Consider inserting permitted activity for unoccupied buildings in each buffer to ensure rules aren't missed if the plan user goes straight to the buffer area applicable to the site they are looking at.	Insert clarity around permitted activity status for unoccupied buildings.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.144	Natural Hazards	NHR15	Amend	permitted activities for the zone, zone provisions do not apply to energy activities.	Amend 1. These are lawfully established or a Permitted Activity for the zone in the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						plan.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.145	Natural Hazards	NHR15	Amend	It is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.	Amend 2. Any unoccupied buildings ... response facilities NOTE: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.583	Natural Hazards	NHR15	Support in part	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings.	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.051	Natural Hazards	NHR15	Amend	Occupied buildings' is not defined	Amend wording of 'unoccupied building'
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.111	Natural Hazards	NHR16	Support in part	For ease of interpretation, rules need to clearly identify that unoccupied buildings (where they are not for critical response facilities) in the buffers are permitted. Consider inserting permitted activity for unoccupied buildings in each buffer to ensure rules aren't missed if the plan user goes straight to the buffer area applicable to the site they are looking at.	Insert clarity around permitted activity status for unoccupied buildings.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.146	Natural Hazards	NHR16	Amend	It is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.	Add Note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.581	Natural Hazards	NHR16	Support	Provided the Earthquake Hazard Overlays are accurately located this policy is supported.	N/A
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.049	Natural Hazards	NHR16	Support	The avoidance of sensitive activities within the earthquake hazard overlays	Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.112	Natural Hazards	NHR17	Support in part	For ease of interpretation, rules need to clearly identify that unoccupied buildings (where they are not for critical response facilities) in the buffers are permitted. Consider inserting permitted activity for	Insert clarity around permitted activity status for unoccupied buildings.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					unoccupied buildings in each buffer to ensure rules aren't missed if the plan user goes straight to the buffer area applicable to the site they are looking at.	
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.147	Natural Hazards	NHR17	Amend	It is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.	Add NOTE: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.050	Natural Hazards	NHR17	Support	The avoidance of sensitive activities within the earthquake hazard overlays	retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.113	Natural Hazards	NHR18	Support in part	<p>Reword these rules for ease of interpretation.</p> <p>Consider inserting permitted activity status in each buffer to make it clear that repairs and maintenance are permitted to occupied and unoccupied buildings.</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. Clarity around increases in floor area for sensitive activities.</p>	<p>Insert additional permitted activity rule in each buffer addressing repairs and maintenance to unoccupied buildings in each buffer (see comment in R15).</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer.</p> <p>While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.</p>
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.148	Natural Hazards	NHR18	Amend	<p>(1) Terminology should be consistent between item 1 in this rule and item "1." in NH-R20, re "area of the building"?</p> <p>(2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(4) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not</p>	<p>(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R20.</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(4) Add a note to the rule, "(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					associated buildings and this should be made clear.	
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.149	Natural Hazards	NHR18	Amend	It is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.	Add NOTE: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.580	Natural Hazards	NHR18	Support in part	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings.	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.582	Natural Hazards	NHR18	Support in part	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings.	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.
Totally Tourism Limited (S449)	S449.013	Natural Hazards	NHR19	Amend	The Proposed Plan should include provision for reconstruction and replacement of existing buildings in the Earthquake Hazard Overlay's other than where they have been damaged/destroyed by natural disaster. This would create the ability to replace their existing buildings to modernise them but retain the existing gross floor area and internal occupancy levels and therefore, not exacerbating the potential risk to life. Rather, a modern replacement building is likely to have less risk to life than the existing structures on the submitter's properties.	Provide for the reconstruction and replacement of existing buildings in the Earthquake Hazard Overlays other than where they have been damaged/destroyed by natural disaster as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.114	Natural Hazards	NHR19	Support in part	Reword these rules for ease of interpretation. Consider inserting permitted activity status in each buffer to make it clear that repairs and maintenance are permitted to occupied and unoccupied buildings.	Insert additional permitted activity rule in each buffer addressing repairs and maintenance to unoccupied buildings in each buffer (see comment in R15). Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. Clarity around increases in floor area for sensitive activities.	While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.052	Natural Hazards	NHR19	Amend	Occupied buildings' is not defined	Amend term 'occupied building'
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.053	Natural Hazards	NHR19	Amend	Occupied buildings' is not defined	Amend term 'occupied building'
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.115	Natural Hazards	NHR20	Support in part	<p>Reword these rules for ease of interpretation.</p> <p>Consider inserting permitted activity status in each buffer to make it clear that repairs and maintenance are permitted to occupied and unoccupied buildings.</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. Clarity around increases in floor area for sensitive activities.</p>	<p>Insert additional permitted activity rule in each buffer addressing repairs and maintenance to unoccupied buildings in each buffer (see comment in R15).</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer.</p> <p>While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.</p>
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.120	Natural Hazards	NHR20	Support in part	<p>Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a, b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.</p>	<p>Alter bullet numbering in R21.</p> <p>Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document</p>
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.128	Natural Hazards	NHR20	Support in part	<p>Activity Status Permitted (ASP)</p> <p>1. R20, R24, and R27 state "There is no increase in the area of the building used for a Critical Response Facility." R30 states "Repairs and maintenance do not increase the area of a building..." Appears to have the same meaning as the heading is for Repairs and Maintenance.</p>	<p>If the intended ASP meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R30 wording to mirror R20, R24, and R27.</p> <p>If ASP meaning for R30 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.150	Natural Hazards	NHR20	Amend	(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item "1." in NH-R18, re "area of the building"? (2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted). (3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.	(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18. (2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted. (4) Add a note to the rule, "(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.584	Natural Hazards	NHR20	Support	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings.	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.116	Natural Hazards	NHR21	Support in part	Reword these rules for ease of interpretation. Consider inserting permitted activity status in each buffer to make it clear that repairs and maintenance are permitted to occupied and unoccupied buildings. Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. Clarity around increases in floor area for sensitive activities.	Insert additional permitted activity rule in each buffer addressing repairs and maintenance to unoccupied buildings in each buffer (see comment in R15). Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.121	Natural Hazards	NHR21	Support in part	Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a,	Alter bullet numbering in R21. Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.132	Natural Hazards	NHR21	Support in part	Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Activity (ASRDA) Discretion is Restricted to: a/1 R21, R25, R31 state: "Implementation of recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment." R28 states: "Recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R28 wording to mirror R21, R25, and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R28 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.136	Natural Hazards	NHR21	Support in part	c/3 R21 states: "The location and design of proposed buildings....." whereby R25, R28, and R31 state: "The location, design and construction materials of proposed buildings..."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R21 wording to mirror R25, R28 and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R21 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.140	Natural Hazards	NHR21	Support in part	It is noted that the words "proposed buildings" are used in all four rules, however the headings relate to both new (which would be proposed) and existing buildings.	That the word proposed be removed from the rules.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.054	Natural Hazards	NHR21	Amend	As written, the rules allow for development of sensitive activities within areas which may suffer severe ground deformation during a rupture of the Alpine fault	Amend to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into earthquake hazard (fault avoidance) zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Totally Tourism Limited (S449)	S449.014	Natural Hazards	NHR22	Amend	This would create the ability to replace their existing buildings to modernise them but retain the existing gross floor area and internal occupancy levels and therefore, not exacerbating the potential risk to life. Rather, a modern replacement building is likely to have less risk to life	Provide for the reconstruction and replacement of existing buildings in the Earthquake Hazard Overlays other than where they have been damaged/destroyed by natural disaster as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					than the existing structures on the submitter's properties.	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.117	Natural Hazards	NHR22	Support in part	<p>Reword these rules for ease of interpretation.</p> <p>Consider inserting permitted activity status in each buffer to make it clear that repairs and maintenance are permitted to occupied and unoccupied buildings.</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. Clarity around increases in floor area for sensitive activities.</p>	<p>Insert additional permitted activity rule in each buffer addressing repairs and maintenance to unoccupied buildings in each buffer (see comment in R15).</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer.</p> <p>While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.055	Natural Hazards	NHR22	Support in part	The rules allow for development of sensitive activities areas of severe ground deformation during a rupture of the Alpine fault.	Amendment of the Earthquake Hazard Zone to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into earthquake hazard (fault avoidance) zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.118	Natural Hazards	NHR23	Support in part	<p>Reword these rules for ease of interpretation.</p> <p>Consider inserting permitted activity status in each buffer to make it clear that repairs and maintenance are permitted to occupied and unoccupied buildings.</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. Clarity around increases in floor area for sensitive activities.</p>	<p>Insert additional permitted activity rule in each buffer addressing repairs and maintenance to unoccupied buildings in each buffer (see comment in R15).</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer.</p> <p>While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.</p>
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.056	Natural Hazards	NHR23	Support	We support the avoidance of community, education, and health facilities within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays	Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.119	Natural Hazards	NHR24	Support in part	Reword these rules for ease of interpretation.	Insert additional permitted activity rule in each buffer addressing repairs and maintenance to unoccupied buildings in

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Consider inserting permitted activity status in each buffer to make it clear that repairs and maintenance are permitted to occupied and unoccupied buildings.</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer. Clarity around increases in floor area for sensitive activities.</p>	<p>each buffer (see comment in R15).</p> <p>Insert permitted activity rule addressing unoccupied buildings in each buffer.</p> <p>While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.</p>
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.122	Natural Hazards	NHR24	Support in part	Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a, b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.	Alter bullet numbering in R21. Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.129	Natural Hazards	NHR24	Support in part	Activity Status Permitted (ASP) 1. R20, R24, and R27 state "There is no increase in the area of the building used for a Critical Response Facility." R30 states " Repairs and maintenance do not increase the area of a building..." Appears to have the same meaning as the heading is for Repairs and Maintenance.	If the intended ASP meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R30 wording to mirror R20, R24, and R27. If ASP meaning for R30 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.152	Natural Hazards	NHR24	Amend	<p>(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item "1." in NH-R18 and NH-20, re "area of the building"?</p> <p>(2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is</p>	<p>(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18 and NH-20.</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(3) Add a note to the rule, "(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam structure and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.	
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.585	Natural Hazards	NHR24	Support in part	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage and infrastructure not buildings. Change the wording of NH - R24 provision 1. to clarify it is the net floor area of buildings.	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.Re word NH - R24 provision 1. to the following: "1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for Critical Response Facility."
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.057	Natural Hazards	NHR24	Amend	Occupied buildings' is not defined	Amend 'occupied building'
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.123	Natural Hazards	NHR25	Support in part	Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a, b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.	Alter bullet numbering in R21. Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.133	Natural Hazards	NHR25	Support in part	Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Activity (ASRDA) Discretion is Restricted to: a/1 R21, R25, R31 state: "Implementation of recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment." R28 states: "Recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R28 wording to mirror R21, R25, and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R28 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.137	Natural Hazards	NHR25	Support in part	c/3 R21 states: "The location and design of proposed buildings....." whereby R25, R28, and R31 state: "The location, design and construction materials of proposed buildings..."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R21 wording to mirror R25, R28 and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R21 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.141	Natural Hazards	NHR25	Support in part	It is noted that the words "proposed buildings" are used in all four rules, however the headings relate to both new (which would be proposed) and existing buildings.	That the word proposed be removed from the rules.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.144	Natural Hazards	NHR25	Support	Recognise the need to have risks assessed by way of hazard assessment and implementation of recommendations.	Retain as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.058	Natural Hazards	NHR25	Amend	The rules allow for development of sensitive activities within areas which may suffer severe ground deformation during a rupture of the Alpine fault	Amendment of the Earthquake Hazard Zone to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into earthquake hazard (fault avoidance) zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Totally Tourism Limited (S449)	S449.015	Natural Hazards	NHR26	Amend	This would create the ability to replace their existing buildings to modernise them but retain the existing gross floor area and internal occupancy levels and therefore, not exacerbating the potential risk to life. Rather, a modern replacement building is likely to have less risk to life than the existing structures on the submitter's properties.	Provide for the reconstruction and replacement of existing buildings in the Earthquake Hazard Overlays other than where they have been damaged/destroyed by natural disaster as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.044	Natural Hazards	NHR26	Amend	Additions and alterations to and new commercial buildings can be appropriately managed through restricted discretionary matters limited to those set out in NHR12.	Activity Status Discretionary Restricted discretionary Refer to matters of discretion and notification status in NHR12.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.145	Natural Hazards	NHR26	Support	Activity status considered appropriate.	Retain as notified.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.147	Natural Hazards	NHR26	Support	Activity status considered appropriate.	Retain as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.059	Natural Hazards	NHR26	Amend	The rules allow for development of sensitive activities within areas which may suffer severe ground deformation during a rupture of the Alpine fault.	Amendment of the Earthquake Hazard Zone to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into earthquake hazard (fault avoidance)

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.124	Natural Hazards	NHR27	Support in part	Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a, b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.	Alter bullet numbering in R21. Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.130	Natural Hazards	NHR27	Support in part	Activity Status Permitted (ASP) 1. R20, R24, and R27 state "There is no increase in the area of the building used for a Critical Response Facility." R30 states " Repairs and maintenance do not increase the area of a building...." Appears to have the same meaning as the heading is for Repairs and Maintenance.	If the intended ASP meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R30 wording to mirror R20, R24, and R27. If ASP meaning for R30 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.153	Natural Hazards	NHR27	Amend	(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item 1 in NH-R18, NH-20 and NH-24, re "area of the building"? (2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted). (3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.	(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18, NH20 and NH-24. (2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted. (3) Add a note to the rule, note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.586	Natural Hazards	NHR27	Support in part	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and infrastructure not general buildings. Change the wording of NH - R27 provision 1. to clarify it is the net floor area of buildings purposes."	Reword NH - R27 provision 1. to the following: "1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for Critical Response Facility
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.060	Natural Hazards	NHR27	Amend	Occupied buildings' is not defined	Amend 'occupied building'
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.125	Natural Hazards	NHR28	Support in part	Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a, b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.	Alter bullet numbering in R21. Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.134	Natural Hazards	NHR28	Support in part	Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Activity (ASRDA) Discretion is Restricted to: a/1 R21, R25, R31 state: "Implementation of recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment." R28 states: "Recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R28 wording to mirror R21, R25, and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R28 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.138	Natural Hazards	NHR28	Support in part	c/3 R21 states: "The location and design of proposed buildings....." whereby R25, R28, and R31 state: "The location, design and construction materials of proposed buildings..."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R21 wording to mirror R25, R28 and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R21 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.142	Natural Hazards	NHR28	Support in part	It is noted that the words "proposed buildings" are used in all four rules, however the headings relate to both new (which would be proposed) and existing buildings.	That the word proposed be removed from the rules.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.146	Natural Hazards	NHR28	Support	Recognise the need to have risks assessed by way of hazard assessment and implementation of recommendations.	Retain as notified.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.061	Natural Hazards	NHR28	Amend	As written, the rules allow for development of sensitive activities within areas which may suffer severe ground deformation during a rupture of the Alpine fault.	Amendment of the Earthquake Hazard Zone to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into earthquake hazard (fault avoidance) zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.587	Natural Hazards	NHR29	Support in part	Reword the title to clarify whether this is for additions and alterations to existing facilities and for new facilities, or whether this is for additions and alterations to new or existing facilities.	Reword the title to clarify whether the provision is for additions and alterations to existing facilities and for new facilities, or whether this is for additions and alterations to new or existing facilities.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.062	Natural Hazards	NHR29	Amend	the current Earthquake Hazard Ovrlays are insufficient,	Amendment of the Earthquake Hazard Zone to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into earthquake hazard (fault avoidance) zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.126	Natural Hazards	NHR30	Support in part	Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a, b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.	Alter bullet numbering in R21. Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.131	Natural Hazards	NHR30	Support in part	Activity Status Permitted (ASP) 1. R20, R24, and R27 state "There is no increase in the area of the building used for a Critical Response Facility." R30 states " Repairs and maintenance do not increase the area of a building..." Appears to have the	If the intended ASP meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R30 wording to mirror R20, R24, and R27. If ASP meaning for R30 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					same meaning as the heading is for Repairs and Maintenance.	
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.156	Natural Hazards	NHR30	Amend	(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item "1." in NH-R18, NH-20, NH-24 and NH-27, re "area of the building"? (2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted). (3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear	(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18, NH20, NH-24 and NH-27. (2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted. (3) Add a note to the rule, "(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.157	Natural Hazards	NHR30	Amend	It is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.	Add NOTE: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.588	Natural Hazards	NHR30	Support in part		Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings. Reword NH - R30 provision 1. to the following: "1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for Critical Response Facility purposes."
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.063	Natural Hazards	NHR30	Amend	Occupied buildings' is not defined,	Amend 'occupied building'
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.127	Natural Hazards	NHR31	Support in part	Earthquake Hazard Rules for the 50, 100, 150 and 200m appear to be the same but with some minor wording differences, and	Alter bullet numbering in R21. Note: this discrepancy is a common theme throughout the document

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					typos which question consistency. R25, R28 and R31 are bullet numbered with a, b, c and d; R21 is bullet numbered 1, 2, 3, 4.	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.135	Natural Hazards	NHR31	Support in part	Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Activity (ASRDA) Discretion is Restricted to: a/1 R21, R25, R31 state: "Implementation of recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment." R28 states: "Recommendations in accompanying hazard risk assessment."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R28 wording to mirror R21, R25, and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R28 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.139	Natural Hazards	NHR31	Support in part	c/3 R21 states: "The location and design of proposed buildings....." whereby R25, R28, and R31 state: "The location, design and construction materials of proposed buildings..."	If the intended meaning is the same for all four rules, rectify R21 wording to mirror R25, R28 and R31, or vice versa. If ASRDA meaning for R21 is intended to be different, clarify meaning.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.143	Natural Hazards	NHR31	Support in part	It is noted that the words "proposed buildings" are used in all four rules, however the headings relate to both new (which would be proposed) and existing buildings.	That the word proposed be removed from the rules.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.148	Natural Hazards	NHR31	Support	R31 - reword the title	Reword title for R31 as there appears to be a typo.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.589	Natural Hazards	NHR31	Support in part	Reword the title for clarity.	Reword the title for clarity i.e.: "Additions and Alterations to New and Existing New Residential, Commercial and Industrial Buildings and Community Facilities, Educational Facilities and Health Facilities in the Earthquake Hazard Overlay - 200m"
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.064	Natural Hazards	NHR31	Amend	The rules allow for development of sensitive activities within areas which	Amendment of the Earthquake Hazard Zone to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					may suffer severe ground deformation during a rupture of the Alpine fault.	earthquake hazard (fault avoidance) zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.158	Natural Hazards	NHR32	Amend	It is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.	Add NOTE: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.590	Natural Hazards	NHR32	Support in part	Clarity is required for both NH - R31 and NH - R32 as to whether these provisions are for the additions and alterations to new and existing buildings, or whether these provisions are for new buildings, and alterations to existing buildings. If the latter clarity is required on the activity status of new buildings in both NH - R31 and NH - R32. Remove reference to Non-complying and Prohibited activity status for critical response facilities if not meeting requirements for discretionary activity requirements, as there are no discretionary activity requirements. The noncomplying status also refers to the Flood overlays.	Reword provisions NH - R31 and NH - R32 to clarify as to whether these provisions are for existing or new buildings. Change reference of Non-complying and Prohibited activity status to N/A, as there are no specifications for what would not meet the discretionary activity provisions and the Noncomplying and Prohibited activity status refers to the Flood overlays.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.065	Natural Hazards	NHR32	Amend	The rules allow for development of sensitive activities within areas which may suffer severe ground deformation during a rupture of the Alpine fault.	Amendment of the Earthquake Hazard Zone to incorporate uncertainty and distributed fault deformation into earthquake hazard (fault avoidance) zones, as directed by the MfE guidelines for planning around active faults.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.066	Natural Hazards	Land Instability Overlay	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from land instability.	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.024	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Russell and Joanne Smith (S477)	S477.003	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose	Any residential activity (by definition of "sensitive activity") will require resource consent within the Land Instability Overlay. Given that there is an approved subdivision with existing dwellings and ancillary buildings, this is unduly restrictive.	Remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions. Alternatively, exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule.
Tim Macfarlane (S482)	S482.003	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose	Any residential activity (by definition of "sensitive activity") will require resource consent within the Land Instability Overlay. Given that there is an approved subdivision with existing dwellings and ancillary buildings, this is unduly restrictive.	Remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions. Alternatively, exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule.
Claire & John West (S506)	S506.003	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose	Any residential activity (by definition of "sensitive activity") will require resource consent within the Land Instability Overlay. Given that there is an approved subdivision with existing dwellings and ancillary buildings, this is unduly restrictive.	Remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions. Alternatively, exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule.
Lauren Nyhan Anthony Phillips (S533)	S533.003	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose	Any residential activity (by definition of "sensitive activity") will require resource consent within the Land Instability Overlay. Given that there is an approved subdivision with existing dwellings and ancillary buildings, this is unduly restrictive.	Remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions. Alternatively, exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.149	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Support in part	<p>The proposed overlays need to be reviewed. The area proposed for Granity is not the area identified in the operative Buller District Plan.</p> <p>The need for geotechnical assessments required by R33 is supported as this could identify essential mitigations.</p>	<p>No changes to R33, however insert rule above R33 for permitted activity criteria to address the following: Unoccupied buildings within the overlay Repairs and maintenance to existing buildings and structures</p> <p>Extensions to floor area of existing</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Suggest providing clarify regarding what is permitted within the overlay to avoid confusion for plan users. Permitted criteria should provide clarity around: Unoccupied buildings within the overlay Repairs and maintenance to existing buildings and structures How extensions to floor area needs to be clarified.	buildings need to be addressed.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.040	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Support		Retain
Stewart & Catherine Nimmo (S559)	S559.003	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose	Any residential activity (by definition of "sensitive activity") will require resource consent within the Land Instability Overlay. Given that there is an approved subdivision with existing dwellings and ancillary buildings, this is unduly restrictive.	Remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions. Alternatively, exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.006	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Amend	Any residential activity will require resource consent.	Remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.012	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Amend	Any residential activity will require resource consent.	Alternative relief: exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.040	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.127	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Support		Retain
Tim and Phaedra Robins (S579)	S579.002	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Amend	Any residential activity (by definition of "sensitive activity") will require resource consent	Amend to remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions
Tim and Phaedra Robins (S579)	S579.003	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Amend	Any residential activity (by definition of "sensitive activity") will require resource consent	Alternative relief amend to exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.007	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose	Restricts new buildings for sensitive activities in the land stability overlay.	Delete this rule in relation to Punakaiki Village.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.038	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose in part	The submission point particularly relates to land instability overlay on Map 34. Considered to be insufficient to understand the application of various hazards to the Punakaiki Village.	Map 34 of the proposed Plan which covers natural hazards is considered to be insufficient to understand the application of various hazards to the Punakaiki Village. Specifically the land instability mapping does not align with the existing mapping and no new assessment is provided to support this change.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.591	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Support in part	New provision NH - R33 required for the provision of alterations/additions/maintenance to existing unoccupied buildings within the Land Instability Overlay, and for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Land Instability Overlay. Existing buildings for critical infrastructure require maintenance, and new buildings associated with critical infrastructure already located within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays will be required. Restricting this to a noncomplying activity status places undue restrictions on the statutory body in charge of maintaining the infrastructure.	Insert new provision NH - R33 for the permitted activity of altering, adding or maintaining existing unoccupied buildings that aren't used for sensitive activities within the Land Instability Overlay, as well as for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Land Instability Overlay (i.e. pump station).
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.067	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from land instability	Retain
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.099	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Amend	Building within this layer may also cause damage to these SASMs differently to the damage caused to property.	Amend to include the following wording: (b) Requirements for geotechnical certification that subject to those measures specified:

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						i. The proposed building or structure will not be likely to be subject to damage from slope instability during its useful life; and ii. The proposed works will not be likely to result in or contribute to damage to any adjoining or downslope property or a Site or Area of Significance to Māori listed in schedule three within or adjoining the natural hazard overlay - land instability alert.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.025	Natural Hazards	NHR34	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.150	Natural Hazards	NHR34	Support	Buildings for sensitive activities should be supported with relevant geotechnical assessment.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.041	Natural Hazards	NHR34	Support	This is too restrictive. Further information should be able to be considered.	Amend to being a Discretionary Activity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.041	Natural Hazards	NHR34	Support	This is too restrictive. Further information should be able to be considered.	Amend to being a Discretionary Activity.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.128	Natural Hazards	NHR34	Support	This is too restrictive. Further information should be able to be considered.	Amend to being a Discretionary Activity.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.008	Natural Hazards	NHR34	Oppose	States that new buildings for sensitive activities in the land stability overlay are non-complying.	Delete this rule in relation to Punakaiki Village.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.069	Natural Hazards	Lake Tsunami Hazard Overlay	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from lake tsunami/seiche waves.	Retain
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.159	Natural Hazards	NHR35	Amend	The rule is generally appropriate for energy activities however it should include provision for upgrading	Amend the heading of NH-R35, Repairs, Maintenance, Upgrading , Additions, Alterations
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.592	Natural Hazards	NHR35	Support in part	The definition of maintenance in the title only appears to refer to historic heritage	Amend the definition of maintenance in the title to refer to buildings and structures.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					and infrastructure not general buildings and structures. Change the wording of NH - R35 provision 1. to clarify it is the net floor area of buildings.	Reword NH - R35 provision 1. to the following: "1. There is no increase in the net floor area of any building used for sensitive activities."
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.068	Natural Hazards	NHR36	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from lake tsunami/seiche waves	Retain
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.001	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	The Coastal Hazards Report was unavailable when the proposed Plan was released. I would like to see the coastal hazards report and be given a chance to comment on it before any decision is made relating to our property. I wish to understand what heights of protection above sea level are considered safe for continued habitation and development and even subdivision. Presumably, the planning team at WCRC have made some decisions about these matters as they must also relate to urban areas and many other rural properties. I also wish to understand what the WCRC considers are appropriate heights for highways and local government roads, and what safeguards or provisions are in place for those strategic assets. We have recently, and purposefully, rebuilt our house on piles at a height above the Karamea Highway.	That the overlay be discussed with affected landowners and on-site inspections be conducted in order to establish an accurate overlay. The report which has been prepared for WCRC should be publicly available before any decisions are made, and meaningful consultation with any affected landowner should be required. I have not identified all the policies and rules affecting the coastal alert overlay but I accept the need for the plan to make provision for sea level rise.
Michael Robson (S327)	S327.001	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend	Re the property located at 4420 Haast Jackson Bay in South Westland which is covered by plus flood plain and coastal hazard severe overlays on it. Due to the demographic of the Haast community it is safe to say that property assets are the sole asset base for most of residents. For those with sections or	That the council provide a list of what preventative measures would need to be taken for any property to be developed. Whether those measures required properties to be built that could be removed in the event of further coastal erosion with minimum floor levels required to be built on stilts, or if the water level

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>who are looking to develop Land further there will be a prolonged resource consent process required with no guidance as to what would likely to be granted resource consent and what would not. A lot of residents will not be able to sell their properties due to the uncertainty as to the process of what would be required by council to obtain a resource consent to build on a property with a hazard overlay.</p> <p>Given the housing shortage and increased cost of living not only on the West Coast area but throughout the country I believe it is inappropriate for the council to be able to put in place such significant restrictions on property without some reasonableness and guidance being provided to the current property owners of future property owners</p>	increases to within a certain distance of the dwelling then the sewage and stormwater must be decommissioned and the dwelling abandoned or removed.
Raylene Black (S420)	S420.002	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend		Request to remove property from Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.080	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	We do not agree that the hazard has been correctly mapped in the vicinity of our property (4217 State Highway 6, Punakaiki).	Amend overlay extent.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.041	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	The Coastal Hazard Severe overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the rules to be more enabling for coastal hazard severe
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.042	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	The Coastal Hazard Alert overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the rules to be more enabling for Coastal Hazard Alert
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.062	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent of overlay as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.063	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.062	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent of overlay as notified.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.063	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.147	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent of overlay as notified.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.148	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.092	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	if Coastal hazard overlay is extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent notified
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.005	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	It is unclear why this area is subject to this overlay. 2/75 Snodgrass Road	That the Coastal Hazard Alert Level Overlay be removed in its entirety from this

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						property.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.006	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	The Coastal Environment Overlay appears to have been applied in a unsophisticated manner on these properties	That the Coastal Environment Overlay be removed from these properties.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.056	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	The associated restrictions on land use are unjustified on these properties.	Amend rules to remove restrictions on these properties
Will Harvey (S157)	S157.001	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	<p>We oppose this time frame for rebuilding in the event of damage being 2 years.</p> <p>We assume that this covers earthquakes as well as erosion from the sea. This is unreasonable given the time required to complete insurance arrangements, tidy up the damaged site so that it is safe, plan future development and comply with council requirements, let alone the availability of suitable builders and materials, especially if the damage was as a result of a major natural event. We think that a reasonable time frame would be 5 years.</p>	Natural Hazards Rule 38 - extend rebuild timeframe from 2 years to 5 years for properties in the Severe Coastal Hazard overlay
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.011	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	<p>Notwithstanding existing use rights which exist due a building being lawfully established at the time of notification of the plan. Westland District Council does not support NH-R38-2. Which states that reconstruction or replacement of a destroyed/damaged building is permitted if it is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years within the Coastal Severe Overlay.</p> <p>There are concerns that through increasing storm surges and ongoing</p>	Where a building has not been re-established under the 12 months allowed under existing use rights, change the activity status for Reconstruction, Repairs and Maintenance to Existing Buildings in the Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay to Discretionary.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>coastal erosion the site could become unsuitable to rebuild with no consideration for mitigation against the natural hazard that destroyed it in the first instance, but also within a period of up to 5 years from the time a building was destroyed the hazardscape could change and intensify drastically. Creating this permitted rule takes away Council's ability to assess risk and require mitigation against further natural hazard threats.</p> <p>- It is considered that existing use rights provisions under s10 of the RMA 1991 may cause difficulty enough if a site is considered to no longer be suitable for rebuilding or replacement of a dwelling. With no ability under the West Coast RPS to extinguish existing use rights Council may be forced to allow a member of public to rebuild in an unsuitable site subjecting them to further emotional and financial effects if it becomes an issue again. For example if a dwelling owner rebuilds where a storm surge has caused the sea to have gone through the building, the Plan (even if this risk has increased) up to 5 years later gives the owner the ability to still rebuild. Furthermore insurance companies will insist on like for like even if it is in extreme danger of the exact same hazard as the District Plan permits it.</p>	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Effectively setting the dwelling owner up to fail.	
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.007	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support	I probably support rules such as NH R 10 and R 38 although I have not seen any report or data which identifies land in the Karamea area, and our property in particular, which is already 500 mm above the 1% AEP flood event.	Retain NH R38
John Brazil (S360)	S360.007	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten-year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.004	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	restricts existing users rights to extend their building.	NH-R38 point 1 restricts extending a current building, this should be removed.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.005	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	Restricts property owners rights on their land.	NH-R38 point 2. b. & c. to be removed.
Te Tumu Paeroa - The office of the Māori Trustee (S440)	S440.015	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support in part	The Māori Trustee considers NH R38(2)(b), with regards to the coastal severe overlay, does not sufficiently account for circumstances outside landowners control that may delay the reconstruction or replacement of a building within the 2 year timeframe. These could include (but are not limited to): Backlog of insurance claims; Supply shortages; Unresolved litigation; Labour shortages; Delays to the repairing of key infrastructure (i.e. roads). However, if reconstruction or replacement works are not completed within a 5 year timeframe the status of this activity should no longer be	The Māori Trustee considers a footnote should accompany NH R38(2)(b) to provide exceptions for circumstances outside landowners control that may delay the reconstruction or replacement of a building within the 2 year timeframe. However, if reconstruction or replacement works are not completed within a 5 year timeframe the status of this activity should no longer be permitted. This aligns with the coastal alert overlay.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					permitted. This aligns with the coastal alert overlay.	
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.026	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.002	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose		Amend permitted Rule NH - R38 to provide for maintenance and repair of existing weather event monitoring structures and WCRC Rating District protection structures.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.025	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	There are currently six protection structures and one monitoring structure in the Coastal Alert Overlay, and three protection structures in the Coastal Severe Overlay. The designation will make these existing structures lawfully established. However, new monitoring or protection structures may be needed in the future to mitigate the impacts of climate change induced weather events. Monitoring structures provide valuable river level and rainfall data for Civil Defence to monitor and manage potential flooding of nearby properties. The protection structures have an important role in protecting adjoining land, buildings and infrastructure from flood risk. Council seeks that Rule NH - R38 is amended as future survey points may be necessary to monitor erosion and accretion.	This Rule should be amended to also provide for construction, maintenance and repair of existing and future hydrology monitoring structures and Rating District protection structures.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.010	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend to read: Where: 1. ... 2. For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where: a. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; b. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5-year a ten-year period in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 year a ten-year period in the Coastal Severe overlay; c. ...
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.005	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.151	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support in part	Overlays need to cover areas where restrictions are needed to address coastal concerns. Suggest a further look at the extent of the overlays. It is noted that the Coastal Alert overlay at Carters Beach is extensive - further reporting should be required to define overlays. Need to ensure that the overlays are not unwarranted and that they are supported and justified by evidence. Insert the word "floor" before area in R38 Point 1.	Further consideration of the overlays needed, illustrating that the extent of the overlays are justified and supported by evidence.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.160	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	It is unclear what this rule adds that is not already covered by NH-R1.	Amend heading of NH-R38: Reconstruction, Repairs and ... to existing Occupied Buildings in the Coastal....
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.042	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.016	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.019	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.020	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend activity status for when compliance is not achieved, to Discretionary Activity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.042	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.129	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.018	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.019	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement	Delete time limit
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.020	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend to state: if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.048	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	Delete 2. so that Rule NH-R38 applies to repairs and maintenance only, and add additional rules so that reconstruction is a restricted discretionary or non-complying activity. This enables adverse effects of reconstruction to be appropriately assessed to give effect to the NZCPS.	Amend: Where For repairs and maintenance there is no increase in the area of the building; For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where: The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years in the Coastal Severe overlay; The reconstructed building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building it replaces. Activity status where compliance not achieved: NA
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.009	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support	Allows for a building to be reconstructed should it be destroyed due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God	Retain as notified.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.013	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.070	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	reconstruction of buildings within hazard overlays should be subject to the same rules and policies as new buildings	Amend to Avoid reconstruction of buildings used for sensitive activities within the Coastal Severe Hazard Overlay,

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.126	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend		Add new condition. 3. There is risk mitigation measures for buildings used for sensitive activities reconstructed within the Coastal Alert Hazard Overlay.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.036	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.036	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.016	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	New investment and reconstruction should be discouraged	delete
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.021	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	History has shown that it is not practical to reconstruct or replace a damaged home within a 2-year timeframe.	Amend Rule NH-R38 so reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in the Coastal Alert Overlay is permitted within a 5-year timeframe.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.00238	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	add new restricted discretionary or non-complying activity rules.	Add new Restricted Discretionary Rule and Non-Complying Rules: NH-RXX Reconstruction of a lawfully established building For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where: The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years in the Coastal Severe overlay;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>The reconstructed building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building it replaces.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to: The effects of natural hazards on people and property;</p> <p>The location and design of proposed buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk;</p> <p>Any freeboard requirements to be included;</p> <p>The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk;</p> <p>The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk;</p> <p>The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site and adjacent properties;</p> <p>Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed natural hazard mitigation measures; and</p> <p>Alternative methods to avoid or mitigate the identified hazard risks.</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary NH-RXX</p> <p>Reconstruction of a lawfully established building not meeting Restricted Activity Standards</p> <p>Activity Status Discretionary</p> <p>Activity status where compliance not achieved: N/A</p>
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.012	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Oppose	Council has concerns regarding making any unoccupied building permitted in the Coastal Severe Overlay. It would be	Change the status for New Unoccupied Buildings in the Coastal Severe Overlay to a Controlled or Restricted Discretionary

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					deemed inappropriate to allow high levels of investment within Severe Coastal overlays just because they are unoccupied buildings. It is considered that Councils should not be encouraging investment in assets in known high hazard areas, allowing damage to property. At the least this should be a Controlled activity to allow for mitigation of destruction of property and potentially consider the risk and level of investment being put at risk.	Activity with controls or restrictions including:- Assessment of risk to building- Consideration of mitigation measures to reduce/manage potential surge of coastal erosion- Consideration of likelihood or potential of complete loss of the building in a surge or coastal erosion situation
John Brazil (S360)	S360.008	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.070	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support in part	Waka Kotahi is unsure how the permitted activity works as there are no permitted activity standard requirements listed in the rule. As currently proposed all new unoccupied buildings and structures in the Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlays are permitted without any other consideration.	Provide clarity on the rule
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.011	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.152	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	Support no resource consent required for unoccupied buildings.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.161	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Amend	Subsequent amendment to permit activities relating to existing unoccupied buildings and structures.	Where submission to NH-R38 is not adopted provide for activities related to existing unoccupied buildings and structures as permitted activities.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.044	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		REtain
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.017	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.021	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.044	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		REtain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.130	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		REtain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.021	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	support this rule.	REtain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.593	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support in part	There is no activity status if compliance with the specific standards is not achieved. Insert provision i.e. Restricted Discretionary where compliance not achieved.	Insert activity status of Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary for activity status where compliance is not achieved.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.014	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.037	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.037	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.017	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Amend	New investment and reconstruction should be discouraged	Amend to state unoccupied buildings of no more than 50m2
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.022	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	There is no reason to limit the establishment of new unoccupied buildings in these overlays.	Retain Rule NH-R39.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.009	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete Point 2.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.021	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Support	I agree that any increase in floor area should meet a predetermined annual exceedance probability (AEP) level. As there have been so many events recently dubbed 1 in 100 years, I think the AEP level should probably be 1 in 500 years. However, without a map I can't say as the effect may be large, and it needs to be done in a planned manner.	Review AEP and extent to see if a higher AEP (eg 1 in 500 years) is preferable.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.027	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.012	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.153	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Support in part	Recognise the need to reflect NZS4404:2010 and the application of the 1% AEP (see NZS4404:2010 - 4.3.5.2) Amend to include 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise.	Amend rule to include 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.162	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	There appears to be some conflict with rule NH-R39. Based on that rule this rule would relate to occupied buildings and the rule should be clear in that regard. As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore, (1) Major dams should be defined (as previously submitted). (2) It should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and structures.	(a) Amend the heading of NH-R40: Additions ... for Occupied Commercial ... (2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted. (2) Add a note to the rule, "(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.045	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.018	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.023	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.045	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.131	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.022	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay,	S605.010	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Allowing for alternative mitigation	Amend NH- R40 as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where: 1. There is no increase to the net floor area used for any

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)						sensitive activity; and Any addition or alteration has been designed to be relocatable or able to be relevelled; or 2. Where any increase in net floor area meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.594	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Support in part	Reword provision to refer to buildings.	Reword NH - R40 to the following: "1. There is no increase to the net floor area of any building used for any sensitive activity; and 2. Where any increase in net floor area of any building meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event."
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.015	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete 2. Where any increase in net floor area meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.071	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	If industrial buildings are permitted in the coastal severe overlay, alert systems and evacuation planning should be mandated.	Add new condition: 3. Industrial buildings in the coastal severe overlay, alert systems and evacuation planning systems shall be in place.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.127	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose	Critical Response Facilities should be relocated out of the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.	Exclude Critical Response Facilities in the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.038	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2. Where any increase in net floor area meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.038	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2. Where any increase in net floor area meets a minimum finished floor

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.010	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.028	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.013	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	Activity status where compliance is not achieved is too restrictive for Coastal Hazard Alert overlay.	Amend activity status where compliance is not achieved for Coastal Hazard Alert overlay from Discretionary to Controlled or to Restricted Discretionary.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.014	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	Matters to which discretion is restricted should be similar to NH - R11.	The matters to which discretion is restricted should be amended to similarly reflect NH - R11: a. Whether there is a functional or operational need for the facility to be located in a Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlays area;b. The effects of natural hazards on people and property;c. The location and design of proposed sites, buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk;d. Any freeboard requirements to be included;e. The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk;f. The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk;g. The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site.;h. How the activity incorporates mitigation of risk to life, property and the environment; andi. Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed natural hazard mitigation measures.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.006	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.154	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Support in part	<p>Suggest a further look at overlays to ensure they are justified and supported by evidence.</p> <p>Clarify permitted activity and the intent of the rule. Clarity sought around extensions and how these are addressed by the rules.</p> <p>There may be merit in splitting how additions and alterations and additions extending ground floor area are addressed within the rules.</p> <p>While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations, clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.</p>	Rewrite of the rule to clarify permitted intent.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.046	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.046	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.132	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.011	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose	The submitters oppose this rule, and seek a permitted activity status	Delete NH - R41
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.595	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Support in part	Reword provision to refer to buildings.	Reword NH - R41 to the following: "There is no increase in net floor area of any building used for a sensitive activity."
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.016	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.023	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	The permitted activity rule should allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road submitters' properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m ² over any continuous 10-year period.	Amend Rule NH-R41(1) to allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road submitters' properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m ² over any continuous 10-year period.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.007	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.155	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Support in part	Overlays to be defined and applicable to areas where risk is needing to be addressed.	Once overlays defined, rule may be considered appropriate as drafted. Would like to see supporting evidence justifying the extent of the overlays.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.164	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	<p>(1) As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore it is unclear how aspects related to major dams are provided for in these rules, particularly given that new unoccupied buildings are permitted.</p> <p>(a) major dams should be defined (as previously submitted),</p> <p>(b) it should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.</p> <p>(2) It is noted that there is no discretion to consider any needs and constraints of activities that may require location in these areas, and provision should be made for considering these matters.</p> <p>(3) It is noted that the benefits arising from an activity are not a matter of discretion when considering such applications. Such matters should form part of consideration of the relevant issues arising.</p>	<p>1) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rule, "(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"(3) Add a new discretion matter h., "h. Whether there is a locational, technical, functional or operational constraint or requirement for the facility needing to locate in the coastal severe or coastal alert overlay."(4) Add a new discretion matter i., "i. The benefits to the community of the activity occurring."</p>
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.047	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.047	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.133	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.017	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.072	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Support	If industrial buildings are permitted in the coastal severe overlay, alert systems and evacuation planning should be mandated.	Add: h Alert systems and evacuation planning
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.128	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	Critical Response Facilities should be relocated out of the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.	Amend to state that Critical Response Facilities be relocated out of the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.011	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.014	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	It is unfair and unreasonable for someone owning a consented section to find that to establish a dwelling is a non-complying activity. This will significantly reduce the land value. The rules in NHR45 would be sufficient to manage the risks.	Delete Rule NHR 43 and apply NHR 45 to Coastal Severe Hazard Areas.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.029	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Bert Hofmans (S504)	S504.007	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Provides an unnecessary additional level of compliance for properties already in the flood alert overlay, costs of technical reports to support consents, discretionary status means matters beyond natural hazards can be considered by the council and restricted discretionary is sufficient to give effect to the policies	Amend to Permitted or at least Restricted Discretionary Activity.
Lindy Millar (S505)	S505.007	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Provides an unnecessary additional level of compliance for properties already in the flood alert overlay, costs of technical reports to support consents, discretionary status means matters beyond natural	Amend to Permitted or at least Restricted Discretionary Activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					hazards can be considered by the council and restricted discretionary is sufficient to give effect to the policies	
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Hapuka Landing Limited (S514)	S514.005	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	Non-complying and discretionary rules are not required to ensure management of natural hazard risk. There is no need to open up consent applications to assessment of all effects (and/or the gateway test) purely on the basis of natural hazard risk when this can be addressed independently. The risk of natural hazards, and/or any potential effects of natural hazards, are discrete issues that can be managed through a restricted discretionary activity status with matters of discretion that address natural hazard risk/potential effects.	Amending the activity status of NH-R43, relating to new buildings for sensitive activities or increases to net floor area of buildings for sensitive activities in the Coastal Hazard Alert overlay, from discretionary to restricted discretionary, with matters of discretion restricted to management of inundation effects.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.015	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.156	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support in part	Overlays to be defined and applicable to areas where risk is needing to be addressed.	Once overlays defined, rule may be considered appropriate as drafted. Would like to see supporting evidence justifying the extent of the overlays.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.048	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.022	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.048	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.134	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.023	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	support this rule.	Retain
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.018	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.073	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.039	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.039	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.024	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	Allow a resource consent application to be made for an activity which does not meet permitted activity rules.	Retain Rule NH-R43.
Erin Stagg (S314)	S314.002	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	There are feasible options to mitigate the risks of natural hazards through design and location. Refer to the submission document for more detail on these	That new sensitive activities be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-complying in the Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay
John Brazil (S360)	S360.034	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Andrew Wright (S364)	S364.001	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Intention to build a dwelling in the Coastal Severe Overlay.	Keep the existing rules that provide adequate protection.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.015	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	It is unfair and unreasonable for someone owning a consented section to find that to establish a dwelling is a non-complying activity. This will significantly reduce the land value. The rules in NHR45 would be sufficient to manage the risks.	Delete Rule NHR 44 and apply NHR 45 to Coastal Severe Hazard Areas.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Hapuka Landing Limited (S514)	S514.006	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Non-complying and discretionary rules are not required to ensure management of natural hazard risk. There is no need to open up consent applications to assessment of all effects (and/or the gateway test) purely on the basis of natural hazard risk when this can be addressed independently. The risk of natural hazards, and/or any potential effects of natural hazards, are discrete issues that can be managed through a restricted discretionary activity status with matters of discretion that address natural hazard risk/potential effects.	Amending the activity status of NH-R44, relating to new buildings for sensitive activities or increases to net floor area of buildings for sensitive activities in the Coastal Hazard Severe overlay, from non-complying to restricted discretionary, with matters of discretion restricted to management of inundation and erosion effects.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.008	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.157	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Support in part	Overlays to be defined and applicable to areas where risk is needing to be addressed.	Once overlays defined, rule may be considered appropriate as drafted. Would like to see supporting evidence justifying the extent of the overlays.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.049	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.049	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.135	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.012	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Activity status will result in the housing stock stagnating, when new development could increase the township's resilience	Amend the activity status of NH - R 44 as follows: NH - R44 Coastal Severe Overlay: New Buildings for Sensitive Activities and Additions and Alterations of Buildings that increase the net floor area for Sensitive Activities Activity Status Non-complying Discretionary Where: 1. New Buildings are not designed to be relocatable or re-levelled; or 2. New Buildings are not designed to meet a finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event. These are located in the Coastal Severe Overlay
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.019	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.074	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Support	The restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards	Retain
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.038	Natural Hazards	Coastal Setback Overlay	Oppose in part	A natural hazard risk assessment should have been undertaken by council in the determination of these areas and should not be put back onto applicants. The location gives council to much discretion and should be informed by set distances. Modification or retention of vegetation gives council to wide a scope	Amend overlay to reflect the outcome of a natural hazard risk assessment undertaken by the Council. Provide more detailed matters of discretion with set distances for location and more narrowing of scope as relates to location and modification/retention of vegetation.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					with regard to landscaping matters. Agree with the other matters in full. I do however believe that set volumes or numbers should be applied, and while I acknowledge that this approach is limited based on the underlying zoning there should be some form of consideration for where these are appropriate, as the current measures are increasingly restrictive or require in-depth analysis from builders, planners etc. with nearly all development requiring resource consent.	
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.093	Natural Hazards	Coastal Setback Overlay	Amend	Coastal Hazard Overlay associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation	Oppose any extension from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.158	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support in part	<p>Include a permitted activity criteria for unoccupied buildings within the overlay.</p> <p>Ensure that term Additions and Alterations is used correctly within the rules as this definition is different to alteration. Clarify rules around extensions to ground floor area and how these are addressed.</p> <p>Clarify rules around repair and maintenance to existing buildings.</p> <p>This could be inserted above R45.</p>	<p>Insert rule above R45 for a permitted activity criteria to address: unoccupied buildings (i.e. to allow for sheds) for repairs and maintenance to existing building</p> <p>Seek clarity around how extensions to floor areas are addressed.</p>
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.050	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.050	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.136	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.596	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support in part	New provision NH - R45 required for the provision of alterations/additions/maintenance to existing unoccupied buildings within the Coastal Setback Overlay, and for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay. Existing buildings for critical infrastructure require maintenance, and new buildings associated with critical infrastructure already located within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays will be required. Restricting this to a noncomplying activity status places undue restrictions on the statutory body in charge of maintaining the infrastructure.	Insert new provision NH - R45 for the permitted activity of altering, adding or maintaining to existing buildings within the Coastal Setback Overlay, as well as for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.159	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Support	No changes sought	No changes sought.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.051	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.052	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.051	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.052	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.137	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.138	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.076	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards	Retain
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.039	Natural Hazards	Coastal Tsunami Overlay	Oppose in part	This is a continuation of s.10 of the RMA and therefore the rule is stating a right that all landowners have.	Amend the rule to reflect that these are rights that all landowners have under s10

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						of the RMA.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.167	Natural Hazards	Coastal Tsunami Overlay	Amend	<p>(1) The rules in this section appear to only relate to Critical Response Facilities (CRF's). Given that intent the heading of the rule should refer to "Critical Response Facilities", as per NH-R49, and the items remain in NH-47 (i.e. 1.-3.) and NH-48 (i.e. 1.-2.) respectively</p> <p>(2) As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore it is unclear how aspects related to major dams are provided for in these rules, particularly given that a wide range of activities, buildings and structures are permitted in this overlay. As submitted elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore,</p> <p>(a) major dams should be defined (as previously submitted),</p> <p>(b) it should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.</p>	<p>(1) The term "Critical Response Facility(ies)" is to be removed from each item in NH-R47 and NH-R48 and placed in the heading of each of the rules as that is what the rules are about and would ensure consistency with NH-R49 terminology.</p> <p>(3) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rules, "(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</p>
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.160	Natural Hazards	NHR47	Support	Recognise the need that Critical Response Facilities be located out of risk area. Suggest adding an advice note that the Coastal Tsunami Overlay rules only apply to Critical Response Facilities.	Add advice note for clarity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.053	Natural Hazards	NHR47	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.053	Natural Hazards	NHR47	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.139	Natural Hazards	NHR47	Support		Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.077	Natural Hazards	NHR47	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from tsunami	Retain
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.025	Natural Hazards	NHR47	Support	There is no reason to restrict buildings in this overlay beyond those used for Critical Response Facilities	Retain provision.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.055	Natural Hazards	NHR48	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.055	Natural Hazards	NHR48	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.140	Natural Hazards	NHR48	Support		Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.078	Natural Hazards	NHR48	Support	The restriction of development in areas at risk from tsunami.	REtain
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.026	Natural Hazards	NHR48	Support	There is no reason to restrict buildings in this overlay beyond those used for Critical Response Facilities.	Retain provision.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.161	Natural Hazards	NHR49	Support	Recognise the need that Critical Response Facilities be located out of risk area. Suggest adding an advice note that the Coastal Tsunami Overlay rules only apply to Critical Response Facilities.	Add advice note for clarity.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.056	Natural Hazards	NHR49	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.056	Natural Hazards	NHR49	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.141	Natural Hazards	NHR49	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.079	Natural Hazards	NHR49	Support	The restriction of development in areas at risk from tsunami	Retain
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.027	Natural Hazards	NHR49	Support	There is no reason to restrict buildings in this overlay beyond those used for Critical Response Facilities.	Retain provision.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.080	Natural Hazards	Hokitika Coastal Overlay	Amend	Terminology for the Hokitika Coastal Overlay differs	Amend to use the preferred nomenclature for flood hazard and coastal inundation of %AEP (annual exceedence probability).
Te Tai o Putini Plan Committee (S171)	S171.005	Natural Hazards	NHR50	Amend	The wording of this rule has been identified as being poorly drafted and will not enable a certain outcome in administration.	Amend wording to 1. Any new buildings located in the protection area of the Hokitika Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme, as mapped by the West Coast Regional Council 2. Where new buildings are not protected by the Hokitika Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event: a. Buildings for sensitive activities have a finished floor level of 500mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event; b. Commercial and industrial buildings have a finished floor level of 300mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.016	Natural Hazards	NHR50	Oppose		Rule NH - R50, is reworded to provide clarity to landowners. Suggested wording: Where new buildings are not protected by the Hokitika/Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event: a. Buildings for sensitive activities have a finished floor level of 500mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						coastal event; b. Commercial and industrial buildings have a finished floor level of 300mm above the 100- year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event. Provide a clear definition for 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (1% ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP).
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.169	Natural Hazards	NHR50	Support	Provides for matters related to energy activities.	Retain
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.050	Natural Hazards	NHR50	Oppose	Delete 2. in Rule NH-R50 so that areas that are not protected by the scheme require a resource consent so that adverse effects can be appropriately assessed, and add new restricted discretionary or non-complying activity rules. This enables adverse	Amend: Activity Status Permitted Where: All new buildings are protected by the Hokitika Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event, as certified by the West Coast Regional Council. Where new buildings are not protected by the Hokitika Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event: Buildings for sensitive activities have a finished floor level of 500mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event; Commercial and industrial buildings have a finished floor level of 300mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.081	Natural Hazards	NHR50	Amend	Residual risk exists for buildings within the Hokitika Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme	Amend to require minimum finished floor levels 500mm above the 100-year ARI coastal inundation level for residential properties and 300mm above the 100-year ARI coastal inundation level for

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						commercial and industrial buildings for all structures within the Hokitika Coastal Hazard Zone.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.00239	Natural Hazards	NHR50	Amend		<p>Add new Restricted Discretionary Rule and Non-Complying Rules:NH-RXX New Buildings in the Hokitika Coastal OverlayWhere new buildings are not protected by the Hokitika Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event:</p> <p>Buildings for sensitive activities have a finished floor level of 500mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event;</p> <p>Commercial and industrial buildings have a finished floor level of 300mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event.Discretion is restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An assessment and consideration of coastal erosion risk; The effects of natural hazards on people and property; The location and design of proposed buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk; The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk; The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk; The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site and adjacent properties;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>Adverse effects on ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity; Any other adverse effects on the environment of any proposed natural hazard mitigation measures; and Alternative methods to avoid or mitigate the identified hazard risks. Activity status where compliance not achieved: DiscretionaryNH-RXX New Buildings in the Hokitika Coastal Overlay not meeting Restricted Activity StandardsActivity Status DiscretionaryActivity status where compliance not achieved: N/A</p>
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.045	Natural Hazards	NHR51	Amend	Restricted discretionary status is more appropriate, with matters of discretion limited to those in NHR12.	Activity Status Discretionary Restricted discretionary Refer to matters of discretion and notification status in NHR12.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.017	Natural Hazards	NHR51	Oppose		<p>Rule NH - R51 is reworded to provide clarity to landowners. Suggested wording: Where new buildings are not protected by the Hokitika/Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event:</p> <p>a. Buildings for sensitive activities have a finished floor level of 500mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event;</p> <p>b. Commercial and industrial buildings have a finished floor level of 300mm above the 100- year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event.</p> <p>Provide a clear definition of clear definition for 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (1% ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						event and a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP).
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.082	Natural Hazards	NHR51	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards and flooding	Retain
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.023	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Support	I think the council should find a way to funnel a government fund to support all rebuilding to meet the agreed AEP/AIP level. This will be a cheaper resilience measure than moving people to completely new subdivisions.	Seek funding support from government for rebuilding to agreed AEP/AIP level.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.020	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Restricted discretionary provisions should also be included to this effect, particularly in consideration of development in Westport, in which the majority of the town has been zoned to prevent future development after a 1 in 60 year flood, considering that houses can be raised and development in other parts of the country do not have rules that are this intense (refer to south Dunedin, Lower Hutt etc.)	Amend Discretionary Activities to be Restricted Discretionary.
The O'Connor Institute Trust Board (S466)	S466.008	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Amend	The definition of the Westport Hazard Overlay is supported, and in particular, the reference to the area to "be protected". It is however interpreted that the protection works planned by the WCRC Long Term Plan will provide that level of mitigation required by the wider planning framework, and addressed in the specific provisions addressed below. As such, it is submitted that the definition of the Westport Hazard Overlay be extended	Include the words "This applies to the area certified by the WCRC as protected noting the impacts of climate change have been included in the design, development and implementation of the Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme".
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.051	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Amend	The definition of the Westport Hazard Overlay is supported, and in particular, the reference to the area to "be protected". It is however interpreted that	Include the words "This applies to the area certified by the WCRC as protected noting the impacts of climate change have been included in the design, development and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the protection works planned by the WCRC Long Term Plan will provide that level of mitigation required by the wider planning framework, and addressed in the specific provisions addressed below. As such, it is submitted that the definition of the Westport Hazard Overlay be extended	implementation of the Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme".
Felicity Watson (S487)	S487.003	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Amend	Regional Council has been considering options for flood protection for some time and its not certain where or when protection measures will be created, or if they will achieve the outcome required by Rule 52.	Confirmation on the timeframe and extent of construction of flood protection measures required to achieve NH - R52 (1).
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	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.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	The Westport Hazard 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.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	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.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	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.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	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.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	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.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	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.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.017	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Amend	Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling of development.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.005	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose	In its current format the financial and social impact would cause a lot of pain for anyone who owns a property.on the modelling to date using 50-year flood heights would be more than adequate. If it was 2% AEP with a 0.5m freeboard there may have been no inundation at all in July 2021.	Amend the rules so that they are based on floor heights required with the flood protection in place. If that is not possible it should include rules that allow them to be considered in the future. The rules should be amended to refer to a 2% AEP level. The rules should have provision to allow for these heights to come into effect for the various areas in town as the works are completed to protect that area.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.027	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose	This overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions talce an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend overlay and amend associated rules to be more enabling.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.059	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach.	Amend overlay and amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.059	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach.	Amend overlay and amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.144	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach.	Amend overlay and amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.104	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose	Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.083	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Amend	Terminology for the Westport Hazard Overlay differs	Amend to use the preferred nomenclature for flood hazard and coastal inundation is using %AEP (annual exceedence probability), and to distinguish between flood ponding areas and flood stream/overland flow paths for lower and higher flood hazard, respectively.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.180	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities			
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	Within the Coastal Hazard Alert overlay allow for buildings which are relocatable	New rule as follows: Permitted activity NH - RX New Relocatable Buildings Activity Status Permitted Where: 1. Buildings are designed to be relocatable or re-levelled in the event of sea level rise or inundation. Advice note: Compliance with Rule NH - RX will be demonstrated through a statement from the building designer or architect confirming that the building has been designed to be relocatable or re-levelled.
Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (S171)	S171.003	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	The wording of this rule has been identified as being poorly drafted and will not enable a certain outcome in administration.	Amend the wording 1. Any new occupied buildings and additions and alterations to existing occupied buildings are located in the protection area of the Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme mapped by the West Coast Regional Council; or

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>2. Where new occupied buildings are located in areas outside those areas protected by the Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme where these are:</p> <p>a. Buildings for sensitive activities where the finished floor level is 500mm above a 1% Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood event;</p> <p>b. Commercial and industrial buildings where the finished floor level is 300mm above a 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% AEP flood event; or</p> <p>3. These are new unoccupied buildings or additions or alterations to existing unoccupied buildings; or</p> <p>4. These are additions and alterations to commercial and industrial activities where there is no increase in area of building that does not meet a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise event and a 1% AEP flood event; or</p> <p>5. These are additions and alterations to buildings for sensitive activities in areas not protected by the Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme where there is no increase in area of building that does not meet a minimum finished floor level of 500mm above a 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise event and a 1% AEP flood event.</p>
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.007	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose	1.0 m sea level rise is excessive given the predicted life of a new built house and	Westport Hazard Overlay 1m sea level rise to be reviewed. This should be no more

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the fact that that sort of sea level rise is speculation at best.	than 0.5m
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.024	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Support	NH-R52 This needs a map to show where the land meets the criteria, such as the one below but with the Hazard category renamed to how high above the land a new building needs to be built to meet the AEP/ARI criteria.	Include a map linked to Rule NH52 that shows where land meets the Permitted Activity criteria.
The O'Connor Institute Trust Board (S466)	S466.012	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	As set out under items 7 and 8 above, it is considered that the purpose and intent of this rule needs to be clearly stated, so that it leads to clear interpretation that is easy to administer. The current rule does not clearly apply the 'protection' to be provided by the WCRC and applied to the rules within the Westport Hazard Area. Likewise, it is in the communities interest for the O'Connor Home site to be further developed in future given the services it provided to the Buller community, including the provision of independent living. It is submitted that clause 1 need not contain the protection standard after the words 'Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme' and before the words 'as certified by the West Coast Regional Council'.	Remove from clause 1 the protection standard after the words 'Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme' and before the words 'as certified by the West Coast Regional Council'.
Troy Scanlon (S468)	S468.003	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose	On the modelling to date using 50 year flood heights would be more than adequate as there should be no flooding.	Amend so that if houses are built above the currently modelled 2% AEP level with an addition 0.5m freeboard then they are a Permitted Activity.
Rick Hayman (S471)	S471.002	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	Properties are being built up to different heights reflecting the regulations at the time of consenting. Building consents approved recently are unlikely to meet the District Plan provisions which will	Reconsider the heights in the rule and align these to reflect building consents that have been issued recently - which is lower

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					create a peppered landscape of different heights across Westport.	
Rick Hayman (S471)	S471.003	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend		Confirm the timeframe and extent of construction of flood protection measures referred to within the rule.
Rick Hayman (S471)	S471.005	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	This will still provide a good level of protection for houses.	Amend the rules to refer to 1% AEP after the flood walls are constructed and require new buildings to have 300mm above this level.
Rick Hayman (S471)	S471.006	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	The costs associated with technical reports for each individual landowner are huge.	Provide a simple mechanism to seek floor level heights or minimum building platform heights associated with subdivision, new home building and existing home modifications on a case-by-case basis that doesn't require expensive technical experts (eg Environment Canterbury approach).
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.011	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	The purpose and intent of this rule is unclear. The current rule does not clearly apply the "protection" to be provided by the WCRC and applied to the rules within the Westport Hazard Area.	Clause 1 should be amended to delete the protection standard after the words "Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme".
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.013	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	unreasonable to put the requirement to mitigate flooding on individual landowners.	Amend the need to provide flood protection to the levels set out.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.014	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	To avoid creating a landscape of elevated new development in the short term.	Amend NH - R52 (2 - 5) to allow for finished floor levels for buildings for sensitive activities to be built to the 1 in 100 year ARI coastal event (without sea level rise) and the 1%AEP flood event until the Flood Protection Scheme is in place
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.017	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	provide for an enabling rule even if a scheme which achieves a lower level of protection is deemed to be acceptable.	Amend the wording of the NH - R52 (1) to allow for new development to occur once an appropriate scheme is in place

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.018	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	NH - R52 Rule properties are being filled to create elevated platforms.	Amend the residential zone rules to allow an exception for recession plane intrusions caused by elevated floor levels arising from compliance with the NH - R52
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.055	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	As set out under items 7 and 8 above, it is considered that the purpose and intent of this rule needs to be clearly stated, so that it leads to clear interpretation that is easy to administer. The current rule does not clearly apply the 'protection' to be provided by the WCRC and applied to the rules within the Westport Hazard Area. Likewise, it is in the communities interest for the O'Connor Home site to be further developed in future given the services it provided to the Buller community, including the provision of independent living. It is submitted that clause 1 need not contain the protection standard after the words 'Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme' and before the words 'as certified by the West Coast Regional Council'.	Remove from clause 1 the protection standard after the words 'Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme' and before the words 'as certified by the West Coast Regional Council'.
The Coda Trust (S480)	S480.001	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose	The rule requires unreasonably high floor levels. Building consents approved recently are unlikely to meet the specified floor levels creating a peppered landscape in Westport.	Reconsider the heights in the rule to reflect the heights building consents have been approved to recently.
The Coda Trust (S480)	S480.002	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	WCRC has been considering flood protection options for some time and there is no certainty about what measures will be created or if they will achieve the outcome required by the rule.	Provide confirmation of the timeframe and extent of construction of flood protection measures required to achieve NH 52(1)
The Coda Trust (S480)	S480.004	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	The rules framework will generate a massive amount of technical reports and	Provide a mechanism to seek floor level heights or minimum building heights associated with subdivision from the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					getting resource consent more difficult and costly	District or Regional Council on a case by case basis similar to the service provided by Environment Canterbury.
Felicity Watson (S487)	S487.002	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	Building consents recently approved are unlikely to meet the standards required in the proposed plan, therefore a peppered landscape is forming in Westport with properties raised to a variety of levels without any cohesion.	Reconsider the heights required in the short term to reflect heights building consents have been approved to recently, which is lower than that required by the rule.
Felicity Watson (S487)	S487.004	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	Any resource consent application to seek a lesser floor level than the high standard required will generate a massive number of technical reports which makes resource consent more difficult and costly.	Provide a mechanism to seek floor level heights, or minimum building platform heights associated with subdivision from District or Regional Council on a case-by-case basis, so that expensive technical reports are not required every time someone wants to build a new house or modify an existing home. Environment Canterbury provide a flood risk assessment with floor levels upon request and a similar service should be available on the West Coast.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.018	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose		Rule NH - R52 is reworded to provide clarity to landowners. Suggested wording: Where new buildings are not protected by the Hokitika/Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event: a. Buildings for sensitive activities have a finished floor level of 500mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event; b. Commercial and industrial buildings have a finished floor level of 300mm above the 100- year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event. Provide a clear definition of clear definition for 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						(1% ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP).
Warren French (S494)	S494.001	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose	The rule requires unreasonably high floor levels. Building consents approved recently are unlikely to meet the specified floor levels creating a peppered landscape in Westport.	Reconsider the heights in the rule to reflect the heights building consents have been approved to recently.
Warren French (S494)	S494.002	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	WCRC has been considering flood protection options for some time and there is no certainty about what measures will be created or if they will achieve the outcome required by the rule.	Provide confirmation of the timeframe and extent of construction of flood protection measures required to achieve NH 52(1)
Warren French (S494)	S494.004	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	The rules framework will generate a massive amount of technical reports and getting resource consent more difficult and costly	Provide a mechanism to seek floor level heights or minimum building heights associated with subdivision from the District or Regional Council on a case by case basis similar to the service provided by Environment Canterbury.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.162	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Support in part	<p>Request a rewrite of R52.</p> <p>Needing to refer to the definition of additions and alterations in order to understand the rules in relation to Natural Hazards, makes the interpretation of the rules more arduous than necessary. The separation of terms additions and alterations with the subsequent meanings defined could make the interpretation of these rules easier, it is acknowledged that a rewrite of these rules would be required but may make the rules clearer to understand.</p> <p>Should the definition of additions and alterations be retained further tweaking what is covered in this definition is</p>	<p>Rewrite rule NH-R52. A simplified rule would be preferred, however if a similar format is followed as proposed in R52 a suggestion is below. Our changes are based on using the existing TTPP definitions. There may be merit in separating out the use of additions and alterations to ensure that a clear concise interpretation of the rules can be achieved for all plan users.</p> <p>Suggestion Activity Status Permitted Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These are new buildings for sensitive activities where the finished floor level is 500mm above 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% AEP flood event; or 2. These are new buildings for critical

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>requested.</p> <p>Floor level requirements to address habitable buildings are supported that reflect New Zealand Standard NZS4404:2010. Reference to the Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Scheme should be removed from R52 as the details of the design are unknown.</p>	<p>response facilities, commercial and industrial activities where the finished floor level is 300mm above a 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise event and a 1% AEP flood event; or</p> <p>3. These are additions and alterations to existing buildings currently used for sensitive activities where there is no increase in the existing floor area that does not meet the finished floor level of 500mm above 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% AEP floor; or</p> <p>4. These are additions and alterations to buildings for critical response facilities, commercial and industrial activities where there is no increase in the existing floor area that does not meet the finished floor level is 300mm above a 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise event and a 1% AEP flood event;</p> <p>5. These are new unoccupied buildings; or</p> <p>6. These are unoccupied extensions to existing buildings</p> <p>7. The conversion of an unoccupied building that alters the habitable space as to increase the likely number of inhabitants where the finished floor level is 500mm above 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% AEP flood event.</p>
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.030	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose	The Westport Hazard overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend to be more enabling
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.057	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.057	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.142	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.001	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	unreasonable to put the requirement to mitigate flooding on individual landowners.	Amend the need to provide flood protection to the levels set out.
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.002	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	To avoid creating a landscape of elevated new development in the short term.	Amend NH - R52 (2 - 5) to allow for finished floor levels for buildings for sensitive activities to be built to the 1 in 100 year ARI coastal event (without sea level rise) and the 1%AEP flood event until the Flood Protection Scheme is in place
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.005	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	provide for an enabling rule even if a scheme which achieves a lower level of protection is deemed to be acceptable.	Amend the wording of the NH - R52 (1) to allow for new development to occur once an appropriate scheme is in place
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.006	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	NH - R52 Rule properties are being filled to create elevated platforms.	Amend the residential zone rules to allow an exception for recession plane intrusions caused by elevated floor levels arising from compliance with the NH - R52
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.074	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose	Westport Hazard Overlay and associated Natural Hazard and Subdivision objectives, policies and rules. 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.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.084	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	Residual risk exists for buildings within the Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme	Amend: minimum finished floor levels 500mm above the 100-year ARI coastal inundation level for residential properties and 300mm above the 100-year ARI coastal inundation level for commercial and industrial buildings for all structures within the Westport Hazard Zone.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.028	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	Allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road submitters' properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m ² over any continuous 10-year period	Amend Rule NH-R52 to allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m ² over any continuous 10 year period without meeting the finished floor area standards set out in Rule NH-R52.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.058	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	Not sufficient justification as to why 1m of sea level rise needs to be accommodated by finished floor levels	Delete reference to 1m sea level rise from Rule NH-R52 insofar as it applies to the Snodgrass Road properties
Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited and Foodstuffs South Island Limited (S464)	S464.046	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Amend	Restricted discretionary status is more appropriate, with matters of discretion limited to those in NHR12.	Activity Status Discretionary Restricted discretionary Refer to matters of discretion and notification status in NHR12.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.019	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Oppose		Rule NH - R53 is reworded to provide clarity to landowners. Suggested wording: Where new buildings are not protected by the Hokitika/Westport Flood and Coastal Erosion Protection Scheme from a 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event: a. Buildings for sensitive activities have a finished floor level of 500mm above the 100-year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event; b. Commercial and industrial buildings have a finished floor level of 300mm above the 100- year ARI plus 1m sea level rise coastal event. Provide a clear definition of clear definition for 100-year Annual Recurrence Interval (1% ARI) plus 1m sea level rise coastal event and a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.163	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Support	Activity status considered appropriate	Retain as notified.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.031	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Oppose	The Westport Hazard overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend to be more enabling
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.058	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.058	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.143	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.085	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards and flooding	Retain
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.029	Natural Hazards	NHR53	Support	Allows a resource consent application to be made	Retain Rule NH-R53.