



Plan Sections: Subdivision

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
G.E. and C.J. Coates on behalf of Nikau Deer Farm Limited (S415)	S415.007	Subdivision	SUB	Oppose	The one hectare subdivisable size was working. Why do we need to change it? As an example, the 10 hectare rule did not work in Tauranga as it resulted in more land being lost to urban sprawl. The fresh water rules have resulted in the loss of productive farm land and this proposed subdivision rule inhibits the sale of these areas. These areas are the most sensible areas to be sold as lifestyle properties.	Keep the area as subdivisable to one hectare. An allowance needs to be made for those wanting to subdivide non-productive land if below the subdivisable area.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.071	Subdivision	SUB	Amend	It is sought that the SASM overlay is removed and sites re-assessed/re-reviewed	Remove all references to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori" in the Chapter
Brendan Te Amo (S85)	S85.002	Subdivision	Subdivision	Support		Support
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.023	Subdivision	Subdivision	Support	Westland District Council supports these Objectives, Policies, Rules and Standards	Retain the objectives, policies, rules and standards.
Transpower New Zealand Limited (S299)	S299.053	Subdivision	Subdivision	Amend	The objectives and policies within the Subdivision zone do not address the effects of subdivision on network utilities/infrastructure/energy activities. Instead the matter is addressed in ENG-P3 and the recommended Transpower specific policy ENG-R10. If SUB-R8 is to be retained within the subdivision chapter, at a minimum cross reference is required to the policies within the Energy chapter.	Provide a cross reference within SUB-R8 to the Energy chapter policies ENG-P3 and ENG-P10

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Christopher and Donna Meates (S430)	S430.004	Subdivision	Subdivision	Amend	the 4ha minimum size is, as indicated above, too small for viable primary production use. As such it will tie up 4 ha of land into one single land unit that is effectively thereby no longer available and removed from viable primary production use. There is no indication that this lot size is optimal to maximise the rural amenity benefits of residential use of the General Rural Zone. Rather, the 5,000m2 size is still capable of providing those benefits, but results in a much more efficient use of the limited physical resource that is land, as it provides for twice the number of residential uses for the same amount of land taken out of viable primary production.	Amend objectives and policies that support a General Rural Zone subdivision standard of 4ha so that they support a 5000m2 minimum lot size .
Suzanne Hills (S443)	S443.031	Subdivision	Subdivision	Amend	They are very low impact, meet the needs of many and there exist opportunities to provide subdivisions for tiny house villages in or near to West Coast towns or settlements. They could include both purchase and lease of land plots for tiny houses.	Review this section to enable the tiny house movement and its contribution to the sustainable use of land and resources.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.075	Subdivision	Subdivision	Amend	The wording of the rules in this section is chaotic and difficult to understand with poor direction provided. It would not be possible for someone to understand the subdivision rules without professional help.	Make subdivision rules more accessible to a lay person.
Rocky Mining Limited (S474)	S474.043	Subdivision	Subdivision	Amend		include a requirement to avoid the establishment of sensitive activities, and associated reverse sensitivity effects, in proximity to mineral extraction activities and known mineral resources;
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.035	Subdivision	Subdivision	Amend	The purposes of the NPSHPL and the TTPP HPL are different; the former aims to protect HPL for use in land-based primary production, particularly LUC Class 1-3 soils; while the pTTPP HPL areas seem to	Review the pTTPP HPL provisions in terms of whether they meet the NPSHPL provisions, and amend the pTTPP HPL provisions once further consultation with affected landowners is

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					be intended to protect the productive 'farm' character and amenity values of rural areas. Council staff understand that the HPL Precinct in the pTTPP was not intended to implement the NPSHPL, however this information was received by Council staff prior to the NPSHPL being released. If this is the case, using the proposed term "Highly Productive Land" for the pTTPP Precincts when it is not implementing the NPSHPL is very confusing for landowners. The pTTPP HPL provisions need to be reviewed in relation to the NPSHPL provisions, to remove the confusion.	undertaken.
Papahaua Resources Limited (S500)	S500.030	Subdivision	Subdivision	Amend		include a requirement to avoid the establishment of sensitive activities, and associated reverse sensitivity effects, in proximity to mineral extraction activities and known mineral resources;
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.128	Subdivision	Subdivision	Neutral	DOC is neutral as these do not affect priority conservation values, biodiversity values, or DOC's interests.	NA
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.342	Subdivision	Overview	Amend	the potential for impact on the provisions of services, including energy and infrastructure.	Amend paragraph 1: Subdivision is the process of ... but it also impacts on adjacent sites and the future use of land, including energy activities and infrastructure and the provision of services . Subdivision affects the natural
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.102	Subdivision	Overview	Amend		This section of Te Tai o Poutini Plan contains the objectives, policies and rules for financial contributions for development of infrastructure and for their use to offset adverse effects on the environment of the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini. Currently the three District Councils on the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini use financial contributions under the RMA as the sole mechanism to provide for the costs and impacts

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						of private development on Council infrastructure and these draft provisions have been developed on the basis of that approach continuing.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.102	Subdivision	Overview	Amend		This section of Te Tai o Poutini Plan contains... for development of infrastructure and ... West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini. Currently the three District Councils on the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini ... the costs and impacts of private development on Council infrastructure ... approach continuing.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.264	Subdivision	Overview	Amend	Amend to make clear that subdivision needs to protect not only scheduled/identified areas, particularly given the lack of a comprehensive SNA schedule.	Amend to make clear that subdivision needs to protect not only scheduled/identified areas, particularly given the lack of a comprehensive SNA schedule.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.521	Subdivision	Overview	Amend	This chapter lacks any reference to other relevant chapters.	Amend to include reference to other relevant chapters.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.522	Subdivision	Overview	Amend	Subdivision can adversely impact wetlands and other water bodies by, for example, fragmentation.	Consider including new rules, or amendments to existing rules to avoid effects on waterbodies and their margins in the subdivision process, in a similar way as is sought for SNAs below.
Brendan Te Amo (S85)	S85.001	Subdivision	Subdivision Objectives	Support	Agree with the proposed new zonings, keeping the growth within the existing towns and not allowing lateral spread of housing here there and everywhere. Grows the population of existing zones and generates economic growth in these already established regions.	Agree with the proposed new zonings, keeping the growth within the existing towns and not allowing lateral spread of housing here there and everywhere.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.068	Subdivision	Subdivision Objectives	Support	KiwiRail supports part c. of this policy which seeks to protect critical infrastructure from adverse effects of subdivision.	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.244	Subdivision	Subdivision Objectives	Support	Council supports the objectives and policies for Subdivision.	Retain as notified. Objectives SUB - O1 - O6; Policies SUB - P1 - P9
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.265	Subdivision	Subdivision Objectives	Amend	It is not clear that the provisions, and especially the rules, of this chapter adequately protect wetlands. These must be protected in accordance with chapter NC (as well as ECO).	Amend provisions of this chapter to ensure wetlands are protected in accordance with s6(a) and the NC chapter (as amended by our submission). Consider including new rules, or amendments to existing rules to avoid effects on waterbodies and their margins in the subdivision process, in a similar way as is sought for SNAs below.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.033	Subdivision	Subdivision Objectives	Support	Subdivision are supported subject to the amendments specified for Policy UB-P6 specified below.	Retain Objectives SUB-01 - SUBO6 and Policies SUB-P1 - SUB P9 subject to the specific amendments to SUB P6 and set out in the submission below.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.401	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Support	We support this objective.	Retain objective.
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.018	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Support in part	Silver Fern Farms supports this objective insofar as it relates to the Site. However, Silver Fern Farm notes that subdivision should achieve patterns of land development that are compatible with purpose, character and qualities of each zone, but notes that subdivision should not lead to unintended reverse sensitivity effects for the industrial zone. For example, where adjacent land to the Site has the proposed rezoning of GRUZ, GRZ, and MRZ, these land uses are markedly different to that of the industrial zone, and by increasing the number of	Amend as follows: SUB - O1 Subdivision achieves patterns of land development that: are compatible with the purpose, character and qualities of each zone. Avoid any reverse sensitivity effects on the operation or expansion of permitted, consented, or existing industrial activities.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					sensitive activities adjacent to the existing Plant, this would likely lead to reverse sensitivity effects.	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.110	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Support	The objective is supported as it seeks to achieve appropriate integration with the purpose, character, and qualities of each zone.	Retain as proposed.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.177	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.177	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.251	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.177	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Support		Retain
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.040	Subdivision	SUB - O1	Amend		Subdivision achieves patterns of land development that are compatible with the purpose, character and qualities quality of the environment each zone.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.402	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support	It is pleasing to see health, wellbeing and safety listed in this objective clause (b). It is also good to see the new clause (c) addressing access and connectivity, and clause (f) addressing resilience to, and avoidance of, natural hazards.	Retain objective.
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.019	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support in part	Silver Fern Farms consider that SUB - O2(e) should also account for the provision of growth and expansion of West Coast/ Te Tai o Poutini industry.	Amend as follows: SUB - O2 Subdivision occurs in locations and at a rate that: [...] e. Provides for growth and expansion of West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini settlements, and businesses and industry ; and [...]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.064	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	KiwiRail supports the intent of this policy however, seeks amendment to ensure it facilitates the safe and efficient operation of critical infrastructure.	Amend as follows: Subdivision occurs in locations and at a rate that: Is supported by the capacity of existing infrastructure networks, or provides for infrastructure facilities and networks that are sufficient to accommodate

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						growth and development that meets the standards required by the Council and the Plan; Facilitates the safe and efficient operation of critical infrastructure; [...]
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.111	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the objective as it ensures that subdivision occurs in locations and facilitates the operation of critical infrastructure. The objective also requires that subdivision enables access and good connectivity.	Retain as proposed.
Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga (S456)	S456.018	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support in part	The Ministry support this objective as it enables subdivision, however the Ministry requests that specific provision for educational facilities is provided to ensure that population growth and the impact on schools is considered within developments.	Amend as follows: Subdivision occurs in locations and at a rate that: Is supported by the capacity of infrastructure networks, or provides for infrastructure facilities and networks that are sufficient to accommodate growth and development that meets the standards required by the Council and the Plan; Facilitates the operation of critical infrastructure; Enables access and connectivity; Provide for the health, wellbeing and safety of the West Coast/Tai o Poutini community; Enables growth and development to be supported by educational facilities Provides for growth and expansion of West Coast/Tai o Poutini settlements and businesses; and Avoids significant natural hazards and are built to be resilient to natural hazards.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.028	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	do not recognise appropriate mitigation measures to reduce or avoid risks	Amend to read: Subdivision occurs in locations and at a rate that: a. ...f. Avoids Sufficiently mitigates risks from significant natural hazards and are built to be

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						resilient to natural hazards.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.039	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support in part	There should be provisions in the subdivision chapter that give effect to the NPSHPL to ensure that subdivision of highly productive land is avoided except as provided for in the NPSHPL.	Amend SUB-O2 by adding: g) gives effect to the NPSHPL Make consequential amendments to objectives, policies and rules to implement the NPSHPL.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.343	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	To provide wording consistent with the plan format.	Amend a. Is supported by the capacity of existing energy and infrastructure networks ... or provides for energy and infrastructure activities , facilities and networks that area sufficient to accommodate growth ...;"
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.344	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	potential effects on energy and infrastructure, and gives effect to RPS provisions.	Amend b. Facilitates, maintains and provides for, and does not adversely impact , the operation and maintenance of critical infrastructure, including energy activities ;
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.105	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	Not only significant natural areas that need protection (RMA s6 [particularly 6(a)], s7)	g. protects and enhances amenity values
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.105	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	It is not only significant natural areas that need protection.	g. protects and enhances amenity values
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.178	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.178	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.252	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support		Retain
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.015	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support	Fire and Emergency support SUB-O2 insofar as it promotes subdivision that is accessible from the transport network and provides for the health and well-being of communities.	No amendment sought.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.178	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.041	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend		add g. Mitigates potential effects on amenity and natural landscapes values by the use of community infrastructure facilities.
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.016	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	do not recognise appropriate mitigation measures to reduce or avoid risks	Amend to read: Subdivision occurs in locations and at a rate that: a. ...f. Avoids Sufficiently mitigates risks from significant natural hazards and are built to be resilient to natural hazards.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.086	Subdivision	SUB - O2	Amend	It is important to define the level of hazard deemed "significant" by the TTPP	Define what constitutes a 'significant' natural hazard
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S140)	S140.039	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support	HNZPT supports SUB-O3 which seeks to ensure that proposed subdivision design and development protects significant historical and Poutini Ngāi Tahu features and resources and responds to the physical characteristics and constraints of the site and surrounding environment.	Retain as proposed
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.403	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support	We support this objective.	Retain objective.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.112	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support	The objective is supported as it ensures appropriate design and development that protects significant coastal, natural, ecological, historical and Poutini Ngāi Tahu features.	Retain as proposed.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.040	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support in part	Highly productive land should be added to the list of matters that are protected.	Amend SUB-O3 by adding: Highly productive land.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.106	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Amend	Not only significant natural areas that need protection (RMA s6 [particularly 6(a)], s7)	Subdivision design and development protects the quality of the environment including the intrinsic value of ecosystems and significant coastal, natural, ecological, historical and Poutini Ngāi Tahu features and resources and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						responds to the physical characteristics and constraints of the site and surrounding environment.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.106	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Amend	It is not only significant natural areas that need protection.	Subdivision design and development protects the quality of the environment including the intrinsic value of ecosystems and significant coastal, natural, ecological, historical and Poutini Ngāi Tahu features and resources and responds to the physical characteristics and constraints of the site and surrounding environment.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.179	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.179	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.253	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.179	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Support		Retain
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.042	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Amend		Amend ...historical and Poutini Ngāi Tahu features and cultural values , and resources...
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.120	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Amend	Amend Objective SUB-O3 to make the objective explicit that the protection of significant features includes landscapes, and the scale, density and design of the subdivision is compatible with the physical characteristics and constraints of the site.	Amend: Subdivision design and development protects significant coastal, natural, ecological, landscape , historical and Poutini Ngāi Tahu features and resources and responds is of a scale, density and design that is compatible with the physical characteristics and constraints of the site and surrounding environment
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.178	Subdivision	SUB - O3	Amend	The objective refers to Poutini Ngāi Tahu features and resources - most of the plan uses 'values'.	Subdivision design and development protects significant coastal, natural, ecological, historical and Poutini Ngāi Tahu values features and resources and responds to the physical characteristics and constraints of the site and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						surrounding environment.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.404	Subdivision	SUB - O4	Support	We support this objective.	Retain objective.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.107	Subdivision	SUB - O4	Support	Amend to support P 05(e)	protects valuable horticulture land from urban sprawl
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.107	Subdivision	SUB - O4	Support	to support P 05(e)	protects valuable horticulture land from urban sprawl
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.180	Subdivision	SUB - O4	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.180	Subdivision	SUB - O4	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.254	Subdivision	SUB - O4	Support		Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.405	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Support	We support this objective.	Retain objective.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.108	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Amend	Needs to be amended to incorporate those omissions of SNAs being recognised and RPS	Esplanade reserves and strips created through subdivision contribute to the protection of identified significant natural heritage and Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, provide natural hazard mitigation
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.108	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Amend	SNAs being recognised in the Buller needs to be recognised throughout this chapter.	Esplanade reserves and strips created through subdivision contribute to the protection of identified significant natural heritage and Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, provide natural hazard mitigation

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.181	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Amend	this objective needs amending and it overreaches.	Amend objective to reflect only the purpose of esplanade reserves and strips as set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.181	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Amend	this objective needs amending and it overreaches.	Amend objective to reflect only the purpose of esplanade reserves and strips as set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.255	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Amend	this objective needs amending and it overreaches.	Amend objective to reflect only the purpose of esplanade reserves and strips as set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.181	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Amend	this objective needs amending and it overreaches.	Amend objective to reflect only the purpose of esplanade reserves and strips as set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.087	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Support	We support the use of esplanade reserves and strips	Retain
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.179	Subdivision	SUB - O5	Support	This objective seeks to protect Poutini Ngāi Tahu values	Retain as notified.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.406	Subdivision	SUB - O6	Support	We strongly support this new policy addressing open space which differs from that in the Exposure Draft Plan	Retain objective.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.345	Subdivision	SUB - O6	Amend	The need is as a direct result of the proposed subdivision.	Amend: Where subdivision ... need for open space created by the subdivision.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.182	Subdivision	SUB - O6	Amend		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.182	Subdivision	SUB - O6	Amend		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.256	Subdivision	SUB - O6	Amend		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.182	Subdivision	SUB - O6	Amend		Retain
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.043	Subdivision	SUB - O6	Amend		Where subdivision occurs, in all zones , sufficient...
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.195	Subdivision	Subdivision Policies	Amend	Add new Policy that applies to rural zones.	Insert a new policy that reads as follows: Allow subdivision in the RURZ - Rural Zones that does not comply with the minimum lot design and parameters when:a. The site size and configuration is appropriate for development intended by the zone;b. The subdivision design maintains rural character and amenity;c. The increased density does not create adverse effects on critical infrastructure; andd. It can be demonstrated that it is consistent with the quality and types of development envisaged by RURZ - Rural Zone Objectives and Policies.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.195	Subdivision	Subdivision Policies	Amend	Add new Policy that applies to rural zones.	Insert a new policy that reads as follows: Allow subdivision in the RURZ - Rural Zones that does not comply with the minimum lot design and parameters when:a. The site size and configuration is appropriate for development intended by the zone;b. The subdivision design maintains rural character and amenity;c. The increased density does not create adverse effects on critical infrastructure; andd. It can be demonstrated that it is consistent with the quality and types of development envisaged by RURZ - Rural Zone Objectives and Policies.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.268	Subdivision	Subdivision Policies	Amend	Add new Policy that applies to rural zones.	Insert a new policy that reads as follows: Allow subdivision in the RURZ - Rural Zones that does not comply with the minimum lot design and parameters when:a. The site size and configuration is appropriate for development intended by the zone;b. The subdivision design maintains rural character and amenity;c. The increased density does not create adverse effects on critical infrastructure; andd. It can be demonstrated that it is consistent with the quality and types of development envisaged by RURZ - Rural Zone Objectives and Policies.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.195	Subdivision	Subdivision Policies	Amend	Add new Policy that applies to rural zones.	Insert a new policy that reads as follows: Allow subdivision in the RURZ - Rural Zones that does not comply with the minimum lot design and parameters when:a. The site size and configuration is appropriate for development intended by the zone;b. The subdivision design maintains rural character and amenity;c. The increased density does not create adverse effects on critical infrastructure; andd. It can be demonstrated that it is consistent with the quality and types of development envisaged by RURZ - Rural Zone Objectives and Policies.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.034	Subdivision	Subdivision Policies	Amend	Supported subject to the amendments specified for Policy UB-P6 specified below.	Retain Objectives SUB-01 - SUBO6 and Policies SUB-P1 - SUB P9 subject to the specific amendments to SUB P6 and set out in the submission below.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.00654	Subdivision	Subdivision Policies	Support	Council supports the objectives and policies for Subdivision.	Retain as notified.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the	S190.407	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support	We strongly support this policy including the new clause (d) which differs from what was in the Exposure Draft Plan.	Retain policy.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.041	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.113	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the policy as it ensures that subdivision creates allotments that are consistent with the zoning and ensures legal, physical, and safe access to each allotment created by the subdivision.	Retain as proposed.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.081	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support in part	Whilst subdivision should be consistent with the qualities listed, it should also provide for the same. For example, with regard to highly productive land. Changes are sought to address these matters.	d. Amend: Enable subdivision that creates allotments that: a. Are consistent with and provide for the purpose, character, and qualities of the applicable zone; Protects significant cultural, historical, natural and ecological features sites and areas identified on the planning maps and in the Schedules in the Plan; Recognises and protects areas of highly productive land; and
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.346	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Amend	Servicing and potential effects on critical infrastructure.	Add f. Can be appropriately serviced and does not adversely affect the operation and maintenance of critical infrastructure, including energy activities.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.103	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Oppose	P1 - P2 adequately covers what P1 is trying to say.	delete
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.109	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Amend		d. Protects the significant cultural, historical, natural and ecological features sites and areas identified on the planning maps and in the Schedules in the Plan; and
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.103	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Oppose	P1 - P2 adequately covers what P1 is trying to say.	delete
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.109	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Amend		d. Protects the significant cultural, historical, natural and ecological features sites and areas identified on the planning maps and in the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Schedules in the Plan; and
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.183	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.183	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.257	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.183	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support		Retain
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.044	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Amend		Amend b. to read Subdivision achieves patterns of land use development that is logical, integrated, reinforces local identity in layout, respects cultural focal points, promotes a variety of compatible uses and densities, is convenient, provides open spaces, is safe, low impact and protects cultural, heritage and landscape values. Maintains the integrity of the zone with lot sizes and dimensions sufficient to accommodate intended land uses;
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.045	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Amend		Add g. Allows for a pattern of development and urban form to promote identity through design and amenity values, sustainable design, integration and connectivity, open space, mixed allotment sizes and complies with any development plan for the area.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.121	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Amend	Amend Policy SUB-P1 to make the policy explicit that the protection of significant features includes landscapes, and not all significant features are mapped in the Plan. For example, these include habitats of significant flora and fauna which may not be mapped, or sites of cultural or heritage significance which may not be mapped.	Amend: Enable subdivision that creates allotments that: Are consistent with the purpose, character, and qualities of the applicable zone; Maintains the integrity of the zone with lot sizes and dimensions sufficient to accommodate intended land uses; Minimises natural hazard risk to people's lives

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						and properties; Protects significant cultural, historical, natural and ecological features sites and areas identified on the planning maps and in the Schedules in the Plan or identified as significant through the resource consent process ; and Have legal, physical and safe access to each allotment created by the subdivision.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.088	Subdivision	SUB - P1	Support	Subdivision which minimises the risk from natural hazards to lives and property	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.408	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support in part	We strongly support this policy, particularly, the inclusion of clause (e), ensuring adequate provision for open space and reserves, including pedestrian and cycle linkages. However, we recommend including pedestrian and cycle linkages is moved to be alongside vehicle access and public transport, as all forms of transport need to be catered for, including walking and cycling. Additionally, we would like to see the provision of quality playgrounds specifically included in clause (e). Quality playgrounds (designed to cater for a wide range of ages, abilities and activity levels) provide safe spaces for children, families and the wider community to gather, be active and have fun. Globally, playgrounds are increasingly catering to older people with equipment designed to assist them to be active in older age. We also support the new clause (j) which differs from what was in the Exposure Draft Plan.	Amend SUB-P2 as follows: Ensure subdivision is appropriately serviced and integrated with existing or planned infrastructure that is provided in an efficient, integrated and coordinated manner by ensuring: a. Infrastructure networks have sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional development, and requiring any necessary upgrades to be completed at the time of subdivision; ... d. Provision for safe and efficient safe and effective transport connections and linkages, including pedestrian, cycling linkages, public transport and vehicle access ; e. Provision for open space and reserves, including pedestrian and cycle linkages accessible, quality playgrounds ;
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.065	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	Stormwater discharge onto the rail corridor has the potential to damage the rail network and disrupt the safe and efficient function of the railway. KiwiRail supports policy direction to ensure that stormwater	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					does not result in increased flooding and erosion risk.	
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.042	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Oppose in part	<p>A - Rule a. is disagreed to in part, as the rule requires developers to upgrade the network as required, however in areas of anticipated development financial and development contributions are expected to cover this.</p> <p>C/D - This is a repeat of s.106 of the RMA in which it is required.</p> <p>E - the rule is vague in terms of what can be considered</p>	<p>A - additional costs, unless for large scale developments should not be required until networks are at capacity as this propagates a first come first serve basis for development.</p> <p>Delete C/D</p> <p>E -- provisions should be around allotment design and engineering matters, with provisions for outdoor and open spaces to be a requirement of the proposed land use.N - should include a note about vesting of services in council upon completion/certification</p>
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.114	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	The policy is supported as it ensures sufficient provision for legal and physical access, which includes safe and efficient vehicle access. The policy also includes adequate pedestrian and cycle linkages as part of subdivision.	Retain as proposed.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.347	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	<p>The policy is generally supported with amendments for,</p> <p>(1) Consistency of terms throughout the document.</p> <p>(2) An amendment is required to the first paragraph to improve interpretation.</p> <p>(3) Given that energy and infrastructure lines can be above ground in the Industrial zone an amendment is required to provide for these activities.</p> <p>(4) An ability to ensure the ongoing access to and operation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of energy activities and infrastructure through</p>	<p>(1) Amend the first paragraph, "Ensure subdivision is appropriately serviced ... or planned infrastructure and energy activities in an efficient, integrated and coordinated ...".</p> <p>(2) Amend item a., "a. Infrastructure and energy activity networks have sufficient ...";</p> <p>(3) Amend item n.ii., "ii. Underground reticulation of services. This is with the exception that electricity activities and infrastructure in the INZ-Industrial zone can be above ground;".</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the subdivision process is required.	
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.110	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	Consider composting toilets, are unlikely to contaminate fresh water	(i) consider composting toilets, which use less water and are therefore unlikely to contaminate fresh water
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.110	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	Use less water and are therefore unlikely to contaminate fresh water	(i) consider composting toilets, which use less water and are therefore unlikely to contaminate fresh water
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.184	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	The exact meaning of "planned infrastructure" is unclear and requires a definition.	Provide a suitable definition of "planned infrastructure" that ensures a robust, and consultative process determined the planned infrastructure that also minimises uncertainty.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.185	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	"deemed reasonable by Council" used in point k. is unnecessary and introduces uncertainty.	Amend k. Supply of electricity and telecommunications using a method that is appropriate to the type of development, location and character of the area including off-grid renewable electricity supply / wireless /satellite where deemed reasonable by the Council;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.187	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	Point m. is too strict in its direction and too broad in its application	Delete point m.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.188	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	Point o. would benefit from providing more detail about how this is achieved.	Amend to develop more detail regarding how point o. is achieved.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.184	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	The exact meaning of "planned infrastructure" is unclear and requires a definition.	Provide a suitable definition of "planned infrastructure" that ensures a robust, and consultative process determined the planned infrastructure that also minimises uncertainty.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.185	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	"deemed reasonable by Council" used in point k. is unnecessary and introduces uncertainty.	Amend k. Supply of electricity and telecommunications using a method that is appropriate to the type of development, location and character of the area including off-grid renewable electricity supply / wireless /satellite where deemed reasonable by the Council;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.187	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	Point m. is too strict in its direction and too broad in its application	Delete point m.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.188	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	Point o. would benefit from providing more detail about how this is achieved.	Amend to develop more detail regarding how point o. is achieved.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.258	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	The exact meaning of "planned infrastructure" is unclear and requires a definition.	Provide a suitable definition of "planned infrastructure" that ensures a robust, and consultative process determined the planned infrastructure that also minimises uncertainty.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.259	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	"deemed reasonable by Council" used in point k. is unnecessary and introduces uncertainty.	Amend k. Supply of electricity and telecommunications using a method that is appropriate to the type of development, location and character of the area including off-grid renewable electricity supply / wireless /satellite where deemed reasonable by the Council;
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.260	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	Point m. is too strict in its direction and too broad in its application	Delete point m.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.261	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	Point o. would benefit from providing more detail about how this is achieved.	Amend to develop more detail regarding how point o. is achieved.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.016	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	Fire and Emergency supports SUB-P3 insofar as it required subdivisions to be appropriately serviced and for infrastructure to be installed at the time of subdivision. Further, Fire and Emergency support the requirement for connections to reticulated systems to be provided where reticulation services are available. Fire and Emergency support the policy as it requires the provision of water supply infrastructure with sufficient capacity for firefighting purposes where reticulated services are not available.	No amendment sought.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.184	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	The exact meaning of "planned infrastructure" is unclear and requires a definition.	Provide a suitable definition of "planned infrastructure" that ensures a robust, and consultative process determined the planned infrastructure that also minimises uncertainty.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.185	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	"deemed reasonable by Council" used in point k. is unnecessary and introduces uncertainty.	Amend k. Supply of electricity and telecommunications using a method that is appropriate to the type of development, location and character of the area including off-grid renewable electricity supply / wireless /satellite where deemed reasonable by the Council;
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.187	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend	Point m. is too strict in its direction and too broad in its application	Delete point m.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.188	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	Point o. would benefit from providing more detail about how this is achieved.	Amend to develop more detail regarding how point o. is achieved.
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.046	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend		Amend 2.n. i. Safe disposal of wastewater to a community reticulate system if located within the development area. Land based treatment allowed for allotments that are a minimum of 4,000m ² in land area where no reticulated network is available and is not within a Drinking Water Protection Zone. Treatment and safe disposal of wastewater with a preference for land-based treatment where no reticulated network is in place;
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.047	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend		Amend 2.n. iii. Sealed footpaths of sufficient capacity for sharing both pedestrian and cycle movements safety.
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.048	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Amend		2. n. iv. Streetlights in urban areas in all residential zones are adequate in providing infomral surveillance and safety for pedestrians, cyclists and the community; and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.089	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	The requirement that infrastructure ensures treatment and safe disposal of stormwater	Retain
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.180	Subdivision	SUB - P2	Support	Clause (i),(l) and (m) support papakāinga and land based wastewater treatment.	Retain as notified particularly clause (i), (l), and (m)
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S140)	S140.040	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support	HNZPT supports SUB-P3 which seeks to enable subdivision where it will not compromise the identified characteristics and values identified in the Historic Heritage chapter and will achieve its relevant objectives and policies.	Retain as proposed
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.409	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support	We support this policy.	Retain policy.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.015	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support	I support this policy.	Retain as notified
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.043	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.115	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support	The policy is supported as it provides for subdivision of land that contains identified features if it does not compromise on the identified characteristics and values of the Overlay Chapter and achieves the relevant objectives and policies.	Retain as proposed.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.351	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Amend	Given the scope of item "b." and any land use requirements of other chapters.	Review to see whether item a is required and delete if a duplication of b.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.111	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Amend	There needs to be some explanation around subdivision within riparian margins	Provide for the subdivision of land within or containing riparian margins, natural character , outstanding natural features and landscapes,... a Not compromise the identified characteristics and values of identified in the Overlay Chapter it is located within;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.111	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Amend	There needs to be some explanation around subdivision within riparian margins.	Provide for the subdivision of land within or containing riparian margins, natural character , outstanding natural features and landscapes,... a Not compromise the identified characteristics and values of identified in the Overlay Chapter it is located within;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.189	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.189	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.262	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.189	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support		Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.410	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Support	We support this policy.	Retain policy.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.044	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Oppose in part	C - the wording building platform contradicts A as the wording does not imply that piles would be appropriate and needs a raised foundation, however this would have the effect of potentially shifting/diverting overland flow paths.	Wording should not specifically refer to foundation, but flood free options based on raised FFL based on the datum and flood data.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.116	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the policy as it seeks to manage natural hazard risks, which could be exacerbated as a result of subdivision. This could ensure that the state highway is not impacted from further land stability, erosion, flooding, etc that may occur from subdivision.	Retain as proposed.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland	S543.043	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Oppose	The hazard overlays provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend to be more enabling

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Building Market Westport (S543)						
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.190	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Support	wording as it is too restrictive.	Amend point c. to recognise that a house can be raised/constructed above flood levels using piles or other building methods that do not involve raising the platform.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.190	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Support	wording as it is too restrictive.	Amend point c. to recognise that a house can be raised/constructed above flood levels using piles or other building methods that do not involve raising the platform.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.263	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Support	wording as it is too restrictive.	Amend point c. to recognise that a house can be raised/constructed above flood levels using piles or other building methods that do not involve raising the platform.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.190	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Support	wording as it is too restrictive.	Amend point c. to recognise that a house can be raised/constructed above flood levels using piles or other building methods that do not involve raising the platform.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.122	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Oppose	Subdivision that creates new or exacerbates existing natural hazards should be avoided.	Amend: Manage significant risks from natural hazards by restricting avoiding subdivision that: a. Creates new or exacerbates existing natural hazards including coastal hazards, erosion, slippage, subsidence, falling debris, fault rupture, severe ground shaking or flooding; or b. Results in adverse effects on the stability of land and buildings; and c. Does not provide safe, flood free and stable building platforms at the time of subdivision
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.090	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Amend	Instances described in SUB-P4, subdivision should be avoided entirely	Amend " Manage significant risks from natural hazards by restricting subdivision that... " to " Manage significant risks from natural hazards by avoiding subdivision that... ".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.129	Subdivision	SUB - P4	Support	Important to define the level of hazard deemed "significant" by the TTPP	define what constitutes a significant hazard.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.411	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	We support this policy.	Retain policy.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.066	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	KiwiRail supports policy direction to avoid subdivision within the FUZ if it compromises the efficient and effective operation of the transport network or results in reverse sensitivity on existing infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.045	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Oppose in part	This standard seems to restrict development, particularly if the developer has financial limitations with regard to the development as this gives council a lot of discretion over the subdivision outcomes.	Amend standard so less restrictive of development.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.117	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	The policy is supported as it avoids subdivision in the Future Urban Zone that may result in the local and wider transport network being compromised, infrastructure being compromised and reverse sensitivity effects. This is a strong policy to ensure that the state highway network would not be adversely affected.	Retain as proposed.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.352	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Amend	Consistency of wording with regard to energy activities.	Amend item b. The need for significant ..., or other infrastructure, including energy activities , in advance of ...;
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.353	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Amend	Specification of matters related to energy activities and infrastructure under item c.	Amend c. The efficient provision, access to, operation, maintenance, repair, upgrade or extension of infrastructure and energy activities being compromised.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.191	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Amend	b. will be very difficult to achieve without significantly impacting future development.	Delete point b. altogether.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.192	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	Should be reworked to have different wording for when plans are in place and when they are not.	Amend policy to have different wording for area that have strucutre plans in place and when areas that do not, to limit uncertainty and perverse outcomes.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.191	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Amend	b. will be very difficult to achieve without significantly impacting future development.	Delete point b. altogether.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.192	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	Should be reworked to have different wording for when plans are in place and when they are not.	Amend policy to have different wording for area that have strucutre plans in place and when areas that do not, to limit uncertainty and perverse outcomes.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.264	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Amend	b. will be very difficult to achieve without significantly impacting future development.	Delete point b. altogether.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.265	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	Should be reworked to have different wording for when plans are in place and when they are not.	Amend policy to have different wording for area that have strucutre plans in place and when areas that do not, to limit uncertainty and perverse outcomes.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.018	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	The matters of control are restricted to the provision and design of physical access to and from the allotments, including roads, and the provision of firefighting water supply. Fire and Emergency support these provisions.	No amendments sought.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.192	Subdivision	SUB - P5	Support	Should be reworked to have different wording for when plans are in place and when they are not.	Amend policy to have different wording for area that have strucutre plans in place and when areas that do not, to limit uncertainty and perverse outcomes.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.412	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	We strongly support this policy including the new clause (b) which differs from from what was in the Exposure Draft Plan.	Retain policy.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.016	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support in part	I support that this policy seeks to minimise reverse sensitivity issues	Retain point d. as notified

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Manawa Energy Limited (Manawa Energy) (S438)	S438.120	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support in part	<p>Manawa generally supports the inclusion of provisions dealing with the potential reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision (and associated activities), however requests that these provisions also take into account Renewable Electricity Generation areas and facilities (in accordance with the provisions of the NPS - REG).</p> <p>To ensure that consistent terminology is used throughout the pTTPP Manawa requests that the term 'energy activities' be replaced with 'renewable electricity generation activities'.</p>	<p>Amend SUB - P6 Avoid subdivision: In the RURZ - Rural Zones that could result in the creation of an unplanned new settlement; In the Earthquake Hazard Overlay that could result in the creation of new allotments; Where detached minor residential units in RURZ - Rural Zones become legally separated from the main residential unit thereby creating cumulative effects on rural character and productivity; Where this could create significant reverse sensitivity issues in relation to the MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone or Energy Renewable Electricity Generation Activities;</p> <p>...</p>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.067	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	<p>KiwiRail seeks amendment to this policy to ensure subdivision in all zones does not result in reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure. The rail network interacts with almost all zones within the West Coast. KiwiRail seeks policy that identifies that subdivision in any zone could result in the location of a noise sensitive use adjacent to the rail corridor. If not managed effectively at the subdivision stage, this can result in reverse sensitivity effects on the operational corridor which threatens the effective function and operation of the existing rail network.</p>	<p>Amend as follows: Avoid subdivision: In the RURZ - Rural Zones that could result in the creation of an unplanned new settlement; In the Earthquake Hazard Overlay that could result in the creation of new allotments; Where detached minor residential units in RURZ - Rural Zones become legally separated from the main residential unit thereby creating cumulative effects on rural character and productivity; Where this could create significant reverse sensitivity issues in relation to the MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone or Energy Activities; In the Coastal environment outside of areas that are already modified unless adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment can be avoided or mitigated; and In areas of significant risk of natural hazards, where this is for the purposes of accommodating and/or servicing people and communities. In all zones that could result in reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure.</p>
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.046	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Oppose in part	<p>A - The terminology is vague in terms of density and part of the consideration should allow for rural subdivision and</p>	<p>Allow for more rural subdivision. In relation to natural hazards allow for adaption not just focus</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					density standards, particularly in instances where rural lifestyle developments are becoming more prevalent due to limited residential areas along the coast. F - is also vague and further considerations for engineering interventions which can mitigate this risk, but have not been addressed within this provision.	on avoidance.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.118	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	The policy is supported as it avoids subdivision in Rural Zones that may result in an unplanned new settlement, which would ensure that planned urban development occurs in appropriate locations.	Retain as proposed.
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.029	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	do not recognise appropriate mitigation measures to reduce or avoid risks	Avoid subdivision: a. ... f. In areas of that does not manage significant risk of natural hazards, where this is for the purposes of accommodating and/or servicing people and communities.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.041	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support in part	The policy lists areas where subdivision is to be avoided. This should be amended to give effect to the NPSHPL by avoiding subdivision as set out in the NPSHPL.	Amend SUB-P6 by adding: g) In the RURZ of highly productive land except as provided for in the NPSHPL.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.082	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support in part	Support a policy to prevent fragmentation in the rural zone. Subdivision should also avoid the potential for reverse sensitivity effects that can result.	Amend SUB-P6 g) That would create reverse sensitivity effects in the RURZ.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.354	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	to give effect to Policy 2 (Chapter 5) and Policy 4 (Chapter 6) of the RPS.	Amend item d. Where this could create reverse significant sensitivity issues ... or Energy Activities;
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.112	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	the adverse effects hierarchy is not being followed here.	e. In the c c oastal environment outside of areas that are already modified unless adverse effects on the natural character of the coastal environment can be avoided or mitigated ;
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.112	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	the adverse effects hierarchy is not being followed here.	e. In the c c oastal environment outside of areas that are already modified unless adverse effects

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						on the natural character of the coastal environment can be avoided or mitigated ;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.193	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	some aspects are too prescriptive.	Delete points a., c., e. and f. Retain point d.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.041	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support in part	We support that this policy seeks to minimise reverse sensitivity issues.	Retain point d. as notified.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.047	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	support that this policy seeks to minimise reverse sensitivity issues.	Retain point d. as notified.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.193	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	some aspects are too prescriptive.	Delete points a., c., e. and f. Retain point d.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.266	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	some aspects are too prescriptive.	Delete points a., c., e. and f. Retain point d.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.193	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	some aspects are too prescriptive.	Delete points a., c., e. and f. Retain point d.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.052	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	support that this policy seeks to minimise reverse sensitivity issues.	Retain point d. as notified.
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.017	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	do not recognise appropriate mitigation measures to reduce or avoid risks	Avoid subdivision: a. ... f. In areas of that does not manage significant risk of natural hazards, where this is for the purposes of accommodating and/or servicing people and communities.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.091	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	Avoiding subdivision which creates new allotments within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays.	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.069	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	that this policy seeks to minimise reverse sensitivity issues.	Retain point d. as notified.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.069	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Support	that this policy seeks to minimise reverse sensitivity issues.	Retain point d. as notified.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.035	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	Policy UB-P6(f) undermines that policy direction	Delete Policy SUB-P6(f).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.181	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend		Including the following: Avoid subdivision: a. In the RURZ - Rural Zones that could result in the creation of an unplanned new settlement, unless the subdivision is to establish papakāinga by Poutini Ngāi Tahu; ...
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.413	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Support	We strongly support this policy including the new clause (c) which differs from what was in the Exposure Draft Plan.	Retain policy.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.119	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Support in part	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the policy. However, the policy appears to allow for subdivision in residential zones that does not comply with minimum lot design and parameters while also requiring that size and configuration is appropriate for the development intended by the zone. This appears to be counterintuitive to the outcomes sought by the zoning. Though it is noted that this policy also requires that any increase in density does not create an adverse effect on critical infrastructure.	Amend the policy to provide clarification on the potential conflict in outcomes sought.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.194	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.194	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.267	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.194	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Support		Retain
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.049	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Amend		add 7. e. It is not within a character area for the area.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.621	Subdivision	SUB - P7	Support	This policy allows for subdivisions within residential zones that do not comply with the	Reword the policy to ensure developments are required to assess that there is capacity to

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					minimum lot design and parameters. It is noted at P7-C the policy requires any increase in density does not create an adverse effect on critical infrastructure. It is considered that the policy should also require evidence from a suitably qualified person that the infrastructure (roading, reticulated water, wastewater and stormwater) has capacity to accommodate the increased density.	accommodate the increased density.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.414	Subdivision	SUB - P8	Support	We support this policy.	Retain policy.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.047	Subdivision	SUB - P8	Oppose in part	Encourages staged development	Not stated
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.415	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Support	We support this policy.	Retain policy.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.017	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	I support the inclusion of policy related to esplanade reserves and strips. However, the purpose as notified is too extensive. It is inappropriate that the policy provides for esplanade strips/reserves wider than 20m. The way in which esplanade strips and reserves are provided for in the Operative Buller District Plan is more appropriate than the wording in the proposed plan.	Delete the wording of this policy and reformulate to reflect the wording of the operative Buller District Plan. The purposes of esplanade reserves and strips to be only those set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values. All reference to the width of esplanade reserves and strips being wider than 20m should be deleted.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.048	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Support	Required by esplanade sections of RMA.	Retain as notified.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.045	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.045	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.045	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.045	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.045	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.045	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.045	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.083	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Not Stated	<p>This policy should give effect to the provisions for requiring esplanade reserves in the RMA</p> <p>Protection of biodiversity values or of sites of significance to Maori etc are not within the purposes of Esplanade Reserves under section 229 of the RMA - so these clauses should be deleted.</p> <p>Where width greater than 20 metres is required, this should be with the consent of the subdividing landowner, as there is no mandatory requirement for taking an esplanade reserve or strip greater than 20 metres in width, and the excess land may have economic value for the landowner that should be taken into account.</p> <p>The location of the site being subdivided should weigh into consideration of waiving of the esplanade reserve requirement in this policy. If the site is isolated and there is no access to the esplanade reserve, it will be costly to maintain for weed and pest control, and maintenance of free flowing water bodies.</p>	<p>Amend Policy as follows:</p> <p>To require esplanade reserves or esplanade strips for allotments of less than 4 ha to enable public access, reduce natural hazard risk, and contribute to the protection of natural character and biodiversity values for the purposes stated in section 229 of the Resource Management Act 1991, except that the width of the esplanade reserve or strip may be varied from 20 metres or waived if: The natural values The protection of conservation values, or the enabling of public access, or the enabling of public recreational use that is compatible with conservation values, or reduction of natural hazard risk warrant a wider or narrower esplanade strip or esplanade reserve; or</p> <p>Topography, site location, or the siting of any building or other feature, renders the 20-metre width inadequate or excessive; or The protection of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori or other taonga requires an esplanade reserve or esplanade strip of greater or lesser width than 20 metres; or The protection or enhancement of biodiversity values or water</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						quality requires an esplanade reserve or esplanade strip of greater or lesser than 20 metres and there is an unconditional sale and purchase agreement with the subdividing landowner for the land where a greater than 20-metre width of esplanade reserve is required ; or The land is within a natural hazard area of where there is an identified risk from one or more natural hazards (such as coastal erosion).
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.022	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Oppose in part	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.113	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Amend		To require esplanade reserves or esplanade strips for allotments of less than 4 ha to enable public access, reduce natural hazard risk, and contribute to the protection of natural character and biodiversity values including corridors for native fauna,
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.118	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Support	There should be a minimum distance/ buffer from SNA	3. There should be a minimum distance/buffer from SNA to buildings or other development such as access/ roads.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.113	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Amend		To require esplanade reserves or esplanade strips ... to the protection of natural character and biodiversity values including corridors for native fauna,
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.118	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Support	There should be a minimum distance/ buffer from SNA to buildings, etc	3. There should be a minimum distance/buffer from SNA to buildings or other development such as access/ roads.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.196	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Amend	The purpose as notified is too extensive.	Delete the wording of this policy and reformulate to reflect the wording of the operative Buller District Plan. The purposes of esplanade reserves and strips to be only those set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						values. All reference to the width of esplanade reserves and strips being wider than 20m should be deleted.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.196	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Amend	The purpose as notified is too extensive.	Delete the wording of this policy and reformulate to reflect the wording of the operative Buller District Plan. The purposes of esplanade reserves and strips to be only those set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values. All reference to the width of esplanade reserves and strips being wider than 20m should be deleted.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.269	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Amend	The purpose as notified is too extensive.	Delete the wording of this policy and reformulate to reflect the wording of the operative Buller District Plan. The purposes of esplanade reserves and strips to be only those set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values. All reference to the width of esplanade reserves and strips being wider than 20m should be deleted.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.196	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Amend	The purpose as notified is too extensive.	Delete the wording of this policy and reformulate to reflect the wording of the operative Buller District Plan. The purposes of esplanade reserves and strips to be only those set out in Section 229 of the Act with the only additional inclusion being Poutini Ngai Tahu values. All reference to the width of esplanade reserves and strips being wider than 20m should be deleted.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.123	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Support	Policy SUB-P9 is supported as it enables the vesting of esplanade reserves and strips to respond to the natural features, constraints and opportunities of the site.	Retain Policy SUB-P9 as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.043	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Amend	Esplanade reserves and strips should not be required to be wider than 20m	Delete references to widths greater than 20m
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.092	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Support	Widening of the esplanade strip where appropriate to provide extra protection from natural hazards	Retain
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.182	Subdivision	SUB - P9	Support	Esplanade reserves are important it is also important to be able to vary the width (including a width larger than 20 metres) of these reserves if it protects other values	Retain clause (c)
Deb Langridge (S252)	S252.007	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend	Landowners should be flexible to needs of their family and if a family member needs a house they should be able to divide that land to accommodate family needs. or if they wish to sell a block off to raise funds they should be able to.	General rural landowners should be able to subdivide land if they wish to into small house size lots
Transpower New Zealand Limited (S299)	S299.056	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Support	Transpower requests non-complying activity status for any rule that does not comply with SUB-R8. This rule provides that link.	Insert a new rule as follows: SUB - R27 - Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor not meeting Restricted Discretionary Activity Standards Activity Status Non-complying
Inger Perkins (S462)	S462.029	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend	Ideally new build projects, for example through subdivision rules for residential buildings, would require their own renewable energy generation systems to meet a high proportion of the buildings' needs and/or require a large proportion of roofs of new residential and commercial buildings to have solar panels/solar water heaters.	Amend subdivision rules for residential and commercial areas to require renewable energy generation systems to support the development's needs.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.012	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend		Review the pTTPP HPL provisions in terms of whether they meet the NPSHPL provisions, and amend the pTTPP HPL provisions once further consultation with affected landowners is undertaken

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.104	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend	Rules on esplanade strips in this chapter only pertain to allotments less than 4ha in size	<p>1. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area is subdivided, other than as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be set aside in the new lot along the mark of Mean High Water Spring of the sea and along the bank of any river or margin of any lake.</p> <p>2. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land is subdivided, other than applies under 1. above, or as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be created from that allotment along the bank of any river or margin of any lake. This requirement for an esplanade strip does not apply where a legal road (formed or not) provides adequate access to the water body. This rule only applies to lakes and rivers as defined in section 230(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>3. An esplanade strip required under 1. or 2. above may on application be reduced in width or dispensed with altogether. In considering any such application the Council shall take into account the matters listed below.</p>
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.104	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend	The Buller District Plan matters need to be transferred into this chapter.	<p>Add 1. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area is subdivided, other than as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be set aside in the new lot along the mark of Mean High Water Spring of the sea and along the bank of any river or margin of any lake.</p> <p>2. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land is subdivided, other than applies under 1. above, or as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be created from that allotment along the</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						bank of any river or margin of any lake. This requirement for an esplanade strip does not apply where a legal road (formed or not) provides adequate access to the water body. This rule only applies to lakes and rivers as defined in section 230(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.3. An esplanade strip required under 1. or 2. above may on application be reduced in width or dispensed with altogether. In considering any such application the Council shall take into account the matters below.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.043	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend	We seek that the rules be at least as stringent, if not more stringent than, the rules in the ECO chapter. Works in riparian margins may well need a stricter approach, given the effects that they can have.	Amend rules to ensure that waterbodies and their margins are protected in the subdivision process, in a similar way to how SNAs are to be protected.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.266	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend	It is not clear if a boundary adjustment could adversely affect a significant natural area.	Add a condition or rule that ensures the subdivision rules (other than the ECO/SUB rules) apply outside of Significant Natural Areas, such as a requirement that an assessment in accordance with Appendix 1 of the WCRPS demonstrates that the clearance and disturbance is not within a Significant Natural Area(s).
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.523	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Amend		Change all references to Schedule Four so that they apply to Significant Natural Areas, which includes those that are not in schedule four, as per the definition of Significant Natural Area in the WCRPS.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.093	Subdivision	Subdivision Rules	Support	The inclusion of natural hazards in matters of control for restricted and restricted discretionary activities	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the	S190.416	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.049	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Oppose in part	The rule is in breach of the RMA, as it does not specify that it allows for additional allotments. How can you have a permitted subdivision as it would still require a s.223/224 certification to confirm the title - confusing provision which should be clarified further.	Not stated
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.120	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the rule as it ensures that any boundary adjustment provides for appropriate safe access by requiring that all existing vehicle access points comply with TRN-R1.	Retain as proposed.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.013	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Oppose	Rule SUB - R1 allows for boundary adjustment subdivisions in the GRZ General Residential and GRUZ General Rural zones. We object to the zone limitation within this rule. Provided the criteria listed in Rule SUB - R1(1) to (4) are met, we submit that the effects of boundary adjustment subdivisions in any zone would be minimal, and therefore should be included in this permitted activity rule.	Amend the rule so that it applies in all zones.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.014	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend	The residential density for the GRUZ General Rural Zone has been set at 4ha in the notified TTPP. Providing this maximum density is met on each site, we submit that there is no justification for sub-section (5) of Rule SUB - R1, which prohibits boundary adjustments from resulting in "potential additional residential units as a permitted activity" in the GRUZ General Rural Zone. Regardless of whether a boundary adjustment results in one title becoming large enough to accommodate an additional dwelling, if the density requirements are met then the effects of	Amend the rule so that provided the maximum density is met on each site, boundary adjustments as a Permitted Activity are able to result in additional residential units in the General Rural Zones.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					residential activity have already been considered acceptable under the TTPP.	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.245	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Support in part	<p>Council supports Rule 1 however seeks guidance on what would be considered to result in a potential additional residential unit for Part 5. Alternatively, to provide a cap on the movement between titles.</p> <p>For example: In the GRUZ - General Rural Zone the boundary adjustment is less than 4ha.</p> <p>Points 1.a and 1.c. are similar in intent. Consider condensing into one.</p>	<p>That a permitted baseline be determined, and the rule amended as follows:</p> <p>Condense 1.a and 1.c into one clause.</p>
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.355	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend	To retention of the ability to access, operate, maintain and upgrade energy activities	Add 6. The ability to access, operate, maintain and upgrade existing energy activities, including associated infrastructure is maintained.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.356	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend	It is unclear whether this rule is intended to apply to overlays.	Clarify whether this rule is intended to apply to overlays.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.198	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 3 and 5.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.199	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend		Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.198	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 3 and 5.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.199	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend		Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.270	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 3 and 5.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.271	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend		Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.017	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Support	Boundary adjustments in all zones require resource consent as either a controlled or restricted discretionary activity. The matters of control/discretion both include the provision of infrastructure and services including for firefighting water supply. Fire and Emergency support this.	No amendment sought.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.198	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 3 and 5.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.199	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Amend		Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.622	Subdivision	SUB - R1	Support	Support as requires that no new Council services are required and that no new roading or access points are required	Retain as proposed
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.417	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Transpower New Zealand Limited (S299)	S299.054	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Support	Transpower supports this provision as it provides for those limited situations where subdivision may be required for its National Grid infrastructure. The permitted activity standards are appropriate, as is controlled activity status where the standards are not met.	Retain this rule

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.069	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Support	The permitted activity status of subdivision for critical infrastructure is supported by KiwiRail.	Retain as proposed
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.050	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.121	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Support	Waka Kotahi supports that subdivision for a network utility or critical infrastructure is a permitted activity, which also requires that all existing vehicle access points comply with TRN-R1.	Retain as proposed.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.246	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Support	Council supports Rule 2. Council seeks a rewording of Part 4 for ease of readability. Council requests the words "is made" after 20m.	Reword Part 4.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.357	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Amend	To requirements of resource consents instead of solely reliance on zone standards.	Amend 2. Any existing buildings ... Activity standards, or the requirements of any land use consent.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.114	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Amend	Grammar	<p>4 Where the The site is less than 4ha adjacent to a river >3m wide or the coast, the <p>provision of an esplanade reserve or strip of 20m;
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.114	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Amend	Grammar	<p>4 Where the The site is less than 4ha adjacent to a river >3m wide or the coast, the <p>provision of an esplanade reserve or strip of 20m;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.200	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.200	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.272	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.200	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.623	Subdivision	SUB - R2	Support	Support that any subdivision for a network utility or critical infrastructure is a permitted activity.	Retain as proposed
Garry Howard (S358)	S358.003	Subdivision	Controlled Activities	Amend	General Rural Zone This is far too restrictive and the size should be reduced from 4Ha to 4000sqm. In the past there had been lifestyle demand for 4Ha (10 acre) land blocks but the reality is that most people can not manage 4Ha that requires larger machinery or stock that requires good farming skills to manage. Allowing for 4000 sqm land blocks is far better utilisation of the land.	Change Controlled Activity Minimum Lot Size for subdivision General Rural Zone from 4ha to 4000sqm.
Julie Madigan (S363)	S363.002	Subdivision	Controlled Activities	Oppose	The current proposal appears to stymie any future smaller developments or business opportunities on blocks of land smaller than 20 hectares. This would be the case even if the land was owned by mining interests and wanted to diversify, and for private landowners	Retain subdivision rules of Westland District Plan (all subdivision a Discretionary Activity to 5000m2 site size)
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.418	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Christopher and Donna Meates (S430)	S430.001	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Oppose	The rule makes subdivision a controlled activity if it complies with the applicable standards, which are set out in SUB-S1 and has a minimum lot size for subdivisions of 4ha within the General Rural Zone. This rule is considered inappropriate, as it will lead to rural allotments that are too small for productive rural uses and too big for efficient residential use. Nevertheless, the residential use of such allotments will be permitted by Rule GRUZ -R3. The current Westland District Plan provides for subdivision within the Rural Zone down to	Reduce the minimum lot size for Controlled Activity subdivision to 5000m2

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					5000m2 as a discretionary activity, which is considered to be a more appropriate size for residential subdivision, also as a controlled activity.	
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.051	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support	Agree in full. Question Part F.	Clarify features referred to
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.122	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support	The controlled activity rule is supported as the matters of control include consideration of the design and provision of access and effects of development phase works on the surrounding area. This would ensure that matters associated to the safe and efficient of the state highway are considered.	Retain as proposed.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.042	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support in part	A matter of control should be included that considers potential for reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities.	Amend SUB-R3 by adding an additional matter of control: g) potential for reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.247	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support in part	Council generally supports the Boundary Adjustment standards however seeks clearer wording with regards to clause 3.a. Clarification was sought at an earlier stage with the TTPP team and replied to as below: "It is for boundary adjustments outside of the rural and residential - so all the special purpose, industrial etc. Clause a is asking it to be checked to ensure that the activity meets the zone standards. "If the rule is to ensure activity meets the zone standards, there will be no need for mention of building consents for proposed buildings.	Amend Rule 3 as follows: 3. The existing or proposed building must: a. Comply with all permitted activity standards relevant to the zone and any overlays and a building consent has been issued for any proposed buildings; or
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.358	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	Applies to overlays whereas SUB-R2 only applies to zones.	Amend item 3.a. Comply with all permitted activity standards relevant to the zone or activity and any overlays and a building consent, where required , has been issued ...

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.359	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	should relate to the management of effects on the listed matters.	Amend f. Management of adverse effects on natural features ...".
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.360	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	Access, operate, maintain or upgrade energy activities, including associated infrastructure.	Add g. The ability to access, operate, maintain or upgrade existing energy activities, including associated infrastructure is retained.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.115	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	A small amount of that area could be cleared as in itself may not be deemed significant.	f Protection, maintenance or enhancement of natural features and landforms, areas of significant indigenous biodiversity, amenity values , historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, archaeological sites or any other identified features.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.115	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	It could be read that a small amount of that area could be cleared as deemed insignificant.	f Protection, maintenance or enhancement of natural features and landforms, areas of significant indigenous biodiversity, amenity values , historic heritage, sites of significance to Māori, archaeological sites or any other identified features.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.201	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	Should apply more broadly than currently proposed	Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.202	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support		Retain points 1 and 3.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.203	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Delete point 2 (and thus delete the escalation to Discretionary Activity if compliance is not achieved).
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.204	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. of "matters of control" to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.524	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	It is not clear if a boundary adjustment could adversely affect a significant natural area.	Add a conditions/standard to SUB - R3 to ensure that the boundary adjustment does not result in a boundary through a Significant Natural Area. Add a matter of control to SUB - R3 for assessment against the significant criteria in Appendix 1 of the WCRPS.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.201	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	Should apply more broadly than currently proposed	Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.202	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support		Retain points 1 and 3.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.203	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Delete point 2 (and thus delete the escalation to Discretionary Activity if compliance is not achieved).
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.204	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. of "matters of control" to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.273	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	Should apply more broadly than currently proposed	Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.274	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support		Retain points 1 and 3.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.275	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Delete point 2 (and thus delete the escalation to Discretionary Activity if compliance is not achieved).
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.276	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. of "matters of control" to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						similar defined specification that is more certain.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.201	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	Should apply more broadly than currently proposed	Amend the rule and/or the definition of boundary adjustment to include subdivisions where the number of allotments (or records of titles) is reduced as a result of the subdivision.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.202	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support		Retain points 1 and 3.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.203	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Delete point 2 (and thus delete the escalation to Discretionary Activity if compliance is not achieved).
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.204	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	parts of the rule that are too restrictive and unclear.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. of "matters of control" to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.050	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend		Add new rule: Zone specific standards shall have precedence where there is any inconsistency with the general standards.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.124	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	Amend Rule SUB-R3 to ensure the subdivision protects coastal features, natural character and landscapes, and any other features identified as significant in the resource consent.	Amend the matters of control in Rules SUB-R3 and SUB-R4: ...Protection, maintenance or enhancement of natural features and landforms, areas of significant indigenous biodiversity, historic heritage, sites and areas of significance to Māori, archaeological sites, coastal features, natural character, landscapes, or any other identified features identified through the resource consent....
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.633	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support	Support that the matters of control include the design and provision of access, provision and design and construction of infrastructure and services	Retain as proposed
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.094	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Support	We support Natural Hazards being included in matters of control	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.183	Subdivision	SUB - R3	Amend	It is important that where required that Poutini Ngāi Tahu values are able to be considered and adjustments made to the application if needed.	Include Poutini Ngāi Tahu Values as a matter for control
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.419	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.052	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	Agree in Full	Retain as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.123	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	The controlled activity rule for subdivision for network utilities, critical infrastructure, access, or reverses is supported as the matters of control include consideration for the design and layout of allotment for the purpose of access and legal and physical access to and from allotments. This would ensure that matters associated to the safe and efficient of the state highway are considered.	Retain as proposed.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.248	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	Council Supports Rules 4.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.361	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Amend	Consistent wording throughout the plan and to reflect activities in the plan.	Amend a. The size, design and layout of allotments for the purpose of network utilities and critical infrastructure, including energy activities and infrastructure , reserves or access;
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.362	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Amend	Should relate to the management of effects on the listed matters.	Amend c. Management of adverse effects on natural features and landforms ..
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.205	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	parts of the rules are excessive given its purpose	Delete point c. under "matters of control".
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.205	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	parts of the rules are excessive given its purpose	Delete point c. under "matters of control".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.277	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	parts of the rules are excessive given its purpose	Delete point c. under "matters of control".
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.205	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	parts of the rules are excessive given its purpose	Delete point c. under "matters of control".
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.634	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	Support that the matters of control include the size, design and layout of allotments for the purpose of public network utilities and access; and the legal and physical access to and from allotments.	Retain as proposed
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.095	Subdivision	SUB - R4	Support	Natural Hazards being included in matters of control	Retain
Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (S171)	S171.016	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Rule SUB - R5 is unclear in relation to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori. These should only apply where these specific sites are located. As currently worded standard 4 in relation to Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori appears to over-ride the rest of the rule.	Amend the rule to make it clear that subdivision is a Controlled Activity within the specific Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori identified in the rule, and that outside any other Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, the other standards in the rule apply.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.420	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.020	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose	If the relief sought by Silver Fern Farms in relation to the zone maps is not granted, Silver Fern Farms would oppose this rule, as it does not recognise the potentially significant land use conflicts that may be caused by residential subdivision (and subsequent development) undertaken within the environs of its site. Silver Fern Farms proposes amendments to require a discretionary consenting pathway and a notification requirement for subdivision in a residential zone that creates new residential lots within 100 m of an industrial zone boundary. This framework will prompt robust assessment of potential reverse sensitivity	SUB - R5 Subdivision to create allotment(s) in all RESZ - Residential Zones, CMUZ - Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, INZ - Industrial Zones, SVZ - Scenic Visitor Zone or PORTZ - Port Zones [entire rule not shown here] This is not within an area of Flood Severe, Coastal Severe or Westport Hazard Overlay or the Airport Noise Control Overlay; This does not create any lots located within 100 m of the boundary of a General Industrial Zone; All Subdivision Standards are complied with; and The subdivision is in general accordance with

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					effects associated with any such subdivision.	any development plan in place for the site. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary where 3 and 4 is not complied with. Discretionary 2,6, 7, 8 or 9 8 is not complied with. Non-complying where 5 is not complied with.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.070	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	KiwiRail supports matter of discretion p. relating to the management of reverse sensitivity. KiwiRail seeks amendment to ensure this applies to critical infrastructure such as the rail network.	Amend as follows: Matters of control are: [...] p. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including critical infrastructure , network utilities, rural activities or significant hazardous facilities.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.053	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Agree in Full	Retain rule but better present the information rather than the cluster within this condition at the moment
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.124	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the rule as it includes matters of control for design and provision for multi modal transport options and access. This would ensure that the subdivision in the stated zones is well connected and integrated.	Retain as proposed.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.046	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.046	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.046	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.046	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.046	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.046	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.046	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.023	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	The activity status when compliance with point 6 (i.e. Coastal Severe Overlays etc) is appropriate. Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.249	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support in part	Council supports Rule 6, however there is an overlap between Points 2 and 3.	Condense Points 2 and 3.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.252	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12. Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.363	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Provision of easements.	Amend Matter of Control g. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.364	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	for consistency of wording regarding reverse sensitivity matters.	Amend Matter of Control p. Management of potential ..., including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						activities), rural ...
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.116	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	A small amount of that area could be cleared as in itself may not be deemed significant.	k Effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, existing amenity values, the quality of the environment, natural character , notable trees or historic heritage within or adjacent to the site;
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.116	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	It could be read that a small amount of that area could be cleared as deemed insignificant.	k Effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, existing amenity values, the quality of the environment, natural character , notable trees or historic heritage within or adjacent to the site;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.206	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	The activity status when compliance with point 6 is appropriate.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.207	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support		Retain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.209	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	the term "development plan" in point 8 is not defined.	Delete point 8.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.210	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.211	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Temporary effects of development and construction should be managed via other parts of the plan.	Delete point j.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.212	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to f.)
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.213	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point l.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.214	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Delete o.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.215	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Consequent amendments to "activity status when compliance not achieved".
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.267	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Condition 1 needs to exclude all Significant Natural Areas consistent with the approach taken in ECO - R4/SUB - R7.	Amend:1. This is not within a Significant Natural Area as identified in Schedule Four and is subject to Rule SUB - R7;
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.042	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support in part	some amendments are necessary.	Delete reference to "development plan" unless a better definition is supplied.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.043	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support in part	some amendments are necessary.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" to refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar specification that is more certain.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.044	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support in part	believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete point j. under Matters of Control.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.048	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete reference to "development plan" unless a better definition is supplied.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.049	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend wording design and layout of allotments to refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar specification that is more certain.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.050	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Delete point j. under Matters of Control.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.206	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	The activity status when compliance with point 6 is appropriate.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.207	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.209	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	the term "development plan" in point 8 is not defined.	Delete point 8.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.210	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.211	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Temporary effects of development and construction should be managed via other parts of the plan.	Delete point j.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.212	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to f.)
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.213	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point l.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.214	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Delete o.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.215	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Consequent amendments to "activity status when compliance not achieved".
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.278	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	The activity status when compliance with point 6 is appropriate.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.279	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.280	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	the term "development plan" in point 8 is not defined.	Delete point 8.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.281	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.282	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Temporary effects of development and construction should be managed via other parts of the plan.	Delete point j.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.283	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to f.)
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.284	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point l.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.285	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Delete o.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.286	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Consequent amendments to "activity status when compliance not achieved".
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.206	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	The activity status when compliance with point 6 is appropriate.	Retain status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.207	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.209	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	the term "development plan" in point 8 is not defined.	Delete point 8.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.210	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.211	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Temporary effects of development and construction should be managed via other parts of the plan.	Delete point j.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.212	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to f.)
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.213	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point l.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.214	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Delete o.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.215	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend		Consequent amendments to "activity status when compliance not achieved".
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.053	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete reference to "development plan" unless a better definition is supplied.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.054	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend wording design and layout of allotments to refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar specification that is more certain.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.055	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete point j. under Matters of Control.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.072	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Subsequent amendment, the reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant.	Amend Rule Condition 3(iv) title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: iv. Any Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay;
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.635	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Support the Rule as the matters of control include design and layout of allotments, design and provision of roads, pedestrian and cycleways, design and provision of access, and the provision of infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting; and the requirements arising from meeting the relevant district Council Engineering Standards or NZS 4404:2010 Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure where Council standards do not exist.	Retain as proposed
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.645	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Support the provision of the standard for management and disposal of wastewater for new allotments	Retain as proposed
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.044	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Where compliance is not achieved, status should be Discretionary.	Amend status when compliance with point 6 is not achieved to Discretionary.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.096	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	Exclusion of areas within the Overlays	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.130	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	The inclusion of Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints as matters of control	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.070	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	We support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete reference to "development plan" unless a better definition is supplied.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.071	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" to refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar specification that is more certain.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.072	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete point j. under Matters of Control.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.070	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	We support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete reference to "development plan" unless a better definition is supplied.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.071	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend wording "design and layout of allotments" to refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar specification that is more certain.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.072	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete point j. under Matters of Control.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.184	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Support	The matters of control include effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu Values .	Retain Clause (4) and matter for control (k) as notified.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.421	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule
Erin Stagg (S314)	S314.007	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Allow for subdivision while protecting Haast airfield	Amend the rule so that future development next to the Haast Airfield should be undertaken sensitively including acoustic insulation and no objection covenants.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.018	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.004	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	I think that parts of this are excessive e.g. if only part of a parcel is located within overlays as specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision (and it should not be non complying, I think discretionary is more appropriate). A subdivision site suitability report is an appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend the rule so that if only part of a parcel is located within overlays this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision (and it should not be non complying, I think discretionary is more appropriate)
Silver Fern Farms Limited by its authorised agents Mitchell Daysh Limited (S441)	S441.021	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Regarding subdivisions and "Matters of control" sub-clause (a), Silver Fern Farms consider that rurally zoned land adjacent to the Site should have controls in place to manage the minimum size of allotments. This viewpoint is consistent with the desire to maintain the character and function of the Zone and to reduce the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects imposed on the Site. For a controlled activity of this nature, Silver Fern Farms recommends including a specified allotment size (m2) to maintain a consistent approach to subdivisions in these areas. Silver Fern Farms support sub-clause (m) but consider that this sub-clause should also encapsulate activities generated in industrial areas such as "meat processing plants". This would provide sufficient	follows: [...] m. Silver Fern Farms recommends that a minimum allotment size is included in sub-clause (a) of "Matters of control". Silver Fern Farms recommends amending sub-clause (m) as Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities, rural activities, industrial activities such as meat processing plants or Major Hazardous Facilities.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					coverage to ensure that potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing operations are adequately managed. Further to sub-clause (m), there is reference to "significant hazardous facilities" however this term has not been defined in the Proposed Plan. It is possible this is in reference to Major Hazardous Facilities, however, for the sake of clarity, this should be amended to one term and a definition of the term provided so as to provide simple identification of when this term applies.	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.071	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	KiwiRail supports matter of discretion m. relating to the management of reverse sensitivity. KiwiRail seeks amendment to ensure this applies to critical infrastructure such as the rail network.	Amend as follows: Matters of control are: [...] m. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including critical infrastructure , network utilities, rural activities or significant hazardous facilities.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.054	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.125	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the rule as it includes matters of control for design and provision for multi modal transport options and access. This would ensure that the subdivision in the stated zones is well connected and integrated.	Retain as proposed.
Horticulture New Zealand (S486)	S486.043	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support in part	A matter of control should be included that considers potential for reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities.	Amend SUB-R6 by adding an additional matter of control: g) potential for reverse sensitivity effects on rural production activities.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.048	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a	Activity status where there is noncompliance with point should be Discretionary. There

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.048	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is noncompliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.048	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is noncompliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.048	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically	Activity status where there is noncompliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.048	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is noncompliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.048	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is noncompliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.048	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose in part	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within overlays a specified in point 4, this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision.	Activity status where there is noncompliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to NonComplying status.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.050	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.250	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support in part	Council supports Rule 6, however there is an overlap between Points 2 and 3.	Condense Points 2 and 3.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.253	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12. Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.
Peter Jefferies (S544)	S544.006	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose	I oppose the fact that the designation is arbitrary and does not relate to a technical assessment of Land Use Capability,	Delete provisions in relation to highly productive land.
Martin & Lisa Kennedy (S545)	S545.006	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose	I oppose the fact that the designation is arbitrary and does not relate to a technical assessment of Land Use Capability,	delete provisions in relation to highly productive land
Nick Pupich Sandy Jefferies (S546)	S546.003	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Oppose	I oppose the fact that the designation is arbitrary and does not relate to a technical assessment of Land Use Capability,	Remove the provisions in relation to highly productive land
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.365	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	The rule is generally supported with a minor amendment regarding provision of easements for both existing and proposed energy activities and infrastructure, and for consistency of wording regarding reverse sensitivity matters.	(1) Amend item m., "m. Management of potential ..., including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities) , rural ...". (2) Add a new item n., "n. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure. ".
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.216	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved should be Discretionary for all points. There should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.217	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Matters of control:	Amend wording "size, design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.218	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to e.)
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.220	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points d. and k. requires amending to provide certainty and clarity.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.221	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.222	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete l.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.268	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Condition 1 suggests that SUB - R7/ECO - R4 does not apply to an Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity beyond that identified as SNA in Schedule Four.	Amend Condition 1 Where: 1. an ecological assessment shows †this is not within a Significant Natural Area, or an SNA as identified in Schedule Four, and subject to Rule SUB - R7;
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.045	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	We support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.051	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.216	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved should be Discretionary for all points. There should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.217	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Matters of control:	Amend wording "size, design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.218	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to e.)
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.220	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points d. and k. requires amending to provide certainty and clarity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.221	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.222	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete l.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.287	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved should be Discretionary for all points. There should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.288	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Matters of control:	Amend wording "size, design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.289	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to e.)
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.290	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points d. and k. requires amending to provide certainty and clarity.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.291	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.292	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete l.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.216	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Parts of the rules are excessive.	Activity status where compliance is not achieved should be Discretionary for all points. There should be no escalation to Non-

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Complying status.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.217	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Matters of control:	Amend wording "size, design and layout of allotments" under point a. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.218	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points b. and c. should reference standards to provide certainty (in a similar manner to e.)
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.220	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Points d. and k. requires amending to provide certainty and clarity.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.221	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.222	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend		Delete l.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.057	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.073	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Subsequent amendment, the reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant.	Amend Rule Condition 3(iv) title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: iv. Any Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay;
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.636	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	Support for reasons noted at SUB - R5	Retain as proposed
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.646	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	Support the provision of the standard for transport and access requirements	Retain as proposed
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.045	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	There are parts of this rule that are too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance with point should be Discretionary. There should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.097	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	The inclusion of Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints as matters of control	Amedn to include Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints as matters of control

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.131	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	exclude areas subject to overlays	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.073	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.073	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.185	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Amend	Rule limits tino rangatiratanga of Poutini Ngāi Tahu by placing restrictions on a subdivision	Amend as follows: 1. This is not within a Significant Natural Area as identified in Schedule Four and subject to Rule SUB - R7; 2. This is not within one of the following locations in the coastal environment: (i) Outstanding Natural Landscape as identified in Schedule Five; (ii) Outstanding Natural Feature as identified in Schedule Six; (iii) High or Outstanding Coastal Natural Character as identified in Schedules Seven and Eight; or 3. This is not within an area of: (i) Outstanding Natural Landscape as identified in Schedule Five; (ii) Outstanding Natural Feature as identified in Schedule Six; (iii) Sites of Historic Heritage as identified in Schedule One; (iv) Any Flood Susceptibility, Flood Plain, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay; (v) This is not within the Earthquake Hazard Overlay; 4. This is not within an area of Flood Severe, Coastal Severe or Westport Hazard Overlay or the Airport Noise Control Overlay; 5. All Subdivision Standards are complied with; and or 6. Where the Subdivision is in the MPZ - Māori Purpose Zone and is in accordance with an Iwi/Papatipu Rūnanga Management Plan for the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						site, then only clause (3)(iv), (v) and clause (4) apply. Retain as matter for control (i) as notified.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.422	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.006	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	I think that the heading is unclear given that areas of Significant indigenous biodiversity have not been mapped (or if they have, where is this information?), and this could be very restrictive for some landowners. The rules need to be less restrictive and more enabling (and clearer).	Amend title to be clearer and make the rule clearer, less restrictive and more
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.126	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the rule as it requires subdivision to consider the design and provision for access.	Retain as proposed.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.015	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	The rule needs to be amended to clarify that the allotment(s) created from the parent title must contain the area of significant indigenous biodiversity and be for the purpose of legal protection of that land. As written, the rule does not make this clear.	That the rule is amended to clarify that the allotment(s) created from the parent title must contain the area of significant indigenous biodiversity and be for the purpose of legal protection of that land.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.017	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	We also query the need for a minimum lot size for this purpose. There may be smaller stands of significant vegetation which are worthy of protection.	Amend so that there is no minimum lot size for this purpose.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.049	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete point 2. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.049	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete point 2. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.049	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete point 2. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.049	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete point 2. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation ; and
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.049	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete point 2. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation ; and
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.049	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete point 2. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation ; and
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.049	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete point 2. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation ; and
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.051	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.084	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	Must be consistent with ECO-R4	Ensure is consistent with ECO-R4
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.024	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose	The provision heading is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. This is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. should be able to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within the identified area of significant indigenous biodiversity or the need for clearance of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation ; and...
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.254	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12. Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.260	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support in part	Refer to ECO R4 Submission	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.261	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	Advice Note does not include "Critical Infrastructure" when referencing R4. Council seeks clarification with regards to whether critical infrastructure has been left out for a purpose or if this was an error.	Include reference to "Critical Infrastructure".
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.367	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	The rule is generally supported with a minor amendment regarding servicing, provision of easements for both existing and proposed energy activities and infrastructure, and for consistency of wording regarding reverse sensitivity matters as per other subdivision consents.	(1) Add a new item f., " f. The provision of infrastructure and services for drinking water, waste water and stormwater, telecommunications and energy. ". (2) Add a new item g., " g. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure. ". (3) Add a new item h., " h. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities), rural activities or significant hazardous facilities. ".
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.117	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	A small amount of that area could be cleared as in itself may not be deemed significant.	3 or the need for clearance within the area of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site;
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.117	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	It could be read that a small amount of that area could be cleared as deemed insignificant.	3 or the need for clearance within the area of significant indigenous vegetation to provide for future access to any site;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.223	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	significant amendments are necessary to be less restrictive and more enabling.	Amend the rule to be less restrictive, more enabling and provide more clarity.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.224	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Unclear given areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are yet to be mapped.	Amend provision heading for clarity.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.225	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	An area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment.	Amend to make it unnecessary for an area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment .

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.226	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Provide opportunities for living closer to nature (e.g. "bush living").	Amend to enable Biodiversity offsetting or environmental compensation to be considered as a way to mitigate the effects of buildings and accessways.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.227	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is unclear what "parent title" means in this rule.	Amend to clarify the term parent title
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.228	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is not necessary for the covenanted area to be with an authorised agency.	amend to allow private covenant.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.269	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support in part	For the reasons set out at ECO - R4/SUB - R7	Amend as sought for ECO-R4
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.046	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Oppose in part	We support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.052	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.223	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	significant amendments are necessary to be less restrictive and more enabling.	Amend the rule to be less restrictive, more enabling and provide more clarity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.224	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Unclear given areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are yet to be mapped.	Amend provision heading for clarity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.225	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	An area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment.	Amend to make it unnecessary for an area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment .
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.226	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Provide opportunities for living closer to nature (e.g. "bush living").	Amend to enable Biodiversity offsetting or environmental compensation to be considered as a way to mitigate the effects of buildings and accessways.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.227	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is unclear what "parent title" means in this rule.	Amend to clarify the term parent title

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.228	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is not necessary for the covenanted area to be with an authorised agency.	amend to allow private covenant.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.293	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	significant amendments are necessary to be less restrictive and more enabling.	Amend the rule to be less restrictive, more enabling and provide more clarity.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.294	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Unclear given areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are yet to be mapped.	Amend provision heading for clarity.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.295	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	An area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment.	Amend to make it unnecessary for an area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment .
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.296	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Provide opportunities for living closer to nature (e.g. "bush living").	Amend to enable Biodiversity offsetting or environmental compensation to be considered as a way to mitigate the effects of buildings and accessways.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.297	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is unclear what "parent title" means in this rule.	Amend to clarify the term parent title
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.298	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is not necessary for the covenanted area to be with an authorised agency.	amend to allow private covenant.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.223	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	significant amendments are necessary to be less restrictive and more enabling.	Amend the rule to be less restrictive, more enabling and provide more clarity.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.224	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Unclear given areas of significant indigenous biodiversity are yet to be mapped.	Amend provision heading for clarity.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.225	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	An area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment.	Amend to make it unnecessary for an area of significant indigenous biodiversity to be within a single allotment .
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.226	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Provide opportunities for living closer to nature (e.g. "bush living").	Amend to enable Biodiversity offsetting or environmental compensation to be considered as a way to mitigate the effects of buildings and accessways.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.227	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is unclear what "parent title" means in this rule.	Amend to clarify the term parent title
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.228	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is not necessary for the covenanted area to be with an authorised agency.	amend to allow private covenant.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.056	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.637	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support in part	Support that the matters of control include subdivision layout, access and design. However, the matters of control do not include the provision and design and construction of infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting.	Reword the rule to include infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting in the matters of control
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.074	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.074	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	Support this rule in principle but believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.186	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Amend	It is important that where required that Poutini Ngāi Tahu values are able to be considered and adjustments made to the application	Include the effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu Values as a matter for control
Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (S171)	S171.014	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Amend	The rule incorrectly refers to the Electricity Transmission Corridor and Transmission Yard and should refer to the National Grid	Replace references to the Electricity Transmission Corridor and Electricity Transmission Yard with references to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor and National Grid Yard.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.423	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Transpower New Zealand Limited (S299)	S299.055	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Amend	Transpower supports the provision of a rule relating to subdivision within proximity of the National Grid. However, amendments are sought to the rule as follows: As	SUB - R8 - Subdivision to create allotment(s) of Land that contains or is within the National Grid Subdivision Corridor Electricity Transmission and Distribution Yard Activity

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>sought in the definitions chapter, Transpower seeks amendment to the rule title to refer to the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor'. Notwithstanding Transpower's concerns with "Electricity Transmission and Distribution Yard" the reference to 'yard' is confusing to plan users in that the 'yard' essentially relates to land use whereas the rule relates to subdivision and therefore 'subdivision corridor' is the correct term (as reflected in the definitions). The provision of a corridor approach gives effect to NPSET policies 10 and 11, noting the NPSET does not apply to energy distribution activities. The bulk of the amendments seek deletion of provisions which do not relate to the effects of the subdivision on the National Grid but instead are general subdivision matters for consideration. The appropriate approach is to address these matters under the underlying zoning or overlay subdivision rule and not conflate these effects with effects on the National Grid: Clauses 1, 2, and 4 are not specific to effects of the National Grid and are addressed under other rules (that is SUB-R6, R10, R11 and R15) and as these rules would also apply (as noted in the Note to the subdivision rules), reference is not required within SUB-R8. Their inclusion confuses the purpose of the rule. Similarly, clauses 3, 5 and 9 are not required as the subdivision would need to comply with the rules for the subdivision in the underlying zoning or overlay and compliance with standards assessed as part of that consent. The compliance with the standards is not a matter relevant to the National Grid and is</p>	<p>Status Restricted discretionary Controlled Where: All resulting allotments, except allotments for access or a public work, demonstrate they are capable of accommodating the principal building or any dwelling or sensitive activity located entirely outside of the National Grid Yard. Vehicle access to National Grid assets is maintained. Matters of discretion are: The extent to which the subdivision allows for earthworks, buildings and structures to comply with the safe distance requirements of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001) ISSN01140663; The provision for the on-going efficient operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of the National Grid, including the ability for continued access to existing transmission lines (including support structures) for maintenance, inspections and upgrading; The extent to which potential adverse effects (including visual and reverse sensitivity effects) are mitigated through the location of building platforms; The extent to which the design and construction of the subdivision allows for activities to be setback from the National Grid to ensure adverse effects on, and from, the National Grid and on public safety and property are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated, for example, through the location of roads and reserves under the transmission lines; The nature and location of any proposed vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of the National Grid; The outcome of any consultation with Transpower; and The extent to which the design and layout of the subdivision</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>not appropriate for inclusion in the rule or assessed as part of the consent. It is also noted that the one hectare minimum allotment size referenced in clause 9 would apply to all zones and does not reflect the underlying zone features. Transpower opposes the controlled activity status and supports a restricted discretionary activity status. The main concern is that a controlled activity status is not able to be declined. Given the national significance of the National Grid and potential for adverse effects, a controlled activity status is not supported. A restricted discretionary activity status for subdivision provides an appropriate incentive and opportunity to design subdivision layouts that avoid building sites within the National Grid Yard. Subdivision is considered the most effective point at which to ensure future reverse sensitivity effects, maintenance access issues, and adverse effects of transmission lines (including amenity issues) are avoided. This can be achieved by designing subdivision layouts to properly accommodate transmission corridors (including, for example, through the creation of reserves and/or open space where buffer corridors are located). Similarly, given the underlying zoning subdivision rule and standards would apply, amendments are sought to delete those matters not relevant to effects on the National Grid. Transpower requests non-complying activity status for any activity that cannot meet clauses 1 or 2.</p>	<p>demonstrates that a suitable building platform(s) for the principal building or any dwelling or sensitive activity can be located outside of the National Grid Yard for each new allotment. This is not within a Significant Natural Area as identified in Schedule Four and subject to Rule SUB – R7; This is not within one of the following locations in the coastal environment: Outstanding Natural Landscape as identified in Schedule Five; Outstanding Natural Feature as identified in Schedule Six; High or Outstanding Coastal Natural Character as identified in Schedules Seven and Eight; or This is not within an area of: Outstanding Natural Landscape as identified in Schedule Five; Outstanding Natural Feature as identified in Schedule Six; Sites of Historic Heritage as identified in Schedule One; Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori as identified in Schedule Three; Any Flood Susceptibility, Flood Plain, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay; This is not within an area of Flood Severe, Coastal Severe or Westport Hazard Overlay or the Airport Noise Control Overlay; All Subdivision Standards are complied with; and Subdivision in the MPZ – Māori Purpose Zone is in accordance with an Iwi/Papatipu Rūnanga Management Plan for the site. This is not within the Earthquake Hazard Overlay; Any allotment created can contain a 15x15m area of land which is located entirely outside of the Electricity Transmission and Distribution Yard; Has reasonable physical and legal access; and Could accommodate a building which can comply with all Permitted Activity standards for the Zone it is located in. The subdivision maintains any existing access to Electricity Transmission and Distribution Yard; Written documentation is provided that</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>demonstrates consultation has occurred with the Electricity Transmission Operator including any response from the operator; and The minimum lot size for any allotment that contains any part of the Electricity Transmission Corridor shall be 1ha. Matters of control are: The size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments; Efficient use of land and compatibility with the role, function and predominant character of the Zone in which the subdivision is located; Where relevant consistency with the NZS 4404 Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision infrastructure; The provision of infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy; The adequacy of water supply for firefighting; The requirement for financial contributions as outlined in Rules FC R1 to FC R12; Effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values or notable trees within or adjacent to the site; Management of any contaminated land; Management of reverse sensitivity effects on the national grid; The provision of esplanade reserves or strips, and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created; Management of any effects on the production value of any highly productive land or high value soils such as those located at Karamea and Totara Flat; Management of construction effects, including traffic movements, hours of operation, noise, earthworks and erosion and sediment control; and Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities, rural activities or significant hazardous facilities. Advice Note: This rule does not apply to subdivisions to create allotments for network utilities, access or reserves which are subject to Rule SUB - R4</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.251	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support in part	Council supports Rule 6, however there is an overlap between Points 2 and 3.	Condense Points 2 and 3.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.255	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12. Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.262	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support	Advice Note does not include "Critical Infrastructure" when referencing R4. Council seeks clarification with regards to whether critical infrastructure has been left out for a purpose or if this was an error.	Include reference to "Critical Infrastructure".
Peter Jefferies (S544)	S544.007	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Oppose	I oppose the fact that the designation is arbitrary and does not relate to a technical assessment of Land Use Capability,	Delete provisions in relation to highly productive land
Martin & Lisa Kennedy (S545)	S545.007	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Oppose	I oppose the fact that the designation is arbitrary and does not relate to a technical assessment of Land Use Capability,	delete provisions in relation to highly productive land
Martin & Lisa Kennedy (S545)	S545.012	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Oppose	While we understand the need for rules we do not understand why the existing rules have not just been reinstated	Replace the rules with those developed in the operative Grey District Plan with regard to National Grid matters.
Nick Pupich Sandy Jefferies (S546)	S546.004	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Oppose	I oppose the fact that the designation is arbitrary and does not relate to a technical assessment of Land Use Capability,	Remove the provisions in relation to highly productive land
Nick Pupich Sandy Jefferies (S546)	S546.012	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Oppose	While we understand the need for rules we do not understand why the existing rules have not just been reinstated.	Replace the rules with those developed in the operative Grey District Plan with regard to National Grid matters
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.370	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Amend	This rule is supported with amendments required to ensure the intended outcomes are achieved with respect to subdivision around distribution lines. New control matters for provision of easements	(1) Amend permitted standard 8,iii., "iii. Could accommodate ... for the Zone it is located in and rules in the Energy Chapter regarding Significant Electricity Distribution Lines. ". (2) Amend permitted standard 10., "10. Written documentation is provided ... occurred with the relevant Electricity Transmission or

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					for existing and proposed energy activities and infrastructure, and for consistency of wording regarding reverse sensitivity matters is also required as per previous rule submissions.	Distribution Operator including any response ...". (3) Amend item i., "i. Management of reverse ... national grid and any Significant Electricity Distribution Line. "(4) Amend item m., "m. Management of potential ..., including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities) , rural ...". (5) Add a new item g., " g. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure. ".
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.074	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support	Subsequent amendment, the reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant.	Amend Rule Condition 3(v) title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: iv. Any Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert or Coastal Tsunami Hazard Overlay;
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.638	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support	Support for reasons noted at SUB - R5	Retain as proposed
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.098	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support	The inclusion of Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints as matters of control	Amend to include Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints as matters of control
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.132	Subdivision	SUB - R8	Support	Exclusion of areas within the Overlays	Retain
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.187	Subdivision	Restricted Discretionary Activities	Amend	Poutini Ngāi Tahu values are not limited to a SASM. It is important that a these values are able to be considered when subdividing.	Include the effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values as a discretion for all rules where it is not already listed in the restricted discretionary rules.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.424	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.007	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	I think that the heading is unclear given that areas of Significant indigenous biodiversity have not been mapped (or if they have, where is this information?), and	Amend the heading and rule to be clearer, make the rule less restrictive and more enabling,

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					this could be very restrictive for some landowners. The rules need to be less restrictive and more enabling (and clearer).	
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.055	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Not Stated	Does this section mean that council has the discretion to decide if land is of significant indigenous biodiversity// can a council planner randomly decide that the vegetation is indigenous -	more clarity as to planners scope with determining an ecological assessment is viable.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.016	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	The rule needs to be amended to clarify that the allotment(s) created from the parent title must contain the area of significant indigenous biodiversity and be for the purpose of legal protection of that land. As written, the rule does not make this clear.	That the rule is amended to clarify that the allotment(s) created from the parent title must contain the area of significant indigenous biodiversity and be for the purpose of legal protection of that land.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.018	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Support	There may be smaller stands of significant vegetation which are worthy of protection.	Amend so that there is no minimum lot size for this purpose
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.051	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.051	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						compensation; and
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.051	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.051	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.051	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.051	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.051	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. Point 2 is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Point 3 should allow biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.052	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.025	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose in part	The provision is unclear given SNAs are yet to be mapped. This is not necessary and a SNA does not need to be within a single allotment. Biodiversity offsetting or compensation etc.	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing an Scheduled Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being located within any

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					should be able to be considered within this point.	Significant Natural Area identified in Schedule Four unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation; and...
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.256	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12. Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.375	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	To ensure consistency of approach across subdivision types.	Add e. The provision of infrastructure and services for drinking water, waste water and stormwater, telecommunications and energy.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.376	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	New control matters for provision of easements.	Add f. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.377	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	To address reverse sensitivity matters.	Add g. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities), rural activities or significant hazardous facilities.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.270	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	For the reasons set out at ECO - R6/SUB - R9	Amend as sought for ECO-R6

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.047	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.053	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Amend	Believe some amendments are necessary.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.058	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.639	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Support in part	Support that subdivision layout, access and design are included under Discretion is restricted to. However, the provision and design and construction of infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting has not been included as a matter of discretion.	Reword the rule to include infrastructure and services for drinking water, wastewater and stormwater and the adequacy of water supply for firefighting under discretion is restricted to.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.075	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.075	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (S140)	S140.041	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support	Inappropriate subdivision can have an adverse impact on historic heritage sites and sites of significance to Māori. HNZPT therefore supports this dedicated rule for subdivision proposals in the Historic Heritage or SASM overlays. HNZPT also supports the provision that applications to subdivide a lot with a Historical Heritage feature will always be limited notified to HNZPT.	Retain as proposed
Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (S171)	S171.017	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	SUB - R10 omits to exclude the Sites of Significance to Māori listed in SUB - R5 as being a Controlled Activity for subdivision. This has the unintended consequence that subdivisions which are within a natural hazard area have to assess the impacts on cultural values, and notification to the rūnanga is required.	Amend Rule SUB - R10 to make it clear that within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori identified in SUB - R5, subdivision is a Controlled Activity, and rule SUB - R10 does not apply.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.425	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.053	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support		Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.257	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12. Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.263	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support	Advice Note does not include "Critical Infrastructure" when referencing R4. Council seeks clarification with regards to whether critical infrastructure has been left out for a purpose or if this was an error.	Include reference to "Critical Infrastructure".
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.264	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support in part	Council support R10 with suggestions for minor amendments. The Rule has been written with mention of Notification at the bottom of the rule. Council seeks to have any mention of notification within the rules be removed. Refer to covering letter.	That the Notification section be removed. And that the following remains as an advice note: 1. This rule does not apply to subdivisions to create allotments for network utilities, access or reserves which are subject to Rule SUB - R4.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.378	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	To address reverse sensitivity matters.	Add I. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities), rural activities or significant hazardous

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						facilities.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.379	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	New control matters for provision of easements.	Add k. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.229	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point e. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.231	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.229	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point e. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.231	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.299	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point e. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.300	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.229	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point e. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.231	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point j.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.125	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Amend	Amend the matters of control to ensure the subdivision protects any natural, cultural or heritage feature identified as significant through the resource consent.	SUB - R10 Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) in Areas of Historic Heritage identified in Schedule One or within Sites or Areas of Significance to Māori identified in Schedule Three not meeting Rule SUB - R5 Amend the Rules to add an additional matter of control or matter of discretion: Management of adverse effects and the protection of any significant natural, cultural or heritage feature or area identified in the resource consent;
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.075	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Oppose in part	Subsequent amendment, the reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant.	Remove reference to "Site or Area of Significance to Māori"
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.640	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support in part	Support the intent of the rule. However, the rule does not provide for accesses to be considered for the allotments under discretion is restricted to. Reword the rule as follows:	g. The provision of infrastructure and services for transport , drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.188	Subdivision	SUB - R10	Support	Only mana whenua can speak to how a subdivision may impact on a SASM. This rule enables that.	Retain as notified
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.426	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.258	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.380	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	New control matters for provision of easements.	Add g. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.381	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	To address reverse sensitivity matters.	Add h. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities), rural activities or significant hazardous facilities.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.119	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	R11 Should be discretionary	change activity status to Discretionary
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.119	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	R11 Should be discretionary	change activity status to Discretionary
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.232	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point b. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.233	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point f.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.232	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point b. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.233	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point f.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.301	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point b. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.302	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point f.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.232	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend	some uncertainty that we oppose.	Amend wording "size, design, shape, location and layout of allotments" under point b. to instead refer to 15mx15m building platform or similar defined specification that is more certain.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.233	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point f.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.126	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Oppose	Oppose the restricted discretionary activity status for Rule SUB-R11 regarding subdivision in the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features. As set out in the overview, subdivision affects the natural and physical environment and introduces long-term development patterns that cannot be easily changed. These patterns directly affect natural landscapes and features and subdivision within outstanding areas should therefore be a fully discretionary activity.	Amend Rule SUB-R11: Activity Status Restricted Discretionary...
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.641	Subdivision	SUB - R11	Support in part	Support the intent of the rule. However, the rule does not provide for accesses to be considered for the allotments under discretion is restricted to.	Reword the rule as follows: c. The provision of infrastructure and services for transport , drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.427	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.008	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	8. SUB - R12, I think that the activity status (where there is non-compliance) should be Discretionary and not Non-complying.	Amend the rule so that the activity status where there is non compliance is Discretionary not Non-complying.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.056	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Not Stated	The provision of this zone is around areas of intensification for future development, however the provisions requiring three waters, would be difficult if this work has not been completed, or is in the process of being completed, or it would have the effect of restricting subdivision.	Greater direction should be provided by the plan.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.127	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support in part	The rule is generally supported by Waka Kotahi as it appropriately links back to SUB-P5, which seeks that subdivision in the Future Urban Zone be avoided if it compromises the efficient provision of infrastructure or requires significant upgrades to infrastructure in advance of integrated urban development. However, it is recommended that the rule be amended to ensure that the existing use and operation of critical infrastructure, such as the state highway, is not adversely affected as a result of subdivision in the Future Urban Zone.	Amend rule as follows: ...d. The provision of infrastructure and services for transport , drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy; x. adverse effects on existing infrastructure.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.259	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support in part	Council seeks to include Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations in the Matters of control or discretion for Rules 5 to 12. Note: R5 has clause Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints in the Matters of control. We seek to change the word constraints to considerations.	To add: Natural Hazards or geotechnical considerations.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.265	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	Council seeks to insert reference to Schedule 2 for Notable Trees.	Discretion is restricted to: g. Effects on Poutini Ngai Tahu values or notable trees within or adjacent to the site identified in Schedule 2.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.382	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	Amendment regarding reverse sensitivity matters.	Amend j. Management of potential ..., including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities) , rural ...
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.383	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	New control matters for provision of easements.	Add k. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure.
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.120	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	amend matters for discretion	g Effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, existing amenity values, the quality of the environment, natural character , notable trees or historic heritage within or adjacent to the site;
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.120	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	amend matters for discretion	g Effects on Poutini Ngāi Tahu values, existing amenity values, the quality of the environment, natural character , notable trees or historic heritage within or adjacent to the site;
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.234	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	the rule should not apply unless there is a development/concept plan in place	Amend so that the rule does not apply until a robust development or concept plan is approved.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.235	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point h.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.236	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete point i.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.237	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	The escalation to a Non-complying status if compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be Discretionary not Non-Complying status.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.234	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	the rule should not apply unless there is a development/concept plan in place	Amend so that the rule does not apply until a robust development or concept plan is approved.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.235	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point h.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.236	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete point i.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.237	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	The escalation to a Non-complying status if compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be Discretionary not Non-Complying status.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.303	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	the rule should not apply unless there is a development/concept plan in place	Amend so that the rule does not apply until a robust development or concept plan is approved.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.304	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point h.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.305	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete point i.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.306	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	The escalation to a Non-complying status if compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be Discretionary not Non-Complying status.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.234	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	the rule should not apply unless there is a development/concept plan in place	Amend so that the rule does not apply until a robust development or concept plan is approved.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.235	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete "and the need for access to be provided to any esplanade reserve or strip created" from point h.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.236	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend		Delete point i.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.237	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	The escalation to a Non-complying status if compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be Discretionary not Non-Complying status.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.642	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Support	Support the intent of the rule. However, the rule does not provide for accesses to be considered for the allotments under discretion is restricted to. Reword the rule as follows:	d. The provision of infrastructure and services for transport , drinking water, wastewater and stormwater, telecommunications and energy
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.100	Subdivision	SUB - R12	Amend	It is essential that future growth adequately considers exposure to natural hazards	Include natural hazards and geotechnical consriants in matters of discretion
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.428	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.006	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	We have lived at our current property for about 30 years. In that time, there have been many river floods. Our property has never flooded as a consequence of the rivers in our area being in flood. Somehow, the high river levels do not affect our property or those around us.	That subdivision is still a possibility within the Flood Susceptibility overlay.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.019	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	I support the Provision	Retain as notified.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.057	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Oppose in part	The subdivision rule is worded well, however the proposal should include a provision with relation to the size of an allotment, that where the subdivision does not result in land use non-compliance, council has the ability to waive the minimum allotment standard. This is solely as Townhouse/Higher Density is becoming more prevalent due to the prohibitive costs of standalone dwellings in larger scale developments. Second d and e as matters of discretion again give council to much scope as realistically what subdivision is not going to give rise to one of these activities... further council could debate the intended use.	Amend rule to allow that where the subdivision does not result in land use non-compliance, council has the ability to waive the minimum allotment standard and that matters of discretion d and e be more accurately defined in the Plan with in regards to natural hazards so that it offers potential solutions or guidance for applicants.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
T Croft Ltd (S460)	S460.005	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Oppose	The Flood Plain overlay appears to have been arbitrarily placed over large tracts of land across the West Coast near larger waterways. Whilst it is acknowledged that this was done as a precautionary measure where flood modelling has not been undertaken (refer Part 2, Natural Hazards chapter), we submit that it is not a fair approach. The only rules relating to the Flood Plain overlay are in the Subdivision section of the TTPP; specifically, Rule SUB - R13(2) requires that subdivision applications for land in this overlay are "accompanied by a hazard risk assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner". This is already provided for in s106 of the RMA. The precautionary approach taken by the TTPP in imposing the Flood Plain overlay is unnecessary, as an assessment of natural hazards at subdivision stage is already required by law.	Remove the flood plain overlay and associated subdivision rule
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.030	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend		Amend to allow relief from the building platform standard SUB - S2 (2)(c) to reconcile the inconsistency in the rule framework, or some other similar relief that allows for SUB - R13 to function as intended
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.054	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support		Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.266	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support in part	Council supports Rule 13 in part, however seeks further definition of a "suitably qualified and experienced practitioner".	That a minimum qualification be defined for "suitably qualified and experienced practitioner."
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.044	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Oppose	The hazard overlays provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend to be more enabling
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.384	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	To ensure consistency of approach across subdivision types.	Add f. The provision of infrastructure and services for drinking water, waste water and stormwater, telecommunications and energy.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.385	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	New control matters for provision of easements.	Add g. The provision of easements, including for both existing and proposed energy activities and associated infrastructure.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.386	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	To address reverse sensitivity matters.	Add h. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including network utilities and critical infrastructure (including energy activities), rural activities or significant hazardous facilities.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.238	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	Consideration will be given to this matter under the assessment required by point 2.	Delete "sensitive activities" from point d.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.048	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.054	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.238	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	Consideration will be given to this matter under the assessment required by point 2.	Delete "sensitive activities" from point d.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.307	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	Consideration will be given to this matter under the assessment required by point 2.	Delete "sensitive activities" from point d.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.238	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	Consideration will be given to this matter under the assessment required by point 2.	Delete "sensitive activities" from point d.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.059	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support		Retain
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.018	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend		Amend to allow relief from the building platform standard SUB - S2 (2)(c) to reconcile the inconsistency in the rule framework, or some other similar relief that allows for SUB - R13 to function as intended
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.076	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	Subsequent amendment, the reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant.	Amend Rule title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: Subdivision to create allotment(s) in the Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert, Coastal Setback, Lake Tsunami and Coastal Tsunami Overlays
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.046	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.101	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Amend	Should not lead to use of the land for critical response facilities within any natural hazard overlay.	Amend The subdivision will not lead to use of the land within the Coastal Tsunami Overlay for critical response facilities; The subdivision will not lead to use of the land within natural hazard overlays for critical response facilities;
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.076	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.076	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support		Retain
Christine Sinclair (S205)	S205.002	Subdivision	Discretionary Activities	Support	I don't support further subdivision in the immediate Okuru area given the lack of infrastructure and the potential for increased flooding and coastal sea level	I would like there to be a hold on any further subdivision in Okuru township and nearby environs.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rises. More capacity for dwellings will have negative environmental impacts. Examples include a lack of sustainable, long-term solutions to district recycling and rubbish disposal. Sewerage and soak pits need to be built in low-lying areas that are increasingly prone to floods and sea level rises. The power supply is hydro-generated with the increasing demands already meaning a much larger backup diesel generator is required to power the district, creating increased noise pollution for those living close by. Increased traffic and light pollution will also spoil the current environment.	
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.429	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule
Alistair Cameron (S452)	S452.010	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Support	allow appropriate land uses to establish in the zone after mining is completed	Retain
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.268	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Support	Council supports rules 14 to 28.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.239	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We support the rule in principle but believe more certainty is required.	Provide a robust definition for "development plan".
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.049	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Amend Non-complying to N/A under Activity status where compliance not achieved
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.050	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Delete point 1.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.055	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	Believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under Activity status where compliance not achieve.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.056	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend		Delete point 1.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.239	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We support the rule in principle but believe more certainty is required.	Provide a robust definition for "development plan".
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.308	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We support the rule in principle but believe more certainty is required.	Provide a robust definition for "development plan".
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.239	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We support the rule in principle but believe more certainty is required.	Provide a robust definition for "development plan".
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.060	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Delete point 1.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.061	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.077	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Oppose	We believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Delete point 1.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.078	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.077	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Oppose	We believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Delete point 1.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.078	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Amend	We believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.430	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.009	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	Some parts of this rule seems very restrictive and I think that the activity status, where there is non-compliance, should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.	Make rule less restrictive and not escape to Non-complying.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.053	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						status
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.053	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.053	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.053	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.053	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.053	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.053	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.055	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.056	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.026	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose in part	Points 1 and 2 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2. Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.267	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Support in part	Refer to ECO R8 Submission.	
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.121	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	R15 Should be a mandatory buffer zone	insert a minimum distance/ buffer from SNA to buildings or other development such as access/ roads.
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.121	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	R15 Should be a mandatory buffer zone	insert a minimum distance/ buffer from SNA to buildings or other development such as access/ roads.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.240	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	The escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.242	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	Too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.271	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	For the reasons set out at ECO - R8/SUB - R15	Amend as sought for ECO-R8
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.051	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.052	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Amend Non-complying to N/A under Activity status where compliance not achieved
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.057	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.058	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.240	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	The escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.242	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	Too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.309	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	The escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.310	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	Too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.240	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	The escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.242	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	Too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.062	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.063	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.079	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.080	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.079	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.080	Subdivision	SUB - R15/ECO - R8	Amend	This is too restrictive.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.431	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.020	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	The escalation of this rule where compliance is not achieved in unnecessarily restrictive.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.010	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	Some parts of this rule seems very restrictive and I think that the activity status, where there is non-compliance, should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.	Amend to be less restrictive and have no escalation to non-complying.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.054	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.054	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.054	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.054	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.054	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.054	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.054	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is noncompliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.057	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	Status where compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.027	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Oppose in part	Point 1 should be deleted from this rule as the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.269	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Support	Council supports rules 14 to 28.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.243	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	Too restrictive.	Delete point 1.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.244	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	The escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.243	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	Too restrictive.	Delete point 1.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.244	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	The escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.311	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	Too restrictive.	Delete point 1.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.312	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	The escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate.	Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.047	Subdivision	SUB - R16	Amend	the escalation to Non-Complying is inappropriate and too restrictive.	Delete point 1.
Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (S171)	S171.018	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Amend	SUB - R17 omits to exclude the Sites of Significance to Māori listed in SUB - R5 as being a Controlled Activity for subdivision. Because Greymouth is within the Coastal Environment this has the unintended consequence of making all subdivision a Discretionary Activity.	Amend Rule SUB - R17 to make it clear that within the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori identified in SUB R5 subdivision is a Controlled Activity, and rule SUB - R17 does not apply.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the	S190.432	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)						
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.058	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Oppose in part	The wording of the rule means that even if they are engaged they still need to be notified	Amend so that notification is not required if iwi are engaged.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.058	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support		Retain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.245	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.245	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.313	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support		Retain
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.048	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.433	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.011	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	SUB - R18, some parts of this rule seems very restrictive and I think that the activity status, where there is non-compliance, should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status.	Amend the rule to be less restrictive and no escalation to non-complying status.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.019	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	Rule SUB - R18 is unclear and requires clarification. It contains a circular reference to the same rule (SUB - R18) and the other rules referenced (with the exception of R20) do not relate to overlays. There are other rules that do specifically relate to overlays, which are not included in the exclusions listed.	Clarify the rule and remove the circular reference.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.028	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.387	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	Item 1 to SUB-R18 should be reviewed to confirm it should not be SUB-R17.	Review 1. and amend if required in terms of cross reference to SUBR18 potentially needing amendment to SUB-R17.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.246	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule contains an error (references itself - perhaps should be SUB - R16) and is unclear.	Amend to correct reference error

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.247	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.248	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support		Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status except in point 3 where mana whenua support the escalation for this point.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.246	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule contains an error (references itself - perhaps should be SUB - R16) and is unclear.	Amend to correct reference error
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.247	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.248	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support		Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status except in point 3 where mana whenua support the escalation for this point.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.314	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule contains an error (references itself - perhaps should be SUB - R16) and is unclear.	Amend to correct reference error
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.315	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.316	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support		Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no escalation to Non-Complying status except in point 3 where mana whenua support the escalation for this point.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.246	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule contains an error (references itself - perhaps should be SUB - R16) and is unclear.	Amend to correct reference error
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.247	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete points 1 and 2.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.248	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support		Activity status where there is non-compliance should be deleted as there should be no

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						escalation to Non-Complying status except in point 3 where mana whenua support the escalation for this point.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.049	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support the provision.	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.434	Subdivision	SUB - R19	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.249	Subdivision	SUB - R19	Amend		REtain
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.272	Subdivision	SUB - R19	Amend	Subdivision within the Natural Open Space Zone would not generally be appropriate and should not be anticipated by the Plan. A non-complying activity status is more appropriate.	Amend SUB - R19 to exclude NOSZ Add a new SUB non-complying rule for subdivision in the NOSZ.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.249	Subdivision	SUB - R19	Amend		REtain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.317	Subdivision	SUB - R19	Amend		REtain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.249	Subdivision	SUB - R19	Amend		REtain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.435	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.059	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Not Stated	You haven't completed this section or given council any scope over the matters of discretion	Make a Restricted Discretionary Activity and provide Matters of Discretion.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.033	Subdivision	SUB - R20	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)	S558.250	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.250	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.318	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.250	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support		Retain
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.050	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support the provision.	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.102	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support discretionary status for subdivision in the Westport Hazard Overlay	Retain
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.036	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	Discretionary activity status is considered appropriate	Retain Rule UB-R20 and discretionary activity status for subdivision of the Snodgrass Road submitters properties.
Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee (S171)	S171.006	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Amend	Rule SUB - R21 is not consistent with the plan approach to managing severe hazards whereby where a severe hazard is identified, subdivision in this area is a non-complying activity. For example	Amend Rule SUB -R21in relation to subdivision in the Coastal Hazard Severe and Flood Hazard SevereOverlay so that it is a Non-complying activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					subdivision in the Earthquake Hazard Overlay is a non-complying activity.	
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.436	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.021	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Oppose in part	I believe this the appropriate activity status for this type of subdivision. For example, if only part of a parcel is located within the noted overlays this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue. However, there appears to be an error for the status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.060	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Not Stated	You haven't completed this section or given council any scope over the matters of discretion.	Make a Restricted Discretionary Activity and provide matters of discretion.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.058	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.058	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.058	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.058	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.058	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.058	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.058	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-Complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.029	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Oppose in part	We support this rule but note the error that where activity status where compliance is not achieved status becomes Non-complying	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.045	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Oppose	The hazard overlays provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend to be more enabling
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.251	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Amend	Error for activity status where compliance is not achieved	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.251	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Amend	Error for activity status where compliance is not achieved	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.319	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Amend	Error for activity status where compliance is not achieved	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.251	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Amend	Error for activity status where compliance is not achieved	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.051	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	Note the error	Amend to: Activity status where compliance not achieved: Non-complying N/A.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.103	Subdivision	SUB - R21	Support	Discretionary status in the Coastal Severe and Flood Severe Natural Hazard Overlays	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.437	Subdivision	SUB - R22	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.061	Subdivision	SUB - R22	Amend	You haven't completed this section or given council any scope over the matters of discretion	Make a restricted discretionary activity and provide matters of discretion.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.253	Subdivision	SUB - R22	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.253	Subdivision	SUB - R22	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.320	Subdivision	SUB - R22	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.253	Subdivision	SUB - R22	Support		Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.438	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.022	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	I support this provision.	Retain
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.062	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Amend	You haven't completed this section or given council any scope over the matters of discretion	Make a restricted discretionary activity and provide matters of discretion.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.046	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Oppose	The hazard overlays provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend to be more enabling
Peter Jefferies (S544)	S544.009	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Oppose	The mapping is arbitrary with highly inaccurate information. I am concerned about the insurance implications and additional cost.	Delete the reference to the flood plain overlay in the rule
Martin & Lisa Kennedy (S545)	S545.009	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Oppose	The mapping is arbitrary with highly inaccurate information. I am concerned about the insurance implications and additional cost.	Delete the reference to the flood plain overlay in the rule
Nick Pupich Sandy Jefferies (S546)	S546.009	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Oppose	The mapping is arbitrary with highly inaccurate information. I am concerned about the insurance implications and additional cost.	Delete the reference to the flood plain overlay in the rule
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.254	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.053	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support the provision.	Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.254	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.321	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.254	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.064	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.077	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Amend	Subsequent amendment, the reference in this rule is therefore irrelevant.	Amend Rule title to remove reference to "Flood Plain" Rule to read: Subdivision to create Allotments in the Flood Susceptibility, Land Instability, Coastal Alert, Coastal Setback, Lake Tsunami and Coastal Tsunami Overlays not meeting Restricted Discretionary Activity Standards
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.052	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.081	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.081	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Rosalie Sampson (S539)	S539.005	Subdivision	Non-complying Activities	Amend	I would also note that in a number of these situations that s.106 of the RMA has more relevance than the above provisions and would allow for conditions of consent or considerations of similar standards in terms of raised height etc. Overall, I believe that the provisions should either be looser utilising more restricted discretionary matters, to inform developers about the scope of consideration rather than non-complying which gives far too much scope to the council to decline or control development throughout the region, where based on the preference of staff could stifle development through the township.	Amend non-complying activities for natural hazards to be restricted discretionary with a focus on hazard matters only.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.439	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.012	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Amend	This rule is too restrictive and should this be Discretionary, instead of non complying.	Amend the rule so is a Discretionary Activity.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.016	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Amend	if only part of a parcel is located within the specified hazard overlay this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue. Amend to discretionary (instead of Non-complying)	Amend to discretionary (instead of Non-complying)
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.063	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Not Stated	Seems weird that you can build in these setbacks, but cannot subdivide seems like this could get flipped via the permitted baseline argument for development.	Review in light of Permitted Baseline.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.060	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Oppose		Delete
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.030	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.255	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity rule	Delete
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.255	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity rule	Delete
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.322	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity rule	Delete
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.255	Subdivision	SUB - R24	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and should be a Discretionary Activity rule	Delete
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.440	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.023	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	I do not support this provision.	Delete.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.061	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose		Delete
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.031	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.256	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and does not provide for situations not foreseen by the plan.	Delete
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.054	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose		Delete
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose		Delete
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.256	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and does not provide for situations not foreseen by the plan.	Delete
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.323	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and does not provide for situations not foreseen by the plan.	Delete
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.256	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive and does not provide for situations not foreseen by the plan.	Delete
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.065	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	We do not support this provision.	Delete
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.053	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.082	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose		Delete
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.082	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose		Delete
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.441	Subdivision	SUB - R26	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.017	Subdivision	SUB - R26	Support	If only part of a parcel is located within the specified hazard overlay this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to discretionary (instead of Non-complying).
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.257	Subdivision	SUB - R26	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.257	Subdivision	SUB - R26	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.324	Subdivision	SUB - R26	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.257	Subdivision	SUB - R26	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.104	Subdivision	SUB - R26	Support	Non-complying status for subdivision in the Earthquake Hazard Overlays	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.442	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Support		
John Brazil (S360)	S360.024	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	I do not support this provision.	Delete
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.015	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Amend	Seems too restrictive, either delete or change to discretionary.	Either delete the rule or change to discretionary activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.062	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose		Delete
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.032	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.258	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.273	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Amend	For the reasons set out at ECO - R9/SUB - R27	Amend as sought for ECO-R9. Amend to identify that the rule applies where SUB - R27 is not met.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.055	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose		Delete
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose		Delete
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.258	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.325	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.258	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.066	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	We do not support this provision.	Delete
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.083	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose		Delete
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.083	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose		Delete
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.443	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.018	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Support	If only part of a parcel is located within the specified hazard overlay this should not automatically result in the entire parcel being considered inappropriate for subdivision. A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to discretionary (instead of Prohibited).
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.270	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Support	Council supports rules 14 to 28.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.259	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.259	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.326	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.259	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Amend	A subdivision site suitability report is the appropriate way to manage this issue.	Amend to Discretionary Activity.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.105	Subdivision	SUB - R28	Support	Prohibited status for subdivision to create allotments in the 20m Earthquake Hazard Overlay	Retain
Christine Wood (S185)	S185.002	Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Not Stated	I do not want any toxic substances added to my drinking water, nor do I want to pay	Not stated.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					for my rainwater I collect from my roof. I totally oppose 3 Waters.	
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.272	Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Amend	Pre-existing non-compliance with those standards should be accommodated in the rules.	Amend all references to compliance with standards to accommodate pre-existing non-compliance that is not being exacerbated by the proposed activity.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.272	Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Amend	Pre-existing non-compliance with those standards should be accommodated in the rules.	Amend all references to compliance with standards to accommodate pre-existing non-compliance that is not being exacerbated by the proposed activity.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.338	Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Amend	Pre-existing non-compliance with those standards should be accommodated in the rules.	Amend all references to compliance with standards to accommodate pre-existing non-compliance that is not being exacerbated by the proposed activity.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.272	Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Amend	Pre-existing non-compliance with those standards should be accommodated in the rules.	Amend all references to compliance with standards to accommodate pre-existing non-compliance that is not being exacerbated by the proposed activity.
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.052	Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Amend		New Standard: Additional matters - Character Areas
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.037	Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Support	The subdivision standards are supported	Retain the subdivision standards in Rule SUB-S1 - SUBS11.
Sarah Bushby (S9)	S9.001	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	I am have a small subdivision underway down Marsden Road to allow me to build next to my mum. It is going slower than expected due the the workload of the surveyor slowing down our submission (7 months on and still not done groundwork..). Changing the minimum subdivision size would mean that we couldn't divide up our family land as planned. The 1HA is still plenty of room for house/lifestyle, but 20HA	I would like the minimum subdivision size for the General Rural Zoneto remain at 1HA rather than increase to 20HA

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					is too much.	
Graeme Cavaney (S121)	S121.001	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	Subdivision in rural areas leads to overpopulation of the area resulting in more pollution including light, waste, more Septic Tanks, stress on Infrastructure, more litter and rubbish, pressure on existing roading and waterways, more noise. It also compromises existing landowners lifestyle with more people in the area, changing land values and loss of farming land .	That sub divisions do not happen in rural areas.
Misato Nomura (S151)	S151.009	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Support in part	Settlement zone is a new zone that did not exist in the Buller district plan. We are agreeable to the minimum lot sizes in Sub S1. Support in part as we have no comments for other zones' minimum lot sizes.	Retain Sub S1 minimum lot size for Settlement Zone sizes.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.444	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Support	We support this standard.	Retain standard.
Glenn Elley (S249)	S249.001	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	The minimum sizes are highly impractical on the west Coast - they would tie up far too much land in non productive rural blocks.	4 Ha blocks are not a feasible minimum size on the West Coast - We do not have enough useable land to warrant this and it needs to be dropped to 1 Ha or less if connected to wastewater services.
Glenn Elley (S249)	S249.002	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	Too much land could be tied up in blocks that ended up not being utilised. No reason to restrict the number of dwellings in either situation as we require more housing - not less.	The 10Ha minimum, for high value productive land, needs to come down to 4Ha as it is almost impossible to run an agricultural business on a 10Ha property so far.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.025	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose in part	The minimum lot sizes for the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone are too large.	Amend General Rural Zone minimum lot size to 1 hectare. Amend Rural Lifestyle Zone minimum lot size to 0.5 hectare/5000m ² .
Charlie McBeath (S403)	S403.001	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose in part	It stops further development or diversification after mining or other previous activities. It would also stymie the socioeconomic benefits for small communities	Reduce the 20 hectare minimum size for rural subdivision.
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.013	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	Rural Lifestyle is too large and should be 5000m ² ,	Amend so that Rural Lifestyle subdivision controlled activity minimum lot size is 5000m ²
Lara Kelly (S421)	S421.014	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	General Rural Zone is too large and should be 1ha (except 10ha in Highly Productive land precinct).	Amend so that the minimum lot size in the General Rural Zone is 1ha except 10h in the Highly Productive Land Precinct.
Christopher and Donna Meates (S430)	S430.003	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	The submitter opposes SUB-S1 as they have property within the General Rural Zone that they are considering would be suitable for subdivision for residential use within the life of this plan. However, the 4ha minimum size is, as indicated above, too small for viable primary production use. As such it will tie up 4 ha of land into one single land unit that is effectively thereby no longer available and removed from viable primary production use. There is no indication that this lot size is optimal to maximise the rural amenity benefits of residential use of the General Rural Zone. Rather, the 5,000m ² size is still capable of providing those benefits, but results in a much more efficient use of the limited	Reduce the minimum lot size for subdivision in the General Rural Zone to 5000m ²

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					physical resource that is land, as it provides for twice the number of residential uses for the same amount of land taken out of viable primary production. This efficiency is increased by the fact that it renders such subdivision more economically viable for the submitter.	
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.064	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose in part		Include a note that if the proposal does not generate new land use non-compliance's or that where this can be demonstrated that council can waive this standard.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.020	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Support		Retain the minimum lot areas as notified.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.025	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Support		Retain approach that minimum lot sizes in the Settlement zones is set as "1000m2 in unsewered areas and 500m2 in sewerred areas".
Russell and Joanne Smith (S477)	S477.021	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too large for a bush block where it is possible to have a sense of spaciousness and rural character and where privacy can be gained without adverse effects to neighbours seeking a rural lifestyle.	Remove the minimum 4ha and replace with something more practical for todays lifestyle housing requirements eg 5000m2 or 1ha
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.022	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	Increase the ability of existing landholdings to provide for semi-rural living expectations	Amend to Minimum Lot Sizes for Each Allotment Standard 1 (g) to provide for the minimum allotment size of the Rural Lifestyle zone of 4,000 m²
Lynley Hargreaves (S481)	S481.019	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too big for a minimum lot size for rural subdivision as it was previously 0.5ha in Westland. Many people living rurally do not wish to farm and if they are able to live on smaller lot sizes this will mean smaller amounts of land are removed from primary production. In any case the subdivision Section 32 report acknowledges that this is not really a problem in Westland anyway, stating "Loss of farming productivity due to	Reduce the minimum lot size for the General Rural Zone to 1ha

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					subdivision is not as a great a concern in Westland".	
Tim Macfarlane (S482)	S482.021	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too large for a bush block where it is possible to have a sense of spaciousness and rural character and where privacy can be gained without adverse effects to neighbours seeking a rural lifestyle.	Remove the minimum 4ha and replace with something more practical for todays lifestyle housing requirements eg 5000m2 or 1ha
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.010	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	This is an inefficient use of land as 4ha is too small for productive use. The West Coast urgently needs more building sites.	Either keep the rural subdivision minimum lot size as it is, or only double it to 1ha per lot.
Claire & John West (S506)	S506.021	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too large for a bush block where it is possible to have a sense of spaciousness and rural character and where privacy can be gained without adverse effects to neighbours seeking a rural lifestyle.	Remove the minimum 4ha and replace with something more practical for todays lifestyle housing requirements eg 5000m2 or 1ha
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.063	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	The minimum lot sizes for the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone are too large.	Amend General Rural Zone minimum lot size to 1 hectare. Amend Rural Lifestyle Zone minimum lot size to 0.5 hectare/5000m ² .
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (S524)	S524.085	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Support in part	Support the minimum lot sizes for rural and rural lifestyle zone Rural Lifestyle Zone 1 hectare; h. General Rural Zone 4 hectares, except that it is 10 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; The minimum lot for subdivision for SIB in SUB-R7 should also be listed	Amend SUB-S1 h): Or 4000m2 in the GRUZ where contains area of significant indigenous biodiversity.
Denis and Wendy Cadigan (S532)	S532.003	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose in part	The minimum allotment size of 4ha for the General Rural Zone is opposed. 4ha is too small to be an economic farming unit, and too large for the lifestyle block market.	Reduce the minimum allotment size to 5,000m2 as is currently provided for in the Westland District Plan as a discretionary activity,
Lauren Nyhan Anthony Phillips (S533)	S533.021	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too large for a bush block where it is possible to have a sense of spaciousness and rural character and where privacy can be gained without adverse effects to neighbours seeking a rural lifestyle.	Remove the minimum 4ha and replace with something more practical for todays lifestyle housing requirements eg 5000m2 or 1ha
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.271	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Support	Council supports Standard 1 and 2.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peter Jefferies (S544)	S544.002	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	I object to a 10 hectare subdivision limit on my land given the conditions. I consider this is not consistent with the existing pattern of land use in the area.	Remove the subdivision restrictions over the Highly Productive Land precinct.
Martin & Lisa Kennedy (S545)	S545.002	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	I object to a 10 hectare subdivision limit on my land given the conditions. I consider this is not consistent with the existing pattern of land use in the area.	Remove the subdivision restrictions over the Highly Productive Land precinct.
Nick Pupich Sandy Jefferies (S546)	S546.002	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	I object to a 10 hectare subdivision limit on my land given the conditions. I consider this is not consistent with the existing pattern of land use in the area.	Remove the subdivision restrictions over the Highly Productive Land precinct.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.260	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	oppose the minimum lot sizes for each allotment for certain zones.	Amend as follows: 1. Each allotment, including the balance allotment must meet the following minimum lot size and contain a 15m x 15m building platform: a. ...g. Rural Lifestyle Zone 4 hectare 5000m² ; h. General Rural Zone 4 hectares 1 hectare , except that it is 10 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; and i. Future Urban Zone 4 hectares. We oppose that the land between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road south of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14694, Part Section 2 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 3 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 4 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 5 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 42 Blk II Steeples SD and Section 71 Blk II Steeples SD). We submit that this should be zoned Rural Residential Precinct. If this decision is not made then we submit that the "Minimum
Stewart & Catherine Nimmo (S559)	S559.021	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too large for a bush block where it is possible to have a sense of spaciousness and rural character and where privacy can be gained without adverse effects to neighbours seeking a rural lifestyle.	Remove the minimum 4ha and replace with something more practical for todays lifestyle housing requirements eg 5000m2 or 1ha

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.260	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	oppose the minimum lot sizes for each allotment for certain zones.	Amend as follows: 1. Each allotment, including the balance allotment must meet the following minimum lot size and contain a 15m x 15m building platform : a. ...g. Rural Lifestyle Zone 4 hectare 5000m² ; h. General Rural Zone 4 hectares 1 hectare , except that it is 10 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; and i. Future Urban Zone 4 hectares. We oppose that the land between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road south of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14694, Part Section 2 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 3 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 4 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 5 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 42 Blk II Steeples SD and Section 71 Blk II Steeples SD). We submit that this should be zoned Rural Residential Precinct. If this decision is not made then we submit that the "Minimum
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.327	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	oppose the minimum lot sizes for each allotment for certain zones.	Amend as follows: 1. Each allotment, including the balance allotment must meet the following minimum lot size and contain a 15m x 15m building platform : a. ...g. Rural Lifestyle Zone 4 hectare 5000m² ; h. General Rural Zone 4 hectares 1 hectare , except that it is 10 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; and i. Future Urban Zone 4 hectares. We oppose that the land between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road south of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14694, Part Section 2 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 3 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 4 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 5 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 42 Blk II Steeples SD and Section 71

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Blk II Steeples SD). We submit that this should be zoned Rural Residential Precinct. If this decision is not made then we submit that the "Minimum
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.260	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	oppose the minimum lot sizes for each allotment for certain zones.	Amend as follows: 1. Each allotment, including the balance allotment must meet the following minimum lot size and contain a 15m x 15m building platform: a. ...g. Rural Lifestyle Zone 4 hectare 5000m² ; h. General Rural Zone 4 hectares 1 hectare , except that it is 10 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; and i. Future Urban Zone 4 hectares. We oppose that the land between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road south of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14694, Part Section 2 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 3 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 4 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 5 Blk II Steeples SD, Section 42 Blk II Steeples SD and Section 71 Blk II Steeples SD). We submit that this should be zoned Rural Residential Precinct. If this decision is not made then we submit that the "Minimum
David Ellerm (S581)	S581.051	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend		Anebd 1 e. Minimum lot size for Settlement Centre Precinct 4000 1500m² in un-sewered areas and 500 750m² in sewerred areas.
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.010	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	Increase the ability of existing landholdings to provide for semi-rural living expectations	Amend to Minimum Lot Sizes for Each Allotment Standard 1 (g) to provide for the minimum allotment size of the Rural Lifestyle zone of 4,000 m²
BRM Developments Limited (S603)	S603.038	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	4ha is too small to be an economic farming unit, and too large for the lifestyle block market.	Reduce the minimum allotment size to 5,000m ² as is currently provided for in the Westland

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						District Plan as a discretionary activity,
Birchfield Ross Mining Limited (S604)	S604.048	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too small to be an economic farming unit, and too large for the lifestyle block market.	Reduce the minimum allotment size to 5,000m2 as is currently provided for in the Westland District Plan as a discretionary activity
Phoenix Minerals Limited (S606)	S606.039	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	Too small to be an economic farming unit, and too large for the lifestyle block market.	Reduce the minimum allotment size to 5,000m2
Whyte Gold Limited (S607)	S607.037	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Oppose	4ha is too small to be an economic farming unit, and too large for the lifestyle block market.	Reduce the minimum allotment size to 5,000m2 as is currently provided for in the Westland District Plan as a discretionary activity, or alternatively rezone 148 Kumara Junction Highway to Settlement Zone - Rural Residential Precinct to allow subdivision to 4,000m2.
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.006	Subdivision	SUB - S1	Amend	Does not provide for productive rural land holdings to be subdivided off from existing lawfully established dwellings	Add additional standard: General Rural Zone subdivision must comply with all of the following standards: i. General Rural Zone 4 hectares, except that it is 20 hectares in the Highly Productive Land Precinct; orii. The Record of Title to be subdivided must be at least 8 hectares in area; iii. The Record of Title(s) to be subdivided must have an issued date of no later than 31 December 1999; iv. The proposed subdivision must create no more than one additional Record of Title, excluding an access allotment; v. The additional lot must have a proposed area of between 5,000m2 and 1.6 hectares.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.445	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support	We support this standard.	Retain standard.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.065	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Oppose in part	Don't bring the building act into resource consents - the processes are separate for	Delete Clause 1 in relation to building platforms.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					a reason and developments will have to comply with these standards anyway	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.636	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support	Council supports Standard 1 and 2.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.261	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support		Retain
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.274	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Amend	It is not certain that the location of building platforms and access will remain outside of significant natural areas once subdivision is completed.	Add a requirement for an indicative building platform and access to be identified for any allotment with a Significant Natural Area, on subdivision applications and for this to be confirmed in a covenant on the title.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.416	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support		Delete "having regard to ground conditions, gradient, access, natural hazards, indigenous vegetation and habitat, amenity and health and safety" from the definition and make sure these matters are included in rules which make provision for building platforms. In SUB-S2 include that these matters must inform the indicative building platform location, such that effects, including for access are avoided or minimized to the greatest extent possible with respect to these matters.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.419	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Amend		Amend SUB-S2 1. ...having regard to ground conditions, gradient, access, natural hazards, indigenous vegetation and habitat, amenity and health and safety. Such that effects, including for access are avoided or minimized to the greatest extent possible with respect to these matters.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.261	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.328	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.261	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support		Retain
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.127	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Amend	Amend Rule SUB-S2 to ensure that building platforms are located outside any significant feature identified in the resource consent, and that they can comply with any applicable overlay area.	Amend: Each allotment must provide a stable, flood free building area suitable for building foundations in accordance with the requirements of the New Zealand Building Code - Acceptable Solution B1/AS4 Approved Document B1/4: Structure Foundations. On sites less than 4ha in size, an indicative building platform on each allotment must be identified in subdivision applications and: Must allow the buildings to comply with the standards for a permitted activity in the underlying zone and any applicable overlay area under this District Plan; and Must not include any area of land to be used for access or for the disposal of wastewater or stormwater; and Must be outside any significant natural, cultural or heritage feature identified in the resource consent; and Must be outside of any area identified in a Natural Hazard overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.106	Subdivision	SUB - S2	Support	Indicative building platforms be outside of any natural hazard overlays	No Change
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.446	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Support	We strongly support this standard on public health grounds, water supply is essential.	Retain standard.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.066	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Amend	Referencing other reports just makes it more difficult for laymen to understand the plan.	The proposal should state approximate sizes for self potable water based on the size of the dwelling
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.272	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Support in part	Council supports Standards 3 to 6 with exception of the use of the term "must be provided". The terms "must be provided with" and	Amend parts of the standards as follows: Sub - S3 1. Where a connection to a District Council or Community reticulated water supply system is

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>"must provide" has been used interchangeably in Standards 3 to 6. Council seeks to have only the term "must provide" used for these standards. Alternatively, to use the term "must be provided by the applicant".</p> <p>The term "must be provided" may imply that the onus to provide lies on council instead of the applicant.</p>	<p>available, all new allotments must be provided with <i>must provide</i> a connection at the boundary and net boundary where access is shared (including firefighting water supply). 2. Where a connection to a District Council or Community reticulated water supply system is unavailable, all new allotments must be provided with <i>must provide</i> access to a self-sufficient potable water supply (including firefighting water supply)</p>
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.262	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.262	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.329	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.019	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Support	Fire and Emergency support that the requirement for all allotments to have access to firefighting water where reticulated water supply is available and for the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.	No amendments sought.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.262	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.643	Subdivision	SUB - S3	Support	Support the provision of the standard for water supply for new allotments	Retain as proposed
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.447	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Support	We strongly support this standard on public health grounds; stormwater management is critical.	Retain standard.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.067	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Amend		Could just make the first note a land use condition for all new dwellings in urban zones that a water tank is provided.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.128	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Support	Waka Kotahi supports this subdivision standard as it requires all allotments to manage stormwater without reliance on state highway stormwater infrastructure.	Retain as proposed.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.273	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Support in part	<p>Council supports Standards 3 to 6 with exception of the use of the term "must be provided".</p> <p>The terms "must be provided with" and "must provide" has been used interchangeably in Standards 3 to 6. Council seeks to have only the term "must provide" used for these standards. Alternatively, to use the term "must be provided by the applicant".</p> <p>The term "must be provided" may imply that the onus to provide lies on council instead of the applicant.</p>	Amend parts of the standards as follows: SUB - S4 2. Where a connection to a District Council or Community stormwater management system is available, all new allotments must be provided with <i>must provide</i> a connection at the boundary or net boundary where access is shared.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.264	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered. Delete Advice Note 2.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.264	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered. Delete Advice Note 2.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.330	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered. Delete Advice Note 2.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.264	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered. Delete Advice Note 2.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.644	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Support	Support the provision of the standard for management of stormwater for new allotments	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.107	Subdivision	SUB - S4	Support	Where the means of stormwater disposal is to ground, that area shall not be subject to instability, slippage or inundation, or used for the disposal of wastewater.	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.448	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Support in part	We support this standard on public health grounds; waste water treatment and disposal is critical. Additionally, we recommend that where residential density exceeds 1.5 dwellings per hectare and the total population is greater than 1000 persons, community reticulated wastewater systems need to be an absolute requirement.	Amend SUB-S5 as follows: 5. For a subdivision where residential density exceeds 1.5 dwellings per hectare and the total population is greater than 1000 persons community reticulated wastewater systems are required.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.068	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Oppose in part	The standard mentions demonstrate sanitary disposal, this is typically a building act matter and would be useless to consider at the planning stage.	Remove reference to requirements around demonstrating sanitary disposal.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.276	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Support in part	Council supports Standard 5 in part. The phrase "all allotments must provide the means for disposal of wastewater from..." may be implied that the wastewater disposal system must be installed at the time of subdivision.	Amend as follows: 1. All allotments must provide a wastewater feasibility report that demonstrates the ability for a wastewater system to be installed on the allotment for all potential land uses that could be established on the respective allotments that does not involve a direct discharge to fresh or coastal water. Original: All allotments must provide the means for disposal of wastewater from all potential land uses that could be established on the respective allotments that does not involve a direct discharge to fresh or coastal water.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.265	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.265	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.331	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.265	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Amend	Should not be required to connect if a system is in place but cannot accommodate them.	Amend so that existing system capacity is considered.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.108	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Amend	Effluent disposal does not cause land instability issues	Amend to read: 1. All allotments must provide the means for disposal of wastewater from all potential land uses that could be established on the respective allotments that does not involve a direct discharge to fresh or coastal water or exacerbate/trigger land instability issues.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.189	Subdivision	SUB - S5	Support	The discharge of wastewater to water is cultural inappropriate.	Retain as notified
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.449	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Support in part	We strongly support this standard on public health grounds; transport and access is critical. We also recommend amending the standard to include provision for pedestrians, cycling, and, where possible, public transport. Ensuring provision for other forms of transport methods creates a more accessible space for residents. Additionally, providing pedestrian and cycling access creates more safe travel options for families and children around their community and also to other important community spaces such as the nearby park, the local school, or workplace.	Amend SUB-S6 as follows: 4. Provision for pedestrians and cyclists must be provided to allotments, and where possible links to public transport must be provided.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.072	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Support	KiwiRail supports the requirement to comply with the Transport Performance Standards, subject to the relief sought above.	Retain as proposed
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.129	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Support	Waka Kotahi supports that the standard includes appropriate provision for vehicular access that is in accordance with the	Retain as proposed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Transport Performance Standards and that all new roads and upgrades of existing roads shall be constructed in accordance with the appropriate standards identified.	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.275	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Support in part	<p>Council supports Standards 3 to 6 with exception of the use of the term "must be provided".</p> <p>The terms "must be provided with" and "must provide" has been used interchangeably in Standards 3 to 6. Council seeks to have only the term "must provide" used for these standards. Alternatively, to use the term "must be provided by the applicant".</p> <p>The term "must be provided" may imply that the onus to provide lies on council instead of the applicant.</p>	<p>Amend parts of the standards as follows: Amend parts of the standards as follows: SUB - S6</p> <p>1. All allotments must be provided with <i>must provide</i> vehicular access to a road by way of a vehicle access point, driveway or right of way in accordance with the Transport Performance Standards.</p>
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.122	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Amend	Need to provide for safe bicycle and pedestrian use	3 ...to provide for safe bicycle and pedestrian use
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.122	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Amend	Need to provide for safe bicycle and pedestrian use	3 ...to provide for safe bicycle and pedestrian use
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.266	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Amend	Note our concerns regarding the referenced Transport Performance Standards.	Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.266	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Amend	Note our concerns regarding the referenced Transport Performance Standards.	Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.332	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Amend	Note our concerns regarding the referenced Transport Performance Standards.	Retain
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (S573)	S573.020	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Support	Fire and Emergency support the requirement for all allotments to have legal and physical access to a road compliant with the relevant standards set out in the transport chapter.	No amendments sought.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Further, Fire and Emergency strongly support the use of New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509 in respect of compliance with the accessway dimension requirements.	
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.266	Subdivision	SUB - S6	Amend	Note our concerns regarding the referenced Transport Performance Standards.	Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.450	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support	We support this standard.	Retain standard.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.069	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support	Agree in full	Retain as notified.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.021	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Amend	We generally support the provision in Subdivision Standards SUB - S7 and SUB - S8 for off- grid electricity and telecommunications services, but suggest that these services should normally be reticulated in Residential zones.	Amend the standard to clarify that these services should normally be reticulated in Residential Area
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.274	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support in part	<p>Council supports Standards 3 to 6 with exception of the use of the term "must be provided".</p> <p>The terms "must be provided with" and "must provide" has been used interchangeably in Standards 3 to 6. Council seeks to have only the term "must provide" used for these standards. Alternatively, to use the term "must be provided by the applicant".</p> <p>The term "must be provided" may imply that the onus to provide lies on council instead of the applicant.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>SUB - S7 1. For all new allotments electricity services must be provided All new allotments must provide electricity services to the boundary of each new Lot or the applicant shall demonstrate that electricity services are able to be provided by alternative means. SUB - S8For all new allotments telecommunication services must be provided All new allotments must provide telecommunication services to the boundary of each new Lot or the applicant shall demonstrate that the telecommunication services are able to be provided by alternative means.</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.277	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support	Council supports Standards 7 and 8.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.267	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.267	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.333	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support		Retain
Greg Maitland (S571)	S571.006	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Amend	there should be no requirement for the land owner to supply power to the boundary.	Amend Rural Life style Zones and the General Rural Zone, to enable the supply of power to the boundary should be discretionary.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.267	Subdivision	SUB - S7	Support		Retain
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.451	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support	We support this standard.	Retain standard.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.070	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support	Agree in full.	Retain as notified.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.071	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Amend	The wording holds no legal weight.	Note 2 should be an advice note rather than a standard
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.022	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support	We generally support the provision in Subdivision Standards SUB - S7 and SUB - S8 for off- grid electricity and telecommunications services, but suggest that these services should normally be reticulated in Residential zones.	Amend the standard to clarify that these services should normally be reticulated in Residential Area
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.278	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support	Council supports Standards 7 and 8.	Retain as notified.
Spark NZ Trading Ltd, Vodafone NZ	S541.001	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Amend	We believe that there is the opportunity to amend SUB-S8 Telecommunications to be more specific about the type of	Amend as follows: SUB-S8 Telecommunications 1. Provision shall be made for telecommunications connections

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ltd, Chorus NZ Ltd (S541)					telecommunication network connectivity generally expected for subdivisions. Within urban and semi-urban i.e., rural residential/settlements fibre connectivity should be a realistic option due to the ultra-fibre broadband (UFB) initiatives delivered in partnership via Crown Infrastructure Partners and Chorus. In rural environments wireless/mobile connectivity is the norm as promoted via the Rural Broadband Initiative (RBI).	<p>to an open access fibre network to the boundary of each new lot for all new allotments in the following zones:a) all CMUZ - Commercial and Mixed Use Zonesb) all INZ - Industrial Zonesc) all RESZ - Residential Zonesd) RLZ - Rural Lifestyle Zonee) SETZ - Settlement Zonef) SVZ - Scenic Visitor Zone2. For all other zones the applicant shall provide written confirmation from a telecommunication network operator confirming that a telecommunications connection (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite) can be provided to all new allotments and describing how this can be achieved.</p> <p>3. At the time of subdivision, sufficient land for telecommunications, transformers and any associated ancillary services must be set aside. For a subdivision that creates more than 15 lots, consultation with telecommunications network utility operators will be required.</p> <p>4. All necessary easements for the protection of telecommunications network utility services must be duly granted and reserved.</p>
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.388	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Amend	Whilst the intended provision is supported there are concerns arising from the proposed wording in relation to provision of electricity by Westpower and existing subdivision regimes which have provided for these matters. Currently Westpower is contacted by those undertaking subdivisions to confirm the ability to supply services and resolve issues	<p>(1) Delete the second sentence of item 2.</p> <p>(2) Amend item 3., "3. All necessary easements for the protection of and access to existing and proposed energy network utility services and infrastructure must be granted and reserved."</p> <p>(3) Add a new item 4., "4. At the time of subdivision the applicant shall supply written confirmation from the energy network utility operator that electricity can be provided to the subdivision and that appropriate easements are proposed to ensure the ongoing ability to access,</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					relating to existing and proposed electricity services and infrastructure, including easements and access. This has been important in integrating electricity into subdivisions and ensuring problems do not arise both in terms of servicing and inadvertently preventing access to electricity infrastructure for current and future development. This has been a successful approach for many years and Westpower is concerned this may be lost given the wording particularly with regard to item "2" which advises that consultation "may" be required for subdivision of "more than 15 Lots". Westpower submits that an additional requirement should be inserted for all subdivision to ensure co-ordination of services as retain the status quo that has successfully existed and been implemented for many years.	operate, maintain and upgrade existing and proposed electricity infrastructure. At the time of completion of the subdivision certification shall be provided from the energy network utility operator that electricity is available at the boundary of each newly created survey plan."
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.268	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.268	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.334	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support		Retain
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.268	Subdivision	SUB - S8	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.452	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Support	We support this standard.	Retain standard.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.072	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Support	Agree in full.	Retain as notified.
Davis Ogilvie & Partners Ltd (S465)	S465.023	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	Subdivision Standard SUB - S9 is inconsistent with the requirements specified for Esplanade Reserves and Strips in s230 Resource Management Act 1991.	this standard should include the minimum area for "lake" as set out in s230; that is <i>"a lake whose bed has an area of 8 hectares or more"</i> .
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.279	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Support in part	Council supports Standard 9 in part. Council seeks consideration of a standard for requirement of Esplanade Reserves or Esplanade Strips for allotments bigger than 4ha. The RMA has set out a requirement of Esplanade Reserves or Esplanade Strips for the bank of a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or more. Standard 9 indicates that it is only necessary for rivers beds of 3m width. It is impracticable to measure exactly 3m and this may potentially create a loophole.	Amend as follows: c. The bank of a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or more where the river flows through or adjoins an allotment. (as per the RMA s230(4))
Buller Conservation Group (S552)	S552.123	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	The bank of a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or greater.	1.c. The bank of a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or greater .
Frida Inta (S553)	S553.123	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	The bank of a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or greater.	1.c. The bank of a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or greater .
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.269	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	the current wording of the operative Buller District Plan regarding this matter is superior.	Delete standard and amend to match rules 7.9.6.1.1-7.9.6.1.3 in the operative Buller District Plan related to Esplanade Strips and Esplanade Reserves (with numbering adjusted as necessary) i.e. Rules1. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area is

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						subdivided, other than as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be set aside in the new lot along the mark of Mean High Water Spring of the sea and along the bank of any river or margin of any lake.2. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land is subdivided, other than applies under 1. above, or as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be created from that allotment along the bank of any river or margin of any lake. This requirement for an esplanade strip does not apply where a legal road (formed or not) provides adequate access to the water body. This rule only applies to lakes and rivers as defined in section 230(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.3. An esplanade strip required under 1. or 2. above may on application be reduced in width or dispensed with altogether. In considering any such application the Council shall take into account the matters listed in xxx below.
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest & Bird) (S560)	S560.275	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	The esplanade strips need a clearer calculation. Width should be determined either over the length of the river adjacent to the subdivision and as relevant to the width of the river.	Amend: c. The bank of a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or more, for the river or when calculated for the length/distance of the bed adjoining the allotment(s) of the subdivision.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.269	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	the current wording of the operative Buller District Plan regarding this matter is superior.	Delete standard and amend to match rules 7.9.6.1.1-7.9.6.1.3 in the operative Buller District Plan related to Esplanade Strips and Esplanade Reserves (with numbering adjusted as necessary) i.e. Rules1. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area is subdivided, other than as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be set aside in the new lot along

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						the mark of Mean High Water Spring of the sea and along the bank of any river or margin of any lake.2. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land is subdivided, other than applies under 1. above, or as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be created from that allotment along the bank of any river or margin of any lake. This requirement for an esplanade strip does not apply where a legal road (formed or not) provides adequate access to the water body. This rule only applies to lakes and rivers as defined in section 230(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.3. An esplanade strip required under 1. or 2. above may on application be reduced in width or dispensed with altogether. In considering any such application the Council shall take into account the matters listed in xxx below.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.335	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	the current wording of the operative Buller District Plan regarding this matter is superior.	Delete standard and amend to match rules 7.9.6.1.1-7.9.6.1.3 in the operative Buller District Plan related to Esplanade Strips and Esplanade Reserves (with numbering adjusted as necessary) i.e. Rules1. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area is subdivided, other than as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be set aside in the new lot along the mark of Mean High Water Spring of the sea and along the bank of any river or margin of any lake.2. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land is subdivided, other than applies under 1. above, or as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be created from that allotment along the bank of any river or margin of any lake. This

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						requirement for an esplanade strip does not apply where a legal road (formed or not) provides adequate access to the water body. This rule only applies to lakes and rivers as defined in section 230(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.3. An esplanade strip required under 1. or 2. above may on application be reduced in width or dispensed with altogether. In considering any such application the Council shall take into account the matters listed in xxx below.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.269	Subdivision	SUB - S9	Amend	the current wording of the operative Buller District Plan regarding this matter is superior.	Delete standard and amend to match rules 7.9.6.1.1-7.9.6.1.3 in the operative Buller District Plan related to Esplanade Strips and Esplanade Reserves (with numbering adjusted as necessary) i.e. Rules1. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land adjoining the Coastal Marine Area is subdivided, other than as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be set aside in the new lot along the mark of Mean High Water Spring of the sea and along the bank of any river or margin of any lake.2. Where any allotment of 4ha or more is created when land is subdivided, other than applies under 1. above, or as a result of a boundary adjustment, an esplanade strip of 20m shall be created from that allotment along the bank of any river or margin of any lake. This requirement for an esplanade strip does not apply where a legal road (formed or not) provides adequate access to the water body. This rule only applies to lakes and rivers as defined in section 230(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.3. An esplanade strip required under 1. or 2. above may on application be reduced in width or dispensed with altogether. In considering

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						any such application the Council shall take into account the matters listed in xxx below.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.453	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Support	We support this standard.	Retain standard.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.073	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Support	Agree in full.	Retain as notified.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.280	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Support	Council supports Standard 10 and 11.	Retain as notified.
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.391	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Amend	To ensure clarity of outcomes sought with respect to network utilities and infrastructure,	Amend 1.a. Public works and network utility services and infrastructure (including energy activities) ;
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.392	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Amend	To ensure clarity of outcomes sought with respect to network utilities and infrastructure,	2.ii. Stormwater ..., water supply, network utilities and infrastructure (including energy activities) ;
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.393	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Amend	To ensure clarity of outcomes sought with respect to network utilities and infrastructure.	Amend 2.iv. Other network utilities and critical infrastructure .
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.270	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Amend	Provision for centre line easements should be deleted.	Delete references to centre line easements.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.270	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Amend	Provision for centre line easements should be deleted.	Delete references to centre line easements.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.336	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Amend	Provision for centre line easements should be deleted.	Delete references to centre line easements.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.270	Subdivision	SUB - S10	Amend	Provision for centre line easements should be deleted.	Delete references to centre line easements.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.454	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Support	We support this standard.	Retain standard.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.074	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Not Stated	What is the purpose of a point strip?	Clarify what a point strip is.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.130	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the provision for point strips as a practical tool to ensure safe access points are obtained.	Retain as proposed.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.281	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Support	Council supports Standard 10 and 11.	Retain as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.271	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Amend	This standard is unclear.	Amend the standard to provide more clarity and certainty.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.271	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Amend	This standard is unclear.	Amend the standard to provide more clarity and certainty.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.337	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Amend	This standard is unclear.	Amend the standard to provide more clarity and certainty.
Laura Coll McLaughlin (S574)	S574.271	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Amend	This standard is unclear.	Amend the standard to provide more clarity and certainty.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Runanga o Ngati Waewae, Te Runanga o Makaawhio (S620)	S620.190	Subdivision	SUB - S11	Amend	Minor correction - references her Majesty the Queen - needs to say His Majesty the King	Amend to reference His Majesty the King
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.400	Subdivision	Overview	Support	Te Mana Ora supports well designed and planned subdivisions and associated infrastructure, reserves and community facilities to ensure good public health, safety, wellbeing and community resilience. Well-designed public places and spaces encourage use by local residents and visitors, and increases social and emotional wellbeing. Coordination and integration of infrastructure, reserves and community facilities is critical across natural, built, social and economic environments for good public health outcomes.	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.119	Subdivision	Overview	Amend	Amend paragraph 3 of the overview to recognise that not all features subject to additional provisions in the Plan are identified in the Plan. These include habitats of significant flora and fauna which may not be mapped, or sites of cultural significance which may not be mapped.	Amend paragraph 3: ...Subdivision of land that contains an identified or significant feature, site or area of natural, cultural, historical or ecological significance, or where there are significant natural hazards will be subject to additional provisions - and assessment against the objectives and policies in the relevant Overlay chapter concerning the feature, site or area. Subdivision applications involving identified features, sites or areas may need to be accompanied by expert reports to assess the effect of the subdivision on the identified feature, site or area....
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.099	Subdivision	Restricted Discretionary Activities	Amend	The inclusion of Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints as matters of control	Amend to include of Natural hazards or geotechnical constraints as matters of discretion