



## Submitter Names: J - K

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

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.001	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	NCA54	Amend	<p>We question the proposal that our land meets the definition under Schedule 7 of NCA54 (Granity, Ratcliffe Ridge) as being of a High Coastal Natural Character. Historically all of our land and that of our neighbours has been highly modified and the vegetation is not indigenous or endemic. It has been logged, burnt, fenced and farmed. We sit on the same ridge as our neighbours however we have chosen to voluntarily retire some of our land from farming and to instead encourage regeneration of vegetation. Whilst this has made the property more attractive from our perspective, it should not mean the analysis of our land is any different to that of our neighbours. To us it is clear that the north/west boundary for NCA54 is incorrect. It should be moved further east to encompass the actual "ridge" that not only fits the description of NCA54, but which is undoubtedly an area with higher conservation values than ours. The white line below is where we think the NCA54 boundary north of the Millerton Track should be. If we had sprayed to remove gorse on our land (rather than encourage natural vegetation to deal with it), it would look very similar to that of our</p>	Amend the plan to reflect an objective analysis and review of the NCA54 overlay.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					northern neighbour in the aerial picture below.	
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>This overlay by definition in the proposal, applies to areas where there is a risk from slope instability, landslide, debris flow and rockfall. In our view, this clearly correlates to a very recent BDC risk analysis and report on the area by Kevin England and we support the intent of that report - in particular the drainage basin classifications identified in table 4 of the report (Appendix A - pages 26 and 27). We would note that the proposed TTPP Land Instability overlay over Granity, Ngakawau &amp; Hector has not "rolled over from the existing BDC plan" - an incorrect and misleading statement in the information sheets provided with the proposed plan. It has not been part of our world until now. We quote from, and concur, with Kevin England's report on this subject:</p> <p>"The Coastal strip north of Hector (between Hector and Miko) has been subject to numerous landslides in the past and is a known land instability area. However, this has been addressed in the recent Te Tai o Poutini Plan Coastal and Land Instability Hazards Draft Document as well as being recognised in the Buller District Plan since 2000, when that area was designated as a "rockfall and rapid debris flow hazard zone".</p> <p>Thus debris hazard zones on titles have always been known to be a part of the land north of Hector but this new overlay is news to us. It feels like our communities are being "picked on".</p> <p>Where is land instability overlay on the</p>	We submit that this overlay is incorrectly positioned and should be based on the current known land instability area north of Hector as per the current Buller District Plan. If the overlay is to be extended, then a more objective, reasoned analysis should be done on the area to ensure it identifies more closely with known areas of risk rather than what appears to be an arbitrary analysis based on very recent occurrences related to rainfall.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>edge of the Buller River in Westport?, where is a land instability overlay at Cape Foulwind? (essentially a built environment on the edge of an unstable cliff at risk of Tsunami and coastal processes), and where is the land instability overlay on the Coast Road (Maps 26 &amp; 30)? which have more extensive escarpments than we do, and regularly reported rockfall on to the state highway and surrounds. To blanket the entire three communities of Hector, Ngakawau and Granity (and out to sea) with this NH overlay seems unreasonable. By comparison at Punakaiki, more care seems to have been taken to accurately identify known areas of risk (Map 155) as confirmed in the fact sheet for the area where it is stated that the overlay covers much of the residential part of Punakaiki Village with rockfall the major hazard. Where in the townships of Hector and Ngakawau has the risk of rockfall ever been an issue?</p> <p>Known areas of slippage due to flooded bush creeks in Granity are apparent but inherent land instability in much of the area is not. TTPP planners should be actively working with BDC to utilise the information provided by Kevin England, disseminated and discussed at local consultation meetings, in order to ensure that landowners are not unjustifiably affected by unreasonable blanket overlays</p>	
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.003	Rural Zones	Rural Zones	Support	Under the current BDC District Plan we are simply zoned Rural. We agree with the TTPP proposal to allow for three zones underneath the Rural Zone (GRUZ, RLZ and SETZ). These seem more in line with modern rural lifestyle activities whilst	We agree with the TTPP proposal to allow for three zones underneath the Rural Zone (GRUZ, RLZ and SETZ).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					protecting highly productive rural land, and taking in to account potential expansion.	
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.004	Rural Zones	Overview	Support	We agree with the statement that places like Granity are now becoming more like commuter towns rather than residential and service towns for the coalfields which were once prevalent in our area. 50 years ago most, if not all, of our local working population would have been working "up the hill".	None stated
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.005	Noise	NOISE - R3	Oppose	<p>We believe this rule is unworkable and unnecessarily costly for new builds in an area where geography and complex topography means that both the State Highway and Rail Corridors have no option but to locate close to and run through, rural and coastal residential areas.</p> <p>Consequently, a large number of residential sections would lie within 80/40m of the existing SHW carriageway and 40m of existing rail tracks. Our communities are fully aware of this fact and thus aware of the underlying noise and vibration that these existing activities create. Where are the baseline measurements and why should new builds be lumbered with the expense of those?</p> <p>Network providers of road and rail are only too happy and financially capable of engaging a project team, providing extensive assessment matrixes and benefit/cost ratios supported by acoustic specialist advice in support of their projects and even hold "noise mitigation" workshops with affected residents where necessary, attended by a swathe of consultants and project staff. However, in this situation, we're talking about individuals and families who in most instances, do not have the</p>	As there are no relevant NZ standards setting out recommended vibration limits and assessment methodologies, we submit that no vibration standard be employed for stand-alone singlestorey residential dwellings.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>financial resources to engage an acoustic or vibration engineer to simply build a single residential dwelling next to an existing rail or road corridor.</p> <p>Recent professional acoustic engineering advice at The Lyric Theatre in Granity cost \$3000. The Tasman Sea creates more noise than the road or railway networks here, and it is a constant.</p> <p>The NZTA's own guide to assessing road-traffic noise references their "go to" standard NZS 6806, which is used in applications for proposed new or altered roads. It states that the agency considers NZS 6806 "a robust tool to help determine appropriate mitigation of the noise effects of new and altered roads" but the standard is widely quoted in documents the agency appears to now be routinely sending to district and regional council planners where plan reviews are underway.</p> <p>From 1 May 2023 new building work in homes must meet new wall, floor and roof insulation performance requirements. These by default will mitigate noise in new buildings with increased glazing standards and extra insulation requirements in floors and ceilings. Homes will be required to reach a minimum R value of 0.37 for all windows and doors from November 2022 and increase this to R0.46 in our part of the country by May 2023. We believe that new dwellings will thus have a higher reduction by default, so why the need to add more complexity in the district plan.</p> <p>The effects of noise and vibration from any new proposals for road or rail expansion can very adequately be managed through the RMA consent process for reverse</p>	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>sensitivity issues and thus the inclusion of the words "or expansion" in the overview for this section of the TTPP is unnecessary.</p> <p>There are no acoustic engineering firms on the coast that we are aware of, although we are confident anyone in those industries would need multiple offices coastwide if this rule is held.</p> <p>In addition, the noise level rules proposed must also be achieved at the same time as adequate ventilation, which will usually require windows to be partially open. Thus, new builds would be subjected to compliance with ventilation requirements of G4 of the Building Code at the same time as having to meet internal noise criteria. The vibration performance standards proposed are not quantifiable and therefore unworkable.</p> <p>Our concern is that it is a difficult and complex task to predict ground-borne vibration, because it is highly dependent on both the rail and the surrounding ground conditions. As a result, it is normally necessary to undertake measurements of actual vibration at a site as part of any assessment and in our view, the cost of this is not warranted. There are many existing dwellings throughout New Zealand that are within about 12 metres of a rail line, and whilst noise and vibration may exceed accepted guidelines at these locations, we believe that rail vibration is widely tolerated in detached single storey residential dwellings.</p> <p>Vibration from existing road and railway corridors are generally considered acceptable as they are within recognised</p>	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>guidelines for human comfort applied internationally. At a proposed vibration level of 0.3mm/s (which appears to have come from a British standard concerned with construction related vibrations), that has clearly been recognised in the proposed TTPP. In the standard (BS 5228-2:2009 Annex B) a level of 0.3mm/s is defined as vibration that might be "just perceptible" in a residential environment. But again, there is no baseline information available in our district, and the proposed TTPP is making it the responsibility of the homeowner to determine this through qualified engineers, potentially adding thousands of dollars to the cost of a new build.</p>	
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.006	Noise	NOISE - R3	Oppose	<p>We believe this rule is unworkable and unnecessarily costly for new builds in an area where geography and complex topography means that both the State Highway and Rail Corridors have no option but to locate close to and run through, rural and coastal residential areas. Consequently, a large number of residential sections would lie within 80/40m of the existing SHW carriageway and 40m of existing rail tracks. Our communities are fully aware of this fact and thus aware of the underlying noise and vibration that these existing activities create. Where are the baseline measurements and why should new builds be lumbered with the expense of those? Network providers of road and rail are only too happy and financially capable of engaging a project team, providing extensive assessment matrixes and</p>	<p>We further submit that the proposed Noise R3 rules for new builds only be held if baseline information specific to each area is made freely available to consent seekers and it is provided to them by the noise generating activities as outlined in the overview for this section of the plan. These should include: • quantifying the current vibration magnitudes induced by traffic or trains operating on existing SHW network and rail corridors throughout the district; and • establishing how quickly the traffic or train induced vibrations decay with distance for the local soil types; and • derive site-specific soil attenuation coefficients for use in estimating the magnitude of ground vibrations resulting from the noise generating activity.</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>benefit/cost ratios supported by acoustic specialist advice in support of their projects and even hold "noise mitigation" workshops with affected residents where necessary, attended by a swathe of consultants and project staff. However, in this situation, we're talking about individuals and families who in most instances, do not have the financial resources to engage an acoustic or vibration engineer to simply build a single residential dwelling next to an existing rail or road corridor.</p> <p>Recent professional acoustic engineering advice at The Lyric Theatre in Granity cost \$3000. The Tasman Sea creates more noise than the road or railway networks here, and it is a constant.</p> <p>The NZTA's own guide to assessing road-traffic noise references their "go to" standard NZS 6806, which is used in applications for proposed new or altered roads. It states that the agency considers NZS 6806 "a robust tool to help determine appropriate mitigation of the noise effects of new and altered roads" but the standard is widely quoted in documents the agency appears to now be routinely sending to district and regional council planners where plan reviews are underway.</p> <p>From 1 May 2023 new building work in homes must meet new wall, floor and roof insulation performance requirements. These by default will mitigate noise in new buildings with increased glazing standards and extra insulation requirements in floors and ceilings. Homes will be required to reach a minimum R value of 0.37 for all windows and doors from November 2022 and increase this to R0.46 in our part of the</p>	



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>country by May 2023. We believe that new dwellings will thus have a higher reduction by default, so why the need to add more complexity in the district plan.</p> <p>The effects of noise and vibration from any new proposals for road or rail expansion can very adequately be managed through the RMA consent process for reverse sensitivity issues and thus the inclusion of the words "or expansion" in the overview for this section of the TTPP is unnecessary.</p> <p>There are no acoustic engineering firms on the coast that we are aware of, although we are confident anyone in those industries would need multiple offices coastwide if this rule is held.</p> <p>In addition, the noise level rules proposed must also be achieved at the same time as adequate ventilation, which will usually require windows to be partially open. Thus, new builds would be subjected to compliance with ventilation requirements of G4 of the Building Code at the same time as having to meet internal noise criteria. The vibration performance standards proposed are not quantifiable and therefore unworkable.</p> <p>Our concern is that it is a difficult and complex task to predict ground-borne vibration, because it is highly dependent on both the rail and the surrounding ground conditions. As a result, it is normally necessary to undertake measurements of actual vibration at a site as part of any assessment and in our view, the cost of this is not warranted. There are many existing dwellings throughout New Zealand that are within about 12 metres of a rail</p>	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>line, and whilst noise and vibration may exceed accepted guidelines at these locations, we believe that rail vibration is widely tolerated in detached single storey residential dwellings.</p> <p>Vibration from existing road and railway corridors are generally considered acceptable as they are within recognised guidelines for human comfort applied internationally. At a proposed vibration level of 0.3mm/s (which appears to have come from a British standard concerned with construction related vibrations), that has clearly been recognised in the proposed TTPP. In the standard (BS 5228-2:2009 Annex B) a level of 0.3mm/s is defined as vibration that might be "just perceptible" in a residential environment. But again, there is no baseline information available in our district, and the proposed TTPP is making it the responsibility of the homeowner to determine this through qualified engineers, potentially adding thousands of dollars to the cost of a new build.</p>	
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.007	Noise	NOISE - R3	Oppose	<p>The dBL and setback rules under this section of the plan appear to be pandering to Waka Kotahi and KiwiRail, based on unfounded fears of reverse sensitivity issues in relation to our existing rail and road corridors.</p> <p>A 2021 "Assessment of Plan Provisions to Provide for Human Health and Amenity in accordance with Section 32 of the RMA" was provided by NZTA senior planner Natasha Reid to the Central Hawkes Bay District Council in March 2022. The executive summary of that report states</p>	<p>If NZTA and KiwiRail would not jointly support the provision of freely available and area specific data associated with noise and vibration, we submit in favour of a "no complaints" covenant approach to residential or rurally zoned new build activity within the setback limits provided to address perceived issues of reverse sensitivity. Even though Waka Kotahi don't support that approach (refer page 31 of their assessment attached), it is nonetheless a mitigation option that resolves the issues outlined in</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>that "Waka Kotahi seeks a gradual reduction in health and amenity effects implemented as new activities are established or existing activities are altered in close proximity to the operational state highway network". It also states that there are "various regulatory methods (within and outside of the RMA) to achieve this outcome. A district plan based method has been assessed as the most implementable method in the current environment".</p> <p>On viewing the document (Appendix B - attached) we cannot help but suspect this report has formed the basis for the rules being imposed on us in relation to noise and vibration for new builds. It rather helpfully provides its own version of potential objectives, provisions and rules for council planning purposes and it appears the majority of these have simply been accepted and put into the proposal plan verbatim.</p> <p>Most of us don't have the time or resources to put together a report like the one produced by Waka Kotahi, but that doesn't mean that because those agencies do, we should simply accept their views.</p> <p>The assessment also suggests, through an appendix report provided by an acoustic engineering firm, that the cost of building a detached residential home with the dBL rules in place, would be minimal at 0-2% of the overall cost of building. However, the engineers note that "the increase in costs is very dependent on the external noise level" which in turn supports our view that existing external noise levels from the</p>	<p>oursubmission. We have enclosed a document related to covenants of this nature as produced by the Quality Planning Resource (<a href="http://qualityplanning.org.nz">qualityplanning.org.nz</a>).</p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					noise generating activities need to be provided by those activities - not the homeowners. By enabling this one request, potential homeowners might find they don't even need upgrades for their builds if external noise levels are very low.	
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.008	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	<p>Our reasonings for this are as follows and have taken into account the principles for rezoning as outlined in the TTPP provided information sheet on this topic.</p> <p>Both our land and that of our northern neighbours (Robert &amp; Lorraine Tyler) is marginal for pastoral activity. Grazing of a small number of dry stock is the only activity undertaken other than typical lifestyle block activities such as the keeping of chooks for domestic purposes.</p> <p>Pukeko and weka are abundant. Grazing can really only be done for 6 months of the year (at best) due to poor soil conditions and limited land availability. We now only graze the rurally zoned railway reserve bordering our property and this is leased from KiwiRail. The Tyler's land and ability to graze is similar, although they allows stock to graze a larger area including the railway reserve. Again, their stock numbers are limited due to the poor quality of the land, which is unable to support anything more intensive than grazing.</p> <p>Both our land and that of our northern neighbours, encompasses a terrace which sits approx. 50m above the railway corridor, extends northwards and which is not a feature of the almost vertical escarpment topography south of our location.</p> <p>We have recently located a small 2 bedroom home (built and transported here</p>	We seek rezoning of our land and that of our northern neighbours as RLZ.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>from Westport) on the lower part of our southern parcel of land (4.5ha) for an elderly family member.</p> <p>We did this in the knowledge that under the current district plan's Rural Zone we would have been permitted to have two dwellings per site which, whilst preventing the conglomeration of housing on single lots, allowed for those that have workers or relatives on the same site.</p> <p>We have a consented barn situated on the terrace described above, and have been preparing an adjacent site for a new home including a geotechnical report on the proposed house site.</p> <p>By nature, the site is elevated, with expansive views and has good access. We just haven't had the resources to apply for consent to build the house yet. The permitted residential density rules proposed for GRUZ due to the size of the property (albeit discretionary) under the proposed TTPP will not allow us to build a house on that site but the RLZ would, whilst still allowing for primary production (in our case grazing) to occur as per the proposed RLZ description. The same applies to our northern block of 7.2ha which is the location of our current residence, and although we have a positive geotechnical assessment for a second residential unit on that site, we have no existing plans to build there. There are surrounding areas of GRUZ land neighbouring us to the east however these are known to support resource extraction and thus conduct authorised activities</p>	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>under a prospecting or exploration permit. Reverse sensitivity issues are well managed by the provisions within the RLZ through density and building setbacks. There are no reticulated services available on our properties and they are both self-contained for water supply, wastewater and stormwater. The minimum 1ha residential unit density proposed for the RLZ would enable this to continue as this size density would support independent septic and rainwater tanks. There would be no requirement for any large scale infrastructure extensions by BDC. We consider that rezoning our land and that of our northern neighbours would have no impact on its current natural character attributes. In reference to natural character, please refer to our submission regarding NCA54 (item 1 above). We also consider that rezoning our land and that of our northern neighbours would not result in the exacerbation of significant natural hazards or increase these risks to the community. In the risk assessment done by Kevin England our properties are rated as medium risk as related to land within 10m of a watercourse. The remaining land is low risk. We refer to our submission above regarding the Land Instability overlay (item 2 above) and the attached Kevin England risk analysis.</p>	
Jackie and Bart Mathers and Gillman (S228)	S228.009	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	As per NH P2 and P5, we would consider the natural hazard risks associated with the railway corridor to be much less than the existing location of the seaward properties in Granity's settlement zone which are	Although we have no specific view on this, we think consideration should be given to rezoning the Rail corridor (currently proposed to zone GRUZ) through our area to RLZ on the basis that this land could

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					subject to the Coastal Severe overlay. This may affect objective RURZ-02 in terms of rural character and amenity but with little choice in local alternatives for coastal retreat, it should perhaps be considered to support settlement viability, particularly when as described above, the surrounding land is not highly productive. The setbacks as proposed for internal boundaries would be problematic due to the narrow corridor of land involved and internal boundary setbacks of 1.5m as per the current district plan for side and rear yards would be more appropriate if possible. A service lane(s) off the State Highway might be a possible solution to the future needs of this area in order to relieve the SHW network setback restrictions along with expansion of the proposed RLZ -R3 item 3 in restricting the size of minor residential units that share a driveway.	well provide a suitable zone for coastal retreat once the corridor is no longer required for rail purposes related to the coal industry.
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.001	Natural Hazards	NH - O3	Oppose in part	Regarding NH-03, it appears the approach taken by the council is to take the current status quo and define rules for any future changes. I am opposed to this approach, as it would leave the community still vulnerable to currently existing risks. an example, it is understood the fuel station in Franz Josef is located very close to the alpine fault. In case of a seismic event, this is likely to result in direct and indirect health effects, cause material and environmental damage, obstruct rescue operations (leakage and hazardous vapours), as well as cause a loss of resilience when compared to a fuel storage located away from a major fault.	Require the removal of existing hazardous activities from locations of high risk - for example the fuel station in Franz Josef that is located on the Alpine Fault.
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.002	Natural Hazards	NHP6	Amend	Under NH-P6 it is noted explained various types of activities should be avoided within	Amend so that existing activities within natural hazard areas that pose a high risk

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					certain distances from the Faultline, however this does not specifically state that existing activities with high risk (such as a fuel station) should be removed to outside the Faultline zone. Relocation of this fuel facility (and any similar other high-risk items) would be highly recommended and should in my view be included as a policy objective under the umbrella of resilience to natural hazards. A situation where in this example a fuel station / hazardous storage facility has been allowed in the past, likely based on an incomplete understanding of earthquake risks, should not be a reason for the regional council to allow this dangerous situation to continue.	are relocated away from such risks
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.003	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Oppose	Regarding the section ECO - P1, WCRC's position and timeline leaves the WCRC ratepayers exposed to the cost of any legal arguments between central government and WCRC about its interpretation of the RMA requirements. In my opinion any money should be spent on identification of significant natural areas (SNAs), and where relevant compensation to landowners, rather than be spent on the pursuit by WCRC of a very unlikely exemption from nation-wide RMA requirements. Furthermore, the 'general vegetation clearance rules' referred to on p.172 will provide a lower degree of environmental protection to areas with high ecological values than when being assessed as SNA. Simply speaking: a lot of valuable nature could be damaged or destroyed without requiring the trigger of a resource consent, therefore the proposed TTPP approach of delaying action until a resource consent is	Identify and protect areas with high ecological values as SNA



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					required does not take a cautious approach when protecting nature.	
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.004	Noise	NOISE - R3	Oppose	<p>the proposal will require new residential construction location, design and its surroundings to be assessed by an acoustic engineer. If the initial house design fails this test, it should be redesigned and re-assessed leading to further costs. The WCRC proposal does not contain any guidance if and how a typical NZ-style house could meet the acoustic requirements.</p> <p>I believe this lack of guidance by WCRC would leave potential house owners and their builders rather frustrated. As it seems to be driven to avoid reverse sensitivity aspects on roading, would it not just be easier to drop a speed limit in areas where new housing is built adjacent to roads (as this means more vehicle traffic joining those main roads, but also more cyclists, pedestrians and pets?</p> <p>The section Noise-R4 also includes requirements on ventilation and temperature control, which are inappropriate, restrictive and expensive..</p>	Delete the proposed rules to limit exposure of residential housing occupants to transport noise.
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.005	Buller Coalfield Zone	BCZ - O2	Oppose in part	<p>The objective does not take into account the effects of CO2 accumulation in the atmosphere, widely known as climate change. The continued normalisation of coal extraction, though historically and currently economically important in this region, should in my view not be carried on indefinitely in to the future by anchoring the extraction of coal into the TTPP. To truly minimise adverse effects on the environment, coal should be left in the ground and not extracted and transported to be burnt elsewhere.</p>	Include time limits for coal mining exploration (to end by 2025) and for coal excavation (to end by 2030). For both a clause could be included to delay those dates if alternative steel production methodologies have not yet matured in first-world economies.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					The consenting of any further coal extraction activities in the Buller Coalfield Zone should be assessed against the developments of non-coal-based technology. Once such technology has sufficiently matured, no further exploration and extraction of coal should be permitted and the priority should be to prevent unnecessary carbon emissions by leaving coal in the ground.	
Jacobus Wiskerke (S95)	S95.006	Buller Coalfield Zone	BCZ - P2	Oppose	This proposed policy aims to facilitate future access to mineral deposits in the Buller Coalfield Zone, but in doing so it sets unspecified demands to future activities or developments. The policy does not state to which locations it refers, what would be considered as 'compromised access' and which time limit would apply. In my opinion it would be reasonable to expect of a regional plan that it	Adjust clause so it clearly defines the location, duration and quality of access sought, allowing other activities and developments to occur without risk of being struck out by the currently proposed wording of policy BCZ-P2. With respect to duration, I would propose a reasonable limit be used (say: until 31-12-2030) which could be reassessed with each future update of the TTPP.
James Bradley (S428)	S428.002	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 122	Oppose	never found any evidence of maori activity	delete
James Bradley (S428)	S428.003	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 122	Oppose	We can't look up the information and no consultation has occurred	Alternative relief require consultation and written assurance that rules won't limit property use
James Bradley (S428)	S428.004	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 122	Oppose	We don't feel that the consultation process has really been a fair.	Iwi representative should have gone to all property they are marking significant for Maori and explain why they are marking it significant and the expectations of the landowners also to show landowners evidence of what they are claiming.
James Bradley (S428)	S428.005	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF	SASM 122	Oppose	We want to know what they are claiming	We would like written assurance that future changes or rulings will not happen

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI				without landowners consultation.
James Hamilton (S4)	S4.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend		Request for rezoning from General Rural Zone to FUZ or Rural Residential. Land situated along Cape Foulwind Road near Buller Bridge. (see map).
Jan and Heward (S353)	S353.001	General Residential Zone	General Residential Zone Rules	Oppose in part	The hosted and non-hosted B and B section of tourist accommodation is as important to the growth of tourism as the motor camps, backpackers, motels or hotels. To remove any of these groups of accommodation out of the region will also remove most of the people that use them, Also removing their spending power. Many of the current B and B's do not meet the long term rental legal standards and are unlikely ever to be brought up to these standards. Other units are let for short periods when the owners do not use them for their own purposes. These also would not become available for long term rental.	Allow for Air BnB and short term rentals in Westport.
Jan and Heward (S353)	S353.002	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Amend	If this rule was in place prior to Mitre 10 being here, would the colour of their building be allowed under this plan? If a Bunnings now wanted to come to the Coast, would they be allowed under this plan? Would Mitre10 have reason to object and hold up or stop the development altogether due to the colour of their building. I can see where you are coming from to control some colours. The new Westland High School Hall and office with its black, bright green and blue cladding is a shocker, However, this is just my opinion. Nobody should be told that they need	To limit the colour range of buildings should be removed altogether.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					permission to use a certain colour regardless of how it may look to others.	
Jan and Heward (S353)	S353.003	Noise	Permitted Activities	Oppose	<p>Issue three "Noise levels"</p> <p>The world health has stated that the maximum noise level one should be exposed to without causing health issues is 45 DBA</p> <p>No new areas should be set up where the noise exceeds this level.</p> <p>In today's age with shift work and weekend work the noise level should not exceed 45 DBA from one zone to another at any time where houses are, and people may be sleeping. Provision should be allowed for normal household activities like mowing, use of chainsaw for firewood, use of motorbike etc. The use of these items should be limited to exclude evenings night and early morning.</p> <p>On the West Coast I do not believe that it is necessary to have a heavy noise zone next to residential housing. If there was ever a need for basic human rights to be protected in a plan surely noise would be the one.</p>	The noise level of 45 DBA should not be exceeded at anytime against any residential property
Jane Neale (S262)	S262.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Amend	The mapping of the Coastal Environment is inconsistent. It varies from a very narrow strip to a wide one, including some important coastal areas, and excluding others. For example, at Okarito part of the "coastal environment" goes a long way inland in places (True forest), and yet excludes the actual lagoon?	Amend the Coastal Environment Overlay in the plan so that it is in agreement with the NZ Coastal Policy statement Policy 1, and reflect this in the maps.
Jane Neale (S262)	S262.002	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Zone	Amend	Any mineral prospecting, exploration and extraction should be subject to a resource consent. These activities can have	Do not prioritise mineral extraction over other uses. Recognise that coal mining is a sunset industry and should not be given

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					damaging effects on the land and neighbours and so should be subject to rules and regulations at the specific case level. The zoning of large areas as Mineral Extraction Zone will be detrimental to those people who already own land in those areas. Land values will fall if a mine can be established in the neighbourhood. Mineral extraction should not be favoured over other types of use and development of the land. The non-mining residents should have as many rights as the miners.	preference over other land uses, including protection and conservation of the land.
Jane Neale (S262)	S262.003	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Amend	Where does the plan ensure more carbon zero focussed business and building on the Coast? No recognition of the carbon sink potential of indigenous forestry and blue carbon sinks such as wetlands. There should be measures to encourage and support emissions reduction and decarbonisation. There seems to be no attempt to plan for managed retreat. We have to start planning for the long term future!	Be more proactive in encouraging managed retreat.
Jane Neale (S262)	S262.004	Natural Open Space Zone	Natural Open Space Zone	Amend	Public Conservation Land (PCL) should be identified as natural open space, not just as open space.	Identify public conservation land in the maps, and ensure it all falls under the Natural Open Space Zone.
Jane Neale (S262)	S262.005	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Amend	In September 2018, the Local Government Commission in its report 'Final Proposal for combined West Coast District Plan' stated that it was intended to promote "the purpose of local government and facilitate improved economic performance on the West Coast."	Amend plan to ensure these promises are included. Particularly relating to Climate change and environmental protection.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>It states the plan will bring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> efficiencies .....</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> effectiveness .....</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> present and anticipated future circumstances relating to resource management</li> </ul> <p>issues needing to be addressed, including growing awareness and understanding of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o appropriate responses to matters such as climate change and natural hazards</li> <li>o matters relating to issues of significance to iwi/Māori</li> <li>o public expectations relating to resource management and environmental protection generally.</li> </ul>	
Jane Neale (S262)	S262.006	ZONES	ZONES	Amend	I haven't seen any mention of disability awareness, needs, access. Is it included?	Include disability access in all areas
Jane Neale (S262)	S262.007	Planning Maps and Overlays	Planning Maps and Overlays	Amend	Some zone boundaries follow ownership lines, some follow geographical lines, others are hard to tell why they were put where they were.	Ensure boundaries for zones are accurate and justifiable.
Jane Nolan (S397)	S397.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose	<p>I vehemently object to any mining on the Barrytown flats. I am concerned about the impact on hydrology of the area and the effects of sea level rise.</p> <p>This all makes the Barrytown flats increasingly fragile and open cast mining here increases the risk of coastal erosion, inundation and salination that will destroy this land and precious wetlands, our home.</p>	Rezone the Barrytown Mineral Extraction Zone as General Rural.
Jane Nolan (S397)	S397.002	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Oppose	<p>I vehemently object to any mining on the Barrytown flats. I am concerned about the impact of sea level rise on coastal erosion and hydrology,</p> <p>This all makes the Barrytown flats increasingly fragile and open cast mining here increases the risk of coastal erosion, inundation and salination that will destroy</p>	Remove this rule. Have no mining on the Barrytown flats in any zone.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					this land and precious wetlands, our home.	
Jane Nolan (S397)	S397.003	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R18	Oppose	I vehemently object to any mining on the Barrytown flats. I am concerned about the impact of sea level rise combined with mining activity. This all makes the Barrytown flats increasingly fragile and open cast mining here increases the risk of coastal erosion, inundation and salination that will destroy this land and precious wetlands, our home.	Remove this rule. Have no mining on the Barrytown flats in any zone.
Jane Nolan (S397)	S397.004	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R25	Oppose	I vehemently object to any mining on the Barrytown flats. I am concerned about the impact of sea level rise combined with mining activity. This all makes the Barrytown flats increasingly fragile and open cast mining here increases the risk of coastal erosion, inundation and salination that will destroy this land and precious wetlands, our home.	Remove this rule. Have no mining on the Barrytown flats in any zone.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.001	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Tourism	Amend		That the plan recognise the importance of Punakaiki as a whole, and of Punakaiki Village, for regional, national and international tourism;
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.002	Scenic Visitor Zone	Scenic Visitor Zone	Amend		That the Plan enable the continuation of the mixed of uses of Punakaiki Village, and if necessary, the upgrade and replacement of the various buildings and structures associated with this
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.003	Settlement Zone	SETZ - PREC3 - Coastal Settlement Precinct	Oppose	The Coastal Settlement Precinct 3 (SETZ-PREC3) provisions are inappropriately restrictive in relation to tourism activities, overly focussed on residential activities and fails to fully recognise existing changes to	Amend the provisions so that tourism activities are enabled within the Punakaiki village

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the values of the coastal environment that result from the Punakaiki Village;	
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The natural hazards overlays are not clear in their geographic application and relationship with other plan provisions, and are overly restrictive;	Review natural hazard overlays to enable tourism development at Punakaiki village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.005	Coastal Environment	Coastal Environment	Amend	The coastal environment overlays are not clear in their geographic application and relationship with other plan provisions, and are overly restrictive;	Review coastal environment overlays to enable tourism development at Punakaiki village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.006	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	The management approach to the Punakaiki Village does not adequately recognise the mix of complementary functions of this village, its existing character and the importance of it being able to continue to adapt. A modified form of the Special Purposes Scenic Visitors Zone (SVZ) better provides for the sustainable management of Punakaiki Village, with the necessary modifications reflecting Punakaiki Village's mixture of uses, including residential and commercial activities, and a built form of relatively low intensity.	Rezone the Coastal Settlement Precinct areas of Punakaiki Village to Scenic Visitor Zone
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.007	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	UFD - O1	Support		Retain as notified.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.008	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	TRM - O1	Oppose in part		Provide for specific recognition of the tourism importance of Fox Glacier/Wheheka, Josef/Waiiau and Punakaiki to Te Tai o Poutini, by adding. <i>Recognising the strategic importance of Fox Glacier/Wheheka, Josef/Waiiau And Punakaiki Townships.</i>
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.009	Scenic Visitor Zone	SVZ - O1	Support		Retain as notified
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.010	Scenic Visitor Zone	SVZ - P1	Amend		Amend by adding as follows: <i>d. Recognises the existing mixed character</i>



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<i>of commercial and residential uses of Punakaiki Township</i>
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.011	Scenic Visitor Zone	SVZ - P3	Support		Retain as notified
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.012	Scenic Visitor Zone	SVZ - P4	Amend		Amend to recognise develop is to be sympathetic to existing built environments as follows: ...scenic <b>and built</b> environments ...
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.013	Scenic Visitor Zone	SVZ - P6	Oppose in part		Amend to recognise develop is to be sympathetic to existing built environments as follows: <i>f. Reflect the character of the existing built environment</i>
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.014	Scenic Visitor Zone	SVZ - R1	Oppose in part		Delete SVZ-R1 4iv and replace to allow residential buildings of no more than 200 m2 in Gross Ground Floor Area per site with any new building not exceeding 100 m2 Gross Ground Floor Area per site.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.015	Settlement Zone	SETZ - PREC3 - Coastal Settlement Precinct	Oppose	Punakaiki village as an important tourism destination should be included within the Scenic Visitor Zone (refer submission for more detail).	Amendments to remove Punakaiki Village from this chapter
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.016	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The approach to natural hazards as it applies to Punakaiki Village are inappropriate. They do not allow for the reasonable use of land and buildings within the Village, and will ultimately result in stagnation of the Village through planning blight. Given the character of Punakaiki Village there is very limited potential for material increase in the consequences of natural hazards through development and redevelopment. An overly strict approach, as proposed, is not warranted.	Remove natural hazard overlays over Punakaiki and include specific provisions appropriate for Punakaiki in the Scenic Visitor Zone rules.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.017	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose		Specific provision should be made for the continued management and development of hazard mitigation structures for Punakaiki Village, recognising the existing investment in, and the character of, the present coastal defence wall.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.018	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose		Remove coastal hazard sever overlay from that part of 11 Owen Street that it overlays
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.019	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Support in part		Retain coastal hazard alert provisions and apply to all of 11 Owen St
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.020	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose		Remove Land Instability Overlay from 11 Owen Street and map as per current mapped as per Rockfall Hazards in operative Buller District Plan
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.021	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	The approach to natural hazards as it applies to Punakaiki Village are inappropriate. They do not allow for the reasonable use of land and buildings within the Village, and will ultimately result in stagnation of the Village through planning blight.	Exclude Punakaiki Village from this rule or if the rule is retained: a. delete condition 2 b. align condition 5 with the SVZ permitted activity rules
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.022	Natural Hazards	NHR2	Support		Retain as notified
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.023	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Oppose in part		Delete condition 4
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.024	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.025	Natural Hazards	NHR34	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.026	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.027	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.028	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.029	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.030	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Map 34 of the Proposed Plan Natural Hazards is insufficient to understand the application of the various hazards to Punakaiki Village. The electronic mapping does not allow the location of the overlay boundaries to be determined on the ground as there is no discernible topographic or legal feature, as such are uncertain and incapable of consistent administration. Specifically the land instability mapping does not align with the existing mapping and no new assessment is provided to support this change (refer maps in submission). It is unclear how the Hazard overlay rules relate to each other and the zone and precinct rules, sometimes providing inconsistent, incoherent and inappropriate regulation.	Remove natural hazard overlays from Punakaiki village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.031	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Support	Two cultural overlays apply to Punakaiki Village, but no regulation results. This approach is supported.	Retain non-regulatory approach to SASM31 and Pounamu Management Area as it relates to Punakaiki Village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.032	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	Support in part	Punakaiki Village is a highly modified environment. It is not an outstanding natural landscape. The Proposed Plan, and the underlying justifications recognise this. This is appropriate.	Do not schedule land within Punakaiki Village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.033	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING	Support	Punakaiki Village is a highly modified environment. It is not an outstanding natural feature. The Proposed Plan, and	Do not schedule land within Punakaiki Village

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		NATURAL FEATURES	NATURAL FEATURES		the underlying justifications recognise this. This is appropriate.	
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.034	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Punakaiki Village is within the Coastal Environment. Given its character it results in an existing localised modification to the values of that environment. Recognising this modification, Punakaiki Village should be managed through the SVZ provisions, not coastal environment provisions.	Remove coastal environment overlay from Punakaiki village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.035	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	Support in part	Punakaiki Village is specifically excluded from the high and outstanding natural character (see below). This is appropriate.	Do not schedule land within Punakaiki Village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.036	SCHED8 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	SCHED8 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	Support	Punakaiki Village is specifically excluded from the high and outstanding natural character (see below). This is appropriate.	Do not schedule land within Punakaiki Village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.037	Coastal Environment	Coastal Environment Rules	Oppose	Punakaiki Village is within the Coastal Environment. Given its character it results in an existing localised modification to the values of that environment. Recognising this modification, Punakaiki Village should be managed through the SVZ provisions, not coastal environment provisions.	Do not apply these rules to Punakaiki Village
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.038	Settlement Zone	SETZ - PREC3 - Coastal Settlement Precinct	Oppose	If the land in the Punakaiki Village is not rezoned Special Purposes Scenic Visitors Zone (SVZ). Then amendments are required to the Settlement zone to provide for a mix of complementary functions and activities in this village, its existing character and the importance of it being able to continue to adapt. n particular for Punakaiki the control on visitor accommodation, home businesses and buildings are unnecessarily restrictive,	Amend rules with the precinct to better reflect the character and type of development appropriate for Punakaiki Village as a significant tourism destination.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					given the scale and nature of the activities that exist within the Punakaiki Village.	
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.039	Settlement Zone	SETZ - R1	Support in part	Support SET-R1(i)(a)	Retain provision providing the ability to utilise smaller sites which have been lawfully established.
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.040	Settlement Zone	Permitted Activities	Amend	The control on buildings are unnecessarily restrictive, given the scale and nature of the activities that exist within the Punakaiki Village. A number of the conditions in the rules are unnecessarily restrictive and do not recognise the current character in Punakaiki, particularly where people do not reside permanently	Insert a new rule within the Settlement Zone which makes it clear that the rights provided for in NH-R1 and NH-R39 as modified by the submission are enabled within the Settlement Zone. The new rule could read: <b>SET-R* Reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings:Activity PermittedAny activity provided for in Rule NH-R1 or NH-R38 is a permitted activity and other rules in the Settlement Zone do not apply to these activities.Note Conditions NH-R1(2) and NH-R38(2)(a) are not supported and are sought to be deleted.</b>
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.041	Settlement Zone	SETZ - R9	Oppose in part	The controls on home businesses are unnecessarily restrictive, given the scale and nature of the activities that exist within the Punakaiki Village. A number of the conditions in the rules are unnecessarily restrictive and do not recognise the current character in Punakaiki, particularly where people do not reside permanently.	Delete the word "permanently" from condition 3(ii)(b).
Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467)	S467.042	Settlement Zone	SETZ - R10	Oppose in part	The control on visitor accommodation are unnecessarily restrictive, given the scale and nature of the activities that exist within the Punakaiki Village. A number of the conditions in the rules are unnecessarily restrictive and do not recognise the current character in Punakaiki, particularly where people do not reside permanently.	Delete conditions 1, 3 and 7

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jan Fraser (S129)	S129.001	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Oppose	<p>The permitted activity under this rule (mineral extraction of up to 20,000m<sup>3</sup> a year per property and 3ha at any one time) provides inadequate control where large-scale sand mining is proposed on several adjacent land parcels as is the case on the Barrytown Flats. One company, TIGA Minerals and Metals Ltd., has two exploration licenses covering 797ha and a mining licence covering 800ha of the Barrytown Flats. TIGA's permits cover several farms and numerous land parcels. They have a declared aim of mining the whole of the Barrytown Flats.</p> <p>GRUZ-R12 would permit TIGA to begin large-scale sand mining on several properties on the Barrytown Flats, with cumulative effects on traffic (10 heavy vehicle truck movements per day per property), dust, noise, light pollution, amenity values, wildlife disturbance and potentially other unanticipated effects. The purpose of living on a lifestyle block on the west coast is for the peace, tranquility and visual vista; these pollutions will make that impossible. Furthermore, if these disturbances are allowed this close to the community, the on selling of these properties will be difficult, and likely to result in considerable financial loss.</p> <p>GRUZ-R12 is therefore not fit for purpose and needs to be removed. Mineral extraction should be regarded as a Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activity (GRUZ - R25) in areas such as the Barrytown Flats with a mix of Rural Lifestyle and General Rural Zones, thereby allowing for appropriate levels of community consultation and adequate</p>	Remove GRUZ R12 and make Mineral extraction a restricted discretionary activity in Rural Zones.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					oversight of the consenting of mineral extraction operations.	
Jan Fraser (S129)	S129.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	<p>From the draft plan (Mineral extraction zone overview section), the rules for designating a land parcel as a Mineral Extraction Zone are:</p> <p>The MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone covers areas where there are discrete, long term mineral extraction activities that are currently authorised. This authorisation is from three different mechanisms and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Coal mining licences under the Coal Mines Act (1979);</li> <li>2. Ancillary coal mining licences under the Coal Mines Act (1979); and</li> <li>3. Resource consents issued under the Resource Management Act (1991)".</li> </ol> <p>We support these rules. However, they do not apply to the Barrytown Flats Mineral Extraction Zone because these land parcels do not have a resource consent for mineral extraction. On the contrary, a mining resource consent was recently declined for this property. Therefore they cannot be zoned as a Mineral Extraction Zone. The decision to decline the consent by the commissioners considering the Barrytown JV mining application on grounds of likely more than minor effects on the environment/wildlife, hydrology and community impacts was comprehensive and unequivocal.</p>	Remove Barrytown Flats from the Mineral Extraction Zone and change to General Rural Zone in keeping with the rest of the agricultural land on the Flats.
Jan Fraser (S129)	S129.003	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R25	Amend	GRUZ-R25 Requires modification to address potential issues arising where multiple land parcels near to one another may be granted mining consents as is currently being proposed on the Barrytown	Amend the rule to take account of potential cumulative effects of multiple mining operations in the same locality as proposed on the Barrytown Flats

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



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					of the proposed additional trucking on existing businesses and communities where effects associated with the activity are likely to be at least minor along the entire route from mine to port in relation to existing vehicle movements and resulting traffic increases and associated issues with noise, dust and amenity values.	
Janice Flinn (S260)	S260.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose in part	<p>There is all-round incompatibility of large-scale mineral sands extraction and processing that attracts the interest of mining companies in this area, with the peaceful rural lifestyle enjoyed by residents and sensitive ecological areas on the Flats. The environment and existing Barrytown Flats economy are not suited to large scale mineral extraction. A conservation centre of excellence already exists there, in the form of Conservation Volunteers which has a large native plant nursery and ecological restoration site, developed over many years. The potential impact of dust residue, heavy traffic and noise pollution would have a profound impact on this significant business. Sustainable tourism businesses feel under threat, because should full-scale mineral extraction proceed, this area will no longer be attractive to tourists. Community disintegration is occurring as people sell or leave to escape the uncertainty and possible noise, dust, vibration and disruption.</p> <p>The heavy traffic generated by the scale of mineral extraction proposals alone gives reason to encourage protection of the general rural zoning of the Flats. The Coast Road is one of the world's finest scenic drives, and is also tight and unstable in</p>	To rezone Barrytown Flats to General Rural instead of the proposed Mineral Extraction Zone

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					parts. The addition of increased volumes of heavy vehicles is incompatible with the existing condition of the road. There are concerning implications for the ecology and hydrology of this coastal ecosystem should mineral extraction proceed. The Flats are notorious for strong prevailing winds from north, west and south, so the prospect of significant quantities of dust settling anywhere along the Flats should be of significant concern. Many of the families who live on the Barrytown Flats make their livings from the land and ecology of the area. Native plant nurseries, ecotourism operators, tourist accommodation, dairy farms and animal-oriented lifestyle blocks sit appropriately within the confines of this landscape,	
Janie Cook (S594)	S594.001	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Oppose	Complexity	Delete
Janie Cook (S594)	S594.002	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Oppose	The website is infuriatingly difficult to navigate and unworkability	Given a hiatus from plan
Janie Cook (S594)	S594.003	Infrastructure	INF - P2	Oppose	Homeowners losing the right to consume rain that falls on their property.	Delete
Janie Cook (S594)	S594.004	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Oppose	Councils' TTPP committee should have defiantly supported ratepayers' rights and pushed back against Government.	Delete plan
Janna Bradley (S593)	S593.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 122	Oppose	never found any evidence of maori activity	delete SASM 122
Janna Bradley (S593)	S593.002	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 122	Oppose	We can't look up the information and no consultation has occurred	Alternative relief require consultation and written assurance that rules won't limit property use
Janna Bradley (S593)	S593.003	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF	SASM 122	Oppose	We don't feel that the consultation process has really been a fair.	Iwi representative should have gone to all property they are marking significant for Maori and explain why they are marking it

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI				significant and the expectations of the landowners also to show landowners evidence of what they are claiming.
Janna Bradley (S593)	S593.004	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 122	Oppose	We want to know what they are claiming	We would like written assurance that future changes or rulings will not happen without landowners consultation.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.001	Interpretation	INTENSIVE INDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Oppose in part	We believe that this definition could inadvertently capture herd homes and wintering barns (where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment). We believe this should be amended so as to be clear that the use of herd homes and wintering barns is not included within the definition of Intensive Indoor Primary Production.	Amend as follows: Means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for a specified time period) or poultry. <b>The use of herd homes and wintering barns where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment is not included in this definition.</b>
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.002	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	We operate industrial activities from our property covered by SASM14. We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for "offensive industries" as it is listed in SASM - P11.	Develop a definition for "offensive industries".
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.003	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	We operate industrial activities from our property covered by SASM14. We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for "hazardous facilities" as it is listed in SASM - P11 and SASM - R17.	Develop a definition for "hazardous facilities".
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	Similarly to NH - O4, the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Oppose in part	The wording of this policy is too restrictive and precludes a landowner seeking other	Include wording that allows technical solutions or differing expert opinion to

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					expert input or utilising solutions where the hazard could be substantially mitigated using technical solutions.	support resource consent applications for development. The wording of NH - P11 is more appropriate for severe overlays than the current wording. Delete "and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so".
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.021	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - P14	Oppose	I believe our properties at 81 Brougham st and 21A Domett street Westport have been wrongly/mistakenly categorised into SASM14	Delete properties from SASM14
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.022	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R2	Oppose in part	Too restrictive.	Delete iii. a. and b.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.023	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R3	Support	We support the rule with SASM14 being excluded.	Retain as notified with SASM14 being excluded from point 2.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.024	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R6	Oppose	Too restrictive.	SASM14 should be excluded from Schedule Three referred to in 1.i. The rule is generally too restrictive.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.025	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R9	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete rule or include SASM14 on the list of sites.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.026	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R10	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.027	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R11	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.028	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R12	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.029	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R13	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.030	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R14	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.031	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R15	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.032	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R16	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.033	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R17	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.034	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Support	We support that areas of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna habitat will be identified through the resource consent process until such time as district wide identification and mapping of significant natural areas is undertaken in an appropriate and consultative way and that a formal Plan Change occurs after that time.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.035	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P3	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.036	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P4	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.037	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P7	Oppose in part	We support that this policy provides for consideration of "the appropriateness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					in accordance with Policy 9 to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied."	
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.038	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P9	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.039	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R1	Oppose in part	We request that provision is made for low-level clearance for building sites within SNAs (including for future/not yet approved subdivisions). Providing for these types of living options can actually facilitate predator and pest management and control and is an important lifestyle option for the region.	Amend wording to provide for building sites.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.040	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R2	Oppose in part	We request that provision is made for low-level clearance for building sites within SNAs (including for future/not yet approved subdivisions). Providing for these types of living options can actually facilitate predator and pest management and control and is an important lifestyle option for the region.	Amend wording to provide for building sites.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.041	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R4/SUB - R7	Oppose in part		Not stated
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.042	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R6/SUB - R9	Oppose in part		Not stated
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.043	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R8/SUB - R15	Oppose in part		Not stated
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.044	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R9/SUB - R27	Oppose		Not stated
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.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
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.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.047	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R14	Oppose	We oppose SASM14 and the rules associated with it.	Delete SASM 14 or provide exclusions for it in associated rules.
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)	S508.049	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 <b>Scheduled</b> 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 <b>unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation</b> ; and
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.
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	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing a <del>Scheduled</del> -Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	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)	S508.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
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
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.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
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: <b>Non-complying N/A.</b>
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.062	Coastal Environment	Coastal Environment	Oppose	This overlay is far too extensive. The extent inland that overlay covers is inappropriate and will unduly restrict development.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.063	Coastal Environment	CE - P5	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.064	Coastal Environment	CE - P6	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.065	Coastal Environment	CE - R1	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.066	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Oppose in part	The maximum height limit of buildings and structures should be that specified for the particular zone. The gross ground floor area is too restrictive and should revert to zone rules.	Delete point 2. a. i. Delete point 2. a. iii.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.067	Coastal Environment	CE - R12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.068	Coastal Environment	CE - R19	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.069	Noise	NOISE - R3	Oppose in part	We believe that these acoustic insulation requirements should apply within 100m of our consented quarry to new buildings used for sensitive activities that built in the General Residential Zone at Alma Road if that proceeds to any extent.	Amend NOISE - R3 so that this rule includes that to include acoustic insulation requirements within 100m of our consented quarry for new buildings used for sensitive activities built at the proposed residential development at Alma Road.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.070	Noise	NOISE - R5	Oppose	We are opposing this due to reverse sensitivity concerns regarding our quarry operations.	Amend to explicitly exclude consented quarrying operations and similar.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.071	Residential Zones	Residential Zones	Support	We support that the properties owned by our family on Orowaiti Road and Brougham Street (through freehold or leasehold titles) are zoned residential (i.e. Lot 3 DP 18892, Pt Section 213 Square 141, Lot 2 DP 692, Lot 10 DP 1086, Lot 11 DP 1086, Lot 12 DP 1086 and Pt Lot 13 DP 1086).	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.072	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose in part	We oppose the entire enclave of General Residential Zoning at Alma Road. We	Amend General Residential Zoning in the Alma Road area to a lower density zone

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					believe this should be General Rural Zone or Rural Lifestyle Zone.	such as General Rural Zone or Rural Lifestyle Zone.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.073	Planning Maps and Overlays	Settlement Zone	Support	We support that 95 Snodgrass Road is zoned Settlement Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14107 and Section 14 Town of Orowaiti).	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.074	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that the land we own at 107 Alma Road is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Lot 4 DP 15375, PT Lot 2 DP 7181, Section 1 SO 14701 and Section 2 SO 14701).	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.075	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that Lot 1 DP 17523 is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. part of 103 Alma Road). Our quarry is important to our business and to the district. It would suffer from inevitable reverse sensitivity issues if adjacent land was zoned for urban/residential use. We support the proposed buffering areas to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on our operation from surrounding land use and housing density changes.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.076	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that the land between our quarry and Pakihi Road is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Lot 2 DP 404550, Lot 2 DP 418652 and Pt Section 24 Blk VII Kawatiri SD). Our quarry is important to our business and to the district. It would suffer from inevitable reverse sensitivity issues if adjacent land was zoned for urban/residential use. We support the proposed buffering areas to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on our operation from surrounding land use and housing density changes. We believe that there is a potential natural hazard risk in this area due to overland flow that requires evaluation.	Retain as notified

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.077	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that the land that we own between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road north of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Sections 26 and 27 Blk II Steeples SD).	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.078	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose	We oppose that the land we own 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.	Amend to <b>Rural Residential Precinct.</b>
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.079	Planning Maps and Overlays	Commercial Zone	Support	We support that Lot 4 DP 15375 and Lot 1 DP 15375 are zoned Commercial Zone (i.e. part of 103 Alma Road and 20 Gillows Dam Road). Our quarry is important to our business and to the district. It would suffer from inevitable reverse sensitivity issues if adjacent land was zoned for urban/residential use. We support the proposed buffering areas to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on our operation from surrounding land use and housing density changes.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.080	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Oppose	We oppose SASM14 and the rules associated with it.	Delete SASM14 or provide exclusions for it in associated rules.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	The Westport Hazard overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend overlay and amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.083	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Oppose in part	This overlay is far too extensive. The extent inland that the overlay covers is inappropriate and will unduly restrict development.	Amend and reduce the inland extent of the Coastal Environment Overlay.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.084	Coastal Environment	CE - O1	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.085	Coastal Environment	CE - O2	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.086	Coastal Environment	CE - O3	Support in part	The term "functional need" does not go far enough in recognising that some activities are required to operate in the coastal environment e.g. due to the location of mineral deposits.	Amend as follows: To provide for activities which have a functional, <b>technical, operational or locational</b> need to locate in the coastal environment in such a way that the impacts on natural character, landscape, natural features, access and biodiversity values are minimised.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.087	Coastal Environment	CE - P1	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.088	Coastal Environment	CE - P4	Support in part	We believe this policy needs amending.	Include a point c. that provides for activities which have a functional, technical, operational or locational need to locate in the coastal environment.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.089	Coastal Environment	CE - P5	Support in part	We support this provision but believe this needs amending.	Amend point d. as follows: Have a functional, <b>technical, locational</b> or operational need to locate within the coastal environment.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.090	Coastal Environment	CE - P6	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.091	Coastal Environment	CE - R1	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.092	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Oppose in part	The maximum height limit of buildings and structures should be that specified for the particular zone. The gross ground floor area is too restrictive and should revert to zone rules.	Delete point 2. A. i. Delete point 2. A. iii.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.093	Coastal Environment	CE - R5	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.094	Coastal Environment	CE - R6	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.095	Coastal Environment	CE - R7	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.096	Coastal Environment	CE - R8	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.097	Coastal Environment	CE - R9	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.098	Coastal Environment	CE - R10	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.099	Coastal Environment	CE - R11	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.100	Coastal Environment	CE - R12	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.101	Coastal Environment	CE - R14	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.102	Coastal Environment	CE - R15	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.103	Coastal Environment	CE - R16	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.104	Coastal Environment	CE - R17	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.105	Coastal Environment	CE - R18	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.106	Coastal Environment	CE - R19	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.107	Coastal Environment	CE - R21	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.108	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that the Coastal Alert Hazard overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension of the Coastal Hazard Alert Overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.109	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that the Coastal Severe Hazard overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension of the Coastal Severe Hazard Overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.110	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that the Flood Severe overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension of the Flood Severe Overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Jared Avery (S508)	S508.111	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that the Flood Susceptibility overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension of the Flood Susceptibility Overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Jennifer Lake (S323)	S323.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Neutral	I support the designation of the Okari Lagoon as a special area (SASM) and acknowledge the special relationship of	Seek review of the boundaries of SASM 19 and 22 where this effects private land used for grazing and extends beyond the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Ngā Tahu, Ngā Waewae, and others to that Lagoon. I refer to SASMs19 and 22. however, I seek more information on the basis for the designation that purports to extend the SASMs beyond the Lagoon and its boundaries, inland onto the land that is currently farm land used for grazing. I understand that this "extension" may be an inadvertence in the drawing of the maps. I am not aware of areas of significance that go beyond the boundaries. I would very much wish to protect any such areas of significance.	lagoon and its boundaries.
Jennifer Lake (S323)	S323.002	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	Amend	I seek more information on the basis for the designation that purports to extend the SASMs beyond the Lagoon and its boundaries, inland onto the land that is currently farm land used for grazing.	Provide more information on the values of SASM 19 and 22
Jennifer Lake (S323)	S323.003	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Support in part	to the extent relevant, I would seek clarification as to whether current statutory provisions, for example, in the Historic Places Act or the Heritage New Zealand Pourere Taonga Act provide adequate protection without the potentially additional burden of an administrative and consent process, which would need to be initiated by private landowners.	Review provisions to determine whether current statutory provisions provide adequate protection for SASM 19 and 22 without the need to additionally schedule in the TTPP
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.001	Activities on the surface of water	ASW - O1	Support in part	The objective is generally supported, however JBNZ requests an amendment to reflect that minor and less than minor adverse effects are acceptable.	Amend the Objective to read The ecological, recreational, natural character, amenity and Poutini Ngāi Tahu values of the District's rivers, lakes and lagoons are protected from the <i>more than minor</i> adverse effects of activities and structures on the surface of water.
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.002	Activities on the surface of water	ASW - P2	Support	This policy sits well with the requested amendment to Objective ASW-O1.	Retain the Policy as proposed.
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.003	Activities on the surface of water	ASW - R2	Support in part	The Rule is generally supported as it provides a Permitted Activity status for recreational jet boating (being a use of	Amend the Rule to read This does not occur on the surface of Lake Mahinapua or Mahinapua



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					motorised watercraft) on the surface of waterbodies. However the rivers that have been used for recreational jet boating via a speed uplifting under the Maritime Transport Act 2013, Maritime Rules Part 91- • Makaawhio River (Jacobs River) and Kaimata/New River (New River) should be maintained as available for recreational jet boating, albeit both rivers are very infrequently boated due to low water flows (Kaimata/New River) and lack of public access (Makaawhio River). In these circumstances an exclusion from a Permitted Activity status for recreational jet boating is considered to be unnecessary and unwarranted.	Creek/Tuwharewhare, Waitangiroto River, <b>Makaawhio River</b> , Arahura River, <b>Kaimata/New River</b> , Makatata Stream or Saltwater Lagoon (at Paroa) except:
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.004	Noise	NOISE - R2	Support	Noise from recreational jet boating activities is not excessive, is intermittent and of short duration and clearly the noise source is ever moving. In these circumstances the effects of the generated noise is acceptable and comparable to other noise generating activities such as vehicles using the road network, trains operating on their rail network and aircraft flying in the vicinity. These noises are part of the lawfully established environment.	Retain the Rule as proposed.
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.005	Noise	NOISE - R2	Support	From time to time there are organised recreational jet boating activities that may sit within the definition of a Temporary Activity as a special event. In these instances the noise effects of a group of recreational jet boats may be more prolonged than for individual boat(s). However, the noise from such activities is still not excessive, is still intermittent and of short duration and the noise source continues to be ever moving. Hence JBNZ supports these activities being exempted	Retain the Rule as proposed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					within the specified time period of 7:00am and 10:00pm.	
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.006	Temporary Activities	TEMP - O1	Support	JBNZ supports the provision of organised recreational jet boating events - being events promoted and organised by JBNZ.	Retain the Objective as proposed.
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.007	Temporary Activities	TEMP - P3	Support	JBNZ supports the Policy. Controls on recreational jet boating events are appropriate where these coincide with Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori.	Retain the Policy as proposed.
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.008	Temporary Activities	TEMP - R6	Support	JBNZ supports the Rule. Recreational jet boating events need to be PERMITTED where the activity standards are met.	Retain the Rule as proposed.
Jet Boating New Zealand (S161)	S161.009	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R5	Amend	JBNZ supports the Rule. If an organised recreational jet boating event coincides with a scheduled site or area of significance to Māori, it is necessary to liaise with the relevant Runanga and obtain their written approval within 10 working days of the same. That said, the expectation is that written approvals shall not be unreasonably withheld.	Retain the Rule as proposed, however add that written approvals shall not be unreasonably withheld.
Joan Blacktopp (S432)	S432.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	Re land north of Hokitika at Three Mile, on Keogans Road legally known as Lots 2, 3 and 4 DP459988 being a total of 3.512 ha. See the attached plan in the submission. The land is on the Selected Land Use Sites (SLUS) register regarding possible contamination, and this would make Industrial activity on the land more appropriate than a dwelling. The site is easily serviced and is accessible to SH6 (the main route along the West Coast) which is only approximately 300m along the well-formed and sealed Keogans Road. It is a positive that the site is near existing well-formed roading network. Also, the site would be easily connected to power as the	Zone Lots 2, 3 and 4 DP459988 being zoned as either Light Industrial or General Industrial under the proposed TTPP.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					power line is near the site. And telecommunications are in the area.	
Joan Kallmann (S618)	S618.001	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Oppose	In response to the Proposed TTPP. When I bought my property, I was not informed, neither did I know that there would be anyone else except myself who would have any jurisdiction over my property that I have paid for myself. It has taken me my entire lifetime and earnings to pay for this. Who has given the authority to you and the district council and to the obscure TTPP to have any authority over our lands whatso ever at all? Please answer this question truthfully.	Delete provisions affecting property
Joanne and Ken Dixon (S213)	S213.001	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Oppose	Each district should have their own individual plans as we have different councils.	Do not have a combined District Plan.
Joanne and Ken Dixon (S213)	S213.002	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Westport/ Kawatiri Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Oppose	We disagree with businesses being told what colours they can apply to the exterior of their building. This is a ridiculous and over the top controlling rule and using Mitre 10 colours as an example of what not to do is crazy, they are a national franchise found in almost every town/city of New Zealand.	We disagree with businesses being told what colours they can apply to the exterior of their buildings and this should be removed from the plan.
Joanne and Ken Dixon (S213)	S213.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	These could severely limit future growth and functionality of Westport and it's outlying areas. The flooding event in July 2021 which affected parts of Westport and outlying areas would more than likely not have happened if both the Regional and the Buller District Council had done there jobs and protected the residents by maintaining the rivers, stopbanks and drains and now the public has to pay for there negligence.	Remove the natural hazard overlays applied to Westport and outlying areas.
Joanne and Ken Dixon (S213)	S213.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	Most properties in Snodgrass are different in terms of topography and susceptibility to flooding, with only 14 of 34 dwellings being	Amend the rules for natural hazards to allow for site specific assessments to demonstrate compliance for permitted

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					flooded and some told that a 1/100 year flood would not affect them, this must be taken into consideration.	activities as opposed to a blanket approach in the Snodgrass area.
Joanne and Ken Dixon (S213)	S213.005	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Oppose	This has been applied in an unsophisticated manner and does not apply to the area.	We request the Coastal Environment Overlay be removed from our and all properties in the Snodgrass Road area.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Outstanding Natural Character	Amend	The line includes highly modified residential subdivision at Point Elizabeth Heights.	Amend to align the ONC boundary with existing property lines.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.002	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	ONL31	Amend	The line includes highly modified residential subdivision at Point Elizabeth Heights.	Amend to align the ONL boundary with existing property lines.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.003	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	NCA38	Amend	The line includes highly modified residential subdivision at Point Elizabeth Heights.	Amend to align the HCNC boundary with existing property lines.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.004	SCHED8 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	NCA37	Amend	The line includes highly modified residential subdivision at Point Elizabeth Heights.	Amend to align the OCNC boundary with existing property lines.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.005	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R2	Amend	500m2 is insufficient for building platform and access on land	Remove 500m2 limit on clearance for building platforms, site and access in an approved subdivision
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.006	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Amend	Any residential activity will require resource consent.	Remove Restricted discretionary activity status for existing subdivisions.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.007	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - P3	Support	Recognises that there are settlements, farms and infrastructure	Retain
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.008	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R5	Amend	The maximum height limit does not reflect the topography.	Remove 5m building limit for established subdivisions.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.009	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R5	Amend	The maximum height limit does not reflect the topography.	Alternative relief: provide a more realistic building height limit which considers the sloping topography of the area, and amend relevant definitions as necessary.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.010	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R6	Amend	The cut height is unduly restrictive and not reflective of the topography of NFL's.	Remove 1 metre cut height or alternatively provide a more generous cut height which enables residential development as intended in existing subdivisions.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.011	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R6	Support	The cut height is unduly restrictive and not reflective of the topography of NFL's.	Remove reference to Coastal Environment.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.012	Natural Hazards	NHR33	Amend	Any residential activity will require resource consent.	Alternative relief: exclude residential activities other than primary residential dwellings from this rule.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.013	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R8	Amend	The maximum height limits for buildings is unduly prohibitive.	Remove 3m height limit as it is arbitrary, particularly given the topography of NFL's.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.014	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R8	Amend	The maximum height limits for buildings is unduly prohibitive.	Alternative relief: provide a more realistic building height limit which considers the sloping topography of the area.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.015	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R8	Amend	The floor limits would also be unduly restrictive.	Inclusion of residential buildings as a permitted activity, and increase floor area to 250m <sup>2</sup> minimum to enable houses.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.016	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R10	Amend	Controlled activity standard 2. Is ambiguous and uncertain	Delete controlled activity standard 2.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.017	Coastal Environment	CE - O1	Support		Retain
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.018	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Amend	Provisions are inconsistent with enabling the intended use of 332A North Beach Road.	Any alternative, consequential, or necessary additional relief to give effect to the matters raised generally in this submission.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.019	Natural Features and Landscapes	Permitted Activities	Amend	The submitter is concerned that this Policy 3 does not flow into the rules.	Amend rules to provide for established existing uses and subdivisions which are intended for residential development, and where residential development is already established.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.020	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - P5	Amend	The policy does not recognise that there is existing subdivision.	Include as additional text: a. Areexisting lawfully established structures <b>or sites</b> ;
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.021	Coastal Environment	Coastal Environment Rules	Amend	The provisions which flow on from Policy 5 do not reflect what is appropriate.	Amend to provide for buildings and structures within the coastal environment ofan appropriate scale.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.022	Coastal Environment	CE - P6	Support	The provision for buildings and structures of an appropriate scale.	Retain
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.023	Coastal Environment	CE - P7	Support	Allows for development in areas already modified and expansion of existing settlements.	Retain
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.024	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Amend	Proposed restrictions on building in the Coastal Environment are unduly restrictive.	Remove grossground floor area size limit for buildings in the RLZ zone by deletingCE-R4.2.iii.I
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.025	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Support	Proposed restrictions on building in the Coastal Environment are unduly restrictive.	Alternative relief: replace with a more appropriate ground floor area limit which appropriately provides for reasonably sized residential dwellings in within the coastal environment, in line with the operative District Plans in the region.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.026	Coastal Environment	CE - R8	Amend	The maximum height limit above 5m for buildings and structures does not reflect the topography of the land	Amend to remove height limit
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.027	Coastal Environment	CE - R8	Amend		Alternative relief: set more appropriate heightlimit where subdivision is in place.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.028	Coastal Environment	CE - R11	Amend	Earthworks are not enabled in an area that has been approved for subdivision.	Include access and building platforms as a permitted activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.029	Coastal Environment	CE - R16	Amend	Matters of discretion are unduly restrictive for an identified and established subdivision.	Remove all matters of discretion where existing subdivisions are in place except those which relate to landscape and amenity values.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.030	Coastal Environment	CE - R18	Amend	Matters of discretion are unduly restrictive for an identified and established subdivision.	Remove all matters of discretion where existing subdivisions are in place except those which relate to landscape and amenity values
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.031	Earthworks	EW - R1	Amend	This rule is a duplication of regional council rules.	Remove 1.5 metre cut height.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.032	Earthworks	EW - R1	Amend		Alternative relief: provide a more generous cut height which enables residential development as intended in existing subdivisions.
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.033	Earthworks	EW - R3	Amend	500m2 is insufficient for building platform and access.	Remove 500m2 limit on earthworks in the RLZ .
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.034	Earthworks	EW - R3	Amend		Alternative relief: provide a more generous earthworks limit such as 2000m2
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.035	Natural Features and Landscapes	Natural Features and Landscapes	Support	Protective elements of the plan as they relate to Outstanding Coastal Natural Character and High Coastal Natural Character; and Outstanding Natural Landscapes	Retain
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.036	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R6	Oppose	sits within an approved subdivision which has existing residential dwellings.	Delete
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.037	Natural Hazards	NHR3	Oppose	there are existing controls in place in relation to the section.	Delete
Joel and Jennifer Watkins (S565)	S565.038	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	there are existing controls in place in relation to the section.	Delete
John Boyles (S175)	S175.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	Map A shows our properties which comprise of approx. 13ha. We do not feel we breach any of the rezoning principles and we meet the "good practice	Amend zoning of 13 ha of land at Waipuna, Grey District to Rural Lifestyle

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>approaches" being</p> <p>a). the zone boundaries are clearly defensible by the Waipuna Road and boundaries</p> <p>b). the zone follows the property boundaries</p> <p>c). we do not feel it is spot zoned being 4 existing residences of 13ha.</p> <p>d) and while zoning is not determined by the existing use rights we feel in this case they should be taken into account as this area has been used for "lifestyle living" for a significant period of time. The soil types of our properties are very stoney and hard to dig and have a brown clay element which means that the areas in paddocks around our houses can in areas be swampy and grow quite mossy and rushy vegetation. With fertiliser and drainage they can allow grazing for animals but revert quickly. The properties all have our own water and sewerage services we have rubbish services and new bins. And we are fully serviced by a tarseal road. We would like to see the new district plan reflect the true nature of the area and not be lumped in with the surrounding rural zoning and its encumbrances that it brings.</p>	
John Boyles (S175)	S175.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>We oppose the proposed natural hazard map over Waipuna area generally stating "flood plain" and wish to have this amended the reasons being</p> <p>a). our properties located on Map a - Waipuna Settlement are 18m above the river level and protected by a significant natural terrace that runs up the length of the valley. Map B and C show the natural terraces of the valley with the red line being</p>	<p>Amend the Flood Plain overlay at Waipuna area to reflect the true risk and suggest the natural terraces and contour maps with GPS be used to do so.</p>



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>the high terrace which ranges from approx. 20 - 30m above river level between us and 966 Waipuna Road</p> <p>b). We have concerns that our properties are shown as being in a flood plain then there is a risk that in the future this could affect our insurance ability and premiums as is happening in Westport.</p> <p>c) we believe that being classed as a flood plain will de-value and affect the resale of our properties at any future time.</p>	
John Brazil (S360)	S360.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	I object to my property (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) being included in the Coastal Hazard Severe overlay.	Amend overlay to exclude Lot 1 DP 336364.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	Similarly to NH - O4, the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: <i>To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.</i>
John Brazil (S360)	S360.003	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Oppose in part	The wording of this policy is too restrictive and precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions where the hazard could be substantially mitigated using technical solutions.	Include wording that allows technical solutions or differing expert opinion to support resource consent applications for development. The wording of NH - P11 is more appropriate for severe overlays than the current wording. Delete " <i>and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so</i> ".
John Brazil (S360)	S360.004	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	I support this provision.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.005	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support	I support this provision.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.006	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten-year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.007	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten-year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.008	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.009	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete Point 2.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.010	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.011	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.012	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R14	Support	NFL - R14 I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.013	Public Access	Public Access Objective	Support	I support the discussion in the PA chapter preceding the objective.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.014	Public Access	PA - O1	Support	I support this single objective	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.015	Subdivision	SUB - P3	Support	I support this policy.	Retain as notified
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
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	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

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					reserves are provided for in the Operative Buller District Plan is more appropriate than the wording in the proposed plan.	reference to the width of esplanade reserves and strips being wider than 20m should be deleted.
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.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.019	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	I support the Provision	Retain as notified.
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".
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".
John Brazil (S360)	S360.022	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	I support this provision.	Retain
John Brazil (S360)	S360.023	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	I do not support this provision.	Delete.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.024	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	I do not support this provision.	Delete
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 <sup>2</sup> .
John Brazil (S360)	S360.026	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Oppose in part	This overlay is far too extensive. The extent inland that the overlay covers is inappropriate and will unduly restrict development. However, I support that Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) is not included in the schedule	Amend and reduce the inland extent of the Coastal Environment Overlay. Listed parcel to remain excluded.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.027	Coastal Environment	CE - O1	Support	CE-01 I support this objective	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.028	Coastal Environment	CE - O3	Support in part	The term "functional need" does not go far enough in recognising that some activities are required to operate in the coastal environment e.g. due to the location of mineral deposits.	Amend as follows: To provide for activities which have a functional, technical, operational or locational need to locate in the coastal environment in such a way that the impacts on natural character, landscape, natural features, access and biodiversity values are minimised
John Brazil (S360)	S360.029	Coastal Environment	CE - P1	Support	I support this provision	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.030	Coastal Environment	CE - P4	Support in part	I believe this policy needs amending.	Include a point c. that provides for activities which have a functional, technical, operational or locational need to locate in the coastal environment.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.031	Coastal Environment	CE - P5	Support in part	I support this provision but believe this needs amending.	Amend point d. as follows: Have functional, technical, locational or operational need to locate within the coastal environment.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.032	Coastal Environment	CE - P6	Support	I support this provision	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.033	Coastal Environment	CE - R1	Support	I support this provision	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.034	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.035	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R15	Support	I support this rule	Retain R15
John Brazil (S360)	S360.036	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R15	Support	I support this rule	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.037	Coastal Environment	CE - O2	Support	I support this objective	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.038	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Oppose in part	The maximum height limit of buildings and structures should be that specified for the particular zone. The gross ground floor area is too restrictive and should revert to zone rules.	Delete point 2. A. i. Delete point 2. A. iii.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.039	Coastal Environment	Permitted Activities within the High Coastal Natural Character Overlay	Oppose in part	I believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.040	Coastal Environment	Permitted Activities within the Outstanding Coastal Environment Area	Oppose in part	I believe this is too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.041	Coastal Environment	Controlled Activities	Oppose in part	I believe this is too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.042	Coastal Environment	Restricted Discretionary Activities	Oppose in part	I believe CE 14-CE-19 are too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.043	Coastal Environment	CE - R21	Oppose in part	I believe this is too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.044	Rural Zones	Rural Zones Objectives	Support	I support these objectives.	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.045	Rural Zones	Rural Zones Policies	Support	I support Policies RURZ - P1 - P12	Retain policies RURZ -P1 - P12
John Brazil (S360)	S360.046	Rural Zones	Rural Zones Policies	Support	I support Policies RURZ P15-P28	Retain Policies RURZ P15-P28
John Brazil (S360)	S360.047	Planning Maps and Overlays	Planning Maps and Overlays	Oppose in part	I oppose my property, Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport), being included in the General Rural Zone. It is more appropriately zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone in the same way adjacent properties are.	Amend so that my property, Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport), is zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.048	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R1	Support in part	However, pre-existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.049	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R2	Support in part	However, pre-existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.050	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R1	Support in part	However, pre-existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.051	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R5	Oppose in part	I believe this rule should be simplified. Additionally, pre-existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Simplify the rule and/or amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.052	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R6	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.053	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R8	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.054	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R9	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.055	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R10	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.056	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Oppose in part	I support this rule in principle but believe that Transport Performance Standards and rules relating to light need to be amended before this rule is acceptable. I believe the rule is also too restrictive.	Improve the Transport Performance Standards and rules relating to light that connect to this rule. Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.057	Light	LIGHT - R4	Oppose in part	rules relating to light need to be amended before this rule is acceptable.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.058	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Oppose in part	Transport Performance Standards are too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.059	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R16	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.060	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R17	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.061	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R18	Support	I support in principle.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.062	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R20	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule. Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.063	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R21	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.064	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R22	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.065	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R24	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.066	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R24	Support	I support this rule.	Retain the rule as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.067	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R26	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.068	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R27	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.069	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R28	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.070	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R29	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.071	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R31	Oppose in part	I believe this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1. Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved"



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
John Brazil (S360)	S360.072	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R1	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.073	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R3	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.074	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R4	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.075	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R5	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.076	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R6	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.077	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R7	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.078	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R8	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.079	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R9	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.080	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R12	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.081	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R13	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.082	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R14	Support in part	I support this rule in principle. However, pre-existing non-compliance with Rule	Amend so that pre-existing non-compliance with Rule RLZ - R1 does not

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					RLZ - R1 should be recognised as being acceptable for the application of the rule.	preclude the application of this rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.083	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R16	Support in part	I support this rule but it is restrictive and non-compliance should not mean the activity is Non-complying.	Delete point 1. Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
John Brazil (S360)	S360.084	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R17	Oppose in part	This rule is too restrictive, and non-compliance should not mean the activity is Non-complying.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.085	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R19	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.086	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R20	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.087	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R21	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.088	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R22	Support	I support this rule.	Retain as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.089	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R23	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete the rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.090	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R24	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete the rule
John Brazil (S360)	S360.091	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R25	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete the rule.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.092	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	Support in part	I support that areas of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna habitat will be identified through the resource consent process until such time as district wide identification and mapping of significant natural areas is undertaken in an appropriate and consultative way and that a formal Plan Change occurs after that time.	Retain Schedule as notified
John Brazil (S360)	S360.093	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Support in part	I support this policy in principle. I believe that a June 2027 deadline is too ambitious to undertake the work in a way that sufficiently involves landowners.	Amend policy to recognise that a June 2027 deadline is too ambitious to undertake the work in a way that

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						sufficiently involves landowners.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.094	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	Support in part	I support that Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) is not included in the schedule.	Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) to remain excluded
John Brazil (S360)	S360.095	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES	Support in part	support that Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) is not included in the schedule.	Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) to remain excluded.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.096	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	Support in part	I support that Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) is not included in the schedule.	Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) to remain excluded.
John Brazil (S360)	S360.097	SCHED8 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	SCHED8 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	Support in part	I support that Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) is not included in the schedule.	Lot 1 DP 336364 (i.e. 261 Utopia Road Westport) to remain excluded,
John Caygill (S290)	S290.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Amend	1 Lack of alignment with national and regional policy direction. (a). The definition of the Coastal Environment needs to be consistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) Policy 1 and the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (RPS), and Coastal Environment as so defined needs to be clearly identified on planning maps.	Comprehensively map the full extent of the Coastal Environment across the West Coast.
John Caygill (S290)	S290.002	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	Amend	SNA's should be identified according to the RPS Appendix 1 Significance criteria, and mapped across the entire West Coast region, and listed in the plan.	SNA's should be identified according to the RPS Appendix 1 Significance criteria, and mapped across the entire West Coast region, and listed in the plan.
John Caygill (S290)	S290.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Open Space Zone	Support	Public Conservation Land is not identified and not zoned consistently.	Clearly identify public conservation land on planning maps and rezone to

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Public conservation land is not clearly distinguishable from other land on the planning maps, nor is it consistently zoned with regard to conservation purposes i.e the protection of natural and cultural resources.	Natural Open Space Zone including the Buller Coalfield Zone Land and Mineral Extraction Zone Land,
John Caygill (S290)	S290.004	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Zone	Oppose	<p>Mineral Extraction Zones not justifiable and should be removed. It is not necessary to create a special purpose zone for lawfully established mining activities.</p> <p>A Zoning approach would override due consideration being given to other natural character, landscape and biodiversity values that are required to be protected by the RPS and the RMA.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed rules for the proposed zones are too permissive: they are inconsistent with protection requirements as set-out in the RPS and the RMA; they do not address adverse effects appropriately and they are inconsistent with regulatory practice for the activities with more than minor adverse effect, and thus conducive to further biodiversity loss.</p> <p>Management of the adverse effects of mining activities should be consistent with the surrounding zone to ensure appropriate remediation.</p>	Delete Mineral Extraction Zones from the plan, and re-zone these areas as appropriate (e.g. Natural open space if currently public conservation land, General Rural Zone or as consistent with adjacent zoning)
John Caygill (S290)	S290.005	Buller Coalfield Zone	Buller Coalfield Zone	Oppose	Coal mining is already a lawfully established activity in parts of this proposed zone. However, because of the special -often unique - character of much of this zone there should be no new permissions granted for extensions to current coal mining operations for new coal mining operations to be set-up. the special nature of the Denniston-Stockton plateau applies to its flora, its fauna, and visible landforms. ' [refer submission re values of	Delete the Buller Coalfield Zone from the Plan.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Denniston - Stockton plateaux). While not disturbing the facts the world still need coking coal for steel production, and that new or extended coal mining in this region would provide a number of well-paid jobs for a number of years, this does not justify the destruction of this fragile and rare - in many ways unique - ecosystem, particularly given that coal (even good coking coal) is not a scarce resource world-wide, and the anticipated economic benefits of new mining operations would be short-lived, while the habitat destruction would last for millennia.	
John Caygill (S290)	S290.006	Coastal Environment	Coastal Environment	Amend	1 Lack of alignment with national and regional policy direction. (a). The definition of the Coastal Environment needs to be consistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) Policy 1 and the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (RPS), and Coastal Environment as so defined needs to be clearly identified on planning maps. Amend the definition of the Coastal Environment throughout the plan to be consistent with the NZCPS1 and the RPS.	Amend the definition of the Coastal Environment throughout the plan to be consistent with the NZCPS1 and the RPS.
John Caygill (S290)	S290.007	Interpretation	AREA OF SIGNIFICANT INDIGENOUS BIODIVERSITY	Amend	The Term 'SNA' as defined in the RPS, should replace the term Areas of significant indigenous biodiversity' in relation to subdivision in the plan, and should be used when referring to as-yet unspecified areas of significant biodiversity as per RPS criteria.	Replace the term Areas of significant indigenous biodiversity with the Term SNA as defined in the RPS.
John Caygill (S290)	S290.008	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	The protection requirements for significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and mandated by the RMA (section 6), and set-out in the RPS, should be included in the plan.	Amend the provisions so that the protection requirements for significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, and mandated by the RMA (section 6), and set-out in the RPS, are included in the

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						plan.
John Caygill (S290)	S290.009	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Oppose	The proposed rules for the proposed zones are too permissive: they are inconsistent with protection requirements as set-out in the RPS and the RMA; they do not address adverse effects appropriately and they are inconsistent with regulatory practice for the activities with more than minor adverse effect, and thus conducive to further biodiversity loss	Ensure there is a requirement for an ecological assessment in accordance with the RPS significance criteria for all new mineral extraction activities.
John Caygill (S290)	S290.010	Planning Maps and Overlays	Mineral Extraction Zone	Oppose	The mineral extraction zone is inappropriate for public conservation resources	Remove the mineral extraction zone from public conservation land.
John Caygill (S290)	S290.011	Planning Maps and Overlays	Buller Coalfield Zone	Oppose	The Buller Coalfield Zone is inappropriate for public conservation resources.	Remove the Buller Coalfield Zone from all public conservation land.
John Davidson (S31)	S31.001	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Oppose	I believe this plan further restricts what private landowners' can do with their property. Currently, approximately 85% of the West Coast land area is under DOC stewardship and this plan if imposed will change that to approximately 92.5%.	Removal of entire plan in its proposed form.
John Davidson (S31)	S31.002	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SCHED3 - SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	Oppose	I have neither received nor been informed of why my property has been classified as being of significance to Maori.	Removal of SASM Classification
John Edington (S264)	S264.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	We wish to advise that we oppose the establishment of SASM 68 -Paroa Lagoon in its current format. The mapping is incorrect and amendments are supported by Poutini Ngāi Tahu.	That the eastern boundary of the designated SASM68 be amended and realigned to the Paroa Lagoon waterway eastern edge. New large scale maps accurately showing this new boundary delineation be produced and supplied to all affected parties for approval.
John Edington (S264)	S264.003	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Amend	The RMA states that because SASM are considered a type of historic heritage, rules associated with them have legal effect from	That any of the proposed references, rules, or conditions, placed on any private property fronting the state highway be

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the time the proposed TTPP was notified. This is totally rejected by the affected private landowners, who are submitting and requesting that these rules be withdrawn from the private properties identified.	withdrawn immediately. Any Rules with immediate effect be withdrawn from the currently effected private properties.
John Helen & Brett Hadland (S318)	S318.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	High Natural Character	Oppose	We Oppose the natural overlay Chesterfield Terrace	Remove the High Natural Character Overlay at Chesterfield Terrace
John Helen & Brett Hadland (S318)	S318.002	Coastal Environment	Coastal Environment	Oppose	Qe oppose the coastal overlay associated with our properties and want them amended	Remove the Coastal Environment Overlay from our property [at 1298 Kumara Junction Highway]
John Hughson (S445)	S445.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 135	Oppose	It is not clear what part of the property is of cultural significance and therefore what the impact on the use of the land will be. The requirement to obtain a resource consent or written approval from Poutini Ngāi Tahu for such a wide range of activities is very restrictive. The justification for such severe restrictions is not provided. The criteria to be used for a resource consent are not clear. The lack of information due to the site being a "Silent File" is unhelpful.	Oppose the identification of the SASM 135 on the property, however the owners do desire to work constructively to take into account the intent of the proposal.
John Menlove (S289)	S289.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	I have already put road and cleared some land for house sites two years ago this land is high and dry on Sergeant hill had cattle on it up to ten years ago i have not grazed it up if cant put sections up there will have no choice but put cattle on this bush block	Rezone this site at Sergeants Hill so can develop the site for residential sections,
John OConnor (S284)	S284.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 24	Oppose in part	I have farmed the area known as the Giants grave for the last 30 years. I was surprised to be notified it was a Urupa and a significant site to Māori, as I had not heard of this before. The landmark is about 15 m high eight or 9 ha in area And stands alone next to State Highway six and 5 km inland from the sea. It is pakihi land quite infertile and has been flipped 20 years ago	Clarification of site and reasons behind the classification as site of significance to Māori as a urupa

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					to put into pasture. At this stage I have no issue about it being a significant site for Māori, but would like to know the justification behind it and the implications of it	
John Sutton (S153)	S153.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 208	Amend	Historical evidence provided insignificant and would encourage racial disharmony.	Restrict the SASM208 at Neils Beach to Maori and public lands, exclude private freehold titles from the SASM.
John Thorpe (S529)	S529.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Mineral Extraction Zone	Support	Mineral extraction delivers new economic opportunities	Retain the mineral extraction zone at Barrytown
John Thorpe (S529)	S529.002	General Rural Zone	General Rural Zone Rules	Support	The West Coast needs industry and employment	Retain the provisions for mineral extraction
John Thorpe (S529)	S529.003	Open Space Zone	OSZ - Open Space Zone Rules	Support	We need industry and economic activity on the West Coast	Retain the rules for mineral extraction
John Thorpe (S529)	S529.004	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Zone	Support	Mineral extraction provides economic opportunities	Retain the mineral extraction zone
John Walsh (S527)	S527.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Planning Maps and Overlays	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the planning maps show two National Grid electricity lines running through their property. Transpower have indicated to the submitter that one or both of the lines would be removed as they may no longer be used as they once fed power to the decommissioned cement works at Cape Foulwind. The National Grid lines appearing on the planning maps for the property will limit future development of the site, and the submitter seeks that the lines be removed from the planning maps if the electricity lines are to be removed.	For the National Grid Lines to be removed from the Planning Maps at 169 Alma Road as they appear to be no longer part of the National Grid.
Jon Barltrop (S572)	S572.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	request the Outstanding Natural Landscapes classification on our property to be reviewed.	Amend Outstanding Natural Landscapes with a view to the boundaries being shifted to South of the stand of Pine trees, to allow us to use our usable portion of our land.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Jon Barltrop (S572)	S572.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	High Natural Character	Amend	request the High Natural Character on our property to be reviewed.	Amend High Natural Character area with a view to the boundaries being shifted to South of the stand of Pine trees, to allow us to use our usable portion of our land.
Jon Barltrop (S572)	S572.003	Rural Lifestyle Zone	RLZ - R9	Oppose	3-Larger families should be able to stay in this precious area at any time and not be restricted due to family size	Delete condition 3.
Jon Barltrop (S572)	S572.004	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Amend	Proposed rules for homestay accomodation in the Buller district	Review proposed rules for homestay accomodation in the Buller district
J P Parsons (S335)	S335.001	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Objectives	Amend	<p>I support the concept of increasing the general public's knowledge of Sites of Significance to Māori, and the encouragement to engage with Rūnanga, however I am very concerned at the lack of detail and guidance over how to do this (engage with Poutini Ngāi Tahu Rūnanga) and how the Objectives, Policies and Rules might be interpreted in the future.</p> <p>Current wording is extremely broad brush and implies or could be interpreted as requiring granting of unconditional access and prevention of any development.</p> <p>I am concerned at the impact of how vague wording may be interpreted by administrators in the future and the negative impact of uncertainty and diminished property values for landowners due to potential restrictions on previously non-notifiable activities.</p>	<p>Define and add conditions to the many broad brush statements that could be open to varied interpretation by decision makers in the future.</p> <p>Provide a process for appropriate engagement with Rūnanga.</p> <p>Please see attached 'large submitter template' for details.</p>
Julian Hall (S400)	S400.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Sites and Ares of Significance to Māori	Oppose	My wife and I own residential properties in Central Greymouth including two small residential zoned titles of land in Central Greymouth which were acquired from Mawhera Incorporation Ltd (Mawhera), which only settled in late May 2022. We do not believe the site is of such	Make provision for exemption under the Plan for all properties that have been willingly sold by the Mawhera Incorporation, and directly or indirectly associated entities, within the last five years, and that have also now been identified under the Te Tai O Poutini Draft

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>significance to Maori, given that they already owned it and made a conscious decision to sell it to us. Mawhera actually went to the trouble of locating and contacting us, as neighbouring property owners on two occasions, asking if we wanted to purchase the two titles from them.</p> <p>If the land truly is of Significance to Maori, why has the Maori Land Court recently passed an order determining the land status of many properties within Central Greymouth to be General Land, as opposed to Maori Land.</p>	Plan as Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori. This provision should apply especially to land that the Mawhera Incorporation, and directly or indirectly associated entities, have had moved from the Maori Land Register to the General Land Register.
Julie MacDonald (S114)	S114.001	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM 68	Amend	No evidence of SASM. LIM report and property value affected. Other neighboring properties have been removed.	Eastern border area of sasm68 to be moved to the Iwi suggested position.
Julie Madigan (S363)	S363.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	The Ross Community in general want the status quo for our immediate area, which in general is already covered by existing mining licences.	Retain the status quo under the Westland District Plan. (No mineral extraction zone - area zoned rural]
Julie Madigan (S363)	S363.002	Subdivision	Controlled Activities	Oppose	The current proposal appears to stymy 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)
Julie Palmer (S334)	S334.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	Owner of a 62 acre block on New Castle St, Waimangaroa.	Rezone my property at New Castle St Waimangaroa for Rural Residential subdivisions, less than 4 hectares in size.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.001	Interpretation	INTENSIVE INDOOR	Amend	definition could inadvertently capture herd homes and wintering barns	Amend as follows: Means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
			PRIMARY PRODUCTION			involve growing fungi, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for a specified time period) or poultry. <b>The use of herd homes and wintering barns where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment is not included in this definition.</b>
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.002	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for "offensive industries".	Develop a definition for "offensive industries".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.003	Interpretation	Definitions	Support	Needs to be a clear definition for "hazardous facilities"	Develop a definition for "hazardous facilities".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.004	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	AG - O1	Support	support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.005	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	AG - O2	Support	support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.006	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	CR - O1	Support	support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.007	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	CR - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.008	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	CR - O3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.009	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	CR - O4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.010	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.011	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.012	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.013	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O4	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.014	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O5	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.015	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O6	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.016	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	NENV- O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.017	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	NENV- O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.018	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	NENV - O3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.019	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	NENV - O4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.020	Transport	TRN - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.021	Transport	TRN - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.022	Transport	TRN - O3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.023	Transport	TRN - O4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.024	Transport	TRN - O5	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.025	Hazardous Substances	HS - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.026	Hazardous Substances	HS - P1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.027	Hazardous Substances	HS - P2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.028	Hazardous Substances	HS - P3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.029	Hazardous Substances	HS - P4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.030	Natural Hazards	Flood Severe Overlay and Flood	Support	that there are no land use rules for the flood plain overlay and this overlay relates	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
			Susceptibility Overlay		only to the subdivision rules.	
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.031	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: <b>To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.</b>
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.032	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.033	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.034	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.035	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.036	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.037	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.038	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2. <del>Where any increase in net floor area meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event.</del>
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.039	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.040	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.041	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Amend	Believe that a June 2027 deadline is too ambitious to undertake the work in a way that sufficiently involves landowners.	Delete " <del>and completed by June 2027</del> " from point 2. iii.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.042	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P2	Amend	The term "functional need" does not go far enough in recognising that some activities are required to operate in certain areas	Amend point d. as follows: The activity has a functional, <b>technical, operational or locational</b> need to be located in the area;
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.043	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.044	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P6	Support	Believe that some of the terms used in this policy need defining.	Define the technical ecological terms used in this policy.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.045	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P7	Support	that this policy provides for the appropriateness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation in accordance with Policy 9	Retain point h
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.046	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P7	Amend	there could be significant adverse effects as a result of SNA mapping if the fixed location of mineral deposits is not provided for in the policy and the temporary nature of mining is not recognised.	Amend to recognise that, in some instances, vegetation clearance is unavoidable (e.g. in the case of accessing mineral resource) but that these effects can be temporary due so subsequent restoration processes.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.047	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P8	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.048	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P9	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.049	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P10	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.050	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R1	Amend	Believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.051	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R2	Amend	Believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.052	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R3	Amend	Believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.053	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R5	Amend	Believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.054	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R7	Amend	Believe this is too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.055	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R10	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.056	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R11	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.057	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R14	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.058	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R15	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.059	Public Access	Overview	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.060	Public Access	PA - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.061	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.062	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.063	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - O3	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.064	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - P1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.065	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - P2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.066	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - P3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.067	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - P4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.068	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - P5	Support		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.
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.
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.
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.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.075	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.076	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.077	Subdivision	SUB - R14	Oppose	We believe this activity should just be discretionary with no conditions.	Delete point 1.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
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".
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".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.081	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.082	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose		Delete
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.083	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose		Delete
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.084	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Amend	This overlay is far too extensive. The extent inland that the overlay covers is inappropriate and will unduly restrict development.	Amend and reduce the inland extent of the Coastal Environment Overlay.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.085	Coastal Environment	CE - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.086	Coastal Environment	CE - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.087	Coastal Environment	CE - O3	Support	The term "functional need" does not go far enough in recognising that some activities are required to operate in the coastal environment e.g. due to the location of mineral deposits.	Amend as follows: To provide for activities which have a functional, <b>technical, operational or locational</b> need to locate in the coastal environment in such a way that the impacts on natural character, landscape, natural features, access and biodiversity values are minimised.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.088	Coastal Environment	CE - P1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.089	Coastal Environment	CE - P4	Amend	Believe this policy needs amending.	Include a point c. that provides for activities which have a functional,

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						technical, operational or locational need to locate in the coastal environment.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.090	Coastal Environment	CE - P5	Amend	Support this provision but believe this needs amending.	Amend point d. as follows: Have a functional, <b>technical, locational</b> or operational need to locate within the coastal environment.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.091	Coastal Environment	CE - P6	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.092	Coastal Environment	CE - R1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.093	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Oppose	The maximum height limit of buildings and structures should be that specified for the particular zone.	Delete point 2. A. i.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.094	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Oppose	The gross ground floor area is too restrictive and should revert to zone rules.	Delete point 2. A. iii.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.095	Coastal Environment	CE - R5	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.096	Coastal Environment	CE - R6	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.097	Coastal Environment	CE - R7	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.098	Coastal Environment	CE - R8	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.099	Coastal Environment	CE - R9	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	We believe this is too restrictive. Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.100	Coastal Environment	CE - R10	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.101	Coastal Environment	CE - R11	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.102	Coastal Environment	CE - R12	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.103	Coastal Environment	CE - R14	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.104	Coastal Environment	CE - R15	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.105	Coastal Environment	CE - R17	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.106	Coastal Environment	CE - R18	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.107	Coastal Environment	CE - R19	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.108	Coastal Environment	CE - R21	Amend	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.109	Earthworks	EW - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.110	Earthworks	EW - P1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.111	Earthworks	EW - P2	Amend		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.112	Earthworks	EW - P3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.113	Earthworks	EW - P4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.114	Earthworks	EW - R2	Amend	Earthworks rules are difficult to understand in the way they are currently structured.	Amend to provide more clarity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.115	Earthworks	EW - R3	Amend	Earthworks rules are difficult to understand in the way they are currently structured.	Amend to provide more clarity.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.116	Earthworks	EW - R2	Amend	Believe these rules are too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.117	Earthworks	EW - R3	Amend	We believe these rules are too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.118	Earthworks	EW - R6	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.119	Earthworks	EW - R7	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.120	Earthworks	EW - R8	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.121	Light	LIGHT - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.122	Light	LIGHT - P1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.123	Light	LIGHT - P2	Amend	Believe that this policy should extend to appropriate lighting of outdoor commercial/industrial activities.	Amend to include the enabling of artificial outdoor lighting that allows safe commercial and industrial activities.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.124	Light	LIGHT - R1	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.125	Light	LIGHT - R2	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.126	Light	LIGHT - R3	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.127	Light	LIGHT - R4	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.128	Noise	NOISE - O1	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.129	Noise	NOISE - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.130	Noise	NOISE - O3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.131	Noise	NOISE - P1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.132	Noise	NOISE - P2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.133	Noise	NOISE - P4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.134	Noise	NOISE - R5	Amend	Reverse sensitivity concerns regarding quarry operations.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Karamea Lime Co quarry.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.135	Noise	NOISE - R5	Oppose	Timeframes for noise emissions are too restrictive.	Delete time restrictions
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.136	Noise	NOISE - R6	Oppose	Timeframes for noise emissions are too restrictive.	Delete time restrictions
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.137	Noise	NOISE - R11	Oppose	Timeframes for noise emissions are too restrictive.	Delete time restrictions
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.138	Noise	NOISE - R6	Amend	Reverse sensitivity concerns regarding quarry operations.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Karamea Lime Co quarry.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.139	Noise	NOISE - R11	Amend	Reverse sensitivity concerns regarding quarry operations.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Karamea Lime Co quarry.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.140	Noise	NOISE - R11	Amend	Correct the error where a Mineral Extraction Zone is referred to as "MEZ".	Correct "MEZ" error.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.141	Rural Zones	RURZ - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.142	Rural Zones	RURZ - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.143	Rural Zones	RURZ - O3	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.144	Rural Zones	RURZ - O4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.145	Rural Zones	RURZ - O5	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.146	Rural Zones	RURZ - O6	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.147	Rural Zones	RURZ - P1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.148	Rural Zones	RURZ - P2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.149	Rural Zones	RURZ - P3	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.150	Rural Zones	RURZ - P4	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.151	Rural Zones	RURZ - P5	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.152	Rural Zones	RURZ - P6	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.153	Rural Zones	RURZ - P7	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.154	Rural Zones	RURZ - P8	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.155	Rural Zones	RURZ - P9	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.156	Rural Zones	RURZ - P10	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.157	Rural Zones	RURZ - P11	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.158	Rural Zones	RURZ - P12	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.159	Rural Zones	RURZ - P15	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.160	Rural Zones	RURZ - P16	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.161	Rural Zones	RURZ - P17	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.162	Rural Zones	RURZ - P18	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.163	Rural Zones	RURZ - P19	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.164	Rural Zones	RURZ - P20	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.166	Rural Zones	RURZ - P21	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.167	Rural Zones	RURZ - P22	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.168	Rural Zones	RURZ - P22	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.169	Rural Zones	RURZ - P23	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.170	Rural Zones	RURZ - P24	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.171	Rural Zones	RURZ - P25	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.172	Rural Zones	RURZ - P26	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.173	Rural Zones	RURZ - P27	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.174	Rural Zones	RURZ - P28	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.175	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	Lot 1 DP 483059 has been zoned GRUZ. This parcel should be zoned MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone.	Amend so that Lot 1 DP 483059 is zoned MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.176	General Rural Zone	GRUZ	Support	Zoning will minimise reverse sensitivity impacts on the quarry.	Retain the General Rural Zone for land to the north, west and south of the quarry area (including quarried land and permitted land)

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.177	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R1	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.178	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R2	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.179	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R3	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.180	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R5	Oppose	Believe this rule should be simplified.	Simplify the rule
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.181	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R5	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.182	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R6	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.183	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R8	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.184	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R9	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.185	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R10	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.186	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R11	Oppose	Believe the rule is also too restrictive.	Delete point 3 or extend the timeframe until a period after cessation of mining activity.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.187	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R11	Amend	Not all prospecting or exploration is required to have a permit from NZPAM	Amend point 1 as follows: This is authorised under a prospecting or exploration permit from NZPAM <b>where legally required</b>
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.188	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Amend	Transport Performance Standards and rules relating to light need to be amended before this rule is acceptable.	Improve the Transport Performance Standards and rules relating to light that connect to this rule.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.189	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Amend	Believe the rule is also too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.190	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R13	Amend	note the minor error.	Retain as notified with minor timing error being corrected (i.e. 12pm).
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.191	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R16	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.192	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R17	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.193	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R18	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.194	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R20	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.195	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R21	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.196	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R22	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.197	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R24	Amend	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.198	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R25	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.199	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R26	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.200	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R27	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.201	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R28	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.202	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R29	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.203	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R30	Amend	Rule is unclear	Amend with more clearly defined terms
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.204	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R30	Oppose	rule is too restrictive	Delete points 1 and 2.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.205	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R30	Support	rule is too restrictive	Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.206	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R31	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.207	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R31	Amend		Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.208	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R32	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.209	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R33	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.210	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R34	Oppose	Rule is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.211	Mineral Extraction Zone	Overview	Amend	support though note effects of activities with existing use rights.	Amend to add a 4th point to include <b>existing use rights</b>
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.212	Planning Maps and Overlays	Mineral Extraction Zone	Support	support zoning for Section 1 SO 15488 and Section 50 Blk IX Oparara SD	Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.213	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Support	oppose that Lot 1 DP 483059 has been zoned GRUZ.	Amend Lot 1 DP 483059 to MINZ - Mineral Extraction Zone
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.214	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - O1	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.215	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - O2	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.216	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Policies	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.217	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R1	Amend	support the principle of this rule. However, point two is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete point 2.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.218	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R2	Support		REtain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.219	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R3	Amend	Point two is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.220	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R2	Support	Amend to allow for existing non-compliance	Amend rule to allow for non-compliance for existing activity
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.221	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R5	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.222	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R6	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.223	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R7	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.224	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R9	Support		Retain
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.225	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R10	Oppose		Delete
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.226	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	Support	support that areas will be identified through the resource consent process	Retain Schedule
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.227	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	Amend	June 2027 deadline is too ambitious to undertake the work in a way that sufficiently involves landowners.	Subsequent amendment to ECO-P1
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.228	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	Support	Support that Lot 1 DP 483059, Section 1 SO 15488 and Section 50 Blk IX Oparara SD are not included	Retain as notified
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.229	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES	Support	support that Lot 1 DP 483059, Section 1 SO 15488 and Section 50 Blk IX Oparara SD are not included	Retain as notified

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.230	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	SCHED7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	Support	support that Lot 1 DP 483059, Section 1 SO 15488 and Section 50 Blk IX Oparara SD are not included	Retain as notified
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.231	SCHED8 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	SCHED8 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	Support	support that Lot 1 DP 483059, Section 1 SO 15488 and Section 50 Blk IX Oparara SD are not included	Retain as notified
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.232	Schedule Nine: Lawfully Established Mineral Extraction and Processing Areas	SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL EXTRACTION AND PROCESSING AREAS	Support	support that the Karamea Lime Quarry is listed	Retain Schedule as notified
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.233	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	Unnecessarily restrictive and complex	Amend to be less onerous
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.234	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	There also appear to be potential errors in the table	Amend to correct errors
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.235	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Support	The qualifiers are not consistent, and this makes the table difficult to use.	Amend to be more consistent and correct errors.
Karamea Lime Company (S614)	S614.236	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support	support the plan requirements.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karen and Dana Vincent (S591)	S591.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Mineral Extraction Zone	Oppose	Biodiversity values, amenity, effect on roading	Delete mining extraction zone at 3261 Coast Road, Barrytown
Karen and Dana Vincent (S591)	S591.002	Mineral Extraction Zone	Permitted Activities	Oppose	All mining activity should be transparent and discretionary, rather than a permitted activity	Amend permitted activities to discretionary
Karen and Dana Vincent (S591)	S591.003	SCHEM7 - SCHEDULE OF HIGH COASTAL NATURAL CHARACTER	NCA34	Support	It's a stunning area and again, should be protected	Amend the HNC overlay on the map extended to include Barrytown beach.
Karen and Dana Vincent (S591)	S591.004	Mineral Extraction Zone	Rules	Amend	Dust, noise, traffic etc, all a big threat to the peace and quiet.	Amend rules to manage adverse effects from dust, noise, traffic, etc.
Karen & Bill Potter (S236)	S236.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	We wish to advise that we oppose the establishment of SASM 68 -Paroa Lagoon in its current format. The mapping is incorrect and amendments are supported by Poutini Ngāi Tahu.	That the eastern boundary of the designated SASM68 be amended and realigned to the Paroa Lagoon waterway eastern edge. New large scale maps accurately showing this new boundary delineation be produced and supplied to all affected parties for approval.
Karen & Bill Potter (S236)	S236.003	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Amend	Tthe RMA states that because SASM are considered a type of historic heritage, rules associated with them have legal effect from the time the proposed TTPP was notified.This is totally rejected by the affected private landowners, who are submitting and requesting that these rules be withdrawn from the private properties identified.	That any of the proposed references, rules, or conditions, placed on any private property fronting the state highway be withdrawn immediately. Any Rules with immediate effect be withdrawn from the currently effected private properties.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.001	Scenic Visitor Zone	Scenic Visitor Zone	Oppose	This zone is superfluous - Settlement Zone can be used	Delete Scenic Visitor Zone. Use Settlement Zone instead.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.002	Buller Coalfield Zone	Buller Coalfield Zone	Oppose	This zone is superfluous.	Include Buller Coalfield Zone area in Mineral Purpose Zone.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.003	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Zone	Oppose	I strongly oppose this zone if it means any Mineral Extraction becomes a Permitted Activity.	Delete the zone, or make or Mineral Extraction in the Zone require a resource consent
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.004	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Mineral Extraction	Oppose	Nowhere should mineral extraction be a right, due to the invasive and damaging nature of the activity of mineral extraction on indigenous biodiversity and the wellbeing afforded to people by the recreational use of natural open space. In considering mineral extraction, the hierarchy of avoidance, mitigation, and remediation must always be considered before offsetting or environmental compensation. There is no need for a Mineral Extraction Zone. If the activity already has a permit I do not see why it needs a Special Zone.	In considering mineral extraction, the hierarchy of avoidance, mitigation, and remediation must always be considered before offsetting or environmental compensation.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.005	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O3	Amend		Amend wording as follows: MIN-O3 To recognize that mineral resources are widespread and fixed in location throughout the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini and that provided adverse effects are managed, mineral extraction activities can be appropriate in a range of locations outside specified zones and precincts. significant unique geology and indigenous biodiversity is not relocatable in order to provide for mining. <b>Therefore the hierarchy of avoidance, mitigation, and remediation must always be considered before offsetting or environmental compensation. Where offsetting or environmental compensation is considered it must be publicly notified.</b>
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.006	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O6	Amend	In considering mineral extraction, the hierarchy of avoidance, mitigation, and remediation must always be considered	Remove part b. of the objective.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					before offsetting or environmental compensation	
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.007	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose	I object in the strongest terms possible to a designation of Mineral Extraction on any area of outstanding biodiversity and natural beauty, in this case, specifically at Denniston.	Exclude Denniston Plateau from the Buller Coalfield Zone
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.008	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Features and Landscapes	Amend	This is an area of outstanding biodiversity and natural beauty.	Include Denniston Plateau in an ONL.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.009	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose	I object in the strongest terms possible to a designation of Mineral Extraction on any area of outstanding biodiversity and natural beauty, in this case, specifically at Te Kuha. This is the location of the only ephemeral wetland in the Ngakawau Ecological District and the area's largest population of Parkinson's rātā.	Rezone Te Kuha so it is not Mineral Extraction Zone or Buller Coalfield Zone.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.010	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	NENV - O3	Amend		Amend as follows: NENV-O3 b. the need for infrastructure to <del>sometimes</del> very rarely be located in significant areas
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.011	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	TRM - O1	Support in part	All the bullet points should be individual objectives, like other sections eg MIN I particularly support: 2 support the development of cycling and walking connections between tourism sites 6 recognising the cumulative effects of visitors	Turn the bullet points into individual objectives. Retain the content as notified.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.012	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	UFD - O1	Support	Generally support, and in particular 4. New developments in less hazardous areas, and 7. definitely support walking and cycling, suggest add micro mobility to transport modes	Add micro mobility to transport modes.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.013	Transport	Overview	Amend	Generally support. More emphasis required on active transport of all variations e.g.	Amend Overview as follows: The West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini has an

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					walking, cycling, scooting, wheelchair, riding Active transport is better located off road on a separate route from motorized transport. Shared paths are a good start, but as active transport modes become more popular, council must make provision for the future separation of active modes in high use locations. In places where volume and speed of the different active modes determine, separate walking and cycling routes must be provided.	extensive road and rail network with a growing number of <b>active transport routes</b> (shared pathways).
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.014	Transport	TRN - O3	Amend	Generally support. More emphasis required on active transport of all variations e.g. walking, cycling, scooting, wheelchair, riding	Amend as follows: TRN -03 To enable accessibility, safety and connectivity of land transport infrastructure and <del>consider</del> <b>provide for</b> the amenity of all transport users, including pedestrians and cyclists.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.015	Transport	TRN - P7	Support	For safety reasons I particularly support b. provide off road cycling and walking routes	Retain as notified.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.016	Transport	TRN - R5	Amend	Shared paths are a good start, but as active transport modes become more popular, council must make provision for the future separation of active modes in high use locations. In places where volume and speed of the different active modes determine, separate walking and cycling routes must be provided.	Amend as follows: Establishment of <b>active transport routes including</b> shared pathways, <del>including</del> <b>walkways, cycleways, and bridleways.</b>
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.017	Transport	TRN - R10	Amend	Shared paths are a good start, but as active transport modes become more popular, council must make provision for the future separation of active modes in high use locations. In places where volume and speed of the different active modes determine, separate walking and cycling routes must be provided.	Amend as follows: Establishment of <b>active transport routes including</b> shared pathways, <b>walkways, cycleways, and bridleways.</b>
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.018	Natural Hazards	NHO4	Support		Retain as notified.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.019	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support	Particularly support P3a - use of natural features and risk management.	Retain as notified
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.020	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support in part	In general I support recognition of the danger to life and property of living in areas susceptible to natural hazards. I support prohibition of further development in hazardous areas as this will become a liability to the council that approved it. However, there needs to be a transition, and this plan is making a good attempt at transitioning. As always the poorer are most constrained by the rules, for example, to rebuild with a certain timeframe. So that the people do not become isolated and abandoned, the coastal settlements need community wide consultation on the way forward. This includes without having to write.	Undertake further community wide consultation with coastal settlements on the way forward.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.021	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Support	I agree that any increase in floor area should meet a predetermined annual exceedance probability (AEP) level. As there have been so many events recently dubbed 1 in 100 years, I think the AEP level should probably be 1 in 500 years. However, without a map I can't say as the effect may be large, and it needs to be done in a planned manner.	Review AEP and extent to see if a higher AEP (eg 1 in 500 years) is preferable.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.022	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	I think the council should find a way to funnel a government fund to support all rebuilding to meet the agreed AEP level. This will be a cheaper resilience measure than moving people to completely new subdivisions.	Seek government support to fund rebuilding to agreed AEP level
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.023	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Support	I think the council should find a way to funnel a government fund to support all rebuilding to meet the agreed AEP/AIP level. This will be a cheaper resilience measure than moving people to completely new subdivisions.	Seek funding support from government for rebuilding to agreed AEP/AIP level.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.024	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Support	NH-R52 This needs a map to show where the land meets the criteria, such as the one below but with the Hazard category renamed to how high above the land a new building needs to be built to meet the AEP/ARI criteria.	Include a map linked to Rule NH52 that shows where land meets the Permitted Activity criteria.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.025	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- O2	Oppose	Remove this Objective. It is self-contradictory. If an area is of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat to indigenous fauna, then it's ecosystem and biodiversity value can not be enhanced by turning it into a subdivision.	Delete objective
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.026	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- O4	Amend	Totally support the preservation and restoration of indigenous biodiversity.	Amend as follows: To maintain the range, diversity <b>and area</b> of ecosystems and indigenous species found on the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.027	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Support	I support this clause for the mapping of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna habitat.	Retain as notified.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.028	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P9	Amend		Amend as follows: a. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is <b>no net loss and, preferably, a net gain in biodiversityd. The arrangements are legally binding in perpetuity</b>
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.029	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - O1	Oppose	Remove this Objective. It is self-contradictory. If an area is of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat to indigenous fauna, then it's ecosystem and biodiversity value can not be enhanced by turning it into a subdivision.	Delete objective and in particular reference to appropriate subdivision, use and development.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.030	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - O1	Oppose	The Plan is covering the need for resilience - building on the edge of a lake is not resilience. If it's not removed it needs measures in place, but it should be removed, as it's not consistent with coastal policy - why do I get prevented from building on my land on the coast while	Remove the Objective

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					others get to build on the edge of a lake which can also rise in level.	
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.031	Commercial Zone	Permitted Activities	Not Stated	Need to be able to live in the commercial zone, I don't see if this is allowed in the rules,	Ensure rules allow for people to live in the commercial zone.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.032	Buller Coalfield Zone	Buller Coalfield Zone Objectives	Not Stated	Reason: Social wellbeing will be brought about by experiencing this area as a natural playground which Mineral Extraction will destroy.	Remove all references to the social wellbeing brought about by the Mineral Extraction.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.033	Buller Coalfield Zone	BCZ - O1	Amend		Remove reference to national significance.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.034	Buller Coalfield Zone	BCZ - O2	Amend	BCZ-02 is very weak in the treatment of adverse effects, "minimises" seems loosely used, to really minimise would be to not go in at all.	Strengthen in terms of treatment of adverse effects.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.035	Buller Coalfield Zone	BCZ - P1	Oppose	If the current mineral extraction is lawfully established, it doesn't need a special zone. Growth and expansion do not meet the country's climate goals. There can be no "managing" adverse effects on the environment when the activity itself (mineral extraction) desecrates the local flora and fauna, and the product creates greenhouse gases that lead to flooding and sea level rise.	Delete the policy.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.036	Buller Coalfield Zone	Buller Coalfield Zone Policies	Amend	Needs an additional Policy to balance the access protection sought by mining interests. In order to protect people's interest in survival via the preservation of biodiversity, the additional policy should read	Add a new policy as follows: <b>To prevent mine spoil covering the unique ancient bonsai forest in the unique gullies in the Buller Coalfield Zone.</b>
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.037	Buller Coalfield Zone	BCZ - P4	Amend	Very weak protection in the phrase "as far as practicable" needs to be much more stringent	May policy more stringent and protective.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.038	Buller Coalfield Zone	BCZ - P5	Oppose	This hinges around the word necessary. I do not think any part of this mineral extraction is "necessary". If it can be shown that in a circular economy it is required then I would consider it.	Delete the policy.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.039	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ	Oppose	I challenge the need for this zone. To pre-designate an area for mineral extraction is not compatible with climate change goals of reduction in deforestation. The Overview states that it is anticipated that there will continue to be widespread mineral extraction outside of the MINZ, which again indicates no need for a separate designation when it is clear there are expectations that the really necessary mineral extractions will be allowed under existing zones and designations.	Delete Mineral Extraction Zone and Provisions from the Plan.
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.040	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - O1	Oppose	Social wellbeing will be brought about by experiencing this area as a natural playground which Mineral Extraction will destroy.	Remove all references to the social wellbeing brought about by the Mineral Extraction
Karen Lippiatt (S439)	S439.041	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - P5	Oppose	There is no way that removal of an area of significant indigenous vegetation "cannot be avoided" unless a life is at stake.	Delete the policy.
Karen Potter (S123)	S123.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Sites and Ares of Significance to Māori	Oppose in part	1/ this process should not impinge on my private property rights 2/ in my 28 years of living on my property there has been no mention or knowledge of my private property being of significance to Māori 3/ if my property remains in SASM68, my market valuation may be adversely affected	Realign SASM 68 so that it's eastern boundary will be aligned to the western boundary of State Highway 7.
Karen Vincent (S393)	S393.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose	My main concerns are for the environment and the many creatures within it. I have at least four threatened and vulnerable species in my creek alone and fear the waterways will be at high risk. The processing will require the contractors to pump huge amounts of water from the streams in the area which will likely destroy an already struggling ecosystem. This is one of the last stands of kahikatea on the Barrytown flats and deserves protection.	Oppose mineral extraction zone at Barrytown Flats.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Dust,noise,traffic etc,all a big threat to the peace and quiet of the environment. And possibly a large health risk. The traffic is a major potential hazard.	
Karen Vincent (S393)	S393.002	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Oppose	It has been pointed out to me that there is some clause which allows subsequent 3ha mining with no resource consent required. This needs to be removed. All mining should be transparent and discretionary rather than a permitted activity.	Remover GRUZ - R12 and require discretionary activity consent for all mining.
Karen Vincent (S393)	S393.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	High Natural Character	Amend	It's a stunning natural area and deserves protection also.	I would like to see the HNC overlay on the map extended to include Barrytown beach.
Karyn Davis (S267)	S267.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Support	I disagree with the proposal to erect a four story complex on Revell street where the pensioner homes are currently located. Why does TTPP contradict climate change rising sea levels . The current seawall issue/protection v resolution is at a standstill due to cost + design. The location of this zone is somewhat curious. There is clearly no logic in the proposed placement seemingly more focus on financial gain than the impact on current residents/homeowners. The current infrastructure cannot support a multi-tenanted build. The state of the footpaths, berms on Revell street is abysmal. Allowing a multi-story complex will adversely impact the neighboring property owners in particular the East side of the street. Their property values will decrease. The lack of sunshine/shade a significant increase of noise pollution.	Rezone the Medium Density Residential Area on Revell St Hokitika to General Residential Zone
Kate Kennedy (S46)	S46.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	There is all-round incompatibility of large-scale mineral sands extraction and processing that attracts the interest of mining companies in this area, with the peaceful rural lifestyle enjoyed by residents	For the proposed Mineral Extraction Zone on the Barrytown Flats to be rezoned General Rural in line with the rest of the Flats.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>and sensitive ecological areas on the Flats. Issues include the presence of sensitive waterbodies around the site, including wetlands, swamps, creeks and springs, and the "cumulative adverse effects" on the tāiko or Westland petrel population from increased vehicle movements along SH6."</p> <p>The activity will also impact on the quiet lifestyle of adjacent residents.</p> <p>Proceeding with forcing mineral extraction upon the Barrytown community is in direct contravention of the West Coast's own economic strategy Te Whanaketanga 2050.</p> <p>Sustainable tourism businesses feel under threat, because should full-scale mineral extraction proceed, this area will no longer be attractive to tourists. Community disintegration is occurring as people sell or leave to escape the uncertainty and possible noise, dust, vibration and disruption. Some residents have had difficulty selling homes as nobody wants to buy near a potential industrial area. The addition of increased volumes of heavy vehicles is incompatible with the existing condition of the road and its scenic/tourism use. Refer submission for further detailed reasons.</p>	
Kate Kennedy (S3)	S3.001	SCHED1A-SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE ITEMS AND AREAS	SCHED1A - SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE ITEMS AND AREAS	Amend	I wish to support the submission made by Jo Hart and Russell Deyell re the concept of the recognition of the The Historic Mining area of the Southern Paparoas as one of the West Coast Historic Heritage Items and Areas and Archaeological Sites, within the Te Tai o Poutini District Plan	List the Historic Mining area of the Southern Paparoas as one of the West Coast Historic Heritage Items and Areas and Archaeological Sites, in Schedule 1, Part 4 of the Te Tai o Poutini District Plan
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.001	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R12	Oppose	Oppose GRUZ-12 as this allows mining operations/mineral extraction to occur over	Remove GRUZ R12 and make Mineral extraction a restricted discretionary activity

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>a sizable area (up to 3 ha and up to 20,000m<sup>3</sup> per year) per property as a "green light" permitted activity without a resource consent even being required. Furthermore, this provision would allow larger scale companies to start mining on the Barrytown flats right now; being a permitted activity; on one property then move on to different/adjacent land parcels, this potentially enabling them to subsequently mine most of the Barrytown Flats . All this without proper consultation with the community that a process of this magnitude should necessitate. There would be increased issues with heavy traffic, dust, noise, pollution, amenity value, and impact on ecosystems and wildlife. Mineral extraction should be considered a Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activity (GRUZ- R25) in rural/rural lifestyle zones to allow for an appropriate level of consultation with the community and adequate control measures (resource consents) and GRUZ -R12 therefore removed.</p>	in Rural Zones.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	<p>Support the conditions related to the establishment of MINZ areas as outlined in the overview section. However, a MINZ at Barrytown cannot occur as there is no current authorisation/ resource consent. It is presumptive to propose such a zone for an area without any current authorisation, resource consent nor social licence to operate. Therefore, remove the proposed MINZ zone from the Barrytown Flats.</p>	Remove any proposed MINZ from the Barrytown Flats. This area needs to remain a General Rural Zone to reflect its current status and character as rural agricultural land.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.003	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O2	Support	<p>To ensure the minimising of adverse effects, as above, is a crucial objective and fully supported as the most important point</p>	Support the objectives of MIN-02 in developing/amending the plan to best manage the adverse effects of future potential

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					here in regard to any future sand mining activities; predicted to expand rapidly in coming years. Not only within the site of the mine; but having implications further afield.	large-scale sand HMC mining.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.004	Mineral Extraction Zone	Rules	Amend	<p>Large-scale heavy mineral concentrate (HMC) mining is a very recent activity in the South Island and its potentially wide-ranging adverse effects on community and environment as yet unproven.</p> <p>By contrast, relatively small-scale artisanal gold mining has been carried out as part of generally accepted West Coast life. The sheer scale of these new potential HMC activities, if carried out, sets the scene for many conflicts between developers and the community: residents living and moving here to rural lifestyle zones for the peace and proximity to abundant unique nature. Not to mention threats to the environment and biodiversity from pollution, noise, increased traffic, habitat disturbance, loss and degradation, dust from vastly increased commercial mining activities. The TTPP needs to add new rules to best manage this possibility. [refer submission for more detail]</p>	<p>Add new rules to mitigate any future and as yet unproven, adverse effects of large scale heavy mineral concentrate mining.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heavy Mineral Concentrate mining should be a Discretionary activity</li> <li>• Negate the possibility of reverse sensitivity arguments being used for existing consented mineral extraction operations where subsequent consents allow an increase in heavy truck movements along the same stretch of road to a level which would generate a minor or more than minor effect on the communities or businesses along the road.</li> <li>• Restrict the movements of trucks at night between the hours of 11pm and 6am.</li> <li>• Monitoring of cumulative effects of dust, noise, effects on wildlife and loss of amenity values from increasing numbers of articulated mining trucks along routes to the port.</li> <li>• Maximum allowable daily heavy truck movements be established for a road (or sections) at the time of granting the first mining consent application using that</li> </ul>



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>road. Allowable truck movements for subsequent applications will be limited to the designated maximum allowable truck movements minus the existing consented daily truck movements from other mine sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notification Decisions should consider whether the effects of heavy truck movements from a mine site to a port will affect commercial tourism and hospitality businesses on the trucking route, potentially many kilometres away from the mine site.</li> </ul>
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.005	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Overview	Support	<p>The media has reported recently that wildlife populations have declined 70% worldwide since 1970 (WWF, BBC, 13/10/22). ECO objectives in this context are therefore crucial to halt any further decline and degradation to the environment, habitat and indigenous biodiversity.</p>	Retain the stated aims and responsibilities of local councils in the ECO Overview to protect indigenous biodiversity.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.006	Planning Maps and Overlays	High Natural Character	Amend		*The High Natural character overlay should be extended to include NCA-041 (Pakiroa Beach).
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.007	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- O1	Support	<p>Fully support the objectives to Identify, protect and maintain indigenous vegetation and habitats as well as maintaining the diversity of ecosystems. Appropriate development or use occurs only where "values of the area can be maintained or enhanced".</p>	Retain Objective ECO-01

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.008	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- O2	Support	Fully support the objectives to Identify, protect and maintain indigenous vegetation and habitats as well as maintaining the diversity of ecosystems. Appropriate development or use occurs only where "values of the area can be maintained or enhanced".	Retain Objective ECO - 02
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.009	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- O3	Support	Fully support the objectives to Identify, protect and maintain indigenous vegetation and habitats as well as maintaining the diversity of ecosystems. Appropriate development or use occurs only where "values of the area can be maintained or enhanced".	Retain Objective ECO - 03
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.010	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO- O4	Support	Fully support the objectives to Identify, protect and maintain indigenous vegetation and habitats as well as maintaining the diversity of ecosystems. Appropriate development or use occurs only where "values of the area can be maintained or enhanced".	Retain Objective ECO - 04
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.011	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P2	Support	This policy does not support the identification of a mineral extraction zone at Barrytown	Support ECO-P2 (e) and apply to mineral extraction at Barrytown.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.012	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P3	Support	This policy does not support the identification of a mineral extraction zone at Barrytown	Retain ECO-P3 (b) & (e) and apply to mineral extraction activities at Barrytown
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.013	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P4	Support	This policy does not support the identification of a mineral extraction zone at Barrytown	Retain ECO-P4 and apply to any potential large-scale HMC mining ventures proposed for Barrytown.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.014	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P8	Support	This policy does not support the identification of a mineral extraction zone at Barrytown	Retain ECO-P8 in general and in apply to consideration of mineral extraction at Barrytown
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.015	Planning Maps and Overlays	High Natural Character	Support in part	It is correct to identify this as an area of high coastal natural character, considering the wider context of the outstanding natural landscape it is in proximity to (Tasman Sea	Support the designation of Pakiroa/Barrytown Beach as an area of High Coastal Natural Character (NCA41). Reflect the value of this area by extending

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>on one side, Paparoa range on the other), its proximity also to Punakaiki, the Paparoa National Park and Great Walk, and part of the great Coast Rd, considered one of the top 10 scenic drives in the world. That there are numerous scenic reserves, SNA's, the only nesting/breeding ground worldwide for Westland Petrel; all should be seen as grounds to prioritise preservation of a high value area where some commercial/agricultural activities and modification (farming) occurs. That the presence of these activities "do not overly detract from the highly expressive and natural processes that are the dominant element of the unit".</p> <p>The dominant element being its context in the wider element; should be grounds for extending the natural character overlay on the map to include NCA41 Pakiroa Beach. The area should be classified as a high coastal natural character area, in line with its neighbours. This is a stunning area and local policy should recognise it as such by giving it the correct classification and thus discouraging further demise.</p> <p><a href="https://tpp.nz/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/NC-Combined-Coastal-TerrestrialONC-HNC-Maps-2013.pdf">https://tpp.nz/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/NC-Combined-Coastal-TerrestrialONC-HNC-Maps-2013.pdf</a></p>	the overlay of high natural character on the map to include NCA41; in keeping with all the neighbouring surrounds on the map as either designated as high or outstanding natural character areas.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.016	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	MIN - O6	Amend	<p>MIN-06(a) takes a broad view of mitigating adverse effects of this activity. However, allowing for biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation would open the possibility for mining companies to simply invest in for eg: some species</p>	Retain strategic direction MIN-06 (a). Remove strategic direction MIN-06 (b).

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					protection or revegetation programme in order to "buy off" the rights to proceed with activities, that in the long run could be even more detrimental to the environment; nor will adequately compensate local residents and businesses for all the adverse effects suffered. This should not be a part of the resource consenting process.	
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.017	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS14	Amend	The standard does not adequately consider cumulative effects of heavy traffic movements that could arise from Heavy mineral concentrate (HMC) mining, with multiple sites trucking HMC along the coast to no more than 2 ports (Westport and Greymouth). [refer submission for more detail]	Expand and change #3 and #4 in TRNS14 to explicitly consider the cumulative effects of heavy mineral concentrate truck movements (or any other extraction-associated large bulk carrier vehicle movements) from mine site to port in relation to cumulative mining truck movements all the way to the port and the potential effects on businesses and communities en route.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.018	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R18	Oppose	This rule only applies to previously mined locations active since 2002 and listed in Schedule 10 which is empty, making GRUZ R18 irrelevant. Therefore this rule should be removed. All proposed mineral extraction activities in General Rural Zones should be considered Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary (GRUZ R25).	Remove GRUZ R-18
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.019	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R25	Amend	GRUZ-R25 Requires modification to address potential issues arising where multiple land parcels near to one another may be granted mining consents as is currently being proposed on the Barrytown Flats. This should include provision for maximum cumulative local transport movements, noise, dust, lighting effects and effects on local wildlife and waterways.	Amend the rule to take account of potential cumulative effects of multiple mining operations in the same locality as proposed on the Barrytown Flats

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.020	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	PUN - W033	Support	The schedule identifies clearly the importance of these areas and why they should be protected.	Retain in the plan and consider its existence as part of the reasons to remove GRUZ R-12, the MINZ zone at Barrytown and to extend the high natural character overlay to include NCA 41 Pakiroa/Barrytown beach.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.021	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	PUN - W034	Support	The area has the values as set out in the schedule.	Retain PUN - W034 and consider its existence as part of the reasons to remove Rule GRUZ -R12, MINZ at Barrytown and extend HNC 41.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.022	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	PUN - 124	Support	Has the values identified in the schedule.	Retain PUN - 124 and consider its existence as part of the reasons to remove GRUZ - R12 and MINZ at Barrytown and to extend HNC - 41.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.023	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	PUN - 044	Support	It has the values identified in the schedule	Retain PUN - 044 and consider its existence as part of the reasons to remove GRUZ - R12 and MINZ at Barrytown and to extend HNC - 41.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.024	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	PUN - 049	Support	It has the values identified in the schedule	Retain PUN - 049 and consider its existence as part of the reasons to remove GRUZ - R12 and MINZ at Barrytown and to extend HNC - 41.
Katherine Crick (S101)	S101.025	Mineral Extraction Zone	Rules	Amend	As large-scale sand mining on the Barrytown Flats is very likely to have adverse effects on the environment and people as more than minor; all resource	Ensure that all resource consents in the future regarding large-scale mining on the Barrytown flats be publicly notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					consents associated with this sort of activity should be publicly notified.	
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.001	Whole Plan	Whole plan	Amend	This plan is confusing, extremely long and complex which makes it very unfriendly. It needs to be rewritten so that it is easy to follow, logical and user friendly.	Rewrite the plan so it is shorter, simpler and meets the intent of the Local Government Reorganisation Scheme for the West Coast made in 2019
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.002	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Oppose	There is a very false justification for enabling mining in this plan and lack of recognition of the importance of Significant Natural Areas. It is saying that since there is such a large area of Public Conservation this means there is no need for further protection of indigenous vegetation including the setting aside of SNAs. I assert that SNAs do need to be assessed in the same way all across New Zealand, not differently on the West Coast.	Amend plan to ensure there is a rule framework that requires SNAs to be identified and mapped across the entire West Coast region, and for these areas to be listed in the plan, according to the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (RPS) Appendix 1 significance criteria.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.003	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Rules	Oppose	It's great that we have the nations remaining large areas of Conservation Land and the last remaining wetlands, Kahikatea forests and significant Coastal areas. These are assets and need protecting for their national and international significance, indigenous biodiversity and natural landscape values.	Amend plan to ensure there is a rule framework that protects the biodiversity of Significant Natural Areas that have not yet been identified and mapped in the Plan. Ensuring that such biodiversity has the same level of protection as the SNAs listed in Schedule Four
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.004	Buller Coalfield Zone	Buller Coalfield Zone Rules	Oppose	This is too permissive rather than being more controlled. I object to all the Mining Extractive Zones allowing permitted activities and they should all be removed.	Remove all permitted activities within the zone.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.005	Mineral Extraction Zone	Rules	Oppose	This is too permissive rather than being more controlled. I object to all the Mining Extractive Zones allowing permitted activities and they should all be removed.	Remove all permitted activities within the zone.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.006	Buller Coalfield Zone	Buller Coalfield Zone	Oppose	A special purpose zone for authorised/lawfully established mining activities is not necessary or appropriate. Managing the adverse effects of these activities should be consistent with the	Remove the Buller Coalfield Zone from the Plan.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					underlying/surrounding zone to ensure that adverse effects and remediation are appropriate. In addition, the zones proposed for the BCZ and the MINZ appear to capture areas that are not currently authorised for mineral extraction as well as areas where mining activities have not yet occurred.	
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.007	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Zone	Oppose	A special purpose zone for authorised/lawfully established mining activities is not necessary or appropriate. Managing the adverse effects of these activities should be consistent with the underlying/surrounding zone to ensure that adverse effects and remediation are appropriate. In addition, the zones proposed for the BCZ and the MINZ appear to capture areas that are not currently authorised for mineral extraction as well as areas where mining activities have not yet occurred	Remove the Mineral Extraction Zone from the Plan
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.008	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	A special purpose zone for authorised/lawfully established mining activities is not necessary or appropriate. Managing the adverse effects of these activities should be consistent with the underlying/surrounding zone to ensure that adverse effects and remediation are appropriate. In addition, the zones proposed for the BCZ and the MINZ appear to capture areas that are not currently authorised for mineral extraction as well as areas where mining activities have not yet occurred. I object to any mining on Public Conservation Land.	Where BCZ and MINZ have been proposed on public conservation land (PCL) rezone this land in these areas as Natural Open Space (NOSZ) and in other areas as General Rural Zone (GRUZ) or as consistent with adjacent zoning where appropriate.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.009	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Amend	The ttp plan seems to ignore conservation values seeing them as non-existent throughout the region. The proposed	Amend the plan provisions to ensure that indigenous biodiversity is maintained, and Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) are

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					approach risks further biodiversity loss in a major way	protected from new mineral prospecting, mineral extraction activities and ancillary activities.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.010	ZONES	ZONES	Amend	The ttp plan seems to ignore conservation values seeing them as non-existent throughout the region. The proposed approach risks further biodiversity loss in a major way.	Ensure there is a requirement for an ecological assessment in accordance with the RPS significance criteria for all new mineral extraction activities.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.011	Planning Maps and Overlays	Planning Maps and Overlays	Amend	On the planning maps, Public Conservation Land (PCL) is not clearly distinguishable from other land, nor does it appear to have been consistently zoned in the One Plan.	Clearly identify public conservation land on planning maps, as a map layer selection option.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.012	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	PCL is held for conservation purposes, which is for the protection of natural intrinsic values by the Department of Conservation. The MINZ and the BCZ being placed over PCL appears to be a deliberate and dangerous error of judgement. It misleads the West Coast public about reality, land management and the law.	Re-zone public conservation land to Natural Open Space Zone (NOSZ)
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.013	Natural Open Space Zone	Overview	Amend	The definitions of these areas are unclear and not what the law requires. Natural Open Space needs protecting by the Department of Conservation as Public Conservation Land. References to this are misleading about what is and what is not Public Conservation Land.	Clarify the references to natural open space zone and public conservation land to ensure that these are accurate and clear
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.014	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Amend	When you look at the maps there is largely no indication of where the Coastal Line actually is. This is not acceptable when the NZ Coastal Policy Statement is definitive on this, and provides clear guidance with the definition of where it needs to be. However this Policy is ignored or applied inconsistently in this plan. This must be addressed across the whole regional coastline.	Amend plan to comprehensively map the full extent of the Coastal Environment across the entire West Coast region.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.015	Interpretation	SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREA	Amend		Incorporate the definition for Significant Natural Area from the RPS into the plan, and use this terminology consistently throughout the plan.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.016	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Rules	Amend	Buller and Westland have not identified SNAs so the rules in these districts needs to be more restrictive over activities and their effects on the environment. If this doesn't happen then to maintain One Plan, Buller and Westland need to carry out an SNA identification process.	Make the rules for vegetation clearance more restrictive in Buller and Westland districts.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.017	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	There is a serious issue with Revell Street in Hokitika. The stop bank ends at the beginning of the new Council subdivision zone planned area. The Coastal Hazard zone runs right up to Gold Links Road where there is a subdivision and new houses. Medium density housing should not be in Coastal Hazard areas.	Rezone medium density residential area on Revell Street.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.018	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	An example of Natural Hazard is in Policy 1 of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement being about coastal processes impacting on the land, and there is an excellent list. But the TTPP One Plan has created only very small coastal areas for protection. This is totally insufficient in protecting indigenous biodiversity and avoiding adverse effects on threatened species.	The Plan needs to incentivize where subdivisions should be so that adaptive and progressive moving of residential areas is away from Coastal Hazard zones.
Katherine Gilbert (S473)	S473.019	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	Natural Hazard Section statements need to turn into policy or rules otherwise it is just misleading. It must be made perfectly clear what is intended considering the future and climate disruption.	Amend natural hazards policies and rules so that they implement the statements in the description and reflect the seriousness of future climate disruption.
Kathleen Maitland (S38)	S38.001	SCHED1A-SCHEDULE OF HISTORIC HERITAGE	HH105	Support	Just a couple of points of information regarding Hoki-39 Bond Street Ross. The Building is used by the Ross Goldfields Information & Heritage Centre not the Ross Community Society. There is	Retain the Ross Goldfields Historic Area

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
		ITEMS AND AREAS			one significant tree a Kahikatea. I am a member of the Ross Goldfields Information & Heritage Centre and was the Manager for a number of years	
Kathleen Mansell (S39)	S39.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	<p>We have had a look at the proposed plan, and see that our 3236m2 property at 3 Bayfield Street, Seddonville (legal Description Secs 36-39 Seddonville Blk XV Mokihinui SD) has had half of it zoned as Settlement Zone and half as General Rural Zone.</p> <p>Our property is on the outskirts of Seddonville and we have no formed road to our property, no street lights, no infrastructure of any type on or to our property.</p> <p>The neighbouring property, to the side of us, and also the property behind us have remained Rural, and we ask that our entire property be zoned as Rural.</p>	Rezone 3 Bayfield Street, Seddonville (legal Description Secs 36-39 Seddonville Blk XV Mokihinui SD) so that our entire property be zoned as General Rural Zone.
Kathryn Bennie (S116)	S116.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 200	Oppose	<p>Because the Te Tai o Poutini plan requires significant areas to be listed I feel that Poutini Ngai Tahu would be better supported if they concentrated on Crown land and not private land. Crown land can be looked at under a wider umbrella with less complication than private property owned by New Zealanders including those of Māori descent. Little in the DOC estate at Jackson Bay has been noted of significance and all private property has been identified and some known sites have been missed using these colonial boundaries. Archeology NZ registered locations in Jackson Bay show three sites that have proven Māori history. My family property has no site registered against it. My family property, like others around me has been built on top of the 8 December</p>	That the Te Tai o Poutini committee reconsider the amount of sites deemed to be of significance to Māori and in doing so remove that interest from my property

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					1880 slip material. The original whenua is buried deep beneath. [refer submission for more detailed korero]. While there are no current rules there is however a facility to add rules in the future.	
Katie Baxter (S211)	S211.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 104	Oppose	Needs more background information and history of the SASM 104 Physically separated from Kawhaka Creek by DOC land Does not understand why site applies to property	Provide clarity on why site 104 is identified as significant.
Katie Baxter (S211)	S211.002	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Not Stated	The plan is not clear on what rules apply to property for SASM 104	Provide clearer rules for Sites of Significance to Māori SASM 104
Katrina McLachlan (S340)	S340.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend		To amend the Flood Plain overlay in the Mawheraiti area, map #41. To take into account the change in elevation and metres above sea level.
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 104	Amend	We do not have any information specifically as what the significance of our property is to Maori. we also note SASM104 Kawhaka Creek catchment claims (Pounamu legends and Ancestors embedded in the landscape).	Clarify what the values of SASM 104 are and what is meant by "Ancestors embedded in the landscape"?
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.002	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 104	Oppose	Considering that the land has been previously mined (change in landscape) and occupied and mostly consist of a riverbed, how are Tupuna embedded in the current landscape?	Remove SASM 104 from property at Old Christchurch Road
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.003	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 104	Oppose	Further to this we note that this is going to be put on our LIM reports. We believe that this would significantly decrease the value of our land. should we in the future want to sell our property we would be negatively impacted. Why does it need to be on our LIM reports?	Do not include information on SASM 104 on LIM reports

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.004	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	What compensation is going to be out in place, should it impact the value of our properties and the ability to sell our properties?	Provide compensation for loss of property values for having SASM 104 on the property.
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.015	Planning Maps and Overlays	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	How were the areas marked on the map? What formula or methodology was used to establish the highlighted areas; they make no sense.	Provide information on how SASM 104 was identified.
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.016	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R5	Not Stated	Activities - Rule - SASM - R5 this is noted blank, what does this mean for us as property holders.	Clarify what rules apply to landowners in SASM 104
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.017	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Oppose	Schedule Three is blank, so we can assume with confidence that this is not going to change and will remain blank? without further encumbrances being placed on our property?	Provide assurance that no further rules in relation to SASM 104 will apply to the property.
Kawhaka Creek Catchment Residence (S297)	S297.018	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Oppose	We are concerned that the process has not transparent that there is an agenda that is not disclosed. We understand that there has been considerable research done over the past 3 years. There is no way we as individuals the we have the resources or the time to research our position with such short notice. Our land is our land, we have worked on it for a significant period of time. it is not just the value of the land, it is the work and labour that has gone into it, the memories it has to us, and the significance it holds for our families and whanau. Its is leaving us with a feeling of being disenfranchised, disempowered, with no participation or voice.	Provide for process that engages with affected property owners.
Kaye Leighton (S174)	S174.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose	We do not support and opposite the proposed zoning map over the Waipuna area that affect our properties and wish to have this amended to the "Rural Lifestyle Zone".	Amend zoning of our property at Waipuna to Rural Lifestyle - refer map in submission.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Map A shows our properties which comprise of approx. 13ha.  As per request for rezoning info sheet we do not feel we breach any of the principles and we meet the "good practice approaches" being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a). the zone boundaries are clearly defensible by the Waipuna Road and boundaries</li> <li>b). the zone follows the property boundaries</li> <li>c). we do not feel it is spot zoned being 4 existing residences of 13ha.</li> <li>d) and while zoning is not determined by the existing use rights we feel in this case they should be taken into account as this area has been used for "lifestyle living" for a significant period of time.</li> </ul> <p>The soil types of our properties are very stoney and hard to dig and have a brown clay element which means that the areas in paddocks around our houses can in areas be swampy and grow quite mossy and rushy vegetation. With fertiliser and drainage they can allow grazing for animals but revert quickly.</p> <p>The properties all have our own water and sewerage services we have rubbish services and new bins. And we are fully serviced by a tarseal road.</p> <p>We would like to see the new district plan reflect the true nature of the area and not be lumped in with the surrounding rural zoning and its encumbrances that it brings.</p> <p>We would be open to a site visit to discuss</p>	

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>the matter further if possible. All of the four residents are in agreement hence we have provided a joint case with Shari and Ben Ferguson to speak on our behalf at the hearing if deemed necessary.</p> <p>We would like to have the zoning amended to a rural lifestyle zone as this is what the area is and always has been for a significant time period.</p>	
Kaye Leighton (S174)	S174.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>We do not support and oppose the proposed natural hazard map over Waipuna area generally stating "flood plain" and wish to have this amended the reasons being</p> <p>a). our properties located on Map a - Waipuna Settlement are 18m above the river level and protected by a significant natural terrace that runs up the length of the valley.</p> <p>We would suggest a site visit to the area which would clearly show that this area is "flood safe".</p> <p>Map B and C show the natural terraces of the valley with the red line being the high terrace which ranges from approx. 20 - 30m above river level between us and 966 Waipuna Road</p> <p>b). We have concerns that our properties are shown as being in a flood plain (which we do not believe) then there is a risk that in the future this could affect our insurance ability and premiums as is happening in Westport.</p> <p>c) we believe that being classed as a flood plain will de-value and affect the resale of our properties at any future time.</p> <p>We have also provided some photos' of the area in the absence of a site visit.</p>	We seek that the Natural Hazard map for the Waipuna area be amended to reflect the true risk and suggest the natural terraces and contour maps along with GPS readings be used to do so.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					We can also provide testimonials if no site visit is undertaken from locals in the area if need be confirming the height of the river in the most significant floods otherwise this can be done at a site visit in person. Some of the residents have lived here their whole lives, and their families before them.	
Kelsey Mundy (S41)	S41.001	Appendix Nine: Airport Approach Path Overlay	Westport Airport and Karamea Aerodrome	Oppose	<p>The Westport Airport approach paths extend over several kilometres over Carters Beach and Cape Foulwind, including over the built up township part of Carters Beach.</p> <p>The proposed maximum height for any building, structure or tree that extends into this path is 1.2m.</p> <p>There is no reason this height limit needs to be this low. There is already significant buildings/houses/sheds and habitation/trees which are much higher than 1.2m so having a maximum height of 1.2m for future buildings etc is useless when that height is dwarfed by existing structures.</p> <p>The maximum height needs to be in line with the majority of the structures already in existence to have any purpose.</p>	Remove the restriction on heights for any building, structure or tree that extends into the Westport Airport flight path OR increase the height to something more reasonable.
Ken and Robyn Ferguson (S192)	S192.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>We oppose the proposed Flood Plain overlay over the Waipuna Area generally stating and wish to have this amended as it factually incorrect and misleading.</p> <p>From map one and two attached we have provided it is very clear that the river has natural terraces in the valley protecting the majority of the land from flooding in a significant event. These terraces range from approx. 33m above river level to over 77m above river level. The majority of the</p>	Amend the Flood Plain overlay over the Waipuna Area to reflect the actual risk and exclude identified areas on terraces.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>land has been mapped as flood plain is not. This needs to be corrected and mapped correctly using contour map, GPS and site investigation.</p> <p>One of the biggest concerns is the risk to our insurance premiums, ability to insure and issues when properties are sold re insuring them,.</p> <p>Having the property incorrectly zoned flood plain will also affect our businesses ability to lend from financial institutions potentially as they will rate us with a higher risk being in flood plain, and this will in hand see us paying higher interest rates and limiting our ability to borrow capital.</p> <p>In the event that we ever wished to sell our property being in a flood zone plain would also impact on the property value and saleability.</p>	
Ken and Robyn Ferguson (S192)	S192.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	<p>The Waipuna Farming area of our property (and the rest of the valley) is a deer, sheep and beef farming operation, covering roughly 1000 hectares in grazable land. While the land is farmed it is not highly productive and the soil types are not able to support high production values.</p> <p>We have no objection what so ever to land that falls into this category being identified and see this as extremely important for New Zealand to protect its arable land from being over taken by urban sprawl, but in this instance feel the system just hasn't gotten things right.</p>	Remove the "Highly Productive Land" Precinct over land at Waipuna.
Ken McTIGUE (S551)	S551.001	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 42	Amend	Devaluation of the freehold land.	Oppose the SASM overlay on property.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ken McTIGUE (S551)	S551.002	SCHED 3: SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI	SASM 42	Support in part		Happy to pass on to Iwi any artefacts found on properties.
Kenneth Doig (S172)	S172.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Support in part	SASM 104 Kawhaka Creek Catchment is a very broad area and while this is understandable with regards to the Pounamu rights. Not all land in this area would have been significant to Maori other than that of Pounamu rights, in particular our property was originally swamp land and it would not have contained any sacred sites. The history of the area directly in our vicinity needs to be investigated further before any decisions are made with a one size fits all approach.	Reduce the size of SASM 104 Kawhaka Creek to align better with the location of the waterbody
Kenneth Doig (S172)	S172.002	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Management of Activities on Identified Significant Sites and Areas	Amend	There should not be a one size fits all approach with regards to development and mining - SASM - P11 (point a) and SASM R7 (point 3). The rights to mine certain areas such as privately owned Victorian Title land should not need to be approved by Poutini Ngāi Tahu rūnanga. Please include the wording With the exception of privately owned Victorian Title Land	Amend P7 and P11 to recognise privately owned Victorian Title Land.
Kevin Klempel (S276)	S276.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	The Zoning for the property listed as 11 Lake Brunner Road is incorrectly zoned and needs to be changed. Because the block is contiguous with and partially adjacent to a Residential area does not mean automatically that it should be residential. The block is adjacent to and contiguous with a Settlement Zones and by physical actuality, prior use and descriptions listed within the plan document actually better fits within this or one of the rural zones and not the General Residential Zone in which it is currently listed.	Rezone the property at 11 Lake Brunner Road as Settlement Zone

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Primarily this title exists around the Moana Residential zone with no direct legal connection to that zone by way of title access into that zone. The size of the title is such that at 6+ ha it exceeds even perhaps the description of a large residential title and falls more correctly into a rural zone size.</p> <p>Costs to subdivide rise in proportion to the sale return of any title and given that the title has no direct access to provide the required services for an urban subdivision into the Moana Residential area those costs are incrementally greater for a title such as this. It is also questionable as to its suitability for urban subdivision, particularly of the type favoured in Moana, Holiday part time live in.</p> <p>Currently the title is run as a small holding with livestock and farm machinery as it has been since the time the first block was surveyed, moving it into the Residential zoning has the potential to provide excessive restriction to an activity that has been running on this land for more than a century now and for good reason.</p>	
Kevin Klempel (S276)	S276.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Planning Maps and Overlays	Amend	The precincts are hard to differentiate and need to be more clearly defined on the maps so so that property owners know to which specific sub zone they are listed in and the consequential restrictions or activities required of them relative to other zones, from within the same document.	Amend the planning maps so the different precincts are clearly differentiated.
Kevin Scanlon (S503)	S503.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The overlays are too extensive	Amend the flood hazard overlays to be more enabling of building and development and to recognise established investment.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kevin Scanlon (S503)	S503.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	The Rules are too restrictive.	Amend the flood hazard rules to be more enabling of building and development and to recognise established investment.
Kim Carol and Robert Terry (S55)	S55.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Open Space Zone	Not Stated	All of these are very important to Greymouth and deserve their very own category  they are within 12KM of the greymouth courthouse which is the new center of town	Recognise the importance of Greymouth Rural Recreation Complexes including Wingham Park, Omoto Racecourse and Greymouth Golf Course
Kim Scrivener (S5)	S5.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend		Property at 2 Sturge Street, Cobden, currently General Residential zone. Wish to stay in Rural Zone.
Kirsty Dittmer (S148)	S148.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	We request that 26 Pandora Ave be included in the Settlement Zone as it would suit this zoning better. The land and the location are not suitable for uses described in the GRUZ zone.	Rezone 26 Pandora Ave Greymouth be included in the Settlement Zone.
Kirsty Dittmer (S412)	S412.001	Appendix Three: Design Guidelines	Greymouth/Māwhera Town Centre and Mixed Use Zone Urban Design Guidelines	Amend	I disagree with some of the statements introducing the guidelines. The historic buildings that are left should be protected but I don't think they should dictate future development or design in the CBD. Some aspects of the guidelines are unclear eg GC1, IW6, GF6 Re GC2 - While views are important and a crucial part of design, this could conflict with other design decisions being made in a new building when the view of a neighbouring building is not as important for the new building owner as other parts of the design. Re BF1 - the division of the lower floor of larger buildings should be determined by the owner/potential tenant. Why specify that the ground floor needs to split up into smaller storefronts. This limits the options for owners.	Amend the designation guidelines as follow: 2.1 Context - <del>"The core of Greymouth/ Māwhera's town centre retains a coherent collection of nineteenth and early twentieth century buildings and architecture/building methods of this period. This represents an important part of the historic heritage resource of the West Coast/Te Tai-o Poutini."</del> GC1 - New buildings/structures <b>on neighbouring properties</b> shall complement and support, rather than dominate these scheduled buildings and structures. GC2 - Take into account the wider surroundings, including natural features, <del>such as views to other buildings, the mountains and the Māwhera/Grey River.</del> IW6 - <b>When a cultural narrative is being expressed</b> Poutini Ngāi Tahu narratives are

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>Re BF4 - Two storey buildings should not be the expected. It is very difficult to get tenants for upstairs tenancies and most greymouth upstairs spaces are empty. The general attitude from GDC from what has been put out to the public for years now that greymouth is shrinking and that the CBD needs to be more compact.</p> <p>Re GF1 - Why let the past dictate that future design needs to be symmetrical?</p> <p>Re GF2 - I Disagree. Solid glazing size will be dictated by the material properties of glass anyway. Lots of building use opaque films over glazing so they can use the ground floor as office spaces.</p> <p>GF3 - It is not always the best option for the whole shop frontage of buildings to be display space. Maybe this is feasible for Mackay St but not for the whole CBD.</p> <p>GF5 - Upper Area - disagree symmetry should be a compliance point.</p> <p>GF6 - Need allow for the camber of the road and the fact that campervans regularly hit verandahs.</p> <p>GF8 - disagree that colour should be included in district plan at all. Building designers and occupiers should be able to have freedom to paint and sign-write their building in whatever way suits their business and the overall design of the building. Bright colours should not be discouraged. The biggest criticism of Greymouth is that the main street is boring and dull. The images shown don't match with the wording. Making a set colour pallette for the town discourages creativity and charactor in the CBD. This clause directly negates the introduction where it says we want the CBD to be visually</p>	<p>creatively reinscribed through architectural design and building, integrated artwork and Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Waewae mandated design professionals and artists are appropriately engaged in such processes.</p> <p><del>BF1 - Where very wide buildings are proposed, their bulk and width shall be reduced by dividing the façade up by vertical divisions into several smaller "storefronts" - something commonly used in the existing Greymouth/Māwhera building stock.</del></p> <p>BF4 - New buildings should ideally be at least two storeys in height, but at a minimum, shall appear similar in height to the existing neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>GF1 - Buildings are to have windows on all street facades with minimum glazing as specified in the relevant rules. <del>Symmetrically located windows are required above ground level, and</del> main doors at ground level are to be oriented to the street (i.e., not at the side or the back). Entrances shall be wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs and pushchairs. Buildings that have more than one frontage (i.e., corner) are to include windows and doors on both facades if there is sufficient length of frontage. The design of side and back elevations that are visible from the street or any other public space should be consistent with the design of the main building frontage.</p> <p>GF2 - The ground floor window of buildings (including glazed doors) in Main Street Frontages must be no less than 50% of the frontage in the Town Centre Zone and on Façade Control Streets in the Mixed Use Zone must have a minimum 20% glazing. <del>On all facades, fully glazed facades will not be</del></p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>interesting.            GL1 - Preferably new buildings are modern. The riverfront position is different now that there is a floodwall as the river connection is lost.</p>	<p><del>permitted unless there are vertical solid breaks at frequent intervals. The glazing is not to be blocked out with opaque or reflective film, or other treatment that obscures the visual connection from the outside into the building.</del></p> <p>GF3 - where the ground floor is used for offices/commercial activity in Main Street Frontage Streets, the display area immediately behind the windows should be designed as reception and waiting areas <b>where feasible.</b></p> <p>GF5 - <i>Upper Area</i> - symmetrical placement of windows <b>is preferred</b></p> <p>GF6 - Verandahs are a requirement in Main Street Frontage Streets and Façade Control Streets and are subject to performance standards in the rules. Verandahs should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complement the building style of the building to which they are attached</li> <li>• Extend over the footpath and full width of the building frontage. <b>Allow space at edge of footpath to allow for road camber</b></li> <li>• Take cues from neighbouring verandahs in terms of height, proportion and style, whilst allowing for variation in design features</li> <li>• Be fully cantilevered with no decorative poles or obstructions of the footpath</li> </ul>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Not obscure windows or architectural details</del></li> <li>• Verandahs on corner buildings should wrap around the building and extend the full width of both frontages (even if only one frontage is classed as a Main Street Frontage or Façade Control Street).</li> </ul> <p>GF8 - delete clause</p> <p>GL1 - delete clause</p>
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.001	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Oppose	Adds a huge extra layer to resource consent on land that has been used for residence and/or business in private ownership for decades. There is nothing in the document that says it will be a fair equally-weighted decision between two parties. It gives all the power to Iwi to allow or deny a fair request for consent. We need a fair and equitable process where we can come to a mutual and reasonable outcome. [refer original submission for more information]	Amend rules to ensure Iwi cannot withhold reasonable consent applications on prejudicial grounds.
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.002	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - P14	Oppose	SASM - P14 is a section under Appropriate activities however the clauses that have to be regarded may make it very difficult to undergo a permitted activity.	Remove policy and provide more regard to the Land or business owners ability to improve the land is required. Address concerns regarding costs to undertake the required assessments and unclear outcomes and timeframes for Iwi involvement.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.003	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - P15	Oppose	Permitted activities in SASM - P15 give Iwi sweeping powers to deny a permitted activity.	Remove policy and provide more regard to the Land or business owners ability to improve the land is required. Address concerns regarding costs to undertake the required assessments and unclear outcomes and timeframes for Iwi involvement.
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.004	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - P13	Oppose in part	SASM - P13 references Schedule 3 which for Punakaiki Area SASM 31 and SASM 32 have nothing in the Category or Relevant Permitted Activity fields. Allows for demolition but not replacement of what was removed, this should be addressed. Clarification sought if upgrading of critical infrastructure includes enlarging / replacing septic tanks which is otherwise in the Inappropriate Activity list (SASM - P11).	Clarification sought on what is critical infrastructure, seems to be more to do with network power lines etc, does this include individual septic tanks and wastewater? In the absence of a town-scheme, we need to be able to replace, expand this if required
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.005	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - O1	Oppose	Private freehold land should not be used to redress tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga. Redress issues need to be addressed at Central Government level and not by certain individual landowners who now find the land they bought in good faith has a sudden new restrictive classification.	SASM-01 should be removed.
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.006	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - O2	Oppose in part	Ngai Tahu should not be given blanket access to all SASM land. This is totally unreasonable to landowners, the clause is not restrictive, gives no need for consultation to landowners as to when, why, how long they wish to have access. Can all Ngai Tahu freely access SASM land?	Amend SASM-02 so that free range to Ngai Tahu to access, maintain and use any land within the SASM classification is changed to periodic access after consultation with landowners for reasonable access to particularly important areas.
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.007	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - O3	Oppose in part	SASM-03 and following list of inappropriate activities gives insufficient clarification as to what is inappropriate subdivision, use and development; how long the consultation	Provide clarification on what is Inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					may take; how much it may cost and leaves it open for activities to be unreasonably denied. Can it be denied based on commercial reasons i.e competition. Ngai Tahu has significant commercial interests and this leaves it open for them to deny permission to prevent commercial competition.	
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.008	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - P5	Oppose	Clarification on level of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiātanga for private land owners decision-making. The use of tino rangatiratanga and kaitiātanga needs to be fully translated and explained. These terms are non commonly used in English and it is absolutely necessary for all parties with this classification to know what is actually means in this context.	Provide clarification of what tino rangatiratanga and kaitiātanga means in regard to SASM and particularly to private landowners in SASM 31 and SASM 32.
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.009	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R2	Oppose in part	Removal of the need to seek consent for minor works such as erecting a new fence. In the proposed plan, landowners are only allowed to maintain existing fences, along an existing alignment. This puts additional time and costs for a minor job. Many very minor works will now require consent, this is unreasonable to landowners	Amend rule so that consent is not required for insignificant work such as a new fences etc
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.010	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R3	Oppose in part	This clause is too restrictive, most alterations, even minor would require some earth disturbance or foot print alteration. Adds time/cost to work on private property.	Remove the restrictions associated with the rule that an activity is only permitted where land disturbance is not involved and change to size, structure or location.
Kirsty Henderson (S125)	S125.011	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R17	Oppose	This clause is too restrictive and could thwart any new builds in Punakaiki. This SASM encompasses the entire residential and commercial area of Punakaiki which has no town treatment plant and is reliant on individual septic tank systems. This clause seems to allow lwi to not allow replacement of current systems - if your septic tank fails can you replace with a new	Remove the ability for lwi to stop reasonable development on grounds of not allowing any changes to or new wastewater disposal.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					one, or expansion of current ones, which may be necessary due to new development, increased tourist numbers etc. It is not reasonable for lwi to prevent this on private land.	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.001	Interpretation	CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE	Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of the rail network within this definition.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.002	Interpretation	FUNCTIONAL NEED	Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of this definition in the Proposed Plan.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.003	Interpretation	Infrastructure	Support	The definition as proposed which replicates the RMA definition, is supported by KiwiRail, noting clause (g) includes rail.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.004	Infrastructure	Other relevant Te Tai o Poutini Plan provisions	Amend	Land transport infrastructure is a term that is used within the Proposed Plan but is not defined. To ensure the plan is interpreted correctly, KiwiRail seeks that this term is defined and that the rail network is included in this definition. The relief sought takes direction from the definition of Land Transport and Infrastructure within the West Coast Regional Land Transport Plan 2021-2031.	Insert as follows: <b>Land Transport Infrastructure means the infrastructure, goods and services facilitating transport on land by any means. This includes coastal shipping and all fixed components of a transportation system, including roadways and bridges, railways, ports, cycle trails and other physical elements.</b>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.005	Interpretation	MAINTENANCE	Support	KiwiRail supports allowing for any work or activity necessary to keep the operation and or function of existing infrastructure as maintenance.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.006	Interpretation	NETWORK UTILITY OPERATOR	Support	KiwiRail supports the use of the RMA meaning of Network Utility Operator, which includes railway activities. This approach supports the integrated management and provision of key infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.007	Interpretation	Noise	Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of this definition as proposed.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.008	Noise	Noise Rules	Amend	KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of a definition of Noise Sensitive Activity to assist with clear interpretation of the Proposed Plan.	Insert as follows: <b>Noise sensitive activity means any lawfully established residential activity, including activity in visitor accommodation or retirement accommodation, including boarding</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<b>houses, residential visitor accommodation and papakāinga; educational activity; health care activity, including hospitals ; congregation within any place of worship; and activity at a marae.</b>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.009	Interpretation	NOTIONAL BOUNDARY	Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of this definition as proposed.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.010	Interpretation	OPERATIONAL NEED	Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of this definition in the Proposed Plan.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.011	Interpretation	PORT ACTIVITIES	Support	KiwiRail supports the inclusion of ancillary transport infrastructure within this definition. KiwiRail owns land adjacent to the Port of Greymouth and Port of Westport and it is important to include rail infrastructure within this definition to accurately capture all port activities within the West Coast.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.012	Interpretation	Reverse sensitivity	Support	KiwiRail supports the definition of reverse sensitivity subject to amendment. KiwiRail seeks amendment to recognise that in the context of rail, activities are more than operation of the railway and the definition also needs to encompass development, upgrading and ongoing maintenance of the rail network including rail yards. It is appropriate to recognise the vulnerability of existing, lawfully established activities such as the rail network to other activities in the vicinity which may be sensitive to adverse environmental effects.	Amend as follows: Reverse sensitivity means the potential for <b>the development, upgrading, operation and maintenance of</b> an approved, existing or permitted activity to be compromised or constrained, by the more recent establishment or alteration of another activity which may be sensitive to the actual, potential or perceived adverse environmental effects generated by an approved, existing or permitted activity.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.013	Interpretation	SENSITIVE ACTIVITY	Amend	KiwiRail supports the listed activities within this definition, however, also considers that the list should be expanded to capture all sensitive activities.	Amend as follows: Sensitive activity means any: residential activity; visitor accommodation; retirement home; healthcare facility; community facility; <del>and</del> <b>educational facility; marae/papakāinga; hospital; or place of worship.</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.014	Transport	Transport	Amend	KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of a definition of Transport Network. This term is used within the Transport Chapter and for clarity, KiwiRail seeks a definition which includes the rail network.	Include the following definition in the proposed plan: <b>Transport Network means all rail, public roads, public pedestrian, cycle and micro-mobility facilities, public transport and associated infrastructure.</b>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.015	Interpretation	UPGRADING	Support	The specific ability to improve or increase the safety or efficiency of existing infrastructure as defined as upgrading, is supported.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.016	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	CR - O2	Support	KiwiRail supports the desire to support the continued function and resilience of critical infrastructure and the support for the facilitation of quick recovery from adverse events.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.017	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	CR - O3	Support	KiwiRail supports the direction to ensure that critical infrastructure takes into account the hazardscape, where practicable. Due to the linear nature of the existing rail corridor it is not always possible or practicable to avoid hazardscapes and KiwiRail supports recognition of this.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.018	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	NENV - O3	Support	Recognition of the need for infrastructure to sometimes be located in significant areas is supported by KiwiRail.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.019	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	UFD - O1	Amend	KiwiRail considers that the objective should be amended to make reference to the protection of critical infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend as follows: To have urban environments and built form on the West Coast/Te Tai o Poutini that: [...] 8. Promote the safe, efficient and effective provision and use of infrastructure, including the optimisation of the use of existing infrastructure and protection of critical infrastructure <b>from reverse sensitivity effects;</b>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.020	Infrastructure	INF - O1	Support	KiwiRail supports the intent of the objective to enable the safe and efficient development, operation, maintenance, and upgrading of infrastructure.	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.021	Infrastructure	INF - O2	Support	The rail network can be vulnerable to adverse effects when incompatible subdivision, land use and development is located adjacent to an established rail line. KiwiRail supports the objective to protect infrastructure from adverse effects.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.022	Infrastructure	INF - O4	Support	The consideration for resilience and the potential impacts of climate change in infrastructure design and provision, is supported by KiwiRail	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.023	Infrastructure	INF - O5	Support	KiwiRail supports recognition of the functional and operational need as well as the benefits of infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.024	Infrastructure	INF - P1	Support	KiwiRail supports the recognition of the positive social, cultural and environmental benefits from the development, continued operation and upgrading of utilities and infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.025	Infrastructure	INF - P2	Support	KiwiRail supports recognition that the adverse effects of infrastructure cannot always be managed and the inclusion of a policy framework how to assess effects in these situations with consideration for the following in particular: Locational, technical and operational constraints; Resilience to natural hazards and climate change; Poutini Ngāi Tahu preference for discharge of wastewater to land; Benefits of co-location of infrastructure; and The need to minimise adverse effects on the environment.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.026	Infrastructure	INF - P3	Amend	KiwiRail supports the protection of infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision, use and development that may constrain or compromise the safety and efficiency of the rail network. Amendments are requested to ensure the policy applies to all rail	Amend as follows: Manage reverse sensitivity effects from subdivision, use and development, on utilities and infrastructure to ensure the safe, secure and efficient operation, <b>maintenance, repair, upgrading, removal and development of infrastructure.</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					activities, not just the operation of the rail network.	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.027	Infrastructure	INF - P5	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 the policy direction and provision for new allotments to manage stormwater onsite.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.028	Infrastructure	INF - P6	Support	KiwiRail supports policy that recognises the benefits that new technologies can bring to rail in terms of efficiency of the operation and safety and resilience of the network.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.029	Infrastructure	INF - R4	Support	KiwiRail supports the permitted activity status of temporary network activities, subject to standards.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.030	Infrastructure	INF - R7	Amend	KiwiRail seeks amendment to this rule to ensure it applies to rail infrastructure. It is essential that rail activities are captured and provided for in the plan and the rules as proposed, fail to specifically provide for rail infrastructure activities. KiwiRail seeks permitted activity status for the installation, extension, operation, upgrade, maintenance and repair, or removal of rail infrastructure and ancillary vehicle access tracks, subject to standards.	Amend as follows: INF - R7 Installation, extension, maintenance, operation, upgrade and repair of <b>rail infrastructure</b> , lines, underground pipelines and ancillary vehicle access tracks erected by a Network Utility Operator. [...]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.031	Infrastructure	INF - R26	Amend	KiwiRail seeks amendment to this rule to ensure it applies to aboveground infrastructure such as rail.	Amend as follows: INF-R26 Installation, extension, maintenance, operation, minor upgrade and repair of <b>rail infrastructure</b> , lines, poles and towers erected by a Network Utility Operator not meeting Permitted Activity standards.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.032	Transport	TRN - O1	Amend	KiwiRail supports recognition of the critical role of land transport infrastructure within this objective.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.033	Transport	TRN - O3	Support	The safety and connectivity of land transport infrastructure is essential. If the interface between roads and rail corridors is not managed effectively, there is the	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					potential for poor safety outcomes. KiwiRail supports the intent of this objective.	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.034	Transport	TRN - O4	Support	KiwiRail supports the objective to encourage a resilient transport network to natural hazards and climate change.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.035	Transport	TRN - O5	Support	KiwiRail supports provision of safe and efficient access.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.036	Transport	TRN - P1	Support	KiwiRail is committed to maintaining and enhancing the rail network to provide safe and efficient transportation and therefore supports this policy.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.037	Transport	TRN - P2	Amend	KiwiRail supports policy that promotes safety at vehicle crossings. KiwiRail seeks amendment to this policy to ensure that rail level crossings are a consideration as well as intersections and State Highways.	Amend as follows: Vehicle crossings and associated access will; Be designed and located to provide for safe, effective and efficient movement to and from sites; Minimise potential conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists on the adjacent road network; and Manage vehicle access to and from sites adjacent to <b>rail level crossings</b> , intersections, and where State Highways meet.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.038	Transport	TRN - P3	Amend	KiwiRail supports the intent of this policy but seeks amendment to ensure that buildings, structures, planting or other visual obstructions vegetation are restricted within sightlines of rail level crossings.	Amend as follows: Maximise user safety at road and rail level crossings by <del>considering the location of</del> <b>restricting</b> buildings , <b>structures, planting</b> and other visual obstructions within sightlines.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.039	Transport	TRN - P4	Amend	KiwiRail does not typically support new at-grade level crossings. KiwiRail seeks amendment to this policy to strengthen the wording and requirement to achieve safety at all rail crossings.	Amend as follows: <del>Ensure any new r</del> <b>Road</b> and pedestrian rail level crossings <del>carefully consider the</del> <b>must ensure</b> safety of road users, pedestrians, and the effective and efficient operation of the regions rail network.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.040	Transport	TRN - P5	Support	KiwiRail supports the control of vehicle access to sites adjacent to all road/rail level crossings to improve safety for road users on the approach to level crossings.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.041	Transport	TRN	Amend	The advice note advising plan users of the need to get approval from KiwiRail where	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					any crossing will intersect with the rail corridor is supported.	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.042	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNS1	Support	KiwiRail support the requirement for vehicle crossings to be setback a minimum of 30m from a railway level crossing as specified in clause TRN- S1. KiwiRail further support the requirement for KiwiRail approval for all new vehicle access points that intersect the rail corridor.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.043	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	TRNTable 1	Amend	Public safety at level crossings is crucial, and protection of sight lines is a key means of ensuring this. KiwiRail therefore support the inclusion of a standard for sight triangles for railway level crossings. This standard would support policy TRN-P3 and TRN-P4 to maximise road user safety and provide for the safe and effective use of the functioning of the transport network. In order to protect sight lines at level crossings, a new rule is proposed. Compliance with the standard would provide for development as a permitted activity, with non-compliance requiring a restricted discretionary activity consent, with discretion restricted to the aspects provided in TRN-P3. KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of the full suite of sight lines at railway level crossings provisions as outlined in our relief sought.	Insert as follows: <b>TRN - RX : Sight lines at railway level crossings All zones Activity status: Permitted Where: a. Compliance is achieved with TRN-SX. TRN - RX : Sight lines at railway level crossings not meeting Permitted Activity Standards All zones Activity status: Restricted discretionary Where: 1. Compliance is not achieved with TRN-SX. Discretion is restricted to: a. The potential for adverse effects on the safety an efficiency of the rail network. Section 88 information requirements for applications: 1. Applications under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, evidence of engagement with KiwiRail TRN - S(X): Level Crossing Sight Triangles Buildings, structures, planting or other visual obstructions must not be located within the restart or approach sightline areas of railway level crossings as shown in the shaded areas of Figure 1 - TRN: Restart Sightlines and Figure 2 - TRN: Approach Sightlines below. Figure 1: Approach Sight Triangles for Level Crossings with "Stop" or "Give Way" Signs</b> [See original submission for

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						requested diagram] <b>Figure 2: Restart Sight Triangles for all Level Crossings</b> [See original submission for requested diagram]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.044	Natural Hazards	NHO3	Support	Rail infrastructure is linear and is not easily relocated. KiwiRail supports the objective that recognises that in some instances, critical infrastructure is required to be located within areas of hazard risk.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.045	Natural Hazards	NHO6	Support	KiwiRail supports the objective to protect infrastructure from natural hazard mitigation measures.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.046	Natural Hazards	NHP3	Support	KiwiRail supports policy which recognises that, in some instances, hard engineering measures are necessary to reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to property or infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.047	Historic Heritage	HH - O4	Amend	KiwiRail supports provisions that seek to protect historic heritage. There are a number of heritage items within the rail corridor and KiwiRail seeks amendment to this objective to recognise the functional and operational need of infrastructure.	Amend as follows: Protect historic heritage by restricting relocation, repositioning, internal and external alterations and additions to heritage items and not allowing demolition and destruction , <b>while recognising the functional or operational need of infrastructure.</b>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.048	Historic Heritage	HH	Amend	KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of a new policy which recognises that there may instances where there is an operational or functional need for critical infrastructure to be located within a heritage setting.	Insert as follows: <b>Only allow new infrastructure on or within heritage items, heritage settings and historic heritage sites, identified in Schedule One where it can be demonstrated that: There is an operational need or functional need that means the infrastructure's location cannot be avoided; and The new infrastructure will protect and maintain the particular heritage and/or cultural values of that building, site, area, item and/or feature.</b>



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.049	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P2	Amend	KiwiRail supports policy that allows activities within significant habitats where the activity has a functional need to be located in that area. KiwiRail seeks amendment to strengthen this policy and include where an activity has an operational need to be located in a significant area. Rail has an operational need to be located within existing designated rail corridors and KiwiRail seeks recognition of this.	Amend as follows: Allow activities within areas of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitats of indigenous fauna where: This is for a lawfully established activity; or It is for a Poutini Ngāi Tahu cultural purpose; or This is undertaken on Poutini Ngāi Tahu or Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu land in accordance with an Iwi/Papatipu Rūnanga Management Plan; or The activity has a functional <b>or operational</b> need to be located in the area; The activity has no more than minor adverse effects on the significant indigenous vegetation or fauna habitat.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.050	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P7	Support	KiwiRail supports ECO-P7 a. and g. which recognise the necessity of critical infrastructure and provides a hierarchy of avoid, remedy or mitigate impacts.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.051	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R1	Support	KiwiRail supports the rule which acknowledges the need to operate, repair and maintain infrastructure where it has been lawfully established as a permitted activity.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.052	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R2	Amend	KiwiRail seeks amendment to ensure that this provision applies to operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and installation of critical infrastructure as well as network utility infrastructure.	Amend as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where: This is for: Walking/cycling tracks, roads, farm tracks or fences; Operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and installation of <b>critical infrastructure</b> , new network utility infrastructure and renewable electricity generation activities; or [...]
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.053	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R5	Support	KiwiRail supports matter of discretion b. which considers the constraints imposed by functional or operational need of critical infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.054	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - P1	Support	KiwiRail supports policy direction that provides for the operation, maintenance, upgrading and installation of new	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					infrastructure within outstanding natural landscapes.	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.055	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - P2	Support	KiwiRail supports policy that recognises that there is existing infrastructure location within outstanding natural landscapes and features, and provides an assessment hierarchy where when significant effects cannot be avoided, adverse effects are remedied, mitigated or offset.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.056	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - P3	Support	KiwiRail supports recognition that there is existing infrastructure within outstanding natural features or landscapes.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.057	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - P5	Support	KiwiRail supports consideration of the functional, technical, operational or locational need of any activity to be sited in the particular location. The rail network is linear and not easily relocated. KiwiRail supports policy direction which identifies the need for rail to be located in certain locations.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.058	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R1	Support	KiwiRail supports this provision as it allows for maintenance, operation and repair of the railway within an ONL or ONF.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.059	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R6	Support	KiwiRail supports reference to the Infrastructure Chapter within this provision.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.060	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - O3	Amend	KiwiRail supports policy which recognises the functional need of an activity to be located in a certain area. However, KiwiRail seeks amendment to include operational need within this policy.	Amend as follows: To provide for activities which have a <b>n operational or</b> functional need to locate in the margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands in such a way that the impacts on natural character are minimised.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.061	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - P2	Support	KiwiRail supports policy that provides for vegetation clearance and earthworks within riparian margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands if for the maintenance, repair, upgrade and extension of infrastructure and effects on natural character are minimised.	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.062	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - R1	Support	KiwiRail supports the permitted activity status of maintenance, operation, minor upgrade and repair of critical infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.063	Natural Character and Margins of Waterbodies	NC - R2	Amend	KiwiRail seeks amendment to this rule to ensure it applies to buildings and structures ancillary to critical infrastructure. Parts of the rail network are adjacent to rivers within the West Coast. KiwiRail seeks permitted activity status of structures necessary to protect the rail corridor in these dynamic environments.	a. Amend as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where the buildings and structures are: Network utilities; Temporary whitebait stands; Environmental monitoring facilities; Parks facilities and parks furniture within an Open Space and Recreation Zone; Natural hazard mitigation structures constructed by a statutory agency or their nominated contractor; or Renewable electricity generation facilities where these have a functional need to locate within the riparian margin; <del>or</del> Stormwater discharge structures and water supply intake structures constructed in accordance with NZS 4404 Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure ; <b>or Critical infrastructure.</b>
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 growth and development that meets the standards required by the Council and the Plan; Facilitates the <b>safe and efficient</b> operation of critical infrastructure; [...]
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 does not result in increased flooding and erosion risk.	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
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
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.067	Subdivision	SUB - P6	Amend	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.	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. <b>In all zones that could result in reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure.</b>
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
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
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	Amend as follows: Matters of control are: [...] p. Management of potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing land uses, including <b>critical infrastructure</b> , network

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					ensure this applies to critical infrastructure such as the rail network.	utilities, rural activities or significant hazardous facilities.
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 <b>critical infrastructure</b> , network utilities, rural activities or significant hazardous facilities.
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
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.073	Coastal Environment	CE - O3	Amend	KiwiRail supports policy which recognises the functional need of an activity to be located in a certain area. However, KiwiRail seeks amendment to include operational need within this policy.	Amend as follows: To provide for activities which have a <b>n operational or</b> functional need to locate in the margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands in such a way that the impacts on natural character are minimised.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.074	Coastal Environment	CE - P3	Amend	The rail network is within the mapped Coastal Environment in certain areas. KiwiRail seeks amendment to this policy to allow for new use and development of the rail network where there is a functional and operational need to be located in these areas.	Amend as follows: Only allow new subdivision, use and development within areas of outstanding and high coastal natural character, outstanding coastal natural landscapes and outstanding coastal natural features where: The elements, patterns, processes and qualities that contribute to the outstanding or high natural character or landscape are maintained; Significant adverse effects on natural character, natural landscapes and natural features, and adverse effects on areas of significant indigenous biodiversity, areas of outstanding natural character and outstanding natural landscapes and features are avoided; The development is of a size, scale and nature that is appropriate to the environment; It is for a Poutini Ngāi Tahu cultural purpose; or It is National Grid infrastructure <b>or critical infrastructure</b> that has a functional

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						and operational need to locate in these areas.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.075	Coastal Environment	CE - P5	Support	KiwiRail supports policy which provides for buildings and structures within the coastal environment if there is a functional or operational need to locate in the coastal environment.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.076	Coastal Environment	CE - P8	Amend	KiwiRail seeks amendment to this policy so that it not only applies to the national grid, but all critical infrastructure. The rail network extends within the coastal environment and KiwiRail seek to ensure that it can continue to operate safely and efficiently.	Amend as follows: Enable the maintenance, repair and operation of <b>critical infrastructure and</b> the National Grid. Where new development and upgrades of <b>critical infrastructure and</b> the National Grid are required, seek to avoid and otherwise remedy or mitigate adverse effects on Overlay Chapter areas.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.077	Coastal Environment	CE - R1	Amend	KiwiRail seeks amendment to this rule to ensure it applies to critical infrastructure and the rail network.	Amend as follows: Maintenance and repair of lawfully established structures, network utilities, <b>critical infrastructure, railway</b> , renewable electricity generation, fence lines and tracks within the Coastal Environment.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.078	Coastal Environment	CE	Support	KiwiRail supports the permitted activity status of network utilities buildings and structures in the Coastal Environment, subject to standards.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.079	Coastal Environment	CE - R7	Support	KiwiRail supports the permitted activity status of earthworks within the coastal environment for the operation, maintenance, repair, upgrade or installation of new network utility infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.080	Coastal Environment	CE - R10	Support	KiwiRail supports the permitted activity status of new buildings or structures within the coastal environment for the operation, maintenance, repair, or minor upgrade of network utility infrastructure.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.081	Earthworks	EW - P4	Support	KiwiRail supports policy to protect critical infrastructure from the adverse effects of infrastructure.	Retain as proposed

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.082	Earthworks	EW - R1	Support	KiwiRail supports the permitted activity status of earthworks by network utility operations, subject to standards.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.083	Earthworks	EW - R2	Support	The permitted activity status of earthworks including stockpiles required for critical infrastructure maintenance, operation, repair, upgrade or installation is supported by KiwiRail.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.084	Noise	NOISE - O2	Support	KiwiRail supports the recognition of the function and operation of existing rail activities, and the aim to protect these activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.085	Noise	NOISE - P1	Support	KiwiRail supports having regard to critical infrastructure when enabling the generation of noise.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.086	Noise	NOISE - P2	Support	KiwiRail supports policy requiring sensitive activities to be located and designed to minimise adverse effects on the amenity and health of occupants when located in close proximity to the railway corridor. Noise and vibration can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is pivotal to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.087	Noise	NOISE - R2	Support	KiwiRail support the inclusions of train movements and level crossing bells as a permitted activity.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.088	Noise	Noise	Amend	KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of noise and vibration controls requiring acoustic insulation and ventilation to be installed in new (or altered) sensitive uses within 100m of the railway corridor. Noise and Vibration from rail corridors can potentially give rise to adverse health and amenity effects on noise sensitive activities located	Include noise, vibration and mechanical ventilation standards provided in Appendix A.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>nearby if not properly addressed and provided for. The proposed standard provides options for developers in achieving an appropriate level of amenity for residents who live within 100m of the rail corridor. The rail network is a 24 hour a day, seven day a week operation, and the frequency, length and weight of trains can change without community consultation. Noise and vibration can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is pivotal to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network. Rail activities not only generate noise, but also vibration effects. KiwiRail seek amendment to require acoustic and vibration treatment for sensitive activities within identified corridors adjacent to the railway networks to ensure an appropriate level of internal amenity is achieved in buildings adjacent to the rail corridor. The proposed standard includes the requirement for feedback form KiwiRail. As the railway and network utility operator, KiwiRail's feedback about any effects of non-compliance is required to ensure that any proposed mitigation is appropriate. KiwiRail also seeks controls within 60m of the railway corridor, for buildings containing new (or altered) sensitive uses to be constructed to manage the impacts of vibration. These controls are important to ensure new development is undertaken in a way that achieves a healthy living environment for people locating within</p>	



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					proximity to the railway corridor, minimising the potential for complaints about the effects of the railway network.	
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.089	Signs	SIGN - P3	Support	KiwiRail supports policy direction that ensures signs do not adversely affect traffic safety, particularly at rail level crossings.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.090	Signs	SIGN - R1	Support	KiwiRail supports this rule as it does not permit signs that obstruct the line of sign of all rail crossing or obstruct, obscure or impair the view of and of any railway sign or signal. This is essential to avoid safety issues arising at level crossings.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.091	Signs	SIGN - R2	Amend	Railway signs are important to alert people of the rail corridor and train movements. KiwiRail supports provisions which allow for signs to be located within the rail corridor as a permitted activity. KiwiRail seek amendment to ensure the Proposed Plan refers to the correct organisation.	Amend as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where: The sign is required by Waka Kotahi - NZ Transport Agency and is located within a road reserve; or The sign is required by <del>NZ Railways Corporation</del> Kiwi Rail and is located within a rail corridor; or The sign is required by the Council and is located within a road reserve or road corridor for a formed legal road.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.092	Temporary Activities	TEMP - P2	Amend	KiwiRail seeks amendment to this provision to allow for the establishment of temporary works sites to carry out works to the rail corridor, which may be adjacent to transport or other infrastructure. For safety reasons it is not always possible to work from within a transport corridor. A discretionary status where a worksite is proposed adjacent to the corridor will not facilitate critical infrastructure works.	Amend as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where: These are removed within 1 month of the activity ceasing and the site reinstated to the original or better condition; The building or structure is located on the same site <b>or an adjacent site</b> as the construction or demolition activity; Relevant zone Setback standards are met where the activity adjoins any Residential or Settlement Zone; The building or structure is on the same site <b>or adjacent site</b> as the construction or demolition activity; Any temporary building is no more than 50m2 in gross floor area where this adjoins a residential zone.
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.093	ZONES	ZONES	Amend	For health and safety reasons, KiwiRail seek a setback for structures from the rail	Amend as follows: New rule: Activity Status Permitted Where: <b>X. No building</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					corridor boundary. While KiwiRail do not oppose development on adjacent sites, ensuring the ability to access and maintain structures without requiring access to rail land is important. KiwiRail note there are specific road boundary setback rules in some zone chapters and varying side and rear boundary setbacks in the Proposed Plan. KiwiRail considers that a 5 metre setback from the rail corridor is appropriate in providing for vehicular access to the backs of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and allowing for scaffolding to be erected safely. This in turn fosters visual amenity, as lineside properties can be regularly maintained. It provides for the unhindered operation of buildings, including higher rise structures and for the safer use of outdoor deck areas at height. KiwiRail seek a 5 metre building setback in all zones which adjoin the rail corridor as proposed in our relief sought. This includes new matters of discretion when there is a non-compliance with the rail boundary setback rule.	<b>or structure may be located within 5m of any site boundary with the rail corridor. Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS New rule: Buildings or structures not meeting Rule XXX-RX Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Where: The building is setback less than 5m from the rail corridor boundary. Discretion is restricted to: the location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor; and the safe and efficient operation of the rail network.</b>
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.094	DESIGNATIONS	KiwiRail Holdings Limited Designations	Amend	KiwiRail seeks minor amendments for consistency with the designation of rail corridors in district plans throughout the country.	Amend as follows: Kiwi Rail Holdings Limited Designations. Designation unique identifier , KRH 1Designation purpose , Railway <b>Purposes</b> Site identifier , <b>Designation Hierarchy under section 177 of the RMA , Primary</b> Lapse date , Given effect to Designation hierarchy under section 177 of the Resource Management Act , N/A Conditions , No Additional information , N/A
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.095	Planning Maps and Overlays	Planning Maps and Overlays	Support	KiwiRail supports the mapped extent of the rail lines as proposed.	Retain as proposed
KiwiRail Holdings Limited (S442)	S442.096	DESIGNATIONS	Rail CorridorsWest Coast	Amend	The objectives identifying Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Character is to ensure	Amend the Proposed District Plan Maps to remove any overlays for; Outstanding Natural Features; Outstanding Natural

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					that these landscapes and their attributes are recognised and protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development. The benefits of infrastructure are provided irrespective of location. The Plan also recognises the functional need for infrastructure to be located within these areas, and that designated land transport corridors are generally highly modified areas.	Landscapes; and Outstanding Natural Character On KiwiRail's designation (as listed under "KRH1 KiwiRail Holdings Limited").
Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd (S414)	S414.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Support in part	So the lime works can continue to work unheeded - We would like the Koiterangi Lime Co. Ltd quarry to be included in the Minerals Extraction Zone.	include Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd quarry in the Minerals Extraction Zone
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.001	Interpretation	INTENSIVE INDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Amend	could inadvertently capture herd homes and wintering barns	Amend as follows: Means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for a specified time period) or poultry. <b>The use of herd homes and wintering barns where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment is not included in this definition.</b>
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.002	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	there needs to be a clear definition for "offensive industries".	Develop a definition for "offensive industries".
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.003	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	there needs to be a clear definition for "hazardous facilities".	Develop a definition for "hazardous facilities".
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.004	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Agriculture Strategic Objectives	Support	support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.005	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Connections and Resilience Strategic Objectives	Support	support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.006	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Mineral Extraction	Support	Support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.007	STRATEGIC DIRECTION	Natural Environment Strategic Objectives	Support	Support the various Strategic Objectives and Policies.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.008	Transport	Transport Objectives	Support	support these objectives.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.009	Contaminated Land	CL - O1	Support	support these objectives.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.010	Contaminated Land	Contaminated Land Policies	Support	support these policies.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.011	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Support	support that there are no land use rules for the flood plain overlay.	Retain no land use rules for the Flood Plain Overlay.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.012	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Amend	the role that protective structures play in mitigation needs to be recognised	Add a new objective: <b>To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.</b>
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.013	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Support	support this policy.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.014	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Delete time limit.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.015	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.016	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	Support this rule	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.017	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	support this rule.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.018	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.019	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement	Delete time limit
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.020	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend to state: if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.021	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	support this rule.	REtain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.022	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.023	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	support this rule.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.024	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R7	Support	Support this rule.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.025	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R11	Support	Support this rule	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.026	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R19	Support	Support this rule	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.027	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Objectives	Support	Support these objectives.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.028	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Amend	support this policy in principle	Amend point 2. iii. as follows: Buller and Westland district wide assessment, identification and mapping of significant natural areas will be undertaken and completed by June 2027; and
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.029	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P2	Amend	functional need" does not go far enough	Amend point d. as follows: The activity has a functional, <b>technical, operational or locational</b> need to be located in the area;

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.030	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R19	Support	Support this rule	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.031	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Objectives	Support	Support these objectives	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.032	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Amend	We believe that a June 2027 deadline is too ambitious	Amend point 2. iii.: Buller and Westland district wide assessment, identification and mapping of significant natural areas will be undertaken <del>and completed by June 2027</del> ; and
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.033	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P2	Amend	functional need" does not go far enough	Amend point d.: The activity has a functional, <b>technical, operational or locational</b> need to be located in the area;
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.034	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P3	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.035	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P6	Amend	Some of the terms used in this policy need defining.	Define the technical ecological terms used in this policy.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.036	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P7	Support	Consideration of "the appropriateness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation.	Retain point h.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.037	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P7	Support	the fixed location of mineral deposits is not provided for in the policy.	Amend to recognise that, in some instances, vegetation clearance is unavoidable (e.g. in the case of accessing mineral resource) but that these effects can be temporary due so subsequent restoration processes.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.038	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P8	Support		REtain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.039	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P9	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.040	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P10	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.041	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R1	Amend	Rules are too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.042	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R2	Amend	Rules are too restrictive	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.043	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R3	Amend	Rules are too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.044	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R5	Support	Too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.045	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R7	Support	this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.046	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R10	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.047	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R11	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.048	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R14	Support		REtain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.049	Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - R15	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.050	Public Access	Overview	Support	the discussion in the PA chapter preceding the objective.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.051	Public Access	PA - O1	Support		REtain
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.
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.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.054	Subdivision	SUB - R5	Amend	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend wording <del>design and layout of allotments</del> to refer to <b>15mx15m building platform</b> 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.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.056	Subdivision	SUB - R7/ECO - R4	Support	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.057	Subdivision	SUB - R6	Support	believe some amendments are necessary.	Amend to be less restrictive.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.058	Subdivision	SUB - R9/ECO - R6	Oppose	This is too restrictive.	Delete points 2 and 3.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.059	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support		Retain
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".
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".
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.064	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.065	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	We do not support this provision.	Delete
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.066	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	We do not support this provision.	Delete
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.067	Earthworks	EW - O1	Support		Retain



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.068	Earthworks	Earthworks Policies	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.069	Earthworks	EW - R2	Amend	Earthworks rules are difficult to understand in the way they are currently structured.	Amend to be more enabling of development and provide more clarity.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.070	Earthworks	EW - R3	Amend	Earthworks rules are difficult to understand in the way they are currently structured.	Amend to be more enabling of development and provide more clarity.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.071	Earthworks	EW - R6	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.072	Earthworks	EW - R7	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.073	Earthworks	EW - R8	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.074	Light	LIGHT - O1	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.075	Light	LIGHT - P1	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.076	Light	LIGHT - P2	Amend	This policy should extend to appropriate lighting of outdoor commercial/industrial.	Amend to include the enabling of artificial outdoor lighting that allows safe commercial and industrial activities.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.077	Light	LIGHT - R1	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.078	Light	LIGHT - R2	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.079	Light	LIGHT - R3	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.080	Light	LIGHT - R4	Amend	These rules are too complicated and restrictive.	Amend significantly to reduce complexity and be more enabling of development.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.081	Noise	Noise Objectives	Support		Retain

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.082	Noise	NOISE - P1	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.083	Noise	NOISE - P2	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.084	Noise	NOISE - P4	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.085	Noise	NOISE - R5	Amend	Reverse sensitivity concerns regarding our quarry operations.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Koiterangi Lime Co quarry.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.086	Noise	NOISE - R6	Amend	Reverse sensitivity concerns regarding our quarry operations.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Koiterangi Lime Co quarry.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.087	Noise	NOISE - R11	Amend	Reverse sensitivity concerns regarding our quarry operations.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Koiterangi Lime Co quarry.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.088	Noise	NOISE - R5	Amend	Timeframes for noise emissions are too restrictive.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Koiterangi Lime Co quarry.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.089	Noise	NOISE - R6	Amend	Timeframes for noise emissions are too restrictive.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Koiterangi Lime Co quarry.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.090	Noise	NOISE - R11	Amend	Timeframes for noise emissions are too restrictive.	Amend to further mitigate reverse sensitivity issues for the Koiterangi Lime Co quarry.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.091	Noise	NOISE - R11	Amend	Correct the error where a Mineral Extraction Zone is referred to as "MEZ".	Correct "MEZ" error.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.092	Rural Zones	Rural Zones Objectives	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.093	Rural Zones	Rural Zones Policies	Support	Support RURZ P1 - P12, P15 - P28	Retain RURZ P1 - P12, P15 - P28
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.094	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend	Parcels owned by Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd should be zoned Mineral Extraction Zone.	Amend Section 2 SO 11712, Section 3 SO 11712, Lot 1 DP 315 and Pt Lot 2 DP 315 to Mineral Extraction Zone

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.095	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R1	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.096	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R2	Support	pre-existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.097	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R3	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.098	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R5	Amend	We believe this rule should be simplified.	Simplify the rule and/or amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.099	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R6	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.100	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R11	Support	Not all prospecting or exploration is required to have a permit from NZPAM	Amend point 1 as follows: <b>This is authorised under a prospecting or exploration permit from NZPAM where legally required;</b>
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.101	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R11	Amend	We believe the rule is also too restrictive.	Delete point 3 or extend the timeframe until a period after cessation of mining activity.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.102	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R13	Amend	We support this rule but note the minor error.	Retain as notified with minor timing error being corrected (i.e. 12pm).
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.103	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R16	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.104	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R17	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.105	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R18	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.106	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R20	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.107	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R21	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.108	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R22	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.109	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R24	Amend	pre-existing non-compliance with Rule GRUZ - R1 should be recognised	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 1, 2, 3 and 4 of Rule GRUZ - R1 does not preclude the application of this rule.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.110	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R25	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.111	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R26	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.112	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R27	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.113	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R28	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.114	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R29	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.115	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R30	Amend	rule is too restrictive and unclear.	Amend with more clearly defined terms.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.116	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R30	Oppose		Delete points 1 and 2.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.117	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R30	Amend		Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.118	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R31	Oppose	this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 1.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.119	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R31	Amend		Amend "Non-complying" to "N/A" under "Activity status where compliance not achieved".
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.120	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R32	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.121	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R33	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.122	General Rural Zone	GRUZ - R34	Oppose	This rule is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.123	Mineral Extraction Zone	Overview	Amend	note that authorisation regarding some effects of activities in the proposed MINZ derived from existing use rights.	Amend to add a 4th point <b>existing use rights</b> .
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.124	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Amend		Amend for land adjoining Section 2 SO 11712, Section 3 SO 11712, Lot 1 DP 315 and Pt Lot 2 DP 315 to be zoned Mineral Extraction Zone
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.125	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Zone Objectives	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.126	Mineral Extraction Zone	Mineral Extraction Policies	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.127	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R1	Amend	point two is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.128	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R2	Amend	We support this rule in principle.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.129	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R3	Amend	point two is unnecessarily restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.130	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R3	Amend	Existing non-compliance with the points noted should be recognised as being acceptable	Amend so that existing non-compliance with points 2 and 3 does not preclude the application of this rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.131	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R5	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.132	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R6	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.133	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R7	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.134	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R9	Support		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.135	Mineral Extraction Zone	MINZ - R10	Amend		Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.136	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	SCHED4 - SCHEDULE OF SIGNIFICANT NATURAL AREAS	Support	support in principle.	Retain
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.137	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	SCHED5 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL LANDSCAPES	Support	support that parcels owned by Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd are not included.	Parcels owned by Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd to remain excluded.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.138	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES	SCHED6 - SCHEDULE OF OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES	Support	support that parcels owned by Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd are not included in the schedule.	Parcels owned by Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd to remain excluded.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.139	Schedule Nine: Lawfully Established Mineral Extraction and Processing Areas	SCHED9 - LAWFULLY ESTABLISHED MINERAL EXTRACTION AND PROCESSING AREAS	Amend	limestone quarry at Kowhitirangi should be listed in the schedule.	Amend Schedule to include Koiterangi Lime Co Ltd Limestone Quarry.
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.140	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Appendix One: Transport Performance Standards	Amend	unnecessarily restrictive and complex.	Amend to be less onerous, more consistent and correct errors.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Koiterangi Lime Co LTD (S577)	S577.141	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Appendix Seven: Mineral Extraction Management Plan Requirements	Support	We support the plan requirements.	Retain
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.001	Interpretation	INTENSIVE INDOOR PRIMARY PRODUCTION	Oppose in part	We believe that this definition could inadvertently capture herd homes and wintering barns (where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment). We believe this should be amended so as to be clear that the use of herd homes and wintering barns is not included within the definition of Intensive Indoor Primary Production.	Amend as follows: Means primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi, or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for a specified time period) or poultry. <b>The use of herd homes and wintering barns where the primary production activity principally otherwise occurs in an outdoor environment is not included in this definition.</b>
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.002	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	We operate industrial activities from our property covered by SASM14. We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for "offensive industries" as it is listed in SASM - P11.	Develop a definition for "offensive industries".
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.003	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	We operate industrial activities from our property covered by SASM14. We believe that there needs to be a clear definition for "hazardous facilities" as it is listed in SASM - P11 and SASM - R17.	Develop a definition for "hazardous facilities".
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.004	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Objectives	Not Stated	Similarly to NH - O4, the role that protective structures play in natural hazard mitigation needs to be recognised in the Natural Hazards Objectives.	Add a new objective: To ensure the role of hazard mitigation played by protective structures and works that minimise impacts of hazards including rock walls and stopbanks is recognised and protected.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.005	Natural Hazards	NHP10	Oppose in part	The wording of this policy is too restrictive and precludes a landowner seeking other expert input or utilising solutions where the	Include wording that allows technical solutions or differing expert opinion to support resource consent applications for development. The wording of NH - P11 is

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					hazard could be substantially mitigated using technical solutions.	more appropriate for severe overlays than the current wording. Delete "and there is significant public or environmental benefit from doing so".
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.006	Natural Hazards	NHP11	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.007	Natural Hazards	NHP12	Oppose in part	This policy is very restrictive.	Retain point b. Delete point g.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.008	Natural Hazards	NHR1	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.009	Natural Hazards	NHR8	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.010	Natural Hazards	NHR9	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.011	Natural Hazards	NHR12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.012	Natural Hazards	NHR13	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.013	Natural Hazards	NHR14	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.021	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - P14	Oppose	I believe our properties at 81 Brougham st and 21A Domett street Westport have been wrongly/mistakenly categorised into SASM14	Delete properties from SASM14
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.022	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R2	Oppose in part	Too restrictive.	Delete iii. a. and b.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.023	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R3	Support	We support the rule with SASM14 being excluded.	Retain as notified with SASM14 being excluded from point 2.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.024	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R6	Oppose	Too restrictive.	SASM14 should be excluded from Schedule Three referred to in 1.i. The rule is generally too restrictive.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.025	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM -R9	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete rule or include SASM14 on the list of sites.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.026	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R10	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.027	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R11	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.028	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R12	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.029	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R13	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.030	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R14	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.031	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R15	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.032	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R16	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.033	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R17	Oppose	Too restrictive.	Delete.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.034	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P1	Support	We support that areas of significant indigenous vegetation and fauna habitat will be identified through the resource consent process until such time as district wide identification and mapping of significant natural areas is undertaken in an appropriate and consultative way and that a formal Plan Change occurs after that time.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.035	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P3	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.036	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P4	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.037	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P7	Oppose in part	We support that this policy provides for consideration of "the appropriateness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation in accordance with Policy 9 to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied."	
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.038	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - P9	Support	We support this policy.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.039	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R1	Oppose in part	We request that provision is made for low-level clearance for building sites within SNAs (including for future/not yet approved subdivisions). Providing for these types of living options can actually facilitate predator and pest management and control and is an important lifestyle option for the region.	Amend wording to provide for building sites.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.040	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R2	Oppose in part	We request that provision is made for low-level clearance for building sites within SNAs (including for future/not yet approved subdivisions). Providing for these types of living options can actually facilitate predator and pest management and control and is an important lifestyle option for the region.	Amend wording to provide for building sites.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.041	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R4/SUB - R7	Oppose in part		Not stated
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.042	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R6/SUB - R9	Oppose in part		Not stated
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.043	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R8/SUB - R15	Oppose in part		Not stated
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.044	Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - R9/SUB - R27	Oppose		Not stated
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.
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	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.	
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.047	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - R14	Oppose	We oppose SASM14 and the rules associated with it.	Delete SASM 14 or provide exclusions for it in associated rules.
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)	S509.049	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 <b>Scheduled</b> 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 <b>unless adverse effects can be addressed by alternative mitigation measures such as biodiversity offsetting and environmental compensation</b> ; and
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.
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	Amend heading to read: Subdivision of Land to create allotment(s) Containing a <del>Scheduled</del> Area of Significant Indigenous Biodiversity not meeting Rule SUB - R7. Delete. Amend to: The subdivision will not result in buildings or access ways being

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					compensation etc. to be considered within this point.	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
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.052	Subdivision	SUB - R13	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
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
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.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.055	Subdivision	SUB - R17	Support	We support the provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.056	Subdivision	SUB - R18	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.057	Subdivision	SUB - R20	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
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: <b>Non-complying N/A.</b>
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.059	Subdivision	SUB - R23	Support	We support this provision.	Retain
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.060	Subdivision	SUB - R25	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.061	Subdivision	SUB - R27/ECO - R9	Oppose	The rule is too restrictive.	Delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.062	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Oppose	This overlay is far too extensive. The extent inland that overlay covers is inappropriate and will unduly restrict development.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.063	Coastal Environment	CE - P5	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.064	Coastal Environment	CE - P6	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.065	Coastal Environment	CE - R1	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.066	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Oppose in part	The maximum height limit of buildings and structures should be that specified for the particular zone. The gross ground floor area is too restrictive and should revert to zone rules.	Delete point 2. a. i. Delete point 2. a. iii.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.067	Coastal Environment	CE - R12	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.068	Coastal Environment	CE - R19	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.069	Noise	NOISE - R3	Oppose in part	We believe that these acoustic insulation requirements should apply within 100m of our consented quarry to new buildings used for sensitive activities that built in the General Residential Zone at Alma Road if that proceeds to any extent.	Amend NOISE - R3 so that this rule includes that to include acoustic insulation requirements within 100m of our consented quarry for new buildings used for sensitive activities built at the proposed residential development at Alma Road.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.070	Noise	NOISE - R5	Oppose	We are opposing this due to reverse sensitivity concerns regarding our quarry operations.	Amend to explicitly exclude consented quarrying operations and similar.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.071	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Residential Zone	Support	We support that the properties owned by our family on Orowaiti Road and Brougham Street (through freehold or leasehold titles) are zoned residential (i.e. Lot 3 DP 18892, Pt Section 213 Square 141, Lot 2 DP 692, Lot 10 DP 1086, Lot 11 DP 1086, Lot 12 DP 1086 and Pt Lot 13 DP 1086).	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.072	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose in part	We oppose the entire enclave of General Residential Zoning at Alma Road. We	Amend General Residential Zoning in the Alma Road area to a lower density zone

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					believe this should be General Rural Zone or Rural Lifestyle Zone.	such as General Rural Zone or Rural Lifestyle Zone.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.073	Planning Maps and Overlays	Settlement Zone	Support	We support that 95 Snodgrass Road is zoned Settlement Zone (i.e. Section 1 SO 14107 and Section 14 Town of Orowaiti).	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.074	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that the land we own at 107 Alma Road is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Lot 4 DP 15375, PT Lot 2 DP 7181, Section 1 SO 14701 and Section 2 SO 14701).	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.075	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that Lot 1 DP 17523 is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. part of 103 Alma Road). Our quarry is important to our business and to the district. It would suffer from inevitable reverse sensitivity issues if adjacent land was zoned for urban/residential use. We support the proposed buffering areas to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on our operation from surrounding land use and housing density changes.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.076	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that the land between our quarry and Pakihi Road is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Lot 2 DP 404550, Lot 2 DP 418652 and Pt Section 24 Blk VII Kawatiri SD). Our quarry is important to our business and to the district. It would suffer from inevitable reverse sensitivity issues if adjacent land was zoned for urban/residential use. We support the proposed buffering areas to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on our operation from surrounding land use and housing density changes. We believe that there is a potential natural hazard risk in this area due to overland flow that requires evaluation.	Retain as notified

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.077	Planning Maps and Overlays	General Rural Zone	Support	We support that the land that we own between Bulls Road and Bradshaws Road north of State Highway 67A is zoned General Rural Zone (i.e. Sections 26 and 27 Blk II Steeples SD).	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.078	Planning Maps and Overlays	Rezoning Requests	Oppose	We oppose that the land we own 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.	Amend to <b>Rural Residential Precinct.</b>
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.079	Planning Maps and Overlays	Commercial Zone	Support	We support that Lot 4 DP 15375 and Lot 1 DP 15375 are zoned Commercial Zone (i.e. part of 103 Alma Road and 20 Gillows Dam Road). Our quarry is important to our business and to the district. It would suffer from inevitable reverse sensitivity issues if adjacent land was zoned for urban/residential use. We support the proposed buffering areas to limit the likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on our operation from surrounding land use and housing density changes.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.080	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Rules	Oppose	We oppose SASM14 and the rules associated with it.	Delete SASM14 or provide exclusions for it in associated rules.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.081	Natural Hazards	Westport Hazard Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend overlay and amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.082	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend Coastal Severe overlay extent to exclude our properties.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.083	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Environment	Oppose in part	This overlay is far too extensive. The extent inland that the overlay covers is inappropriate and will unduly restrict development.	Amend and reduce the inland extent of the Coastal Environment Overlay.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.084	Coastal Environment	CE - O1	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.085	Coastal Environment	CE - O2	Support	We support these objectives.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.086	Coastal Environment	CE - O3	Support in part	The term "functional need" does not go far enough in recognising that some activities are required to operate in the coastal environment e.g. due to the location of mineral deposits.	Amend as follows: To provide for activities which have a functional, <b>technical, operational or locational</b> need to locate in the coastal environment in such a way that the impacts on natural character, landscape, natural features, access and biodiversity values are minimised.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.087	Coastal Environment	CE - P1	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.088	Coastal Environment	CE - P4	Support in part	We believe this policy needs amending.	Include a point c. that provides for activities which have a functional, technical, operational or locational need to locate in the coastal environment.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.089	Coastal Environment	CE - P5	Support in part	We support this provision but believe this needs amending.	Amend point d. as follows: Have a functional, <b>technical, locational</b> or operational need to locate within the coastal environment.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.090	Coastal Environment	CE - P6	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.091	Coastal Environment	CE - R1	Support	We support this provision.	Retain as notified.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.092	Coastal Environment	CE - R4	Oppose in part	The maximum height limit of buildings and structures should be that specified for the particular zone. The gross ground floor area is too restrictive and should revert to zone rules.	Delete point 2. A. i. Delete point 2. A. iii.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.093	Coastal Environment	CE - R5	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.094	Coastal Environment	CE - R6	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.095	Coastal Environment	CE - R7	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.096	Coastal Environment	CE - R8	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.097	Coastal Environment	CE - R9	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.098	Coastal Environment	CE - R10	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.099	Coastal Environment	CE - R11	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.100	Coastal Environment	CE - R12	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.101	Coastal Environment	CE - R14	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.102	Coastal Environment	CE - R15	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.103	Coastal Environment	CE - R16	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.104	Coastal Environment	CE - R17	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.105	Coastal Environment	CE - R18	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.106	Coastal Environment	CE - R19	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.107	Coastal Environment	CE - R21	Oppose in part	We believe this is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling of development.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.108	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that this overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension to the Coastal Alert Hazard overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.109	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that this overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension of the coastal setback overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.110	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that this overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension of the flood severe hazard overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Kyle Avery (S509)	S509.111	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that the coastal severe hazard overlay will be extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Oppose any extension of the coastal severe hazard overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.