

At my appearance at the Natural Hazards hearing on Tuesday 8 October the Hearings Panel asked whether there was scope for changes in relation to natural hazards, including whether submissions create scope for greater regulation than the notified provisions. Two matters raised were scope in relation to changes to more refined faultline mapping and the land instability overlay at Punakaiki. The Hearings Panel offered me the opportunity to respond to these questions by today.

The following is my response to those questions.

The Buller District Council's submission (#538) states at page 24:

NH – Natural Hazards

General Comments

One area that Council understands will be contentious are the Natural Hazards provisions. This submission can be summed up as an attempt to allow improvements or upgrades to existing buildings and infrastructure, but restrict new development in areas that will likely increase the number of people potentially exposed to the risk/hazard. Council realises the significant impact of the various overlays to residents and in particular the current challenges facing Buller. A review of all natural hazard overlays is required and needs to be supported with evidence to justify their extent. It seems that further technical reporting is required.

The statement does not appear to have been recorded in the summary of decisions requested.

Although this is a general statement, it does seek a decision/change to the TTPP where the submission states '*A review of all natural hazard overlays is required and needs to be supported with evidence to justify their extent. It seems that further technical reporting is required.*'

I consider this statement to provide scope for amendments to Faultline mapping and other overlays such as the land instability mapping at Punakaiki, arising from the Buller District Council's submission, (if not otherwise provided by any other submissions).

The BDC's submission did not directly identify the land instability overlay at Punakaiki as part of its submission on Rule NH-R33, but did state '*The proposed overlays need to be reviewed*', as recorded in the summary of decision requested S538.149.

The submission from J & J Whyte (S647.004) is that *the natural hazards overlays are not clear in their geographic application and relationship with other plan provisions, and are overly restrictive*. The decision sought is '*Review natural hazard overlays to enable tourism development at Punakaiki village*'.

I consider these submissions to provide scope for amendments to the natural hazard overlays including the natural hazard mapping at Punakaiki and faultline mapping.

I trust this fulfils the extent of questions asked, but I am happy to address any other questions.

Regards

Craig