



## Plan Sections: [section name], [section name]

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
Alan Anderson (S188)	S188.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>Okuru Settlement is protected by a rock seawall defence. In the 22 years since the wall was erected, there has been no damage, the wall has not eroded, sunk or been inundated. I feel it offers Okuru good protection and it is well managed by the WCRC.</p> <p>The Okuru Settlement is also protected by a large sandspit located approx 300 metres from rock seawall which acts as a natural defence and barrier from the sea.</p> <p>To mitigate any risk from flood water building up from the Okuru River an emergency consent has been applied for with the WCRC to open a mouth through spit if needed to release flood water out to sea.</p> <p>This TTPP decision effects our largest asset, our home. It could mean our property is devalued or uninsurable in the future.</p>	I would like the Coastal Severe Overlay removed from my property, 59 Johnston Crescent, Haast and replaced with a Coastal Alert Overlay.
Andrew Wright (S364)	S364.001	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Intention to build a dwelling in the Coastal Severe Overlay.	Keep the existing rules that provide adequate protection.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Anthony Eden (S578)	S578.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	The report done by GNS contradicts the NIWA report in relation to what might happen to the Okuru lagoon.	The effects of climate change on the Okuru lagoon are reassessed taking into account both the GNS and NIWA reports, and a practical reassessment of what has actually been happening there over the past 22 years since the Okuru flood wall was constructed.
Anthony Eden (S578)	S578.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	the model on which future planning rules and limitations have been applied to Okuru may be incorrect	The effects of climate change on the Okuru lagoon are reassessed taking into account both the GNS and NIWA reports, and a practical reassessment of what has actually been happening there over the past 22 years since the Okuru flood wall was constructed.
Antony Burt (S132)	S132.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	We are over 300m inland from the Mean High Tide mark with sand dunes , that according to our neighbour who has farmed there for more than 25 years, and is closer to the coast than us, the dunes have grown in size and he has reclaimed more land than when he started due to beach deposits. We border the main arterial road network SH7 for the West Coast and the KiwiRail lines that service the Dairy Factory and believe if the risk was such that future development need to be ceased as the risk of coastal erosion was so severe and the likelihood medium to high, that the council would have gone forward with a future plan for managing the roading and rail networks.	Remove the overlay on coastal land to the south of the Arahura River defined as a coastal alert hazard overlay, which prevents any further development and consented dwellings.
Antony Burt (S132)	S132.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The current modelling plan dated 1995 on the TTPP site models erosion at the most extreme rate of 5m per year (this is not actual), we have lived here for 3 years, and our neighbour who is coastal for 25 years,	Provide more information justifying the coastal alert overlay on the property at Greyhound Road, Arahura. Remove the hazard overlay unless there is better information and proof.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					has said the dunes have grown on his property and not retreated at all.	
Antony Burt (S180)	S180.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	Planning to build some dwellings on the land.	To remove the property from the Coastal Hazard severe Overlay. [Hokitika to Arahura coastline]
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Avery Bros (S510)	S510.108	How The Plan Works	Overlays	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 from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.013	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.014	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.015	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete 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>
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.016	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.017	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.018	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.019	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.092	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	if Coastal hazard overlay is extended from what is notified in the proposed plan. We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent notified
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.093	Natural Hazards	Coastal Setback Overlay	Amend	Coastal Hazard Overlay associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation	Oppose any extension from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Avery Brothers (S609)	S609.095	Planning Maps and Overlays	Planning Maps and Overlays	Support	Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay	Retain in extent notified
Bert Hofmans (S504)	S504.006	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The basis and process by which the areas have been defined is hard to follow. The layer seems to be simplistic and hard to follow - the bathtub model is overly simplistic and the overlay is overly restrictive given the level of risk.	Remove Lots 1-3 DP 395733 Block iX Oparara SD Flagstaff Road Karamea and other properties in a similar position from the Coastal Hazard Alert Overlay.
Bert Hofmans (S504)	S504.007	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Provides an unnecessary additional level of compliance for properties already in the flood alert overlay, costs of technical reports to support consents, discretionary status means matters beyond natural hazards can be considered by the council and restricted discretionary is sufficient to give effect to the policies	Amend to Permitted or at least Restricted Discretionary Activity.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Bradshaw Farms (S511)	S511.108	How The Plan Works	Overlays	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 from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Brett Avery (S513)	S513.108	How The Plan Works	Overlays	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 from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.151	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support in part	Overlays need to cover areas where restrictions are needed to address coastal concerns. Suggest a further look at the extent of the overlays.  It is noted that the Coastal Alert overlay at Carters Beach is extensive - further reporting should be required to define overlays. Need to ensure that the overlays are not unwarranted and that they are supported and justified by evidence.  Insert the word "floor" before area in R38 Point 1.	Further consideration of the overlays needed, illustrating that the extent of the overlays are justified and supported by evidence.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.152	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	Support no resource consent required for unoccupied buildings.	Retain as notified.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.153	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Support in part	Recognise the need to reflect NZS4404:2010 and the application of the 1% AEP (see NZS4404:2010 - 4.3.5.2) Amend to include 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise.	Amend rule to include 1% ARI plus 1m sea level rise.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.154	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Support in part	Suggest a further look at overlays to ensure they are justified and supported by evidence.  Clarify permitted activity and the intent of the rule. Clarity sought around extensions and	Rewrite of the rule to clarify permitted intent.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>how these are addressed by the rules.</p> <p>There may be merit in splitting how additions and alterations and additions extending ground floor area are addressed within the rules.</p> <p>While considering the definition of Additions and Alterations, clarify where extensions to floor areas sit.</p>	
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.155	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Support in part	Overlays to be defined and applicable to areas where risk is needing to be addressed.	Once overlays defined, rule may be considered appropriate as drafted. Would like to see supporting evidence justifying the extent of the overlays.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.156	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support in part	Overlays to be defined and applicable to areas where risk is needing to be addressed.	Once overlays defined, rule may be considered appropriate as drafted. Would like to see supporting evidence justifying the extent of the overlays.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.157	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Support in part	Overlays to be defined and applicable to areas where risk is needing to be addressed.	Once overlays defined, rule may be considered appropriate as drafted. Would like to see supporting evidence justifying the extent of the overlays.
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.158	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support in part	<p>Include a permitted activity criteria for unoccupied buildings within the overlay.</p> <p>Ensure that term Additions and Alterations is used correctly within the rules as this definition is different to alteration. Clarify rules around extensions to ground floor area and how these are addressed.</p> <p>Clarify rules around repair and maintenance to existing buildings.</p> <p>This could be inserted above R45.</p>	<p>Insert rule above R45 for a permitted activity criteria to address: unoccupied buildings (i.e. to allow for sheds) for repairs and maintenance to existing building</p> <p>Seek clarity around how extensions to floor areas are addressed.</p>
Buller District Council (S538)	S538.159	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Support	No changes sought	No changes sought.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Cape Foulwind Staple 2 Ltd (S568)	S568.010	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	A coastal hazard assessment of the cliffs in relation to two subdivisions has been undertaken, namely Larsen Street (RM170036) and The Cliffs (RM220064). The Buller District Council have received both hazard assessments.	The zoning of Coastal Alert hazard lines, for the Larsen Street and The Cliffs developments at Cape Foulwind reflect the detailed site specific reports for their land.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.019	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.020	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend activity status for when compliance is not achieved, to Discretionary Activity.
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.021	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.022	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain
Catherine Smart-Simpson (S564)	S564.023	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.042	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.044	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		REtain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.045	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.046	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.047	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.048	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.049	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.050	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support		Retain
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.051	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.052	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.062	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent of overlay as notified.
Chris & Jan Coll (S558)	S558.063	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.042	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.044	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		REtain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.045	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.046	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.047	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.048	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.049	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.050	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support		Retain
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.051	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.052	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.062	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent of overlay as notified.
Chris J Coll Surveying Limited (S566)	S566.063	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Christine Sinclair (S205)	S205.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Support	<p>I am a landholder and resident of the settlement of Okuru. I agree that there does need to be better mitigation strategies around residential development particularly in low-lying and flood-prone areas given the increasing potential hazards associated with climate change, more extreme weather events and coastal sea level rises.</p> <p>In terms of flood mitigation, the northern subdivision of Hapuka Landings is an example of poorly planned and managed land use given building has been consented to without any flood or erosion mitigation measures in place. There appears to be an inconsistent and unfair application of rules considering the Okuru population pays for the seawall in the village, but there is nothing on the northern boundary that would</p>	Support natural hazard overlays at Okuru.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					protect the coast from flooding in the event of coastal sea rise and river mouths changing direction. I would support local solutions to coastal flooding hazards, such as sea walls and pump systems such as those installed in Blaketown, to protect existing property- but there needs to be consensus and an opportunity for all affected residents to be involved in these processes.	
Coastwide Surveys Limited (S495)	S495.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Is identified as Coastal Severe due to an error.	Coastal Hazard Severe overlay be amended to Coastal Hazard Alert overlay for Greyhound Road, Arahura, consistent with the surrounding area.
Dean Van Mierlo (S570)	S570.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The area is approx. 50m above mean sea level, located on a limestone strata, and is separated from the ocean by approx. 140m	Amend the maps to remove the "coastal setback" from the mapping of Lot 2 DP 307444, Blk V Brighton SD.
Dean Van Mierlo (S570)	S570.003	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	There is no realistic threat from coastal processes to activities in this area.	Alternative relief, credible modelling should be provided that demonstrates the coastal setback area mapped on Lot 2 DP 307444, Blk V Brighton SD, is at real risk of coastal processes.
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.048	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	Delete 2. so that Rule NH-R38 applies to repairs and maintenance only, and add additional rules so that reconstruction is a restricted discretionary or non-complying activity. This enables adverse effects of reconstruction to be appropriately assessed to give effect to the NZCPS.	Amend: Where For repairs and maintenance there is no increase in the area of the building; <del>For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where:</del> <del>The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God;</del> <del>The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years in the Coastal Severe overlay;</del> <del>The reconstructed building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building it replaces.</del> Activity status where compliance not

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						achieved: NA
Department of Conservation (S602)	S602.00238	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	add new restricted discretionary or non-complying activity rules.	<p>Add new Restricted Discretionary Rule and Non-Complying Rules:<b>NH-RXX Reconstruction of a lawfully established building</b>For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where:</p> <p><b>The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God;</b></p> <p><b>The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years in the Coastal Severe overlay;</b></p> <p><b>The reconstructed building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building it replaces.</b></p> <p><b>Discretion is restricted to:</b>The effects of natural hazards on people and property;</p> <p><b>The location and design of proposed buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk;</b></p> <p><b>Any freeboard requirements to be included;</b></p> <p><b>The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk;</b></p> <p><b>The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk;</b></p> <p><b>The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site and adjacent properties;</b></p> <p><b>Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed natural hazard mitigation measures; and</b></p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<b>Alternative methods to avoid or mitigate the identified hazard risks. Activity status where compliance not achieved: DiscretionaryNH-RXX Reconstruction of a lawfully established building not meeting Restricted Activity StandardsActivity Status DiscretionaryActivity status where compliance not achieved: N/A</b>
Erin Stagg (S314)	S314.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Support	Re 4398a Haast- Jackson Bay Road - the site has subdivision consent and resource consent to construct a dwelling. We support its inclusion in the Coastal Severe Hazard Overlay	Retain 4398a in the Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay
Erin Stagg (S314)	S314.002	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	There are feasible options to mitigate the risks of natural hazards through design and location. Refer to the submission document for more detail on these	That new sensitive activities be a Discretionary Activity rather than Non-complying in the Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay
Frank and Jo Dooley (S478)	S478.026	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	To take into consideration the reduced risk from coastal effects due to accreting sand spit	Amend to remove the coastal severe overlay from 211 Utopia Road
Frank O'Toole (S595)	S595.014	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	To take into consideration the reduced risk from coastal effects due to accreting sand spit	Amend to remove the coastal severe overlay from 211 Utopia Road
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.016	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.017	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.018	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
Geoff Volckman (S563)	S563.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain
Gerard Nolan (S261)	S261.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	I think that where we live 55 Johnston Cresnet Okuru should be on the same alert level as the rest of Okuru Village ( Coastal Hazard Alert ), we are all situated on the same ground level and houses are back to back.	Change 55 Johnston Cres Okuru to Coastal Hazard Alert Overlay from Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay
Graeme Anderson (S187)	S187.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	<p>Okuru has a Rock River/Sea protection wall that has provided excellent protection for the Okuru Settlement. There has never been any major damage to the wall since being built. Okuru is also a special rated area with funds available if necessary for repairs.</p> <p>Current application for an emergency consent with WCRC to open a mouth through the sand spit to release any flood water which is also mitigating high risk.</p> <p>Niwas predictions are based on Okuru having no protection wall in place.</p>	I would like my property - 61 Johnston Crescent, Okuru, Haast to have Coastal Severe Overlay removed from property and replaced with Coastal Alert Overlay.
Graeme Quickfall (S255)	S255.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>I am a landowner with a 2.4 hectare property within the boundary of Greyhound road and SH 6 at Arahura which has the Coastal alert hazard overlay.</p> <p>The property has been surveyed and is at 4m elevation above high tide mark and 320 metres set back from the beach and behind 7-8m high sand dunes. The property is 600 metres to the west of the Arahura River. The Arahura River has flood protection on the southern side of the river, east of</p>	Remove the Coastal Alert Overlay from the property within the boundary of Grehyound road and SH 6 Arahura.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					<p>the bridge towards the head water. The northern side of the river is lower lying and sees most of the flood waters yet this is not accounted for in the TTPP reports.</p> <p>The TTPP report states there is little long term study done on accretion and erosion for our area. Now that they have given the classification of coastal alert and not coastal severe, they have reported that they have only completed inundation modelling and mapping and erosion for areas classed as severe, which means the property is really only affected by inundation for a 1m sea level rise over the next 100 years. It looks as if the report shows my property is affected by 1m or less but in my opinion the report is incorrect. The property is elevated around 1-1.5m above the Mawhera owned land which borders the river and south to my boundary, but the map shows this is less affected than my property. To the best of my knowledge and our seaside neighbour who has lived here since 1998, neither that property nor mine have ever been affected by flood waters. He owns the coastal side of the road from the start to Greyhound Road to his house and the rest in Maori lease land.</p> <p>The plan also states that no areas of the state highway which on the southern boundary of my land, is affected, yet their modelling map shows the inundation colouring over the main road, contradicting their plan</p>	



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					comments. The west coast region has suffered from a number of recent extreme rainfall and flood events and in particular in 2022, and yet my property was not affected by any flooding or inundation. This is clear evidence that the property is not at risk of extreme flood events.	
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.593	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support in part	There is no activity status if compliance with the specific standards is not achieved. Insert provision i.e. Restricted Discretionary where compliance not achieved.	Insert activity status of Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary for activity status where compliance is not achieved.
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.594	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Support in part	Reword provision to refer to buildings.	Reword NH - R40 to the following: "1. There is no increase to the net floor area <b>of any building</b> used for any sensitive activity; and 2. Where any increase in net floor area <b>of any building</b> meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event."
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.595	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Support in part	Reword provision to refer to buildings.	Reword NH - R41 to the following: "There is no increase in net floor area of any building used for a sensitive activity."
Grey District Council (S608)	S608.596	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support in part	New provision NH - R45 required for the provision of alterations/additions/maintenance to existing unoccupied buildings within the Coastal Setback Overlay, and for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay. Existing buildings for critical infrastructure require maintenance, and new buildings	Insert new provision NH - R45 for the permitted activity of altering, adding or maintaining to existing buildings within the Coastal Setback Overlay, as well as for new buildings that are not for sensitive activities in the Coastal Setback Overlay.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					associated with critical infrastructure already located within the Earthquake Hazard Overlays will be required. Restricting this to a noncomplying activity status places undue restrictions on the statutory body in charge of maintaining the infrastructure.	
Griffen & Smith Ltd (S253)	S253.007	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>The Coastal Hazard Alert overlay covers most of the Mitre 10 Mega site, including the main shop building and the large storage shed in the yard. Griffen &amp; Smith object to this overlay affecting their site. They submit that the boundary of the overlay appears arbitrary, being "straight-lined" through their site, and has potential to unfairly affect their insurance cover in future. The overlay excludes the buildings on the western side of Waterwalk Road south of the lagoon, and submits that these buildings are more likely to be inundated in the event of a coastal surge due to their location near the lagoon. Refer to submission for plan showing LIDAR ground levels along Waterwalk Road and detail on floor levels within the Mitre 10 Mega buildings.</p> <p>Griffen &amp; Smith submit that mitigation measures against inundation have already been implemented at the time of building on their site. Furthermore, the Coastal Hazard Alert overlay does not appear to account for the protection afforded by the Greymouth Flood Wall, including floodgates designed to stop water from flowing</p>	Remove the Coastal Hazard Alert overlay from the Mitre 10 Greymouth site

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					along the railway line and/or backing up through the culvert under Raleigh Street into the lagoon. We note that the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay does take into consideration the Greymouth Flood Wall system.	
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.001	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	<p>The Coastal Hazards Report was unavailable when the proposed Plan was released. I would like to see the coastal hazards report and be given a chance to comment on it before any decision is made relating to our property.</p> <p>I wish to understand what heights of protection above sea level are considered safe for continued habitation and development and even subdivision. Presumably, the planning team at WCRC have made some decisions about these matters as they must also relate to urban areas and many other rural properties.</p> <p>I also wish to understand what the WCRC considers are appropriate heights for highways and local government roads, and what safeguards or provisions are in place for those strategic assets.</p> <p>We have recently, and purposefully, rebuilt our house on piles at a height above the Karamea Highway.</p>	That the overlay be discussed with affected landowners and on-site inspections be conducted in order to establish an accurate overlay. The report which has been prepared for WCRC should be publicly available before any decisions are made, and meaningful consultation with any affected landowner should be required. I have not identified all the policies and rules affecting the coastal alert overlay but I accept the need for the plan to make provision for sea level rise.
Hamish Macbeth (S307)	S307.007	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support	I probably support rules such as NH R 10 and R 38 although I have not seen any report or data which identifies land in the Karamea area, and our property in particular, which is already 500 mm above the 1% AEP flood event.	Retain NH R38

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Hapuka Landing Limited (S514)	S514.005	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	Non-complying and discretionary rules are not required to ensure management of natural hazard risk. There is no need to open up consent applications to assessment of all effects (and/or the gateway test) purely on the basis of natural hazard risk when this can be addressed independently. The risk of natural hazards, and/or any potential effects of natural hazards, are discrete issues that can be managed through a restricted discretionary activity status with matters of discretion that address natural hazard risk/potential effects.	Amending the activity status of NH-R43, relating to new buildings for sensitive activities or increases to net floor area of buildings for sensitive activities in the Coastal Hazard Alert overlay, from discretionary to restricted discretionary, with matters of discretion restricted to management of inundation effects.
Hapuka Landing Limited (S514)	S514.006	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Non-complying and discretionary rules are not required to ensure management of natural hazard risk. There is no need to open up consent applications to assessment of all effects (and/or the gateway test) purely on the basis of natural hazard risk when this can be addressed independently. The risk of natural hazards, and/or any potential effects of natural hazards, are discrete issues that can be managed through a restricted discretionary activity status with matters of discretion that address natural hazard risk/potential effects.	Amending the activity status of NH-R44, relating to new buildings for sensitive activities or increases to net floor area of buildings for sensitive activities in the Coastal Hazard Severe overlay, from non-complying to restricted discretionary, with matters of discretion restricted to management of inundation and erosion effects.
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	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
					material increase in the consequences of natural hazards through development and redevelopment. An overly strict approach, as proposed, is not warranted.	
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	Support in part		Support the removal of coastal hazard severe overlay from any 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)	S467.026	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose		In relation to Punakaiki Village, delete this rule.
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 in capable of consistent administration. Specifically the land instability mapping does not align with the	Remove natural hazard overlays from Punakaiki village

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
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.
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)	S508.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
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	Oppose any extension of the Coastal Hazard Alert Overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	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.
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.
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)	S360.007	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

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
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)	S360.034	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
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
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	Undertake further community wide consultation with coastal settlements on the way forward.



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					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.	
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.
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.
Kenneth Wiltshire (S749)	S749.003	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	The Plan is not "a Plan" - because there is no proposed mitigation. It simply identifies hazards - and based on hypothetical assumption.	That possible mitigation plans be included, so as to suggest to Councils and ratepayers/owners what kind of remedial action can be taken to minimise hazard risk in the short, medium and long terms.
Kerera Corbett-Manga (S750)	S750.001	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Not Stated	Not enough information	Not stated - not enough information
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
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.
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)	S509.082	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)	S509.108	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)	S509.111	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.
Lee Cummings (S554)	S554.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Support	Support the coastal hazard severe mapping at Rapahoe as it excludes our property at 4 Statham Street from the overlays	Retain the coastal hazard severe overlay boundaries at Rapahoe as notified
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.082	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend coastal severe and coastal alert overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Leonie Avery (S507)	S507.111	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	We understand that there is a possibility that the coastal hazard overlays 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 any coastal hazard overlay from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Lindy Millar (S505)	S505.006	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The basis and process by which the areas have been defined is hard to follow. The layer seems to be simplistic and hard to follow - the bathtub model is overly simplistic and the overlay is overly restrictive given the level of risk.	Remove Lots 1-3 DP 395733 Block iX Oparara SD Flagstaff Road Karamea and other properties in a similar position from the Coastal Hazard Alert Overlay.
Lindy Millar (S505)	S505.007	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	Provides an unnecessary additional level of compliance for properties already in the flood alert overlay, costs of technical reports to support consents, discretionary status means	Amend to Permitted or at least Restricted Discretionary Activity.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					matters beyond natural hazards can be considered by the council and restricted discretionary is sufficient to give effect to the policies	
Lyn McIntosh (S469)	S469.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	Concerns farm property at Totora Lagoon. Property runs adjacent to the sea but is protected by natural high sand dunes. and historic photographs back to 1948 show no evidence of coastal erosion. So why are there isolated areas (totaling 3 hectares approximately) that are within the Coastal Hazard - Alert layer? And particularly when much of Hokitika isn't? The LiDAR mapping shows a "depression", but the sand dunes are 11 metres high. So that coastal inundation would affect the depression itself (which is 2.5 metres into a lower terrace of 7 metres, that is itself fronted by the dunes) defies logic.	That the Coastal hazard - Alert Overlay be entirely removed from the farm property at Totora Lagoon
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.010	Natural Hazards	NHP1	Support	Support the approach of identifying hazard areas in overlays.	Retain approach of identifying hazard areas in overlays.
Margaret Montgomery (S446)	S446.038	Natural Hazards	Coastal Setback Overlay	Oppose in part	A natural hazard risk assessment should have been undertaken by council in the determination of these areas and should not be put back onto applicants. The location gives council to much discretion and should be informed by set distances. Modification or retention of vegetation gives council to wide a scope with regard to landscaping matters. Agree with the other matters in full. I do however believe that set volumes or numbers should be applied, and while I acknowledge that this	Amend overlay to reflect the outcome of a natural hazard risk assessment undertaken by the Council. Provide more detailed matters of discretion with set distances for location and more narrowing of scope as relates to location and modification/retention of vegetation.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					approach is limited based on the underlying zoning there should be some form of consideration for where these are appropriate, as the current measures are increasingly restrictive or require in-depth analysis from builders, planners etc. with nearly all development requiring resource consent.	
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.041	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	The Coastal Hazard Severe overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the rules to be more enabling for coastal hazard severe
Martin & Co Westport Ltd and Lumberland Building Market Westport (S543)	S543.042	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	The Coastal Hazard Alert overlay is inappropriate. Associated provisions take an excessively restrictive approach to hazard management and mitigation.	Amend the rules to be more enabling for Coastal Hazard Alert
Michael Robson (S327)	S327.001	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend	Re the property located at 4420 Haast Jackson Bay in South Westland which is covered by plus flood plain and coastal hazard severe overlays on it. Due to the demographic of the Haast community it is safe to say that property assets are the sole asset base for most of residents. For those with sections or who are looking to develop Land further there will be a prolonged resource consent process required with no guidance as to what would likely to be granted resource consent and what would not. A lot of residents will not be able to sell their properties due to the uncertainty as to the process of what would be required by council to obtain a resource consent to build on a property with a hazard overlay.	That the council provide a list of what preventative measures would need to be taken for any property to be developed. Whether those measures required properties to be built that could be removed in the event of further coastal erosion with minimum floor levels required to be built on stilts, or if the water level increases to within a certain distance of the dwelling then the sewage and stormwater must be decommissioned and the dwelling abandoned or removed.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Given the housing shortage and increased cost of living not only on the West Coast area but throughout the country I believe it is inappropriate for the council to be able to put in place such significant restrictions on property without some reasonableness and guidance being provided to the current property owners of future property owners	
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.004	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The Coastal Hazard Severe and Coastal Hazard Alert layers over Okuru are wrong and have been misapplied. The NIWA report is obscured somewhere and this a breach of natural justice. There are conflicts in timelines and the submitter believes Councils are protected by statute on liability for negligence after 10 years and so that should be the timeframe for assessment. The Building Act talks about 50 years, and says nothing about a building lasting for 100 years. The zones will have a significant social and financial impact on Okuru Residents as property values will fall and people will be unable to sell. We consider the NIWA report is based on flawed methodology, and does not consider the unique geography. Erosion at Okuru is largely caused by river action within the estuary not sea wave action. Any prediction 50 to 100 years into the future is bound to be wrong. The NIWA report did not include any consultation with landowners or consider risk mitigation	Amend the severe and coastal hazard alert zones at Okuru to address the matters raised in the submission.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.008	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend		Adopt a more realistic timeframe for assessment of coastal hazards than 100 years
Michael Snowden (S492)	S492.018	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R43 should move from a Discretionary Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	That Rule NH-R43 move from a Discretionary Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.005	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.006	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.007	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.008	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Neil Mouat (S535)	S535.080	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	We do not agree that the hazard has been correctly mapped in the vicinity of our property (4217 State Highway 6, Punakaiki).	Amend overlay extent.
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	The mapping subject to the Variation is opposed because: - Such mapping is inconsistent with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS); - The NIWA methodology informing the Variation overestimates coastal hazard risk, including uncertainties with respect to erosion and inundation; - There is a lack of site specific hazard risk - Policies 24 and 25 of the NZCPS are applicable; and - Consultation has been insufficient and ineffective.	That the proposed mapping overlays are not accepted;



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
P & A Horrell (S715)	S715.002	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Oppose	<p>The associated Coastal Hazard Overlay Rules applying to those Overlays affected by Variation 2 are opposed, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The mapping concerned has fundamentally altered the planning framework for property owners so affected;</li> <li>- The Rules themselves are directly derived from the overlays, which are now themselves being revised;</li> <li>- There are significant changes introduced by the Variation; and</li> </ul> <p>It is therefore essential that all affected landowners, including the Submitter, can participate in discussions to provide input on what are significant modifications. In particular, such Rules need to be clear and unambiguous in relation to lawfully established activities (including by subdivision consents partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, c.f. blanket risk avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach.</p>	<p>That the respective Rules are amended to protect existing and consented residential activities and buildings, including extensions and modifications to existing residential buildings, by providing for them as a Permitted Activity;</p> <p>And</p> <p>That any additional or consequential relief necessary to properly address the issues raised in this submission is granted. This includes alternative, consequential, or necessary amendments to both the proposed TTPP and the District Plan, as required to fully implement the requested changes and ensure that all relevant matters are adequately addressed.</p>
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.006	Natural Hazards	Permitted Activities	Amend	<p>Within the Coastal Hazard Alert overlay allow for buildings which are relocatable</p>	<p>New rule as follows: Permitted activity</p> <p><b>NH - RX New Relocatable Buildings Activity Status Permitted Where: 1. Buildings are designed to be relocatable or re-levelled in the event of sea level rise or inundation. Advice note: Compliance with Rule NH - RX will be demonstrated through a statement from the building designer or architect confirming that the building has been designed to</b></p>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<b>be relocatable or re-levelled.</b>
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.009	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support	Allows for a building to be reconstructed should it be destroyed due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God	Retain as notified.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.010	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Allowing for alternative mitigation	Amend NH- R40 as follows: Activity Status Permitted Where: <b>1. There is no increase to the net floor area used for any sensitive activity; and Any addition or alteration has been designed to be relocatable or able to be relevelled; or 2.</b> Where any increase in net floor area meets a minimum finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event.
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.011	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose	The submitters oppose this rule, and seek a permitted activity status	Delete NH - R41
Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605)	S605.012	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	Activity status will result in the housing stock stagnating, when new development could increase the township's resilience	Amend the activity status of NH - R 44 as follows: NH - R44 Coastal Severe Overlay: New Buildings for Sensitive Activities and Additions and Alterations of Buildings that increase the net floor area for Sensitive Activities Activity Status <del>Non-complying</del> <b>Discretionary</b> Where: <b>1. New Buildings are not designed to be relocatable or re-levelled; or 2. New Buildings are not designed to meet a finished floor level of 300mm above a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event.</b> <del>These are located in the Coastal Severe</del>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Overlay
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.014	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose in part	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Amend rule so that there is a ten year period within which lawfully established buildings can be reconstructed/replaced in all overlays or delete time limit and if compliance is not achieved, this should be a Discretionary Activity.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.015	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.016	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose in part	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.017	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.018	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Oppose in part	The activity status when compliance is not achieved within the Coastal Severe Overlay is too restrictive.	Amend status when compliance is not achieved to Discretionary for both Coastal Alert and Coastal Severe Overlays.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.019	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain as notified.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.020	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	Activity status is too restrictive.	Amend status to Discretionary.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.082	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose in part	This overlay is too extensive.	Amend overlay extent to exclude our properties.
Paul Avery (S512)	S512.108	How The Plan Works	Overlays	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 from what has been notified that would include our properties. Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.036	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement and there	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

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					is no activity status where compliance is not achieved.	Discretionary Activity.
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.037	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.038	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>
Peter Langford (S615)	S615.039	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain
Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721)	S721.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	The Beach at Punakaiki is a "pocket" between Razorback and Dolomite Points. It is thus buffered against littoral drift and protected from tropical cyclones (Cyclone Fehi having had no affect). And the Coastal Engineering Report referred to in Submission Point 721.001 includes defining photographs of the 1920s and 1950s, illustrating no real change in the beach through advance or retreat relative to today	That the Maps altered by Variation 2 take into account the "pocket" nature of the Beach at Punakaiki, the natural hazard protection afforded by it, and fact that the Beach itself has altered little since the 1920s.
Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721)	S721.005	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Amend	In terms of the socio-economic dimensions of Punakaiki, it is an important tourism location, and one subject to varying and potentially complex market trends. This needs to be recognised in the TTPP generally. It is important, therefore, that the Plan, including Variation 2, takes a "wider view" of the issue, and both recognise existing and the potential for further natural hazard mitigation works if necessary.	That provisions of the TTPP associated with Natural Hazards management recognise that hazard risk can be mitigated by appropriate measures, such as the construction of seawalls, thereby reducing risk itself and allowing certain development to proceed.
Raylene Black (S420)	S420.002	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and	Amend		Request to remove property from Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
			Coastal Alert Overlay			
Richard Henschel (S285)	S285.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	<p>We don't agree with the arbitrary and generalised mapping of natural hazards across the property. Without a proper survey or expert inspection, the property has been identified in its entirety, as being susceptible to coastal inundation. This has been done despite no historical evidence, as well as, during our 12 year ownership, never having been affected by coastal inundation or flooding across the most part of the land. (refer submission for more detail).</p> <p>We don't find the process of identifying for Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert being robust but rather, a 'worst case scenario' to mitigate risks. This impacts the usability, insurability, value of the property as well as the well-being of the owner of the property.</p> <p>The risk management proposed is also too extreme for a time scale that reflects only current knowledge of climate change and its mitigation.</p>	<b>Remove the Flood hazard susceptibility and the Coastal hazard alert category removed from the property at 4456B Karamea Highway or return this to to the previously identified area adjacent to the highway.</b>
Richard Wallis (S97)	S97.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	<p>Despite our building platforms being unaffected by the 100 year flooding in the recent 20 years that we have owned the above properties, the majority of our building platforms have been zoned Red (Coastal severe Hazard). These building platforms were built to the approved elevation by the Westland District Council.</p>	Remove Severe Coastal Hazard Overlay from 59 Cuttance, Okuru and replace with Coastal Hazard Alert Overlay

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Richard Wallis (S97)	S97.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	The surrounding land at Cuttance Okuru is existing subdivision land is identical to the land on the south and the forestry land east of the sections has been identified as Coastal Hazard Alert and it would make sense to include the shaded green area as per the attached Diagram to be Coastal Hazard Alert as well.	Include the shaded green area as per the attached Diagram at Okuru to be Coastal Hazard Alert as well.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.004	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	restricts existing users rights to extend their building.	NH-R38 point 1 restricts extending a current building, this should be removed.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.005	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	Restricts property owners rights on their land.	NH-R38 point 2. b. & c. to be removed.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.006	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Using a term such as "Coastal Hazard Severe" may negatively affect property values and their ability to gain insurance. Also, this has been used as a generic term without looking at what measure have been used to protect individual properties or communities.	the use of the term "Coastal Hazard Severe" to be removed.
Robert Burdekin (S378)	S378.007	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Oppose	1.0 m sea level rise is excessive given the predicted life of a new built house and the fact that that sort of sea level rise is speculation at best.	Westport Hazard Overlay 1m sea level rise to be reviewed. This should be no more than 0.5m
Ros Bradley (S725)	S725.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Oppose	Communications for Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping have been poor. No maps were sent with the letter, the website was hard to navigate, and it was confusing as to who did and didn't get (and who should/shouldn't have got) letters.	That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Ruth Henschel (S150)	S150.005	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose in part	<p>We don't agree with the arbitrary and generalised mapping of these across the property. Without a proper survey or expert inspection, the property has been identified in its entirety, as being susceptible to coastal inundation. This has been done despite no historical evidence, as well as, during our 12 year ownership, never having been affected by coastal inundation or flooding across the most part of the land.</p> <p>We don't find the process of identifying for Flood hazard susceptibility and Coastal hazard alert being robust but rather, a 'worst case scenario' to mitigate risks. This impacts the usability, insurability, value of the property as well as the well-being of the owner of the property.</p>	<b>Remove Flood hazard susceptibility and the Coastal hazard alert overlays removed from 4456B Karamea Highway or returned to the previously identified area adjacent to the highway.</b>
Scenic Hotel Group (S483)	S483.016	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	<p>Concerned will limit future development such as hotel extensions, conference centres. Could impact valuations, raise owners costs.</p>	<p>Oppose Coastal Hazard Overlays (Alert and Severe) over the following properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Punakaiki Beachfront Motels, Mabel Street, Punakaiki</li> <li>• Punakaiki Rocks, Hotel and Bar, Owen St, Punakaiki</li> <li>• Sec 21 Mabel Street, Punakaiki</li> <li>• Sec 23 Mabel Street, Punakaiki</li> <li>• Sec 24 Mabel Street, Punakaiki</li> <li>• Sec 25 Mabel Street, Punakaiki</li> </ul>
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.016	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	New investment and reconstruction should be discouraged	delete

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.017	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Amend	New investment and reconstruction should be discouraged	Amend to state unoccupied buildings of <b>no more than 50m2</b>
Scoped Planning and Design Limited (S617)	S617.018	Natural Hazards	Natural Hazards Rules	Amend	There are no controls for areas at risk of tsunamis or areas affected by coastal erosion vulnerable to storm surge	New sensitive activities are prohibited within the Coastal Severe Overlay
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.005	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	It is unclear why this area is subject to this overlay. 2/75 Snodgrass Road	That the Coastal Hazard Alert Level Overlay be removed in its entirety from this property.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.021	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	History has shown that it is not practical to reconstruct or replace a damaged home within a 2-year timeframe.	Amend Rule NH-R38 so reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in the Coastal Alert Overlay is permitted within a 5-year timeframe.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.022	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support	There is no reason to limit the establishment of new unoccupied buildings in these overlays.	Retain Rule NH-R39.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.023	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	The permitted activity rule should allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road submitters' properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m <sup>2</sup> over any continuous 10-year period.	Amend Rule NH-R41(1) to allow the floor area of a dwelling in the Snodgrass Road submitters' properties to be extended by 25 - 50 m <sup>2</sup> over any continuous 10-year period.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.024	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	Allow a resource consent application to be made for an activity which does not meet permitted activity rules.	Retain Rule NH-R43.
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.056	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Oppose	The associated restrictions on land use are unjustified on these properties.	Amend rules to remove restrictions on these properties
Snodgrass Road submitters (S619)	S619.058	Natural Hazards	NHR52	Amend	Not sufficient justification as to why 1m of sea level rise needs to be accommodated by finished floor levels	Delete reference to 1m sea level rise from Rule NH-R52 insofar as it applies to the Snodgrass Road properties
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.010	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time for reconstruction/replacement.	Amend to read: Where: 1. ...



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<p>2. For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where:</p> <p>a. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God;</p> <p>b. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within <del>5-year</del> <b>a ten-year period</b> in the Coastal Alert overlay and <del>2-year</del> <b>a ten-year period</b> in the Coastal Severe overlay;</p> <p>c. ...</p>
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.011	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		Retain
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.012	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	Point two in this rule is too restrictive.	Delete point 2.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.013	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	Activity status where compliance is not achieved is too restrictive for Coastal Hazard Alert overlay.	Amend activity status where compliance is not achieved for Coastal Hazard Alert overlay from Discretionary to Controlled or to Restricted Discretionary.
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.014	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	Matters to which discretion is restricted should be similar to NH - R11.	The matters to which discretion is restricted should be amended to similarly reflect NH - R11: <b>a. Whether there is a functional or operational need for the facility to be located in a Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlays area;</b> <b>b. The effects of natural hazards on people and property;</b> <b>c. The location and design of proposed sites, buildings, vehicle access, earthworks and infrastructure in relation to natural hazard risk;</b> <b>d. Any freeboard requirements to be included;</b> <b>e. The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk;</b> <b>f. The timing, location, scale and nature of any earthworks in relation to natural hazard risk;</b> <b>g. The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural</b>

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						<b>hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site.;h. How the activity incorporates mitigation of risk to life, property and the environment; andi. Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed natural hazard mitigation measures.</b>
Steve Croasdale (S516)	S516.015	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support		Retain
Sue Templeton (S207)	S207.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	53 Anderson Lane, OKURU, Haast We have excellent protection from our Rock Sea Wall which surrounds Okuru village. Our funds in our Okuru Rating District Account cover any work that needs to be done in the future from river erosion. We have a Estuary in front of our sections "village" & then out from that a Spit, which is a natural barrier from the sea. We also have "Open Bay Islands" (Taumaka Island) which sits out from Okuru. These Islands also protects us & disperses the high seas further south and North of Okuru.	Strongly oppose the overlay 'Coastal Severe' and wish to be changed to Coastal Alert.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.213	Natural Hazards	NH - R38	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.214	Natural Hazards	NH - R39	Support in part	We support this rule. However, we note that there may be increased risk of damage to these unoccupied buildings due to the impacts of climate change.	Retain rule.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.215	Natural Hazards	NH - R40	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.216	Natural Hazards	NH - R41	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.217	Natural Hazards	NH - R42	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.218	Natural Hazards	NH - R43	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.219	Natural Hazards	NH - R44	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.220	Natural Hazards	NH - R45	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Mana Ora (Community and Public Health) of the NPHS/ Te Whatu Ora (S190)	S190.221	Natural Hazards	NH - R46	Support	We support this rule.	Retain rule.
Te Tumu Paeroa - The office of the Māori Trustee (S440)	S440.015	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Support in part	The Māori Trustee considers NH R38(2)(b), with regards to the coastal severe overlay, does not sufficiently account for circumstances outside	The Māori Trustee considers a footnote should accompany NH R38(2)(b) to provide exceptions for circumstances outside landowners control that may delay the reconstruction or replacement of a building within the 2

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					landowners control that may delay the reconstruction or replacement of a building within the 2 year timeframe. These could include (but are not limited to): Backlog of insurance claims; Supply shortages; Unresolved litigation; Labour shortages; Delays to the repairing of key infrastructure (i.e. roads). However, if reconstruction or replacement works are not completed within a 5 year timeframe the status of this activity should no longer be permitted. This aligns with the coastal alert overlay.	year timeframe.  However, if reconstruction or replacement works are not completed within a 5 year timeframe the status of this activity should no longer be permitted. This aligns with the coastal alert overlay.
Tim Penlington, Katie Deans, Karl and Brenda Feyen, Catherine Woods, Richard Wallis (S137)	S137.001	Planning Maps and Overlays	Coastal Hazards Variation Maps	Amend	We have determined from your TTPP rezoning maps that despite our building platforms being unaffected by the 100 year flooding in the recent 20 years that we have owned the above properties, the majority of our building platform have been zoned red (coastal severe hazard). These platforms were built to the approved elevation by the Westland district Council.	Remove Coastal Severe Hazard overlay from property at Cuttance Road and replace with Coastal Hazard Alert overlay as per the attached diagram.
Tim Penlington, Katie Deans, Karl and Brenda Feyen, Catherine Woods, Richard Wallis (S137)	S137.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Amend	The surrounding land is existing subdivision land is identical to the land on the south and the forestry land east of the sections has been zoned blue (alert).	Include the shaded green area at in the attached diagram within the Coastal Alert Overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.070	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	reconstruction of buildings within hazard overlays should be subject to the same rules and policies as new buildings	Amend to Avoid reconstruction of buildings used for sensitive activities within the Coastal Severe Hazard Overlay,

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.071	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	If industrial buildings are permitted in the coastal severe overlay, alert systems and evacuation planning should be mandated.	Add new condition: 3. Industrial buildings in the coastal severe overlay, alert systems and evacuation planning systems shall be in place.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.072	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Support	If industrial buildings are permitted in the coastal severe overlay, alert systems and evacuation planning should be mandated.	Add: h Alert systems and evacuation planning
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.073	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.074	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Support	The restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.075	Natural Hazards	NH - R45	Support	Support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards.	REtain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.076	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Support	We support the restriction of development in areas at risk from coastal hazards	Retain
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.126	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend		Add new condition. 3. There is risk mitigation measures for buildings used for sensitive activities reconstructed within the Coastal Alert Hazard Overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.127	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Oppose	Critical Response Facilities should be relocated out of the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.	Exclude Critical Response Facilities in the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.
Toka Tū Ake EQC (S612)	S612.128	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	Critical Response Facilities should be relocated out of the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.	Amend to state that Critical Response Facilities be relocated out of the coastal severe overlay, and preferably the coastal alert overlay.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.013	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Land heights are not available for LIDAR measurements and could not be accurately determined. The NIWA report makes it clear there is a lack of data at Hannah's Clearing. The proposed Severe Hazard Area covers land that is higher than land not included in the overlay. The community engagement process has been poor. The proposed overlay is	Remove severe coastal hazard overlay from Hannah's Clearing village.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					causing residents unnecessary anxiety and loss of quality of life.	
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.014	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Oppose	It is unfair and unreasonable for someone owning a consented section to find that to establish a dwelling is a non-complying activity. This will significantly reduce the land value. The rules in NHR45 would be sufficient to manage the risks.	Delete Rule NHR 43 and apply NHR 45 to Coastal Severe Hazard Areas.
Vance & Carol Boyd (S447)	S447.015	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Oppose	It is unfair and unreasonable for someone owning a consented section to find that to establish a dwelling is a non-complying activity. This will significantly reduce the land value. The rules in NHR45 would be sufficient to manage the risks.	Delete Rule NHR 44 and apply NHR 45 to Coastal Severe Hazard Areas.
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (S450)	S450.070	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support in part	Waka Kotahi is unsure how the permitted activity works as there are no permitted activity standard requirements listed in the rule. As currently proposed all new unoccupied buildings and structures in the Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlays are permitted without any other consideration.	Provide clarity on the rule
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.002	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose		Amend permitted Rule NH - R38 to provide for maintenance and repair of existing weather event monitoring structures and WCRC Rating District protection structures.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.015	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose		Maps are refined for the coastal setback overlay to the property level.
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.021	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	The natural hazard overlay maps do not follow natural land contours. Maps need to be refined to exclude areas that are not subject to natural	Maps relating to Natural Hazard overlays are refined to the property level for natural hazard overlays.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					hazards, rather than relying on general studies.	
West Coast Regional Council (S488)	S488.025	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	There are currently six protection structures and one monitoring structure in the Coastal Alert Overlay, and three protection structures in the Coastal Severe Overlay. The designation will make these existing structures lawfully established. However, new monitoring or protection structures may be needed in the future to mitigate the impacts of climate change induced weather events. Monitoring structures provide valuable river level and rainfall data for Civil Defence to monitor and manage potential flooding of nearby properties. The protection structures have an important role in protecting adjoining land, buildings and infrastructure from flood risk. Council seeks that Rule NH - R38 is amended as future survey points may be necessary to monitor erosion and accretion.	This Rule should be amended to also provide for construction, maintenance and repair of existing and future hydrology monitoring structures and Rating District protection structures.
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.011	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	Notwithstanding existing use rights which exist due a building being lawfully established at the time of notification of the plan. Westland District Council does not support NH-R38-2. Which states that reconstruction or replacement of a destroyed/damaged building is permitted if it is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years within the Coastal	Where a building has not been re-established under the 12 months allowed under existing use rights, change the activity status for Reconstruction, Repairs and Maintenance to Existing Buildings in the Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay to Discretionary.

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



Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					if this risk has increased) up to 5 years later gives the owner the ability to still rebuild. Furthermore insurance companies will insist on like for like even if it is in extreme danger of the exact same hazard as the District Plan permits it. Effectively setting the dwelling owner up to fail.	
Westland District Council (S181)	S181.012	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Oppose	Council has concerns regarding making any unoccupied building permitted in the Coastal Severe Overlay. It would be deemed inappropriate to allow high levels of investment within Severe Coastal overlays just because they are unoccupied buildings. It is considered that Councils should not be encouraging investment in assets in known high hazard areas, allowing damage to property. At the least this should be a Controlled activity to allow for mitigation of destruction of property and potentially consider the risk and level of investment being put at risk.	Change the status for New Unoccupied Buildings in the Coastal Severe Overlay to a Controlled or Restricted Discretionary Activity with controls or restrictions including:- Assessment of risk to building- Consideration of mitigation measures to reduce/manage potential surge of coastal erosion- Consideration of likelihood or potential of complete loss of the building in a surge or coastal erosion situation
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.160	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	It is unclear what this rule adds that is not already covered by NH-R1.	Amend heading of NH-R38: Reconstruction, Repairs and ... to existing <b>Occupied</b> Buildings in the Coastal....
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.161	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Amend	Subsequent amendment to permit activities relating to existing unoccupied buildings and structures.	Where submission to NH-R38 is not adopted provide for activities related to existing unoccupied buildings and structures as permitted activities.

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.162	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	There appears to be some conflict with rule NH-R39. Based on that rule this rule would relate to occupied buildings and the rule should be clear in that regard. As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore, (1) Major dams should be defined (as previously submitted). (2) It should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and structures.	(a) Amend the heading of NH-R40: Additions ... for <b>Occupied Commercial</b> ... (2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.  (2) Add a note to the rule, " <b>(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)</b> "
Westpower Limited (S547)	S547.164	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	(1) As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore it is unclear how aspects related to major dams are provided for in these rules, particularly given that new unoccupied buildings are permitted. (a) major dams should be defined (as previously submitted), (b) it should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings. (2) It is noted that there is no discretion to consider any needs and constraints of activities that may require location in these areas, and provision	1) Define "major dam" as previously submitted. (2) Add a note to the rule, " <b>(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)</b> "(3) Add a new discretion matter h., " <b>h. Whether there is a locational, technical, functional or operational constraint or requirement for the facility needing to locate in the coastal severe or coastal alert overlay.</b> "(4) Add a new discretion matter i., " <b>i. The benefits to the community of the activity occurring.</b> "

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
					should be made for considering these matters. (3) It is noted that the benefits arising from an activity are not a matter of discretion when considering such applications. Such matters should form part of consideration of the relevant issues arising.	
Will Harvey (S157)	S157.001	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Oppose	<p>We oppose this time frame for rebuilding in the event of damage being 2 years.</p> <p>We assume that this covers earthquakes as well as erosion from the sea. This is unreasonable given the time required to complete insurance arrangements, tidy up the damaged site so that it is safe, plan future development and comply with council requirements, let alone the availability of suitable builders and materials, especially if the damage was as a result of a major natural event. We think that a reasonable time frame would be 5 years.</p>	Natural Hazards Rule 38 - extend rebuild timeframe from 2 years to 5 years for properties in the Severe Coastal Hazard overlay
Will Harvey (S157)	S157.002	Planning Maps and Overlays	Natural Hazards	Oppose	Erosion is only at the northern end of the beach and we are 70m from and 2m above the sea. A house has already been built on the site with a s72 Building Act Notice on it. The boundaries of the Severe Coastal Hazard overlay cross through the building - not clear how rules affect it - consent requirements are unclear.	Remove Coastal Severe Hazard overlay from Hannah's Clearing and our property at 197 Haast - Jackson Bay Road.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.129	Natural Hazards	NHR38	Amend	Two and five years is an insufficient length of time.	Amend rule so that there is no specified limit within which lawfully established buildings can be

Submitter	Submission Point	Plan Section	Provision	Position	Reasons	Decision Requested
						reconstructed/replaced in all overlays.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.130	Natural Hazards	NHR39	Support		REtain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.131	Natural Hazards	NHR40	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.132	Natural Hazards	NHR41	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.133	Natural Hazards	NHR42	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.134	Natural Hazards	NHR43	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.135	Natural Hazards	NHR44	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.136	Natural Hazards	NHR45	Support		Retain
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.137	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Oppose	This rule is too restrictive.	Delete
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.138	Natural Hazards	NHR46	Amend	This rule is too restrictive.	Amend to be more enabling.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.147	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Support	We do not support our properties being included in any extension.	Retain extent of overlay as notified.
William McLaughlin (S567)	S567.148	Natural Hazards	Coastal Severe and Coastal Alert Overlay	Amend		Amend associated objectives, policies and rules to be more enabling.

