



Plan Sections: Natural Hazards, Natural Hazards Maps - Coastal Hazards Variation Maps

This is a summary of decisions requested in submissions made on the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan Variation 2 Coastal Hazards Mapping. Note that this document may only contain a subset of decisions requested. Summaries of all decisions requested and details on how to make a further submission are available at www.ttpn.nz

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------|---|--|
| Mary Stewart (S222) | S222.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Is concerned this will affect land value and ability to get insurance as well the quality of the scientific data used to identify the overlay. | That Karamea not be included in the Coastal Hazard Overlays until the LIDAR is completed. |
| David & Janice McMillan (S670) | S670.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Our property is not affected by this natural hazard risk and we consider the identification is inaccurate. | Remove Coastal Alert and Coastal Setback overlays from the property at 6 Main Road, Ngakawau . |
| Dee Deaker (S691) | S691.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Natural Hazards | Oppose | People and communities should have the freedom to live where they wish and exist. The WCRC should resist unreasonable "dictates" by central government. TTPP/WCRC/BDC need evidence if going against ratepayer wishes, and should be transparent about what is happening or required | Neither Variation 2 nor the TTPP goes ahead in its present form; and opposition to any form of management retreat is noted |
| Mark Vanstone (S708) | S708.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Impacts on property prices and insurance | Oppose coastal hazard overlay on 33 Glasseye Drive, Karamea. |
| Kenneth Wiltshire (S749) | S749.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Assumptions and propositions are scientifically invalid and untestable. In particular, the one metre rise in sea level over 100 years is hypothetical only. It takes no account of topography, and beyond minimal photographic comparisons, there is little evidence of scientific measurement or research on coastal processes to show erosion and | Oppose the coastal natural hazards maps in the proposed Plan for the Granity - Ngakawau area |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | deposition cycles, river change courses and flooding data over time. There have, for instance been NO studies of beach profiles or attrition rates along the Ngakawau Straight between 11 Main Road and Torea Street. Yet this area has been included within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, devaluing property and suggesting both State Highway 67 and the electricity distribution network to Karamea are under threat. | |
| Mary Stewart (S222) | S222.003 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Is concerned about the impact of the coastal hazards identification on rates, and the amount of protection provided for Karamea. I have a number of questions about how this will be managed in the future - how will access to Karamea be maintained, will protection works be upgraded, will we be required to retreat. | That further consultation is undertaken about the proposals for Coastal Alert areas. |
| Mary Stewart (S222) | S222.004 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Is concerned about the impact of the coastal hazards identification on rates, and the amount of protection provided for Karamea. I have a number of questions about how this will be managed in the future - how will access to Karamea be maintained, will protection works be upgraded, will we be required to retreat. | That proactive measures be implemented to ensure that Karamea area is future proofed with adequate seawalls and river stop banks. |
| Mary Stewart (S222) | S222.005 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | I am concerned about the accuracy of the maps and the science that underpins them. | That I have the option to resubmit when accurate LIDAR has been completed. |
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.045 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Amend | While Variation 2 is about Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING, such Mapping itself links to provisions - and in particular Objectives, Policies and | That when and where Variation 2 has in fact altered the Natural Hazard Overlays applying to a property, those persons affected also be able to comment on the relevant provisions of the Natural Hazards Chapter. Ideally (and it |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter. If and when a Change in overlay has changed the provisions - and particularly Rules - which apply, it is appropriate that comments on the relevant provisions of the Natural Hazards Chapter can also be considered. | is understood to be the case - and supported), submissions on both Variation 2 and the Natural Hazards Provisions should be heard together. |
| Mandy Deans (S549) | S549.004 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | There is really no need for such an Overlay - or certainly to the extent that it imposes such penalties and constrains residents. Rather, ratepayers should be facilitated in their ability to respond to the erosion threat by carrying out mitigation works - such as the bund installed by ratepayers in 2016. The WCRC should ideally grant a West Coast-wide resource consent for erosion protection works, which would enable e.g. works to alter the Arawhata River mouth (to align the outlet in a manner that promotes beach accretion, c.f. erosion) at Neils Beach and various other such works elsewhere. | We have been asking WCRC for a number of years for a Resource Consent to be set up for changing the Arawhata River mouth, should it be necessary. We ask now that you continue to explore the implementation of one Resource Consent for the whole of the West Coast, for doing works to reduce erosion. We see this as a logical and timely application that would assist all coastal communities. |
| Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605) | S605.045 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Assumptions and propositions are scientifically invalid and untestable. In particular, the one metre rise in sea level over 100 years is hypothetical only. It takes no account of topography, and beyond minimal photographic comparisons, there is little evidence of scientific measurement or research on coastal processes to show erosion and deposition cycles, river change courses and flooding data over time. There have, for instance been NO studies of beach profiles or attrition | That submissions on the objectives and policies that relate to the Coastal Natural Hazards are further considered alongside the Rules and Variation 2 at the same hearing. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|---|--|
| | | | | | rates along the Ngakawau Straight between 11 Main Road and Torea Street. Yet this area has been included within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, devaluing property and suggesting both State Highway 67 and the electricity distribution network to Karamea are under threat. | |
| Dave Henderson (S742) | S742.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Not Stated | Not enough information | Not stated - not enough information |
| David Hughes (S743) | S743.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Not enough information, very sparse on information. | Place implementation on hold until the public is fully informed. |
| Kenneth Wiltshire (S749) | S749.006 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Amend | Mitigation plans and damage minimisation, including progressive, proactive retreat, receive very brief mention only. There is certainly no discussion as to HOW such outcomes are to be achieved, with no real guidance offered to local Councils. This is arguably a nationwide problem, requiring Government commitment and support to address. Certainly there is nothing to suggest HOW such matters should be addressed going forward, despite arguably \$ billions in costs with potentially millions affected. There are potentially NUMEROUS options to better protect properties and infrastructure from coastal erosion and inundation. | That the Plan text include mitigation plans for national hazards, so as to guide both Councils and ratepayers/owners as to what remedial action may be undertaken in the short, medium and long terms. |
| Les & Kathy McManaway (S751) | S751.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | It has no basis in fact. Not enough information. | Withdraw the Variation |
| Lynda Reynolds (S752) | S752.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Not enough information | Withdraw the Variation |
| Marilyn McKinney (S753) | S753.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Not enough information, no graphs to view. Did not receive this one in mail. | Withdraw the Variation |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|------------|---|---|
| Maxmillion Donnelly (S754) | S754.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Oppose | Not enough information, cannot find the zone graph of Westport to know what houses are effected by this plan. | Not stated - not enough information |
| Patricia Paxton (S755) | S755.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Not Stated | Not enough information, do not know how they will be affected. | Withdraw the Variation |
| Piet & Alison Geldenhuys (S757) | S757.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Not Stated | Do not understand how this variation effects their property | Not stated |
| Ray Karl (S759) | S759.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Not Stated | Not enough information | No stated - not enough information |
| Ronald Williams (S760) | S760.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Not Stated | Not enough information | Not stated - not enough infomration |
| Wendy Sheenan (S761) | S761.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards | Not Stated | They do not understand how experts come up with this variation | Not stated - do not understand how experts come up with this variation |
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.046 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Policies | Amend | Further to Submission point S467.045, Policies NH_P1 to NH-P3, plus any new Policies recommended that will have relevance to the Coastal Hazard Overlays affected by Variation 2 should be able to be commented on when and where the Overlay has changed relative to a given property. | That when and where Variation 2 has altered the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay applying to a given property, persons so affected be able to comment on Policies NH-P1 to NH-P3 plus any new policies of relevance, in addition to the change in mapping itself. |
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.050 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Policies | Amend | As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply. | Create a new policy for natural hazards alert overlay. Ensure that the policy recognises that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance. |
| Desna Bruce Walker (S692) | S692.005 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Policies | Oppose | All individual owners have had thus far is the notice, the public meeting in Westport (with a Carters Beach Meeting of 28 July 2024 not attended, despite invitation), and extension of the initial closing date for submissions to 30 August 2024. Initial communication (via letter) was very poor, with insufficient information | That engagement with the community, especially owners of affected properties, be more thorough, transparent and clear (informing owners individually), with "managed retreat" removed as an option unless a property is in immediate danger.. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | contained. Many are concerned about effects on property values and insurance costs, transition and relocation costs, do not favour a regulatory approach, and believe more should be spent on coastal protection works. And such feedback has not been listened to. | |
| Michael Rogers (S709) | S709.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Policies | Support | Overall, the provisions for Natural Hazards - and particularly the Policies - are supported. But the Natural Hazard Overlays and their generation is not. | That the Natural Hazard Policies - of the TTPP, as originally notified in the natural Hazards Chapter, be retained. |
| Mitchell Rogers (S710) | S710.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Policies | Support in part | The Natural Hazards Policies provide for existing structures to be maintained, but guidance is lacking as to how protection measures should be designed and what thresholds make a property uninhabitable. Local communities have already taken action to prevent inundation - including seawalls, enhanced drains and pumps. The process needs to be formalised. | That existing protection structures and provision for their maintenance are included in the Planning. |
| Mitchell Rogers (S710) | S710.002 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Policies | Amend | National guidance is required on how to incorporate the effects of climate change into development. The Environmental Defence Society has drafted some documents, providing a good plan for this. This should be incorporated into the Policies, applying both national directions and local solutions, to give communities clear guidance on what can and should be done, e.g: - Where to put protective structures; - Where to adapt properties; - When to abandon properties; - How to be compensated, etc. | That Climate Change planning be incorporated into the Natural Hazards policies. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.047 | Natural Hazards | NHP1 | Amend | As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply. | Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance. |
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.048 | Natural Hazards | NHP3 | Amend | As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply. | Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance. |
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.049 | Natural Hazards | NHP5 | Amend | As Variation 2 has altered the extent of the hazard overlays, and in some cases which hazard overlay applies it is appropriate for people who have properties affected by Variation 2 to be able to address all of the relevant provisions on the Plan that apply. | Ensure that the policies recognise that the appropriate management response in the policies applying in the Coastal Hazard Alert areas is mitigation, not avoidance. |
| Forest Habitats Limited (S186) | S186.005 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Support in part | It is in fact clear that properties outside the hazard mapped areas are not being thoroughly assessed - e.g. Golf Links Road subdivision, which a subsequent assessment by a Registered Engineer confirms is in fact at risk of flooding. This is consistent with submission point S488.020 in the WCRC submission on the TTPP, which concludes that hazard maps do not follow contours and need further refinement to determine which areas are in fact subject to natural hazard risk. Reliance on general studies alone is placing undue restrictions on some property owners. | That the Natural Hazards Rules make it clear that site specific investigations by a registered Engineer - assessing flood levels and proposing mitigation measures such as minimum floor levels, and based on detailed topographical information - should take precedence over hazard mapping, which is based on high level, often out of date, modelling. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|--|---|
| Michael Snowden (S492) | S492.015 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | <p>While Variation 2 concerns Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING, Rules relevant to the Variation require greater clarification - particularly in terms of legal effect/operative status, in relation to consents given effect to, previous subdivisions and existing use rights. Clarity is required as to what "lawfully established" means, while certain rules are unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>Particular Changes to Rules sought are set out in submission points 492.016 to 492.019 below. Should these not be possible, then additional, alternative, consequential or otherwise necessary changes to the Rules generally may be sought.</p> | <p>That the Rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter that are of relevance to Variation 2 are given greater clarity with respect to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal effect/operative effect of the Rule; - Savings/exemptions when resource consents are granted and/or implemented ahead of the Rule itself becoming Operative; - Existing use rights apply; and <p>The meaning of "lawfully established (with that to be consistent with such terminology in the RMA).</p> |
| Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669) | S669.003 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | <p>Driftwood on beaches also aids dune rebuilding. The WCRC and Westland DC should work together to ensure that driftwood gathering (principally undertaken to provide firewood) is regulated to ensure it takes place away from areas where its presence is vital to dune rebuilding. This would be as part of the Regional Land and Water Plan and existing Westland District Plan, with the latter carrying through to the TTPP.</p> | <p>Address the possible regulation of Driftwood gathering in an appropriate section of the TTPP to ensure it does not undermine the dune rebuilding process. Identify a specific driftwood collection area or alternatively a driftwood collection exclusion zone.</p> |
| Allison Sutton (S672) | S672.003 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | <p>The Arawata River mouth acts as a natural, ongoing provider of replenishment material at Neils Beach. The NIWA Report of 2016 confirms that this is providing the mouth is aligned north/northwest (as typically occurring following floods) c.f. a tendency to veer east over time. Allowing river realignment works to</p> | <p>That the TTPP provide a new permitted activity for special rating districts for river realignment works including at the Arawata River mouth to support erosion mitigation and accretion facilitation at Neils Beach.</p> |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | "correct" such an unfavourable veering eastwards as a Permitted Activity would facilitate dune rebuilding. And this should be a Permitted Activity, because any need to apply for resource consent would be costly, while facilitating such an exercise would be a cost-effective means of hazard mitigation for ratepayers. | |
| Barbara Clark (S673) | S673.002 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | Aware from a previous talk in Nelson on Climate Change that "triggers" can be used to decide when properties are at risk. Feeling is that present approach is somewhat of a "blunt hammer" (i.e. too undifferentiated and too harsh) | That a triggered, stage and conditional process for when land must be abandoned is adopted. |
| Biggles Limited (S685) | S685.002 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | <p>- There are significant changes introduced by the Variation; and 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, specifically:</p> <p>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>-</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; And 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. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|--|--|
| Finn Lindqvist (S694) | S694.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | Recognise no modelling is "perfect"(in fact proving only 40% reliable during 2022 New Zealand storms), while sea level rise estimates themselves take no note of land rise via tectonic processes (which has been documented at Neils Beach). Want to see stringent, somewhat draconian Rules applying to such overlays modified (e.g. along lines of Tasman District Council approach in Ruby Bay. That refers to "adaptation building" - applying floor levels above sea level and encouraging use of relocatable buildings. Approach as it stands threatens to "wipe out" small coastal communities like Neils Beach. | That Rules NH-R38 to NH-R46, applying to the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays concerned be modified by a more nuanced approach, consistent with the Government's Coastal Hazards and Climate Change Guidance" Document (2024). Additional rooms and new dwellings with floor heights above sea level and relocatable buildings should be permitted within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay. |
| MTP Limited (S711) | S711.002 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | The associated Coastal Hazard Overlay Rules applying to those Overlays affected by Variation 2 are opposed, because: - The mapping concerned has fundamentally altered the planning framework for property owners so affected; - The Rules themselves are directly derived from the overlays, which are now themselves being revised; - There are significant changes introduced by the Variation; and 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 | 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; And 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. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | partially given effect to and other existing use rights, while some Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, specifically: | |
| Murray & Rachel Petrie (S712) | S712.002 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | That erosion is occurring is not in dispute - but 100 years is a time in which much can change. Such Overlays effectively apply Rules which constrain development, but do nothing to protect people and properties (including their values) | Such Rules need to be refocused - and through community engagement - so that they ensure community viability and sustainability, c.f. "chasing people out" That feedback on the sources of information be provided, confirming its accuracy and how it could be better responded to. |
| Rod Thornton (S724) | S724.001 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Amend | Effects of Climate Change are acknowledged, and no issue is raised with respect to mapping alterations, BUT RULES APPLYING TO the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays are opposed. Specifically, the Rules as they stand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impinge on personal choice and property rights to too great an extent; - Create a scenario in which technical evidence to support proposals is unknown, and can easily burgeon out; - Don't consider possible mitigation measures or alternative uses; - Create potential "vested interests" for some pushing particular agendas (e.g. "managed retreat"); - Are based on questionable assumptions (e.g. 100 year events, one metre rise in sea level); - Have been justified by some on a "don't panic" or "doesn't effect existing use rights" basis - but that hides the real truth; and - Doesn't allow for possible changes in processes, cycles, etc. Further investigation of the Rules applying is necessary. | That the Rules applying to the Overlays concerned are further investigated and amended accordingly. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|---|---|
| Rod Thornton (S724) | S724.002 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Oppose | <p>Rules Applying to the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays are opposed. Specifically, the Rules as they stand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impinge on personal choice and property rights to too great an extent; - Create a scenario in which technical evidence to support proposals is unknown, and can easily burgeon out; - Don't consider possible mitigation measures or alternative uses; - Create potential "vested interests" for some pushing particular agendas (e.g. "managed retreat"); - Are based on questionable assumptions (e.g. 100 year events, one metre rise in sea level); - Have been justified by some on a "don't panic" or "doesn't effect existing use rights" basis - but that hides the real truth; and - Doesn't allow for possible changes in processes, cycles, etc. <p>Further investigation of the Rules applying is necessary.</p> | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping not proceed - with the status quo to remain. |
| Westpower Limited (S547) | S547.0514 | Natural Hazards | Natural Hazards Rules | Neutral | <p>Given the topography of the Region, it is inevitable that elements of Westpower's 2,229 circuit kilometres of lines, cables and other infrastructure needs to be sited within areas subject to Natural Hazard Overlays. Westpower supports the use of up to date data to inform hazard risk, and this has no problems with the Variation itself - just that this network could be potentially further impacted by the Variation modifying the Coastal Hazard-type Overlays. Westpower therefore seeks a</p> | That notwithstanding any Changes to Overlays resulting from Variation 2: Coastal natural Hazards mapping, the TTPP continue to encourage and provide for the continued distribution of electricity to the community and Westpower's other activities associated with this as "Regionally Significant Infrastructure". |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | comprehensive, integrated and strategic approach to the distribution and supply of electricity throughout the West Coast, including the ability to continue such supply, notwithstanding any such changes. It is understood that no changes have been made to the Natural Hazard Rules, with Westpower's earlier submissions on the Natural Hazards Chapter itself remaining unchanged. | |
| Charlotte May Treasurer (S762) | S762.003 | Natural Hazards | All Natural Hazard Overlays | Oppose | Approach to Natural Hazard threats is excessive - and driving people away from the region. | That the overall approach/response to coastal erosion and inundation be reconsidered. |
| Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669) | S669.002 | Natural Hazards | Permitted Activities | Amend | Consistent with the above, the Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee has in fact asked the WCRC to consider allowing river mouth realignment works to be undertaken as a Permitted Activity (in accordance with the Regional Land and Water Plan) - so as to ensure any movement of the mouth eastwards can be "corrected", thereby enabling beach replenishment to continue. | Include a new Permitted Activity to allow river out realignment works for Special Rating Districts. |
| John Sutton (S704) | S704.003 | Natural Hazards | Permitted Activities | Amend | Driftwood on beaches also aids dune rebuilding. The WCRC and Westland DC should work together to ensure that driftwood gathering (principally undertaken to provide firewood) is regulated to ensure it takes place away from areas where its presence is vital to dune rebuilding. This would be as part of the Regional Land and Water Plan and existing Westland District Plan, with the latter carrying through to the TTPP. | Address the possible regulation of Driftwood gathering in an appropriate section of the TTPP. This could include either the identification of areas for collection, or exclusion zones. |
| MTP Limited (S711) | S711.006 | Natural Hazards | Permitted Activities | Amend | This is consistent with Policy 25 of the NZCPS, that avoiding increasing risk, | Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | c.f. blanket risk avoidance or risk reduction, should be the approach. | structures. |
| P & A Horrell (S715) | S715.006 | Natural Hazards | Permitted Activities | Amend | 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. | Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing structures. |
| Vance & Carol Boyd (S447) | S447.018 | Natural Hazards | NHR1 | Amend | the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced. | Amend NH - R1 as follows: Reconstruction and Replacement of Lawfully Established Buildings in all Natural Hazard Overlays Activity Status Permitted Where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is the reconstruction/replacement of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan; 2. <u>This is the reconstruction, replacement, or reasonable extension of an existing structure which has either obtained resource consent, or been lawfully established at the time the Plan becomes operative; and</u> 3. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; 4. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed or replaced within 5 2 years in the Westport Hazard, Coastal Severe and Flood Severe Overlays; 5. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed or replaced within 5 years in all other natural hazard overlays; and 6. The reconstructed/replaced building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building that it replaces. |
| Michael Snowden (S492) | S492.016 | Natural Hazards | NHR1 | Amend | Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R1 should be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal | That Rule NH-R1 be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity. | |
| Biggles Limited (S685) | S685.006 | Natural Hazards | Permitted Activities | Support | 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 | Permitted Activities under Rules NH-R1 and NH-R38 should be expanded to include provision for existing structures. |
| John Sutton (S704) | S704.002 | Natural Hazards | Permitted Activities | Amend | Consistent with the above, the Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee has in fact asked the WCRC to consider allowing river mouth realignment works to be undertaken as a Permitted Activity (in accordance with the Regional Land and Water Plan) - so as to ensure any movement of the mouth eastwards can be "corrected", thereby enabling beach replenishment to continue. | That a Permitted Activity that allows for river mouth realignment works undertaken by a Special Rating District Committee be included in the Plan. |
| Karen Lippiatt (S439) | S439.042 | Natural Hazards | NHR38 | Amend | The five year timeframe for building a home on properties subject to the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays is unduly restrictive. It is unduly restrictive, given there are transportable or tiny home options. | That the five year restriction on building within the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays be removed. |
| Vance & Carol Boyd (S447) | S447.019 | Natural Hazards | NHR38 | Amend | the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced. | Amend the rule as follows: Where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For repairs and maintenance there is no increase in the area of the building; 2. For the rebuild or reasonable extension of an <u>existing structure which has either obtained resource consent or been lawfully established at the time the Plan becomes operative;</u> |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | | <p>3. For reconstruction of a building lawfully established at the time of notification of the Plan where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building has been destroyed or substantially damaged due to fire, natural disaster or Act of God; 2. The destroyed/damaged building is reconstructed within 5 years in the Coastal Alert overlay and 2 years in the Coastal Severe overlay; 3. The reconstructed building is similar in character, intensity and scale to the building it replaces. |
| Michael Snowden (S492) | S492.017 | Natural Hazards | NHR38 | Amend | Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R38 should be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity. | That Rule NH-R38 be expanded to include rebuilds and reasonable extensions of existing structures (as of the date the proposed TTPP Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative) as a Permitted Activity. |
| Vance & Carol Boyd (S447) | S447.020 | Natural Hazards | NHR43 | Amend | the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced. | Amend to be a Restricted Discretionary Activity |
| Vance & Carol Boyd (S447) | S447.021 | Natural Hazards | NHR43 | Amend | the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced. | Alternative Relief - amend as follows: <u>Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Where:</u> <u>1. These are located within a single title subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes at the time the Plan becomes operative.</u> |
| Biggles Limited (S685) | S685.004 | Natural Hazards | NHR43 | Oppose | 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 | Rule NH-R43 should be Restricted Discretionary Activities |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|---|---|
| MTP Limited (S711) | S711.004 | Natural Hazards | NHR43 | Oppose | Rules are unnecessarily restrictive | Rule NH-R43 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity |
| P & A Horrell (S715) | S715.004 | Natural Hazards | NHR43 | Oppose | Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, | Rules NH-R43 should be Restricted Discretionary Activity |
| Vance & Carol Boyd (S447) | S447.022 | Natural Hazards | NHR44 | Amend | the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced | Amend to Restricted Discretionary Activity |
| Vance & Carol Boyd (S447) | S447.023 | Natural Hazards | NHR44 | Amend | the statuses of some activities under proposed TTPP rules relevant to the Variation are unnecessarily restrictive and should be reduced | Alternative Relief: Amend as follows: <u>Activity Status Restricted Discretionary Where:</u> <u>1. These are located within a single title subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes at the time the Plan gains legal effect.</u> |
| Michael Snowden (S492) | S492.019 | Natural Hazards | NHR44 | Amend | Consistent with Submission point S492.015, Rule NH-R44 should move from a Non-Complying Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Alternatively, Rule NH-44 should exclude single titles already subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes as of the date that the proposed Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative. | That Rule NH-R44 move from a Non-Complying Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Alternatively, Rule NH-44 exclude single titles already subdivided for lifestyle or residential purposes as of the date that the proposed Rule gains legal effect or becomes operative. |
| Biggles Limited (S685) | S685.005 | Natural Hazards | NHR44 | Oppose | 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 | Rule NH-R44 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity |
| MTP Limited (S711) | S711.005 | Natural Hazards | NHR44 | Oppose | Rules are unnecessarily restrictive | Rule NH-R44 should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity |
| P & A Horrell (S715) | S715.005 | Natural Hazards | NHR44 | Oppose | Rules are unnecessarily restrictive, | Rule NH-R44 should be Restricted Discretionary Activity |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| Barbara Clark (S673) | S673.001 | Natural Hazards | Westport Hazard Overlay | Oppose in part | <p>Initiatives like Westport NBS meeting appreciated and believe those working on TTPP well intentioned, but public typically lack technical knowledge and skills, so many groups are involved, and concerns about properties cannot be overlooked. Various conditions for managing impacts of climate change need to be differently managed.</p> <p>Own situation is one of having lived in Westport since June 2020, having moved into new home in July 2021 - just before big flood. Information on hazards had been lacking, and situation not helped by COVID-19. Many variables can affect a build or rebuild. Costs of inflation, updates to the Building Code, neighbourhood aesthetics and family requirements also need factoring in. Any restrictions need to be more "nuanced", e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building on flood-prone land could be subject to a bond: and/or - Options can be looked at for provisions of services; and - Opportunity exists to include statements on LIMs and in Property Files. | Remove all building conditions relating to the Buller Hazard Zone |
| Forest Habitats Limited (S186) | S186.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Neutral | Hazard mapping is a high level, overview, modelling-type exercise. It cannot replace site-specific engineering assessments based on detailed topographical data | That hazard mapping be for guidance purposes only - and to put people on notice that there may be a potential hazard. |
| Forest Habitats Limited (S186) | S186.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Alert level mapping in the Arthurstown Road area, south of the Hokitika River does not reflect that in the Land River Sea Report. And it was understood | That the Hazard Mapping in the Arthurstown Road area be unchanged - i.e. as initially included in the TTPP. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | that Variation 2 did NOT include changes around Hokitika. | |
| Forest Habitats Limited (S186) | S186.004 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Presumably both the initial TTPP Flood Hazard Mapping and that for Variation 2 were based on the 2019 Data from the Land River Sea Report. This is already out of date - the bed of the Hokitika River having migrated northwards leading to significant accretion along the southern riverbank. Out of date and inaccurate maps are placing undue risks and costs on property owners, without site-specific engineering evidence to support these restrictions | That hazard mapping should be a guide only, and should not be used by Councils for making definitive decisions when assessing development proposals. |
| Chris Reynolds (S362) | S362.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | There is no reliable data to make assumptions. This is not consultation. | Do not impose hazards without reliable data on 294 Utopia Road |
| Chris Reynolds (S362) | S362.004 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | There is no reliable data. Information sent did not even include a map or anything else that could be easily referred to. This is NOT "consultation. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - certainly unless and until there is more reliable data and better information generally. |
| Laurence Rueter (S381) | S381.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Submitter argues that they take full responsibility for living (and sustainably) AND STAYING where they are. Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping is seen as a waste of ratepayers' money and an initiative ill informed by sea level rise of one metre in 100 years, climate change, etc. and refusal to consider resilience and adaptability. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. |
| Richard Arlidge (S419) | S419.007 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Relates essentially to sand dunes relative to Okari Road (the road being constructed on these). This sand dune country is highly vulnerable to sea level rise and storm surge, and should be included. | Expand the Coastal natural Hazard Overlays inland from Okari Road, to include the sand dune country. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.043 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | For Punakaiki Village, there is limited potential for material; increase in the consequences of natural hazards through development and redevelopment. An overly strict approach to existing buildings and existing land is not warranted. | The approach to natural hazards as it applies to Punakaiki Village needs to allow for the reasonable use of land and buildings. |
| Jane Whyte & Jeff Page (S467) | S467.044 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support in part | The Variation removes the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay from part of 11 Owen Street, Punakaiki. It is preferable that if any Natural Hazard Overlay is to apply to this property in whole or in part, that it be the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. | That the Coastal Hazard -Severe Overlay to be removed from 11 Owen Street, Punakaiki, with any part of that property deemed susceptible to Natural Hazards to be subject to the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. |
| Lyn McIntosh (S469) | S469.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Consultation on determining the criteria for the Overlays has been insufficient. It is realistically based on a "worst case scenario", a seemingly "blanket approach (relative to any land under 2.5 metres of the sea) and without regard for consequences, such as devaluing of property and increasing of insurance costs. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. |
| Michael Snowden (S492) | S492.013 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping as a procedure is opposed on the following basis (as conveyed to the TTPP Committee on 20 May 2024, ahead of the Variation itself being notified): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inconsistency with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPSD), the West Coast Regional Policy Statement (RPS) and Ministry for the Environment (MFE) guidance on coastal hazard mapping; - The methodology used in NIWA reports informing the Variation; - Uncertainties in the mapping of erosion and inundation hazards - | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - because the mapping itself requires revision, consistent with the NZCPS, the RPS and MFE guidance on coastal hazards mapping . |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | stemming from the NIWA reports; - Policies 24 and 25 of the NZCPS; - Ineffective and insufficient consultation; and - Inconsistency with Plan Variation processes in other Councils. | |
| Michael Snowden (S492) | S492.014 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Consistent with Submission point S492.013, the Coastal Hazard - Alert and Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlays, as imposed by the TTPP and altered by Variation 2 should not, therefore, remain on the Submitters properties at Okuru, South Westland, being Lot 5 DP 3034 and Section 6 SO 11816. Such mapping is considered "out of date" relative to the latest topographic mapping, and should at the very least be amended to exclude the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay from the south-western area of these properties. | That consistent with Submission point 492.013, the Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert be removed from the Submitter's properties, at Okuru, South Westland being: - Lot 5 DP 3034; and - Section 6 SO 11816. And Should such relief itself not be possible, then at the very least the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay be excluded from the south-western area of the Submitter's properties. |
| Mandy Deans (S549) | S549.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Concerns Nelis Beach - Map CHA26 - which shows much of the Township subject to the Coastal Hazard - Severe Alert. This has significant implications, i.e.: - Increased costs of (and potentially no access to) insurance; - Property values, hence reduced capital and falling rates; - Houses becoming unsaleable; - Inability to achieve loans for building or maintenance; - Major anxiety for residents - Significant decrease in WCRC and Westland DC rates take. The process has not involved consultation, and is therefore | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | undemocratic - and for an initiative with far reaching consequences for residents. | |
| Mandy Deans (S549) | S549.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The science behind the Variation itself is lacking. The NIWA Report by Dr Murray Hicks (2016) points to Neils Beach being subject to cyclical depletion AND REPLENISHMENT over the past 40 years. And a bund has been installed to reduce the erosion risk, while the overlays as shown exclude properties at the Highway end of the Village yet INCLUDE houses opposite these on a hill. This suggests no account has been taken of land contours | That the classification of Neils Beach as Coastal Hazard Severe be changed to enable us as ratepayers to have control over our freehold properties and to be free from penalties imposed on us. |
| Frank O'Toole (S595) | S595.032 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support in part | It is noted that (consistent with relief sought by the Submitter on the TTPP as initially notified) Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping does reduce and better define The Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, relative to the Submitter's property at 211 Utopia Road. BUT, the Rules as they apply (which it is noted are not themselves altered by the Variation) plus presence of such an overlay on a property being noted on a LIM Report means there are still implications for property values. | That as a minimum, the Change made by Variation 2 to the Coastal Hazard-Severe Overlay along the Orowaiti Lagoon Frontage relative to properties on Utopia Road be accepted. |
| Frank O'Toole (S595) | S595.033 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The property at 211 Utopia Road in fact includes a drop off to the river, to the north of the line of the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay. In the 20 years the Submitter has lived on the site, the highest levels occurred during the 2021 flood - and did NOT extend into the grassed paddocks beneath the stopbank (there being | That the position and extent of the Coastal Hazard Severe Overlay more accurately reflect the top of the bank location on 211 Utopia Road and surrounding properties. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | approximately 1 metre clearance between the fences and the highest flood level, with the stopbank itself adding another 2 metres). This, plus the fact that the sand spit on the northern side of the Lagoon is accreting, should enable the overlay extent to be shifted further north. | |
| Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605) | S605.040 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | <p>Is a joint submission - including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. <p>Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping.</p> | That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay has been extended over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2 be removed (with the situation returned to what it was prior to Variation 2). |
| Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605) | S605.041 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support in part | <p>Is a joint submission - including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. <p>Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson</p> | That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay has been reduced over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2, then such a reduction of coverage should proceed. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping. | |
| Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605) | S605.042 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Mapping in relation to 4 Owen Street does not allow the location of Overlay boundaries to be determined on the ground, because there is no discernible topographic or legal feature. Such boundaries would, therefore, be uncertain and impractical to administer. | That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay be removed from the property at 4 Owen Street |
| Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605) | S605.043 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support in part | Is a joint submission - including: - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also | That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been reduced over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2, then such a reduction of coverage should proceed. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|---|
| | | | | | desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping. | |
| Paparoa Track Services Ltd, Craig and Sue Findlay, Tim Findlay, Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd (S605) | S605.044 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | Is a joint submission - including: - Paparoa Track Services Ltd; - Craig and Sue Findlay; - Tim Findlay; - Dion Findlay; and - Punakaiki Beach Camp Ltd. Punakaiki residents who own 4 Owen Street, 12 Owen Street, 18 Dickson Parade and 20 Punakaiki Road, and also operate the Camp (on Crown Land). Have previously submitted jointly on the TTPP when notified - seeking a relaxation of restrictions imposed by Coastal Hazard - Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlays - esp. finished floor requirements. Also desire that relocatable buildings that do not meet the requirement for finished floor levels can be moved as part of managed retreat. Wish to effectively restate such issues under Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping. | That any area where the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been extended over residential property in Punakaiki or the Punakaiki Beach Camp as a result of Variation 2 be removed (with the situation returned to what it was prior to Variation 2). |
| Grey District Council (S608) | S608.852 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support | The Submitter is supportive of the Variation generally. Within Grey District, those areas subject to the overlays concerned are sparsely populated - except Rapahoe, 12 Mile and Colville Close (Punakaiki). Recognise is a Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING Variation, but given implications for property rights | That extensive landowner consultation is undertaken when and where there are properties affected by the Overlays - and particularly if restrictions will increase. Where risk is assessed as severe and removal of occupation could be necessary, landowner rights must be at the forefront of Council decisions. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | (esp. at Rapahoe) cannot be viewed in isolation from Objectives, Policies and Rules. | |
| Gary Clarke (S667) | S667.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | There is no scientific evidence to support the new mapping. Such Overlays should not take into account a possible rise in sea level of one metre, which is speculative. Such changes would prevent an ability for property owners to plan and create stress. The resultant decrease in land values will penalise owners. The inherent suggestion that voluntary relocation may be appropriate is incorrect - it being more likely to be forced, through consequential economic pressure. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping not proceed - with the mapping of such overlays as it presently stands retained. |
| Anna Leary (S668) | S668.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The overall need to plan for and mitigate coastal hazard risk is understood. But data from GNS Science in 2016 showing Okarito to be rising (as shown on a Map). Also CLIMsystems provides location specific climate assessments and insights - which demonstrate that risk associated with Okarito property concerned was less than anticipated. Information is available at www.climsystems.com and www.gns.cri.nz . | That all data available - including that from GNS (2016) and CLIMsystems - is taken into account in Variation 2 mapping for Okarito. |
| Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669) | S669.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Use of the LiDAR data to more accurately identify erosion and inundation risks is supported, but other mitigating factors must be considered. In particular: - Neils Beach is sheltered by Jackson Bay from southerly and westerly winds, with the Arawata River supplying millions of tons of foreshore | That Map CHA26, which assigns a Coastal Hazard - Severe (Erosion and Inundation) classification to much of the Neils Beach township area be reconsidered and amended (so as to better provide for the survival of a vibrant community and not carry a burden of unnecessary penalties for property owners). |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-----------|------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | <p>rebuilding materials in flood flow. -</p> <p>The 2016 NIWA Report "River Related Shore Erosion at Hokitika and Neils Beach, Westland" (Hicks, 2016) points to positioning of the Arawata River mouth affecting the extent of erosion or depletion - i.e. north east/east = erosion 2010-2015, c.f. north since 2016, allowing NE induced waves to move gravels in front of the township;</p> <p>- Fact is the NIWA 2022 reports (Measures and Rouse, "Review of West Coast Region Coastal Hazard Areas Version 2" and Bosserelle and Allis "Mapping for Priority Coastal Hazard Areas in the West Coast") make much of the 2010 to 2015 erosion BUT DO NOT MENTION the subsequent fantastic beach rebuild; and</p> <p>- This has been somewhat aided by construction of an earth bund - consented to by the WCRC, constructed by residents and financed by Special Rating District funds, enabling windblown sand to be trapped to aid dune rebuilding. That this bund is not considered by NIWA in its reports as a means of erosion prevention is INCORRECT - because it has assisted such a rebuild (aided by a favourable alignment of the River mouth), while the lagoon behind it has more or less drained itself (ponding only now occurring during heavy rains; while</p> <p>There are now at least 41, c.f. around 15, houses in the township.</p> | |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | So what is in the NIWA Reports is essentially out of date, meaning the Coastal Hazard Severe classification is "over-reach", and carries with it an unnecessary burden for property owners of additional insurance costs and other commercially negative connertations. | |
| Neils Beach Special Rating District Committee John Sutton (S669) | S669.004 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | <p>Application of the overlay as it stands is unnecessary, and is likely to drive people away from the community due to negative commercial consequences, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inability to afford insurance; - Devaluing of properties; - Rendering properties unsalable; - Making it difficult to obtain bank loans; - reducing the WCRC and Westland DC rating bases; and <p>Creating an effective "slum". Consistent with this, those Coastal Natural Hazard Zones applied should be periodically reviewed, with both Rivermouth realignment works and the management of driftwood gathering off the beach (in relation to dune areas) facilitated.</p> | Provide for periodic reviews of the coastal severe hazard overlay at Neil's Beach taking into account dune rebuilding |
| David & Janice McMillan (S670) | S670.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | <p>Area at 6 Main Road Ngakawau - where experience of storms and events (e.g. Cyclones Fehi and Gita, other storms, King Tides from Supermoons, etc. over period 2022-2024) have NOT led to any inundation of property - simply small entries to carpark and occasionally the road. Unique geographical position plus temporary seawall contains storms well. NZTA can and does protect the</p> | That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay line is redrawn in a way that ensures 6 Main Road, Ngakawau is removed from such coverage (which presently includes two thirds of the property). The line should be pulled back to the western edge of the State Highway - as shown on a map included (which shows all other features mentioned, including those which protect the property concerned). |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | Highway, while tree planting adjacent to residence itself has worked well. If ever needed, future mitigation could include 900x500 Gabion Baskets on a Nib to the front. House itself was built to a high and safe in 1951 by Ministry of Works, on what is a Government surveyed and developed land parcel. There has been NO subsequent risk to the property. Erroneously including it within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay will have adverse consequences for property values, mortgages, insurance, etc. | |
| Brette & Irene-Sharel Kokshoorn (S671) | S671.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The Variation is lacking in information - with the Mp Viewer on the Website not loading and the Maps not being appropriately colour coded. In particular, it is unclear to what height Raleigh Creek is expected to rise - hence to what extent will the property at 971 Seven Mile Road Rapahoe be "affected"? Raleigh Creek itself is a low flow estuary-type Creek, and would need to rise substantially (i.e. at least 6 metres or more) to pose any flooding or inundation risk at the property concerned. | That the area identified as Coastal Hazard Risk be removed from 971 Seven Mile Creek Road, Rapahoe. Anything reflecting any existence of such risk to the property should similarly be removed from any LIM Report or Land Title for the property. |
| Allison Sutton (S672) | S672.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Opposition is specifically to the majority of Neils Beach township being included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay as refined by Variation 2. Because: - Does NOT believe that the NIWA Report "Rivermouth-Related Shore Erosion at Hokitika and Neils Beach, Westland" (Hicks, 2016) has been properly considered - which discusses cyclical erosion/accretion at Neils | That Map CHA 26 be reviewed and audited - with a view to removing and/or considerably reducing the Coastal Hazard-Severe and Coastal Hazard-Alert overlays as they apply to Neils Beach. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>Beach; while</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Subsequent NIWA Reports by Measures and Rouse (2022) are inaccurate (i.e. Neils Beach now has 41 c.f. 15 houses, and does not consider either the post 2015 accretion phase or presence of a gravel bund constructed in 2015; - "Lagoon" referred to at Area E in 2022 Report has in fact drained away (only now ponding in heavy rain periods). <p>So while not opposed to the initiative (i.e. more informed mapping of coastal natural hazard risk GENERALLY, as based on LiDAR data), this needs to be properly informed and accurate, given potential consequences for insurance, financing, mortgages, property values and ability to sell. Fact is that the information in this instance is OUTDATED relative to Neils Beach - certainly based on personal observations over the past 28 years.</p> | |
| Allison Sutton (S672) | S672.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | <p>Somewhat related, the apparent lack of "nuance" in mapping needs correcting. Specifically, Neils Beach at Area E (as referred to in the NIWA Report of 2022) was at the time and still is in a phase of accretion, with NO erosion taking place. This would suggest what is on Map CHA 26 is excessive , and should at least be subject to periodic review c.f. 100 year modelling, to better appreciate the actual impacts which climate change and sea level rise are having</p> | That information sources informing Map CHA 26 be further reviewed and properly audited for factual accuracy. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | on erosion and accretion at Neils Beach. | |
| Helen & Tom Sawyers (S674) | S674.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Persons/property (at 2 McIntyre Road Carters Beach) received NO notification of the Variation (finding out via neighbours). And information itself is not easily understood (including the computer mapping). | That the Coastal Hazard-Alert overlay on the property at 2 McIntyre Road Carters Beach be removed. |
| Joshua Tranter (S675) | S675.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The problem itself is "man-made" - and principally due to: - Lack of infrastructure maintenance - particularly stormwater; and - Not dredging the Buller River (both Councils seen as being at fault). | No change should be made to Coastal natural Hazards mapping. The issue is "man-made" - with Councils needing to accept responsibility by continuously dredging the River and upgrading infrastructure to OECD standards. |
| Mike MacMillan (S677) | S677.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The modelling process used is speculative and not based on factual historical evidence. What is intended compromises property values and people's rights to live where they choose. | That any scientific evidence supporting Variation 2 be at least subject to independent scientific analysis, and take greater account of historical evidence of erosion and inundation. |
| Mike MacMillan (S677) | S677.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The modelling process used is speculative and not based on factual historical evidence. What is intended compromises property values and people's rights to live where they choose. | Withdraw Variation |
| Adriana James (S678) | S678.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Communication has been unclear, confusing and inadequate - with no effort made to correct this. Scientific data is too difficult for lay person to understand. There is NO available data regarding sea level rise for the entire West Coast. | Defer Variation until sufficient data available - ideally for a ten year period. Based on proper analysis, c.f. incorrect extrapolation and unsubstantiated modelling. And more informed, transparent and democratic consultation. |
| Adrienne Fraser (S679) | S679.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Does not understand implications for property , and requires better informing. [Property is 52 Henley Street, Westport] | Plan Change needs to be better informed - and particularly in terms of implications for individual properties. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| Alexa Kliebenstein (S680) | S680.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support | Variation is supported - because Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (being Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD). So supports for THIS property (notwithstanding Original Submission of 10 Nov 2022 and Further Submission of 30 Jun 2022 filed on behalf of Snodgrass Road Submitters). Also aware that Variation itself does not alter Rules or Policies of the Natural Hazards Chapter. | Support removal of Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay from 2/75 Snodgrass Road. That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceeds. |
| Andrew Dempster (S681) | S681.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Focus is on rising sea levels and Variation as outlined is confusing. The focus should be on enhancing infrastructure to deal with the principal source of flooding (i.e. blocked inland waterways and enclosing sand bars) c.f. sea level rise and imposing more "red tape" via associated consenting requirements. | I oppose the intent of the planned variation 2 as a resident landowner as it focuses on rising sea levels as its basis of evidence. |
| Andrew Lisseman (S682) | S682.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | This particular Variation and the Plan in its entirety should be scrapped (a letter requesting the latter having been sent (a letter requesting the latter having been sent on 14 September 2022). Is seen as driven by an ill-informed climate change agenda aimed at extracting money and subjugating freedoms. Has asked 12 questions which were in fact included in a SEPARATE email as well - which were all responded to in a separate email on 4 September 2024. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping (and ideally the TTPP in its entirety) be withdrawn. |
| Andrew Wiffen (S683) | S683.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The Maps contain significant errors - there being no data verification with respect to how LiDAR relates to humps and hollows. Also ASSUMES | Before the Variation proceeds, the maps must be made more accurate by: - Clarifying sea, river and land boundaries; -Excluding hump and hollow land (as data not sufficiently |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | sea level rise - how has that been verified, and is it acceptable? Is earthquake modelling included (earthquakes being just as likely as sea level rise). | accurate); and Verifying whether sea level rise assumptions are appropriate (as parts of the coast will rise and fall, based on Mean High Tide Line (MHTL). |
| Ash Oldham (S684) | S684.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The Variation contains no history regarding sea level rise in the past 10 years, and no other facts to back up any other levels. Believes from observance that land around Westport is accreting, not eroding. Has lived at lower end of [15] Domett St for past 40 years, and believes that Cyclone Fehi flooding resulted from non working non return valve fitted to culverts at what is now Avery's corner on Orowaiti Road, with waters then flooding Paddocks leading to Domett Street and inundating the stormwater system. And despite complaints the problem has never been fixed. | That the history of how mapping changes have been made is shown - so that true extent of problem is shown (c.f. mere "scaremongering"). |
| Biggles Limited (S685) | S685.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Consultation has been insufficient and ineffective. In particular, the submitter owns a site within the Hapuka Landing subdivision, which has been subject to a considerable amount of earthworks which have raised the site well above sea level. A specific Consent Notice was placed on all 18 allotments, requiring that residential buildings are set back sufficiently to avoid the risk of coastal erosion and inundation. Furthermore, the effects dealt with by the Variation generally can be remedied or mitigated with earthworks and building placement (including the imposition of minimum floor levels). | That the submitter's property at 33 Fox Moth Drive Okuru (Lot 17 DP 498766) is excluded from the coastal hazard overlays concerned. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| Biggles Limited (S685) | S685.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <p>The mapping subject to the Variation is opposed because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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; |
| Brian McFarlane (S686) | S686.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <p>The proposed mapping makes no distinction between individual properties at Carters Beach (e.g. floor or section level), while the location has no history of serious flooding or susceptibility to Tsunamis. Most tsunamis occur in the Pacific Ocean (c.f. Tasman Sea), and the natural hazards portal indicates no previous claims on the property (40 Cook Street, Carters Beach);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no record of sea level rise at carters Beach or on the West Coast; -The information from NIWA is unreliable and unproven; - The TTPP has taken considerable time to reach the stage it has and consultation thus far has been poor. A very short timeframe has been allowed for property owners to absorb what is considerable information; and Implications for Carters Beach | Withdraw Variation as relates to Carters Beach |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | residents should be carefully considered before the Natural Hazard Overlays are altered. Property values may be impacted, affecting resale values and eroding security | |
| Brian McFarlane (S686) | S686.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | <p>Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping is opposed for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The informing letter is overly complicated, leaving property owners concerned and anxious; - The proposed mapping makes no distinction between individual properties at Carters Beach (e.g. floor or section level), while the location has no history of serious flooding or susceptibility to Tsunamis. Most tsunamis occur in the Pacific Ocean (c.f. Tasman Sea), and the natural hazards portal indicates no previous claims on the property (40 Cook Street, Carters Beach); - There is no record of sea level rise at carters Beach or on the West Coast; -The information from NIWA is unreliable and unproven; - The TTPP has taken considerable time to reach the stage it has and consultation thus far has been poor. A very short timeframe has been allowed for property owners to absorb what is considerable information; and Implications for Carters Beach residents should be carefully considered before the Natural Hazard Overlays are altered. Property values may be impacted, affecting resale | That Carters Beach residents be better informed - in plain and simple terms - how their properties may be affected by Variation 2. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|---|---|
| | | | | | values and eroding security. | |
| Christine Carter (S687) | S687.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | None given | Any Variation of the Maps north of Hector should be delayed until full LiDAR mapping is complete. Insurance companies should be informed of such action. |
| Christine Carter (S687) | S687.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | None given | More information provided to the communities of Karamea and Little Wanganui to explain the reasons for Variation 2 properly. |
| Colman Creagh (S688) | S688.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | Decision appears to be a "bulk one" - whereas properties in Rapahoe need to be treated separately - in terms of how far they are from the sea and how high above sea level they are (most having built well away from the sea and at high altitude). State Highway 6 itself is an effective "sea wall" relative to the Rapahoe elevated terrace. Much of downtown Greymouth, Cobden, Blaketown and even the WCRC Offices at Paroa are in a position of inundation from rising sea levels - so can the Council's own Planners "get it right"? | Recognise SH6 acts as a "seawall" for Rapahoe protecting the area on the elevated terrace. Ensure mapping reflects the individual risk to property not a "bulk approach". |
| Craig Hipson (S689) | S689.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | The Variation is opposed with respect to 110 Golf links Road, Ruatapu, Hokitika. The section has never flooded, even after prolonged rains, with a drain at the rear emptying into the Mahinapua Creek. | That 110 Golf Links Road, Ruatapu, Hokitika not be included in the Variation as it is not subject to flooding or inundation. |
| David Gourlay (S690) | S690.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Computer modelling used to supposedly indicate what is hazardous has no proven accuracy. Claims by NIWA have no scientific evidence and are unfounded. Proposed Variation in its entirety is disagreed with. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| Dee Deaker (S691) | S691.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | While not specifically stated, "managed retreat" could become a likely future scenario. Humasn have lived close to coast and rivers for years, with no real changes in climate in last 10,000 years to suggest that cannot continue. Future should be monitored, but "modelling" and "worst case scenarios" have limitations, and should not be construed as evidence of sea level rise and that "the worst" will happen. People and communities should have the freedom to live where they wish and exist. The WCRC should resist unreasonable "dictates" by central government. TTPP/WCRC/BDC need evidence if going against ratepayer wishes, and should be transparent about what is happening or required. | undertake monitoring and provide information and data to residents who remain free to make their own decisions about where they live (no forced retreats); |
| Desna Bruce Walker (S692) | S692.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The approach taken in terms of a 100 year projection is contrary to Policy 24 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, recommendations of the Ministry for the Environment's Coastal Hazard and Climate Change Guidance and the International Panel of Climate Change recommendations. It is also contrary to the New Zealand Sea Rise Programme, which recommends that "low confidence" scenarios be applied to stress testing infrastructure, allowing subdivision and applying managed retreat, while there are a series of reports (e.g. that of the Expert Working Group on Managed retreat) which all recommend a more moderate | That sea level rise is based on more moderate RCP 2-. 4.5, with regular monitoring of sea level every 2-5 years for next 25 years, and 100 year coastal planning period reduced to 25 years |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | approach be taken to issues such as sea level rise. | |
| Desna Bruce Walker (S692) | S692.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The effects of such planning, if given effect to, could be catastrophic. No one in fact taking responsibility for "what if it DOESN'T in fact happen, while the livelihoods and rights of people are being compromised. There is in fact NO evidence to support a 1 metre rise in sea level in 100 years, and such reaction to it has obvious consequences for people, properties, and livelihoods, and is prematurely forcing "overreactions" in terms of safety, such as managed retreat. | That each district be able to manage their own risk assessments, based on local knowledge and input. Individual property owners need to have a much bigger say |
| Desna Bruce Walker (S692) | S692.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Presence of such Overlays shows up on LIM Reports with obvious consequences. And this is AHEAD OF submissions (written and oral being considered). All individual owners have had thus far is the notice, the public meeting in Westport (with a Carters Beach Meeting of 28 July 2024 not attended, despite invitation), and extension of the initial closing date for submissions to 30 August 2024. The sea level at Carters Beach is in fact RETREATING relative to this property - due to the build up of sand since the addition of tip heads or groins at the Buller River mouth. | That the proposed Coastal Hazard - Alert overlay be removed from 33 Elley Drive, Carters Beach. Such an overlay should not be shown unless and until the Plan has come into effect. |
| Elizabeth Duncan (S693) | S693.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support | Is noted that, consistent with Original Submission of 10 November 2022 and Further Submission of 30 June 2023 that Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD. It is noted that | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceed noting that the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay is removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road in this proposed Variation. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping does not impact on the Natural Hazard Rules of the TTPP. | |
| Finn Lindqvist (S694) | S694.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <p>Own property at Neils Beach an area where Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay appears to take no cognisance of heavily forested bush covered hill, which acts as a "buffer zone" between property and coast (passing on the inland, c.f. coastal side of it), and on which an extra room is planned.</p> <p>Recognise the no modelling is "perfect"(in fact proving only 40% reliable during 2022 New Zealand storms), while sea level rise estimates themselves take no note of land rise via tectonic processes (which has been documented at Neils Beach. So not opposing mapping in itself. Approach as it stands threatens to "wipe out" small coastal communities like Neils Beach.</p> | Review the mapping and remove it from my property at Neil's Beach |
| Daniel Reynolds (S695) | S695.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unnecessary or pre-emptive use of 1 metre sea level rise figure - based on models which are little more than an "educated guess" - Scepticism about sea level rise projections - and why should it be "expected" when current NIWA data for Westport and Granity-Hector points to no change -Modelling measures are pseudoscience at best (some data even showing levels are decreasing); <p>Poor consultation process - i.e. entire use of "Te Tai o Poutini" has been confusing (many associating it with the Polytechnic, and has simply</p> | Withdraw Plan Change - Approach needs to slow down - by improving local data collection on sea level and groundwater changes and adopting a prudent, evidence-based approach including clarifying and understanding the rate of sea level change (i.e. is it linear or exponential), improving the consultation process and adopting an adaptive, flexible approach so that international trends are more critically examined, and premature, unnecessary actions are avoided. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | "assumed" people know more than they do; and" -Approach must therefore be more "prudent" - e.g. installation of metres and tectonic change instruments, then having qualified researchers critically analyse data (so that approach is scientific and "knee jerk" reactions are avoided. Overall approach is "heavy handed" and based on uncertainty. | |
| George Field (S696) | S696.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support | Is noted that, consistent with Original Submission of 10 November 2022 and Further Submission of 30 June 2023 that Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD. It is noted that Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping does not impact on the Natural Hazard Rules of the TTPP. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceed as it removes the coastal hazard - alert overlay from 2/75 Snodgrass Road. |
| Glen Kingan (S697) | S697.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The property concerned is within the area north of Hector (hence NOT within the area to which the updated LiDAR data yet applies). The present situation is thus confusing. The overlays as they exist do not follow the contour of the land, and should be removed. | Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping should be placed on hold - until all accurate LIDAR data is received. |
| Glen Kingan (S697) | S697.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The property concerned is within the area north of Hector (hence NOT within the area to which the updated LiDAR data yet applies). The present situation is thus confusing. The overlays as they exist do not follow the contour of the land, and should be removed. Such overlays put property owners at a disadvantage, and should not be applied unless properly | Remove the Coastal Hazards Alert layer from the property concerned - i.e. 127C Kohaihai Road, Karamea. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | informed. The property is in fact at 28 feet/9 metres AMSL - similar to the Aerodrome runway and three neighbours, yet this property plus the southern end of the Aerodrome runway are incorrectly subjected to the overlay. Such a situation has consequences for the ability to extend, sell and insure the property. And there is no risk of either coastal erosion or coastal inundation - in own lifetime or beyond. | |
| Jason Jacobs (S698) | S698.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Does not believe own place (at 53 Bright Street, Cobden) would be affected - as if it was, others who were not so informed would be affected first. And the Cobden Greymouth area is protected by the floodwall. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn. |
| Jim & Anne Murray (S699) | S699.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Science to justify the zoning is lacking - many experts disagree with what are "worst case scenarios" which are unnecessary. Consultation has been lacking. The implications of what is proposed are high, i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A major hike in insurance costs; - Capital value of buildings declining; - Future building requiring resource consent as well as a building permit; - Major anxiety for Neils Beach property owners; and - Reduced capital assets resulting in rates being increased by WCRC and Westland DC | That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay as it applies to Neils Beach be removed. Rather, an Advisory Notice be issued to ratepayers, who should also be advised of the Hearings. |
| Joelyn Billett (S700) | S700.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | No Reason Given. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping not proceed. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| Joey Keen (S701) | S701.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The property was purchased in late 2022 - and on the basis of the Natural Hazard Overlays as they then existed. EXPANDING such and overlay to INCLUDE that are between the dwelling and Utopia Road at the property known as "Rock Wall" is what is opposed. Because that area can (according to local contractors) be protected from erosion and will be done so. | That the land at 331 Utopia Road Westport, between the dwelling and the road edge not be included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay, as now proposed by the Variation. The situation as it existed in the proposed Plan - i.e. such an overlay covering only those areas across the dwelling and towards the water (thus excluding the southern end of the property) is acceptable. |
| Joey Keen (S701) | S701.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | There is also a sand bar along North Beach that will afford protection to the area. This has been building up over recent years and will increase such protection in future years. The Orowaiti River mouth is a substantial distance to the north, with Google Maps having shown how erosion levels over three year periods have decreased substantially since the River migrated northwards. This will enable erosion protection plans to be put in place for the property. | That the land at 331 Utopia Road Westport, between the dwelling and the road edge not be included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay, as now proposed by the Variation. The situation as it existed - i.e. such an overlay covering only those areas across the dwelling and towards the water (thus excluding the southern end of the property) is acceptable. |
| Joey Keen (S701) | S701.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | An "open mind" should be taken to such trends - which clearly show that the Orowaiti River is migrating northwards, thus reducing the level of erosion and making erosion protection practicable. | That the land at 331 Utopia Road Westport, between the dwelling and the road edge not be included in the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay, as now proposed by the Variation. The situation as it existed - i.e. such an overlay covering only those areas across the dwelling and towards the water (thus excluding the southern end of the property) is acceptable. |
| John & Suzanne Willetts (S702) | S702.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Concerns 146 and 147 Torea Street, Granity in particular - where Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping has effectively revised overlay from Coastal Hazard - Alert to Coastal Hazard - Severe. These properties, plus several adjacent ones, are protected by a rock seawall, between | That the proposed application of the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay to 146 and 147 Torea Street Granity not proceed, with the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay retained for those properties. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | the end of the properties and the sea itself, meaning Coastal Hazard -Alert is deemed sufficient. | |
| John & Suzanne Willetts (S702) | S702.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Consistent with the above, the NIWA Report "mapping for Priority Coastal Hazard Areas in the West Coast (2022) itself points out that sea walls have in fact been constructed - at various properties in Hector, Ngakawau and Granity. The Report acknowledges that such walls can effectively mitigate coastal hazard risks to an extent. | That the proposed application of the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay to 146 and 147 Torea Street Granity not proceed, with the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay retained for those properties. |
| John & Suzanne Willetts (S702) | S702.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Further to the above, the NIWA Report itself should NOT "assume" that longer term protection by such walls will fail, due to lack of investment. The wall protecting 146 and 147 Torea Street was constructed and is maintained by reputable contractors (one of whom was Buller District Council approved). Raising the Coastal Hazard level applying to the site and others so protected is based on assumptions and erroneous. | That the proposed application of the Coastal Hazard - Severe overlay to 146 and 147 Torea Street Granity not proceed, with the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay retained for those properties. A similar approach should be taken to all properties which similarly benefit from seawall protection. |
| John Phillips (S703) | S703.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Neutral | Concerned with any potential impacts on 78 Domett Esplanade, Cobden. Unaware that this property "affected" to any extent - and should not be so, because it is not known to have had any history of issues with coastal hazards. | That the Submitter be advised, should the proposed Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping Variation affect what is a residential dwelling at 78 Domett Street, Cobden in any way. |
| John Phillips (S703) | S703.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Neutral | Concerned with any potential impacts on the Greymouth Nursery at Preston Road, Greymouth. Understands that it should not be so, because what is a commercial property should be | That the Submitter be advised, should the proposed Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping Variation affect what is a commercial nursery business at Preston Road, Greymouth in any way. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | adequately protected by the Greymouth Floodwall. | |
| John Sutton (S704) | S704.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | <p>Use of the LiDAR data to more accurately identify erosion and inundation risks is supported, but other mitigating factors must be considered. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Neils Beach is sheltered by Jackson Bay from southerly and westerly winds, with the Arawata River supplying millions of tons of foreshore rebuilding materials in flood flow. - The 2016 NIWA Report "River Related Shore Erosion at Hokitika and Neils Beach, Westland" (Hicks, 2016) points to positioning of the Arawata River mouth affecting the extent of erosion or depletion - i.e. north east/east = erosion 2010-2015, c.f. north since 2016, allowing NE induced waves to move gravels in front of the township; - Fact is the NIWA 2022 reports (Measures and Rouse, "Review of West Coast Region Coastal Hazard Areas Version 2" and Bosserelle and Allis "Mapping for Priority Coastal Hazard Areas in the West Coast") make much of the 2010 to 2015 erosion BUT DO NOT MENTION the subsequent fantastic beach rebuild; and - This has been somewhat aided by construction of an earth bund - consented to by the WCRC, constructed by residents and financed by Special Rating District funds, enabling windblown sand to be trapped to aid dune rebuilding. That | That Map CHA26, which assigns a Coastal Hazard - Severe (Erosion and Inundation) classification to much of the Neils Beach township area be reconsidered and amended so as to better provide for the survival of a vibrant community and not carry a burden of unnecessary penalties for property owners. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>this bund is not considered by NIWA in its reports as a means of erosion prevention is INCORRECT - because it has assisted such a rebuild (aided by a favourable alignment of the River mouth), while the lagoon behind it has more or less drained itself (ponding only now occurring during heavy rains; while</p> <p>There are now at least 41, c.f. around 15, houses in the township.</p> <p>So what is in the NIWA Reports is essentially out of date, meaning the Coastal Hazard Severe classification is "over-reach", and carries with it an unnecessary burden for property owners of additional insurance costs and other commercially negative connerations.</p> | |
| John Sutton (S704) | S704.004 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | <p>Application of the overlay as it stands is unnecessary, and is likely to drive people away from the community due to negative commercial consequences, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Inability to afford insurance; - Devaluing of properties; - Rendering properties unsalable; - Making it difficult to obtain bank loans; - reducing the WCRC and Westland DC rating bases; and <p>Creating an effective "slum".</p> <p>Consistent with this, those Coastal Natural Hazard Zones applied should be periodically reviewed, with both Rivermouth realignment works and the management of driftwood gathering off the beach (in relation to dune areas) facilitated.</p> | Any coastal hazard classification for Neils Beach should be less severe and periodically reviewed; with Initiatives by the Neils Beach community to better manage coastal erosion facilitated and taken advantage of. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| Karamea Aerodrome Inc (S705) | S705.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The Karamea Aerodrome is uniform in level across the entire site (i.e. 28 feet/9 metres AMSL). The LiDAR Data used cannot, therefore, be following the land contour (which itself ensures that the entire property at Aerodrome Road Karamea is well and truly NOT coastal erosion or inundation susceptible). | That the entire Karamea Aerodrome property has the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay removed from it. |
| Irene & Ken Tiller (S706) | S706.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | More information is required on the heights to which Raleigh Creek is expected to rise, before deeming 1003 Seven Mile Road, Rapahoe "affected". Raleigh Creek itself is a low, flat, estuary creek - rising by 6 metres or more maximum, and even then poses no flooding or inundation risk to the property concerned. No flooding or inundation has been witnessed in the past 50 years on the site, meaning any proper investigation would realistically conclude that NO such risk exists | That any Coastal Hazard Risk Overlays be removed from the property at 1003 Seven Mile Road, Rapahoe - as well as any LIM Reports and Land Titles of relevance. |
| Kevin Smith (S707) | S707.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | the science is lacking as is knowledge overall (particularly local) with what is proposed seemingly politically driven and poorly presented - leaving communities confused and upset. | That the Proposed Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be at least delayed, pending any further direction from the Coalition Government. |
| Mark Vanstone (S708) | S708.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Opposition is to the way in which an initiative, which will impact on property prices and insurance, has been "pushed onto" the community without consultation. | That affected residents are notified well in advance of initiatives such as this, so that they can have their say. |
| Michael Rogers (S709) | S709.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The approach to Natural Hazard Overlays - including Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays - has been flawed, i.e.: - Communication with especially small communities has been poor - leaving | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn, and the overall delineation of the Natural Hazard Overlays be re-examined, in the context of existing initiatives to protect properties from erosion and inundation. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>many with a feeling of not being listened to and over something which has significant implications for property values, rates, insurance, etc., and therefore communities; while</p> <p>-No account has been taken of existing seawalls and numerous other erosion/inundation mitigation initiatives to protect property;</p> <p>This is realistically a New Zealand-wide problem - i.e. the Government needs to recognise just where initiatives such as this are leading - given the obvious responses from agencies concerned and the "snowball" effect this will have on many communities and local authorities. Can, for instance, the Government look at stepping in to e.g. provide affordable insurance, buy out "Red zones", etc.</p> | |
| Michael Rogers (S709) | S709.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <p>What has resulted from Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping, does not appear "relevant" to the real situation, i.e.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indications are the data was from around 2016 - and much has changed since then; - Raster to vector transfer has been poor - meaning "real values" within the 5 metre resolution are not reflected; - Seawalls and other mitigation devices constructed since 2018 have not been considered (some of which can withstand 8 metre swells, amidst strong westerly winds and king tides); - No consideration has been given to the real effects of storm surges, wind | <p>That the whole approach to determining Natural Hazard Overlays is amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Take into account existing mitigation features (e.g. seawalls); - Involve infrastructural organisations and consider the protection of their assets; - Consider reassessments, in the context of physical force changes; - Allow ongoing community input; - Consider other effects - e.g. earthquakes, and tectonic uplift; - Respond to hazard risk identification in terms of setting rates; - Consider consequences for areas abandoned over time (e.g. extent to which infrastructure is maintained); and - Address compensation for landowners |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>direction, tsunami, rainfall extent, tidal variations, etc. which all impact on inundation levels and extent; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no real consistency between Overlay delineation and physical features. <p>The Tusnami Overlay (while not affected by the Variation itself) is incorrectly applied. The overall consequence is a series of Overlays which themselves have no practical benefit, but major socio-economic implications for property owners and communities. Responses by key infrastructure providers (e.g. NZTA, KiwiRail, Westpower) are not considered. And there is no real direction in terms of WHERE TO go, should inundation occur Has only a quite inadequate "desktop" analysis been undertaken</p> | |
| Mitchell Rogers (S710) | S710.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | <p>The methodology is understood, but the data has not been well presented, with clear errors on alert layers that are based on elevation but don't factor in real situations. Also it is clear that the LiDAR data used for the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay was taken prior to 2018, when several cyclones removed areas of coastline and forced walls to be built. Certain such walls are significant (e.g. Hector beachfront, excluding just two properties), with some being over five metres above mean beach level, affording significant protection to towns and infrastructure, with drainage possible behind these. Yet Such initiatives have not been</p> | <p>That the Coastal Natural Hazard Maps align with up to date information. Locals in impacted communities should be consulted as part of this process (as they could advise on what is in place, could be provided, etc.).</p> |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | factored into the mapping, leaving many such areas within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay. It is important to understand the specifics along the entire coastline, as such Overlays have massive effects on e.g. insurance, rates and other costs. | |
| MTP Limited (S711) | S711.001 | 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 Variation mapping overlays are not accepted;. |
| MTP Limited (S711) | S711.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The submitter owns a site within the Hapuka Landing subdivision, which has been subject to a considerable amount of earthworks which have raised the site well above sea level. A specific Consent Notice was placed on all 18 allotments, requiring that residential buildings are set back sufficiently to avoid the risk of coastal erosion and inundation. Furthermore, the effects dealt with by the Variation generally can be remedied or mitigated with earthworks and building placement (including the imposition of minimum floor levels). | That the submitter's properties at 19 and 29 Fox Moth Drive Okuru (Lots 10 and 15 DP 498766) are excluded from the coastal hazard overlays concerned. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| Murray & Rachel Petrie (S712) | S712.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Ongoing insurance will be so expensive once this is notified that landowners will not be able to afford the premiums. Neils Beach has a beach that naturally rebuilds from material transported from the Arawhata River a proven natural occurrence documented by NIWA? The WCRC also have in place a rating district fund for beach protection works for the community, a process to date that works and has provided the community with extra protection since it was established and has helped to rebuild the beach | The natural hazards overlay from 12 O'Leary Place Neils Beach be removed |
| Murray & Rachel Petrie (S712) | S712.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The remapping and Rules will impact adversely on insurance and building/rebuilding costs, leading to problems with mortgages, rates, business viability and maintenance of property. The Submitter's own property at 12 O'Leary Place remains with the Coastal Hazard-Alert Overlay. What implications does this have (e.g. will the Council pay any compensation)? The real problem seems to be that no notice is taken of the fact that neils Beach is in fact naturally rebuilding - through material transported by the Arawhata River, while a Rating District Frind is in place for beach protection works, that has afforded extra protection. Building restrictions, c.f. effective "Red Zoning" would be the way to go. | That the extensive application of the Coastal Hazard-Severe Overlay to much of Neils Beach be revised, in the context of local beach rebuilding processes and coastal erosion protection initiatives. |
| Murray Gibson (S713) | S713.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards | Oppose | The approach is incorrect because: - Climate change is not as severe as scientists are making out; | Do not proceed with the Variation |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | Variation Maps | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific computer modelling is mere "guesswork" and not to be trusted; -Neils Beach has in fact existed for thousands of years - and will continue to do so; - Mental health issues that will arise due to the initiative as it exists will be huge; - Properties will be left uninsurable, devalued and virtually unsaleable; and - Will such properties still be rated - by the WCRC and Westland DC. And the driving force is simply man-made weather manipulations, which need to stop. | |
| Murray Gibson (S713) | S713.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | <p>The approach is incorrect because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate change is not as severe as scientists are making out; - Scientific computer modelling is mere "guesswork" and not to be trusted; -Neils Beach has in fact existed for thousands of years - and will continue to do so; - Mental health issues that will arise due to the initiative as it exists will be huge; - Properties will be left uninsurable, devalued and virtually unsaleable; and - Will such properties still be rated - by the WCRC and Westland DC. And the driving force is simply man-made weather manipulations, which need to stop. | That the overall approach inherent in Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be amended - to one which better reflects local conditions, pays less attention to climate change and scientific modelling, and seeks a more practical outcome. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| Nicholas Keen (S714) | S714.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Concerns extent to which Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay affects 331 Utopia Road, Westport ("Rock Wall"). Initially only covered the dwelling and out towards the water (when purchased in late 2022). But now encompasses the entire property - i.e. now includes the southern portion of the property, between the existing dwelling and Utopia Road (i.e. away from the water). Why? Because it will affect usability of the land and measures can be put in place to afford protection. And a sand bar/build up along North Beach is increasing, and will continue to afford enhanced protection from severe erosion. So extending the Coastal Hazard-Severe Overlay in relation to the property is incorrect and unnecessary. | That the Coastal Natural Hazard Map which includes 331 Utopia Road , Westport be amended - so that in relation to that property, there is no extension of the Overlay beyond what existed on the initial map (i.e. as was included in the Plan when notified). |
| P & A Horrell (S715) | S715.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The submitter owns a site within the Hapuka Landing subdivision, which has been subject to a considerable amount of earthworks which have raised the site well above sea level. A specific Consent Notice was placed on all 18 allotments, requiring that residential buildings are set back sufficiently to avoid the risk of coastal erosion and inundation. Furthermore, the effects dealt with by the Variation generally can be remedied or mitigated with earthworks and building placement (including the imposition of minimum floor levels) | That the submitter's property at 31 Fox Moth Drive Okuru (Lots 16 DP 498766) is excluded from the coastal hazard overlays concerned. |
| Paul Drake (S716) | S716.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards | Oppose in part | Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards effectively "tags" freehold properties, with a view to forcing people off. This | That the existing overall approach under the RMA remain - but the mapping not be include provision for climate |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | Variation Maps | | is (similar to COVID-19 approach) a case of "bureaucratic overreach". Are other agencies (e.g. Local Government New Zealand, the United Nations, the World Economic Forum, etc.) involved? So called "environmental reasons" (global warming, climate change, etc.) have been scientifically challenged. Do not oppose overall intent to map - but don't use "fear mongering", "mandatory bullying", etc. | change. |
| Paul Fraser (S717) | S717.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Feeling is that Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping has arbitrarily changed the Hazard Overlay boundaries - and principally to deflect responsibility from the Councils and place pressure on property owners (in terms of property values, rates and insurance costs. Enquiries of neighbours confirm that the area (adjacent to 52 Henley Street, Westport) has not, in fact, flooded in past 30 years. And Councils have allegedly done NOTHING in the past to alleviate flood risk - and now are imposing a "punishing" approach. | That: The status quo be maintained for Overlay boundaries; and that the Councils themselves seek to better mitigate flood events. |
| Paul Murray (S718) | S718.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | An initiative such as this is understandable, given current knowledge, data on climate change, and associated risks to property and human life. But are potential financial implications - especially in terms of insurance, building costs including resource consents, etc. which needs better understanding. Could the Council provide an estimate of such likely costs? At the same time, can | That there be a more proactive approach to natural hazard mitigation, through reinforcing flood protection and mitigation, with greater attention paid to the costs of initiatives such as Variation 2 for landowners. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | there not be proactive plans to better mitigate hazard risks - e.g. could stopbanks be further improved? Landowners are concerned about costs and other consequences, and would prefer to see initiatives to protect, rather than measures to penalise. | |
| Peter Scott (S719) | S719.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Opposes what is effective "Red Zoning" of Neils Beach (i.e. inclusion of what is virtually the entire Township within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay). This will devalue properties and takes no account of beach replenishment processes centred on the Arawhata River (which can themselves be facilitated via managing the outlet via southward movement every five years). Consequences will be unsellable properties (would these then be rates free?), which is creating stress, anxiety and mental health issues. | That the Coastal Hazard -Severe Overlay as it applies to Neils Beach be removed. |
| Prue & Daimon Schawalger (S720) | S720.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The information sent via post was extremely hard to read and understand, and what was online was no better. [re 133 Russell Street, Westport] | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn |
| Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721) | S721.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The Maps as updated by Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping do not take into account the raised platform on the seaward side of the Main Road at Punakaiki. This is an anomaly - because it effectively results in a clear swathe of land running through the Village that is free of Hazards, yet that area (in fact not much above sea level) is in fact deemed less susceptible to hazard | That the Coastal Natural Hazard - Severe and Coastal natural hazard - Alert Overlays, as amended by Variation 2 take into account the raised platform on the seaward side of the Main Road at Punakaiki, in defining the extents of the Overlays. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | risk than the Submitter's property on the raised platform. Surely the lower land would be more susceptible to flooding from both the coast (via seawall overtopping) and the Pororari River (back flooding), while the platform has not been reached by even the highest seas to date. Furthermore, a Coastal Engineering Report and Works Completion Certificate for a house build on the platform itself confirms there is adequate protection on the platform for a one metre rise in sea level. | |
| Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721) | S721.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The Submitter's own property includes a double-layer armour rock seawall, 80 metres inland from MHWS and parallel to the coastline, to the immediate east of the property boundary. It is largely unsighted (being mostly buried or planted in flax). It is that, not the rock placed in front of Takutai House (which is part of landscaping only) which should be a defining feature. | That the Seawall, as opposed to the Rock, be used as a defining protective feature on the Submitter's property, in terms of aligning the Coastal Hazard Overlays in the Punakaiki Area. |
| Punakaiki Farm Ltd (S721) | S721.004 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | There is a disconnect between the Submitter's own seawall and the Scenic Hotel Group property's frontage, through to the toe of the Pancake Rocks. The Group itself has seen no need to build such a structure, but could do should the need arise. The Submitter's own wall includes around 1,000 tonnes of rock. | That the ability to construct further seawall protection, if necessary, be noted. |
| Rae Reynolds (S722) | S722.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The TTPP Committee (the Submitter having listened into the TTPP Committee Meeting of 7 August 2024) acknowledges that the process has not been well managed and caused | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping as it stands be withdrawn. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <p>much anxiety, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many confused and upset people; -Calls not responded to - Letters not understood (not "plain English"); -Consequences for insurance, etc.; - Map Viewer on website not working properly and difficult to locate - and from the outset; - Confusion around "Te Tai Poutini" - many thinking it was the Polytechnic (and simply threw the information away) - Somewhat related, letters didn't really include much in the way of contact information (with significant opposition to use of Te Reo Maori expressed by some); - No understanding of what the Variation was based on (scientifically); and - Not properly identified as to who was/was not "affected" - leaving many "confused". <p>Entire process needs to be rethought/redone.</p> | |
| Rebecca Blackhurst (S723) | S723.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <p>Submitter questions validity of data , including 1 metre sea level rise and 100 year worst case scenario being applied , and relative to a "one off" LiDAR mapping exercise. Ideally want BOTH Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping, and entire TTPP Withdrawn.</p> <p>Have addressed a series of points on matters including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TTPP Committee membership (esp. relative to elected personnel); | The Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Credentials of TTPP Committee Members; - What do Overlays in fact mean, and what are implications; - To what extent do Councils "have a say" in what can take place on affected properties; - Can people be forcibly removed from homes; - What about "red stickered" houses - can people remain; - What happens to properties following "retreat"; - Who is responsible for climate modelling, and can they be held accountable for errors; - Will there be compensation, and on what basis; - Will such Overlays appear on LIM Reports; and - To what extent is the TTPP a "theft of property rights". <p>Those are not THEMSELVES to do with the Variation directly, and have been answered separately.</p> | |
| Ros Bradley (S725) | S725.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | <p>The mapping itself seems unreliable. For instance the Map showing McIntyre Road, Carters Beach shows the Hazard Area extended to include the road, but not the adjacent farm. Yet in July 2021, the road remained dry while the farm flooded. And the Submitter's property at 1 McIntyre Road was similarly not flooded - being at least one metre above any known "flood zone".</p> | That the Variation 2 mapping be discontinued in its present form - unless and until it can become better substantiated and more reliable. |
| Sam Carter (S726) | S726.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards | Amend | Inclusion of the property at 26 Nikau Heights, Little Wanganui within Coastal Hazard Overlays is opposed. | That Coastal Natural Hazard Mapping for the Area be updated - but on a properly notified basis, with consideration given to measures to effectively mitigate |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | Variation Maps | | It is well above both the sea and the river. While recognising that the LiDAR update does not apply to this area, any risks would be well into the future - there have been no past effects from flooding. Such inclusions unnecessarily threaten the existence of small communities like Little Wanganui - through impacting property values, insurability, etc. And consultation has been insufficient re: responsibility for financing, where people move to, etc. | such risks. |
| Stephen & Pauline Tranter (S727) | S727.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The proposal has been incompetently and deceptively run - being highly confusing and based on inadequate literature. The timeframe is inadequate, and takes no account of people's needs to seek professional assistance. And no account is taken of potential tectonic uplift through earthquakes - which would well and truly "cancel out" the effects of a one metre rise in sea level over 100 years. So the data cannot be "credible". | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping not proceed - with no changes made to previous such mapping. |
| Steve Miller (S728) | S728.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Property at 19 Glasseye Drive, Little Wanganui is within a Coastal Hazard Overlay, and this will affect insurability, saleability and value of the property concerned. And is one on which has been investment in a superfruit orchard and a dwelling. | That any Coastal hazard Overlays on 19 Glasseye Drive, Little Wanganui be removed. |
| Steve Miller (S728) | S728.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Other housing in the community and the community in general will be similarly adversely affected by Coastal Hazard Overlays similarly applied. The NIWA data on which the Variation is based is incorrect and falsified, with what is an approach that | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. Rather, effort should go into having insurance companies take a more reasonable approach to the insuring of properties potentially affected by natural hazards. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | | | | will greatly reduce Council rate takes short sighted and misinformed. Greater accountability is needed. | |
| Stuart Liddicoat (S729) | S729.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose in part | Owner of 36 Hall Street, Cobden - which is close to the edge of the Coastal Hazard Overlays as they exist. Such mapping (as seemingly advised by NIWA) requires a "second opinion" - as the consequences of such overlays for what is a relatively low socio-economic area could be significant. Impacts on insurance costs and saleability potential could cripple some households. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be subject to a "second opinion" in terms of the NIWA informing. Alternatively, the Council should consider contributing towards the cost of insuring affected properties. |
| Tania Reynolds (S730) | S730.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Support | Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping is supported - given that (consistent with Submission of 10 November 2022 and Further Submission of 30 June 2023 on TTPP by Snodgrass Road Residents), the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay has been removed from 2/75 Snodgrass Road (Sec 2 Orowaiti Blk III Kawatiri SD). | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping proceed. |
| Tom McGaveston (S731) | S731.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Concerns 367 Utopia Road (near Westport). Coastal Hazard Overlays should not apply to this property - because it has been subject to extensive coastal protection works, including rock wall armouring (installed under WCRC Consent RC-2017-0090-01 to 04), informed by a Geotechnical Assessment from Tonkin and Taylor. | That any Coastal Hazard Overlays on 367 Utopia Road be removed, |
| Trevor Reid (S732) | S732.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Why is the shed at 68 Veale Way included within the Coastal hazard - Severe Overlay, which seems to "kink" onto the property. Neighbours far closer to the sea are outside the | That the area of 68 Veale Way that is within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay be removed from this Overlay. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Overlay. And the coastline would appear to be building up, c.f. eroding. | |
| Vanessa Kingan (S733) | S733.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | A Variation such as this should be put on hold at least until ALL data of relevance is received. Proceeding without areas north of Hector covered by the upgraded data has created confusion (particularly given the letter was sent to many such properties, stating they are "affected"). And the Overlays concerned take no real account of land contours. It is unfair to put property owners at a disadvantage (re: insurance, finance, sales, etc.) ahead of the full picture being available. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. Alternatively, it only apply to those areas where the data is presently available, with the Overlays themselves otherwise removed from the TTPP maps. |
| Vanessa Kingan (S733) | S733.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The Submitter's property at 127C Kohaihai Road, Karamea is at the same elevation at the neighbouring Karamea Aerodrome (i.e. 28 feet/9 metres AMSL). Besides a small section of the southern runway (which should also not be included), the property concerned is the only one subject to the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. Without accurate data being available, it is unacceptable to have an Overlay of this nature compromising future building options, potential sale and insurability. Realistically, the property concerned is in no danger of flooding, having not done so in the Submitter's 40 years or likely to do so within a similar future period). | That the Coastal Hazard-Alert Overlay be removed from the property at 127C Kohaihai Road, Karamea. |
| Vicki Stevenson (S734) | S734.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Has no idea what "all this rubbish" is about. Own home at 75/2 Snodgrass Road has never been flooded. Have neve had problems securing Building | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Permits from the Buller District Council, and home has never flooded. Car shed did once, but a large concrete wall protects the lower part of the property and a pump is on-site. Figures a bit hard to understand, but would appear to be arguing are 700 metres back from coast and 3 metres above sea level. Part of Snodgrass Road is lower, but that can be fixed. | |
| William Sage (S735) | S735.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | A Variation such as this should be put on hold at least until ALL data of relevance is received. Proceeding without areas north of Hector covered by the upgraded data has created confusion (particularly given the letter was sent to many such properties, stating they are "affected"). And the Overlays concerned take no real account of land contours. It is unfair to put property owners at a disadvantage (re: insurance, finance, sales, etc.) ahead of the full picture being available. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. Alternatively, it only apply to those areas where the data is presently available, with the Overlays themselves otherwise removed from the TTPP maps. |
| William Sage (S735) | S735.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The Submitter has two properties - at 419C and 419D Kohaihai Road, Karamea. 419C has the house and other buildings on it, and has a small corner (without buildings on it) within the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. 491D is not yet built on, and has the top end of it within the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay. The line is a straight one, following neither topography nor relative distance from the coast. Given the elevation of both properties, neither are expected to flood, while the Overlay mapping as it stands | That the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay be removed from 191D and 491C Kohaihai Road, Karamea. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|---------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | relative to them appears without reason or justification. | |
| Hans Gutenbrunner (S736) | S736.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Submitter's property is 4589 Karamea Highway, Karamea. Should NOT be subject to any Coastal Hazard Overlays. A consented to seawall has been on the site for 30 years - there having been no inundation of the site since or prior to installation. The property also borders an Estuary, c.f. the open sea which is distant. There is no evidence of the seawall having eroded, while a 6 metre high sand pit is present beyond the Estuary, which mitigates any high waves. | That any Coastal Hazard Overlays be removed from 4589 Karamea Highway, Karamea. |
| Hans Gutenbrunner (S736) | S736.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | It is unclear how the present Coastal Hazard Overlays were arrived at. And it is certainly unclear how methods of modelling can predict levels in 100 years. Given the significant impact of the Overlays in terms of insurance and notations on LIM Reports, this matter needs to be properly addressed before an initiative such as Variation 2 proceeds. Karamea is a tightknit community, and many locals are quite frightened by the implications. | That the methodology behind Variation 2 be reviewed, with the community better informed as to how the Overlays were arrived at and their implications. |
| Laurie & Marlene Collins (S737) | S737.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The entire proposal is deceptive - because the erosion concerned is man-made. Information (including the mapping itself) provided has been deceptive, being based on data that is neither conclusive nor credible, with the information confusing and difficult to navigate. The timeframe for submitting was ridiculously short, for something that has high implications and requires professional | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn, and the Coastal Hazard Overlays as they were previously be reinstated. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|---|
| | | | | | interpretation. And if allowing for a one metre rise in sea level over 100 years, then the potential for uplift resultant from Alpine Fault activity to counter such an effect must also be considered. | |
| Susan Norgart (S738) | S738.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The science is not settled. While the LiDAR data may be considered more accurate, there is no historical data to support sea level rise occurring - and certainly at and around Carter's Beach. Meaning there is nothing to support areas being at risk from coastal erosion or inundation. And to base things on a one metre rise in sea level over 100 years and one in 100 year events is extreme and flawed. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - unless and until more accurate data is available, certainly with respect to sea level rise. |
| Susan Norgart (S738) | S738.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Consistent with Submission point 738.001, there is no evidence to suggest that the Submitter's property at 1A Marine Parade, Carters Beach is at risk from coastal hazards. | That any Coastal Hazard Overlays applying to 1A Marine Parade, Carters Beach be removed - and this reflected in any future LIM Reports for the property. |
| Susan Norgart (S738) | S738.003 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Submission points 738.001 and 738.002 are backed up by a letter to the TTPP Committee Chairman, dated 25 August 2024, expressing concerns re: the process for Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping, i.e.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Origin of the correspondence was unclear; - It appear to have been a "sporadic" mailout - with some at Caters Beach having received the mailout, but others having not done so; - The initial period for submissions (closing 16 August 2024) was inadequate - and only extended out to | That the Submitter's letter of 25 August 2024, to the TTPP Committee Chairperson, expressing concern about the Variation 2 process overall, be considered as part of the submission itself. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | <p>30 August 2024 under considerable pressure;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no apparent effort on the part of the Council to actively engage with the public (i.e. as part of developing the approach itself); - Compartmentalising the approach to Coastal Natural Hazards MAPPING only limits appreciation of wider implications, e.g. implications of such overlays, consistency with reducing Carbon Emissions, etc.; - Councils are supposedly being empowered to consider managed retreat by withdrawing services to certain areas. Yet an initiative such as this particular one is based on extreme climate modelling, which is itself based on little more than guesswork and fantasy; and - Continuing to roll out a framework that effectively forces people off properties without adequate and balanced scientific research is unacceptable. The science supporting the LiDAR data is clearly not yet settled. <p>This letter should be attached to the submission, and considered as part of it.</p> | |
| Alan Paxton (S739) | S739.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Information given is insufficient to enable any informed decision to be made. Needs to be greater attention given to timeframes, costs, priorities and especially repercussions (including property values). | That more detailed information is provided before Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping is allowed to proceed. |
| Ann Hamplough (S740) | S740.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards | Oppose | Could not understand the letter or information. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn - unless and until better informed. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | Variation Maps | | | |
| Damer Farrell (S741) | S741.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The information creates confusion and uncertainty, being: - Unclear; - Assuming what is fiction to be fact; - Is not consultative or informing; - Is a knee jerk reaction, suggesting the Plan is missing vital information; - Is unclear about WHO is sending the material (the website providing little other detail); and - About something it appears that the Council are trying to "slip over" ratepayers | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn - unless and until an honest and informative meeting takes place, in order to provide greater clarity and consider "knock on" effects (such as impacts on rates, insurance and saleability). |
| Derek Roberts (S744) | S744.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The information is inadequate - and over the head of people, making it impossible to make any balanced conclusion or decision (e.g. no idea what "LiDAR means). Realistically, it is yet another "knee-jerk" reaction to unproven theories on land movement. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. |
| Grant Rowberry (S746) | S746.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Presence of Coastal Hazard-Severe and Coastal Hazard - Alert on Submitter's property at 10 Main Road Ngakawau is opposed. The boundary line should be shifted to the middle of the Main Road. The Overlays as they stand do not represent a true and accurate picture of erosion or inundation risk. There is no scientific evidence to suggest storm surges or sea level rise will change this, based on 20 years residence - during which time the sea has not come close to, let alone entered, the property. And the house itself was built 70 years ago, and has survived numerous | That the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay be removed from the property at 10 Main Road, Ngakawau. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|---|
| | | | | | Cyclones (including Fahey) and surges | |
| Grant Rowberry (S746) | S746.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | Further to Submission point 746.001, there is also a significant mitigating factor, being a seawall in front of, and to both sides of, the property at 10 Main Road Ngakawau. Three rows of planted flaxes and a main road fence are also in place, with the house itself 100 metres back from the Beach. And consideration is also being given to a further seawall. Realistically, the closes any Coastal Hazard Overlay should come to the property itself is the middle of Main Road. | That both the Coastal Hazard - Alert Overlay be removed from the property at 10 Main Road, Ngakawau. Such Overlays should not extend closer to the property than the centre of Main Road. |
| Jane Abraham (S747) | S747.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The information is simply not understood - and needs to be made more understandable. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards mapping be withdrawn - at least until made more understandable. |
| Janette Donaldson (S748) | S748.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Opposition is to BOTH Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping and the TTPP generally. Feeling is that much of the so-called "science" behind the Variation is merely hypothetical - and particularly notion of having to protect against "one in 100 year events". Truth is that such overreaction simply leads to unnecessary destabilising of communities through e.g. managed retreat and the adverse reactions to this healthwise (mental and physical). | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn. |
| Janette Donaldson (S748) | S748.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Somewhat related to Submission point 748.001, the real point is being missed - i.e. the need to better mitigate against such hazards. Argument supported with seven news articles re: problems in achieving such initiatives, plus associated issue | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn, with the TTPP Project stopped and funded no further. Rather, such funding should go into Hazard Mitigation initiatives, such as a Westport Floodwall. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|---|--|
| | | | | | of too much being spent on the TTPP itself which is seen to be achieving nothing - and certainly showing no empathy in terms of what the consequences are of the approach being taken. | |
| Kenneth Wiltshire (S749) | S749.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <p>Communication has been inadequate and inappropriate. It should have been via letter or email directly to the property owner - not by "word of mouth" or Facebook.</p> <p>There has been "digital exclusion" around the mapping tool. The LiDAR approach is very poor and very user unfriendly as a programme - being virtually impossible to access by lay persons. this effectively excludes over half the interested parties from being properly informed.</p> | Withdraw the Variation |
| Kenneth Wiltshire (S749) | S749.004 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | <p>Assumptions and propositions are scientifically invalid and untestable. In particular, the one metre rise in sea level over 100 years is hypothetical only. It takes no account of topography, and beyond minimal photographic comparisons, there is little evidence of scientific measurement or research on coastal processes to show erosion and deposition cycles, river change courses and flooding data over time. There have, for instance been NO studies of beach profiles or attrition rates along the Ngakawau Straight between 11 Main Road and Torea Street. Yet this area has been included within the Coastal Hazard - Severe Overlay, devaluing property and suggesting both State Highway</p> | That risk categorisation - and particularly with respect to Ngakawau Road - be better informed, by taking into account the sea wall constructed by NZTA. |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|--------------------------------|------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|--|--|
| | | | | | 67 and the electricity distribution network to Karamea are under threat. | |
| Paul Reynolds (S756) | S756.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | The proposed maps are based on unreliable data. particularly the claim that sea level will rise by one metre over the next 100 years is unsupported by credible evidence Given this, the consequential economic burdens placed on property owners - due to insurance costs, property values, etc. - cannot be justified. It is essential that the data be more reliable for something with potentially draconian consequences. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be deferred - until such time a s more reliable data is available. |
| Rachael Blick (S758) | S758.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Amend | The property concerned has never flooded in 16 years of residence, and house is built up high. Neighbours didn't get the letter - in fact was only one in the street who got the letter. Has been no inspection, and believes the exercise to be nothing more than a "land grab". | That 153 Peel Street Westport have any of the Coastal Hazard Overlays concerned removed from it. |
| Charlotte May Treasurer (S762) | S762.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Re: Northern Buller Museum Granity Trust at 54 Back Road Granity. February 2022 flood did leave silt in grounds and building of Museum, But was due to culvert being blocked with debris, NOT flooding of Granity Creek. And was due to Council and KiwiRail failing to clear culverts. Truth is not being told. | That Variation 2: Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping be withdrawn |
| Charlotte May Treasurer (S762) | S762.002 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Answer for Westport is to move it. | That moving affected settlements be looked at. |
| Anthea Keenan (S763) | S763.001 | Planning Maps and Overlays | Coastal Hazards Variation Maps | Oppose | Has raised concerns about: -Cost inefficiencies of TTPP process - i.e. budget of \$1.7m, but spending now \$5m (and across @3,000 | Not stated |

| Submitter | Submission Point | Plan Section | Provision | Position | Reasons | Decision Requested |
|-----------|------------------|--------------|-----------|----------|--|--------------------|
| | | | | | rateable properties; and - "Politics" of debt - and feeling that ratepayers received nothing in return Overall point re: Variation 2 is that the mapping has caused further confusion | |