

Variation 2 to Proposed TTPP – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping

Submission form

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

Your details:

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?

☐ Individual

☒ Organisation

First Name: Rodger

Surname: Griffiths

Organisation (if applicable): Westpower Limited

Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission ☐ Yes ☒ No

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

I am/am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Postal Address: C/- West Coast Planning Ltd, 6 Dowling Road, Paroa 7805

Attention: Martin Kennedy

Email Address: Martink@xtra.co.nz

Phone Number: (03) 7626554

Signature: 

Date: 30/8/24

My submission:

(Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended, and the reasons for your views.)

See attached.

This image shows a single page of blank, lined notebook paper. The paper is white and features approximately 20 evenly spaced, horizontal blue lines running across its width. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the page.

I would like the following decision(s) to be made with respect to this Variation:

All submitters have the opportunity to present their submission to Commissioners during the hearing process. Please indicate if you wish to speak to your submission

I wish to speak to my submission

I do not wish to speak to my submission

If any others making similar submissions wish to be heard:

☐ Yes, I would consider presenting a joint case with them

☒ No, I would prefer to present my own individual case

Enquiries

All queries regarding this variation or the TTPP in general can be addressed to the TTPP Team at info@tttpp.nz, 03 768 0466, or 0508 800 118.

Public information

All information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. The content provided in your submission form will be published on the Te Tai o Poutini Plan website and made available to the public.

We collect, use and share your information for the following purposes as directed by Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991:

- Original submission, and the associated address for service, is required (and made public) for:
 - Further submitters to serve their submission on an original submitter
 - TTPP Planning Technician to contact you about making an oral presentation supporting your written submission and/or advising you of the decision of the hearing panel.
- A summary of submissions report is produced following the close of submissions. This report assists the hearings panel and the public to review the submissions made.
- All submission data is required to ensure a sound and accurate consultation and hearings process.

If you wish to update or correct your name or address for service, please contact the TTPP Team on 0508 800 118 or by email at info@tttpp.nz

Validity of Submissions

Please note that submissions may be struck out in whole or in part if authorities (including Council staff, Independent Commissioners or Legal authorities delegated jurisdiction with respect to such decision-making) deem any submission partially or entirely:

- Is frivolous or vexatious in its content;
- Discloses no reasonable or relevant case for a position taken;
- Contains offensive language; and/or
- Is supported only by material that *purports* to be independent expert evidence, but has in fact been prepared by a person who is not independent and/or does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Those hearing submissions may also refuse to take a submission further in whole or in part if believing that there allowing otherwise would be an abuse of the hearing process.

Submission to Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan

Submitter Name: Westpower Limited

Contact Person: Martin Kennedy

Contact Email: Martink@xtra.co.nz

Coastal Hazard Mapping			
Provision	Position	Reason	Requested Decision
New Maps	Neutral	<p>Westpower is a submitter to natural hazards provisions in the pTTPP. This is because; given the topography of the Region, the spread of development and land use activities and the extent of the electricity network (2,229 circuit kilometres of lines and cables), some sections of the network fall within proposed hazard areas. Additional regulation has the potential to impact the provision of electricity to the community. Westpower has considerable experience in managing potential hazard risks as a lifelines operator for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>Whilst Westpower supports the use of accurate and up to date information it is aware that the submissions on the provisions of the pTTPP, as they relate to natural hazards, have not been heard or determined. There is potential for the activities of Westpower, in servicing the communities from Haast to Punakaiki, to be impacted by the changing provisions particularly given the complex nature of regulation for a range of activities, values and issues. Having reviewed the available on-line mapping it is apparent that there is the potential for the Westpower network to be further impacted by the proposed changes dependent on the final outcome of proposed TTPP provisions.</p> <p>Options available to Westpower may be limited by other considerations or requirements in the pTTPP. Westpower seeks to ensure a comprehensive, integrated and strategic approach to the distribution and supply of electricity throughout the areas of the West Coast within which it operates, taking into account the conditions and context of the region. This includes coastal hazard matters. In making this submission Westpower understands that the proposed mapping does not alter proposed rules and submissions already made in regard to those provisions.</p>	Ensure that the continued distribution and supply of electricity to the community, and Westpowers activities as “Regionally Significant Infrastructure” throughout the region, are appropriately recognised and provided for through pTTPP provisions.

Variation 2 to Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) – Coastal Hazards

Submission form

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

Please note:

Following public concern expressed over the initial notification of this Variation in June 2024, the TTPP Committee has agreed to the Variation being renotified. Importantly, it is now possible for submitters to submit on BOTH the mapping changes AND provisions of relevance in the TTPP's Natural Hazards Chapter.

- The Variation is a publicly notified one – so anyone is welcome to lodge a submission.
- All submissions received following the initial notification in June 2024 will still be considered.
- Submissions initially lodged can be added to, should the submitter desire to do so.
- Submissions close at **5.00pm on Thursday 19 December 2024.**

Your details:

Are you submitting as an individual, or on behalf of an organisation?

☐ Individual ☒ Organisation

Did you previously submit on Variation 2 when it was notified in June 2024?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, do you wish to have this particular submission:

☒ Added to your initial submission ☐ Considered an entirely new submission

First Name: Rodger Surname: Griffiths

Organisation (if applicable): Westpower Ltd

Would you gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission ☐ Yes ☒ No

If you could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission please complete the following:

I am/am not directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that (a) adversely affects the environment; and (b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

Postal Address: C/- West Coast Planning Ltd, 6 Dowling Road, Paroa 7805

Attention: Martin Kennedy

Email Address: MartinK@xtra.co.nz

Phone Number: (03) 7626554

Signature: M Kennedy

Date: 19/12/24

My submission:

(Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended, and the reasons for your views.)

See Attached.

(Please feel free to use additional sheets)

I would like the following decision(s) to be made with respect to this Variation:

See Attached

(Please feel free to use additional sheets)

All submitters have the opportunity to present their submission to Commissioners during the hearing process. Please indicate if you wish to speak to your submission



I wish to speak to my submission



I do not wish to speak to my submission

(please note that with this option you will receive less correspondence in relation to the hearings but you can keep up to date on the TTPP website)

If any others making similar submissions wish to be heard:



Yes, I would consider presenting a joint case with them



No, I would prefer to present my own individual case

Enquiries

All enquiries regarding this Variation or the TTPP in general can be addressed to Doug Bray, Senior Policy Planner, TTPP Team, West Coast Regional Council, Ph (03) 768-0466 Ext 9109 or 0508 800 118 or info@tppp.nz.

Public information

All information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information. The content provided in your submission form will be published on the Te Tai o Poutini Plan website and available to the public.

Validity of Submissions

Please note that submissions may be struck out in whole or in part if authorities (including Council staff, Independent Commissioners or Legal authorities delegated jurisdiction with respect to such decision-making) deem any submission partially or entirely:

- Is frivolous or vexatious in its content;
- Discloses no reasonable or relevant case for a position taken;
- Contains offensive language; and/or
- Is supported only by material that *purports* to be independent expert evidence, but has in fact been prepared by a person who is not independent and/or does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

Those hearing submissions may also refuse to take a submission further in whole or in part if believing that there allowing otherwise would be an abuse of the hearing process.

Submission to Variation 2 to Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan (TTPP) – Coastal Hazards

Submitter Name: Westpower Limited

Contact Person: Martin Kennedy

Contact Email: Martink@xtra.co.nz

Westpower Limited – The Submitter

Westpower is a submitter and further submitter to natural hazards provisions in the pTTPP.

Westpower is also a submitter to the original Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping.

It is understood that the existing submissions as they relate to,

- pTTPP provisions and mapping regarding natural hazards as a whole, including coastal hazards (original pTTPP submission – dated 11 November 2022),
- further submissions to submissions by other parties to notified pTTPP provisions, and
- Variation 2 – Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping (dated 30 August 2024),

are retained and do not have to be resubmitted.

To assist we have attached the submissions tables for,

Appendix 1 - natural hazards (original pTTPP Submission – 11 November 2022), and

Appendix 2 - Variation 2 (Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping – 30 August 2024),

We have not attached the further submissions as we understand they will be brought across with the original submissions to which they relate.

Westpower seeks to ensure that the continued distribution and supply of electricity to the community, and Westpowers activities as “Regionally Significant Infrastructure” throughout the region, are appropriately recognised and provided for through pTTPP provisions for the benefit of, and to meet the demand for renewable electricity, from the West Coast community.

This is because; given the topography of the Region, the spread of development and land use activities and the extent of the electricity network (2,229 circuit kilometres of lines and cables), some sections of the network fall within proposed hazard areas. Additional regulation has the potential to impact the provision of electricity to the community. Westpower has considerable experience in managing potential hazard risks as a lifelines operator for the benefit of the community.

Whilst Westpower supports the use of accurate and up to date information it is aware that the submissions on the provisions of the pTTPP, as they relate to natural hazards, have not been heard or determined. There is potential for the activities of Westpower, in servicing the communities from Haast to Punakaiki, to be impacted by the changing provisions particularly given the complex nature of regulation for a range of activities, values and issues. Having reviewed the available on-line mapping it is apparent that there is the potential for the Westpower network to be further impacted by the proposed changes dependent on the final outcome of proposed TTPP provisions.

Options available to Westpower may be limited by other considerations or requirements in the pTTPP. Westpower seeks to ensure a comprehensive, integrated and strategic approach to the distribution and supply of electricity throughout the areas of the West Coast within which it operates, taking into account the conditions and context of the region. This includes coastal hazard matters. In making this submission Westpower understands that the proposed mapping does not alter proposed rules and submissions already made in regard to those provisions.

Whilst the existing submissions are retained in regard to coastal hazard matters some additional submission points are made for completeness, particularly given some of the provisions (Objectives and Policies) have already been discussed at the "Natural Hazards" hearing and it is unclear how matters arising at that hearing may be impacted by new matters arising through this process. This is particularly as there have been no decisions from that hearing process.

Accordingly additional points of submission are made here to be added to those two sets of earlier submissions. These additional submissions are made based on the Objectives, Policies and Rules as notified not as proposed through the s42A Report submitted to the Natural Hazards hearing.

Coastal Hazard Provisions and Mapping - Additional Submission Points			
Provision	Position	Reason	Requested Decision
NH-01	Support in Part	Use of a regionally consistent approach will ensure appropriate management on the West Coast. It is understood that the intent is to manage potential risk to people and buildings and the objective should be amended to reflect that outcome.	Amend NH-01, "To use a regionally consistent, risk based approach to natural hazard management with respect to people and buildings."
NH-02	Amend	Whilst the intent of the objective is understood presumably the reference to property is intended to relate to buildings, given the intended rules. It is also unclear how reduction in risk to the environment from natural hazards is to be achieved via rules in the plan.	Amend NH-02, "To reduce the risk to people, property and the environment <u>buildings</u> from natural hazards, thereby promoting the well-being of the community and environment <u>buildings</u> ."
NH-03	Amend	It is now proposed through the plan hearing process to make reference to "Regionally Significant Infrastructure" and "functional and operational need". Further any need to locate such infrastructure	Amend NH-03, To only locate critical <u>regionally significant</u> infrastructure within areas of significant natural hazard risk where there is <u>a functional</u>

		within these areas will by default add a potential risk to that infrastructure that will be managed through design. It is also understood that reference to “property” is intended to be a reference to “buildings”, accordingly reference should be to other people and buildings.	or operational need to be located in these areas , and to design infrastructure so as not to exacerbate natural hazard risk to other people and property.”
NH-O5	Support	It is relevant to consider potential effects of climate change on natural hazards.	Retain
NH-P1	Support	It is important for developing plan provisions, and for plan users and administrators, to identify areas at significant risk from natural hazards.	Retain
NH-P10	Support in Part	It is appropriate to manage the location of sensitive activities in the coastal severe overlay. It is understood that this provision refers to “sensitive activities” as defined in the notified pTTPP (page 46).	Confirm that reference to “sensitive activities” is as proposed at page 46 of the notified pTTPP: Definitions – Sensitive Activities.
NH-R41	Support in Part	It is appropriate to manage the location of sensitive activities. It is understood that this provision refers to “sensitive activities” as defined in the notified pTTPP (page 46).	Confirm that reference to “sensitive activities” is as proposed at page 46 of the notified pTTPP: Definitions – Sensitive Activities.
NH-R43	Support in Part	It is appropriate to manage the location of sensitive activities. It is understood that this provision refers to “sensitive activities” as defined in the notified pTTPP (page 46).	Confirm that reference to “sensitive activities” is as proposed at page 46 of the notified pTTPP: Definitions – Sensitive Activities.
NH-R44	Support in Part	It is appropriate to manage the location of sensitive activities. It is understood that this provision refers to “sensitive activities” as defined in the notified pTTPP (page 46).	Confirm that reference to “sensitive activities” is as proposed at page 46 of the notified pTTPP: Definitions – Sensitive Activities.
NH-R45	Support in Part	It is appropriate to manage the location of sensitive activities. It is understood that this provision refers to “sensitive activities” as defined in the notified pTTPP (page 46).	Confirm that reference to “sensitive activities” is as proposed at page 46 of the notified pTTPP: Definitions – Sensitive Activities.
NH-R46	Support in Part	It is appropriate to manage the location of sensitive activities. It is understood that this provision refers to “sensitive activities” as defined in the notified pTTPP (page 46).	Confirm that reference to “sensitive activities” is as proposed at page 46 of the notified pTTPP: Definitions – Sensitive Activities.

Appendix 1 - natural hazards (original pTTP Submission – 11 November 2022)

Non-complying Activities	Oppose	The proposed set of "non-complying activities" does not include reference to Rule ENG-R6 which advises that non-compliance with standards in that rule will result in a "non-complying" activity status. A new rule is required in that regard.	(1) Insert new Rule for activities not in compliance with Rule ENG-R6, <u>"ENG-R?? Activities in and around the Significant Electricity Distribution Lines that do not comply with Permitted Activity standards"</u> <u>Activity Status Non-Complying</u> <u>Activity Status where compliance not achieved: N/A."</u>
ENG - R20	Neutral	Whilst the connection to Rules ENG-R12, ENG-R13 and ENG-R14 is understood it already seems to be provided for in proposed ENG-R18 as reference to the restricted discretionary rules shows that the only matter of compliance required for that category is ENG-R1.	(1) Consider whether this rule is required or could be incorporated into ENG-R18.

Natural Hazards Section			
Provision	Position	Reason	Requested Decision
Natural Hazards	Support in Part	While the general intent of the overview is supported there is no reference to the network of energy activities already occurring throughout the West Coast. Additional comments need to be included in that regard including some commentary regarding the practicability, given the extent and conditions in the region, of avoiding all natural hazards.	(1) Amend paragraph 3, "The risks associated with natural hazards ... are considerably greater - hence risk is higher. <u>There is a considerable network of energy activities and infrastructure, including critical infrastructure, on the West Coast that services the communities spread throughout the region and in to neighbouring regions. Such activities have been, and will continue to be, developed taking into account the local conditions. This includes consideration of, and design for, natural hazard occurrence. Given the topography and conditions on the West Coast practical risk management solutions are required to ensure maintenance and enhancement of the energy supply to the communities. A risk-based approach ...</u> ".
Natural Hazards Objectives	Support in Part	It is considered relevant to include an objective to recognise that energy activities may require location within areas of hazard due to the nature of the activity and the conditions on the West Coast.	(1) Add a new objective NH-??, <u>"NH-?? To recognise and provide for the constraints imposed by the locational, technical, functional and operational requirements of energy activities, including energy aspects of infrastructure and critical infrastructure, with regard to natural hazards."</u>
NH - O6	Support in Part	While the intent of the objective is acknowledged it should be noted that the plan has split energy activities from infrastructure in terms of management. It is not	(1) Amend NH-O6, "Measures taken to ... other people, property, <u>energy activities and infrastructure, including critical infrastructure</u> , and the environment."

		clear why those matters would not be a part of this objective. The objective should be amended to include those activities to ensure consistency of approach.	
NH - P2	Support in Part	The general intent of the proposed policy is supported however it is considered that an amendment would assist in linking this policy with others by referring to managing natural hazard risk.	(1) Amend NH-P2, "Where a natural hazard ... significant, apply a precautionary approach to <u>managing natural hazard risk</u> ."
NH - P3	Support in Part	The general intent of the policy is supported however it is submitted that, (1) The wording between items "b." and "c." and (2) A new item "d." is required. These amendments are to provide for energy activities, both existing and new, and to ensure consistency of wording and approach for energy activity matters throughout the plan.	(1) Amend item c., "c. Recognising <u>and providing for</u> circumstances <u>where</u> hard engineering solutions may be the only practical means of protecting existing communities, <u>energy activities and infrastructure, including</u> critical infrastructure; <u>or</u> ." (2) Add a new item d., " <u>d. recognising and providing for the locational, technical, functional and operational constraints and requirements of energy activities, including energy aspects of infrastructure and critical infrastructure.</u> "
NH - P6	Oppose in Part	Whilst the intent of the policy is understood an issue arises regarding the definition of "critical response facility". The policy seeks to avoid the development of critical response facilities in the Earthquake Hazard overlay, presumably that is all parts of the overlay given the distances in items "b.-d." (1) It is noted that major dams are included in the definition of "critical response facilities" however there is no definition of what is considered a major dam. A definition is required as previously submitted. (2) It is understood that the intent, with regard to major dams, is that that the issue relates only to the dam itself. The Policy should advise that it is the dam itself that is being referred to and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam. Such an amendment would be consistent with Policy NH-P7.	(1) Add a new definition for "major dam" as set out above. (2) Amend NH-P6a., "a. Development of critical response facilities (<u>note: in reference to "major dams" it is the dam itself and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to.</u>)". (3) Amend item a., "a. Development of critical response facilities, except where it is demonstrated that a site is needed due to the technical, locational, operational or functional constraints or requirements of an activity and earthquake hazard risk has been appropriately managed;"

		(3) There may be instances where a location is required due to the constraints or requirements of an activity and this exception should be recognised and provided for where appropriate risk management is undertaken.	
NH - P7	Support	The intent of the policy is supported	(1) Retain
NH - P8	Oppose in Part	<p>The same issue arises as set out in NH-P6 above. The policy seeks to avoid the development critical response facilities in the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay. Whilst the intent is understood there are issues arising dependent on definitions used.</p> <p>It is noted that major dams are included in the definition of "critical response facilities" however there is no definition of what is considered a major dam. A definition is required as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) It is understood that the intent, with regard to major dams, is that that the issue relates only to the dam itself. The Policy should advise that it is the dam itself that is being referred to and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam.</p>	<p>(1) Add a new definition for "major dam" as set out above.</p> <p>(2) Amend NH-P8,</p> <p>"Avoid locating critical facilities within the Coastal Tsunami Hazard overlay <u>(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to.)</u>".</p>
NH - P11	Support	The policy is appropriate.	(1) Retain
NH - P12	Support in Part	The policy is generally supported with minor amendment to item "g." for consistency of wording throughout the plan.	<p>(1) Amend item g.,</p> <p>"g. The <u>locational, technical, functional and operational constraints and requirements of activities needing</u> to locate in these areas; and".</p>
NH-R1	Oppose In Part	It is unclear whether this rule is intended to be more restrictive than other natural hazard rules that permit certain building activities. Whilst it is accepted that this is the only rule relating to "reconstruction and replacement" there are numerous rules providing for new buildings, particularly unoccupied buildings, or repairs and maintenance that appear to allow for increased floor areas for certain buildings. The "Activity status where compliance not achieved" section refers	<p>(1) Amend this rule to ensure that it does not conflict with, or restrict, building activity that can occur under permitted activity rules elsewhere in the "Natural Hazards Section".</p> <p>(2) It is not possible to make a submission in regard to the activity status for activities that do not comply with permitted standards "1.-5." As it is not known what the intent is in that regard.</p>

		plan readers to the specific natural hazard overlay rules however there are no rules for "reconstruction or replacement" in any of those overlay rules.	
NH - R6	Support	The intent of the rule is supported.	(1) Retain
NH - R7	Support	The intent of the rule is supported.	(1) Retain
NH - R8	Support in Part	Whilst the intent of the rule is understood an issue arises regarding the definition of "critical response facility". It is noted that major dams are included in the definition of "critical response facilities" however there is no definition of what is considered a major dam. A definition of major dams is required as submitted above. However in the case of this matter, given the required location for dams, it is submitted that major dams should be excluded from control by the rule. This would be consistent with Rule NH-R7.	(1) Add an advice note to Rule NH-R8 <i><u>"Note: With reference to Critical Response Facilities this rule does not apply to major dams."</u></i>
NH - R11	Support in Part	The policy seeks consent status in regard to certain Critical Response Facilities which, as submitted above, includes major dams. (1) Given the submission above, and for clarity, a note should be added that this rule does not apply to major dams (2) For consistency of terminology throughout the plan regarding the constraints and requirements of certain activities item "a." should be amended.	(1) Add an advice note to Rule NH-R11 <i><u>"Note: With reference to Critical Response Facilities this rule does not apply to major dams."</u></i> (2) amend item a., "a. Whether there is a <u>locational, technical, functional or operational constraint or requirement</u> for the facility <u>needing</u> to locate in a flood ...".
NH-R13	Neutral	Check double up with non-complying activity NH-R14	(1) Resolve if an issue
NH - R14	Neutral	Check double up with discretionary activity NH-R13	(1) Resolve if an issue
NH - R15	Support in Part	The intent of the rule is supported however, (1) Item "1." refers to " <i>permitted activities for the zone</i> " however zone provisions do not apply to energy activities therefore the rule should be " <i>permitted in the plan</i> ". (2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are defined as	(1) Amend item 1., "1. These are lawfully established or a Permitted Activity <u>in the plan.</u> " (2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted. (3) Amend item 2. by adding, "2. Any unoccupied buildings ... response facilities (<i><u>note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or</u></i>

		<p>part of critical response facilities and therefore major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(2) For the purpose of item "2." it is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p><u>associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R16	Oppose in Part	<p>As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore,</p> <p>(1) Major dams should be defined (as previously submitted),</p> <p>(2) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>(1) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rule,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R17	Oppose in Part	<p>As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore,</p> <p>(1) major dams should be defined (as previously submitted),</p> <p>(2) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>(1) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rule,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R18	Support in Part	<p>(1) Terminology should be consistent between item 1 in this rule and item "1." in NH-R20, re "area of the building"?</p> <p>(2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(4) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R20.</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(4) Add a note to the rule,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R20	Support in Part	<p>(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item "1." in NH-R18, re "area of the building"?</p>	<p>(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18.</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p>

		<p>(2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>(4) Add a note to the rule,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R24	Support in Part	<p>(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item "1." in NH-R18 and NH-20, re "area of the building"?</p> <p>(2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18 and NH-20.</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(3) Add a note to the rule,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam structure and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R27	Support in Part	<p>(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item 1 in NH-R18, NH-20 and NH-24, re "area of the building"?</p> <p>(2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18, NH20 and NH-24.</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(3) Add a note to the rule,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R30	Support in Part	<p>(1) Terminology should be consistent between item "1." in this rule and item "1." in NH-R18, NH-20, NH-24 and NH-27, re "area of the building"?</p> <p>(2) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(3) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made</p>	<p>(1) Amend terminology for consistency between this rule and NH-R18, NH20, NH-24 and NH-27.</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(3) Add a note to the rule,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>

		clear.	
NH-R32	Support in Part	<p>(1) As discussed elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore, major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(2) It is understood that the intent of the rule is that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and this should be made clear.</p>	<p>(1) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rule, <i>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</i></p>
NH - R36	Support in part	The rule is generally appropriate for energy activities however it should include provision for upgrading	(1) Amend the heading of NH-R35, "Repairs, Maintenance, <u>Upgrading</u> , Additions, Alterations ...".
NH - R38	Support in Part	<p>It is unclear what this rule adds that is not already covered by NH-R1.</p> <p>(1) Given Rule NH-39 presumably this rule then must relate to occupied buildings and the rule should be amended to reflect that.</p>	<p>(1) Amend heading of NH-R38, "Reconstruction, Repairs and ... to existing <u>Occupied</u> Buildings in the Coastal ...".</p>
NH - R39	Support in Part	The intention of this rule is supported provided the submission to NH-R38 is adopted. Where not adopted this rule will require amendment to permit activities relating to existing unoccupied buildings and structures.	(1) Where submission to NH-R38 is not adopted provide for activities related to existing unoccupied buildings and structures as permitted activities.
NH - R40	Oppose in Part	<p>There appears to be some conflict with rule NH-R39. Based on that rule this rule would relate to occupied buildings and the rule should be clear in that regard. As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore,</p> <p>(1) Major dams should be defined (as previously submitted).</p> <p>(2) It should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings and structures.</p>	<p>(1) Amend the heading of NH-R40, "NH-R40 Additions ... for <u>Occupied</u> Commercial ...".</p> <p>(2) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rule, <i>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</i></p>
NH - R42	Oppose in Part	(1) As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore it is unclear how aspects related to major dams are provided for in these rules, particularly given that new	<p>(1) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rule, <i>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings</i></p>

		<p>unoccupied buildings are permitted.</p> <p>(a) major dams should be defined (as previously submitted),</p> <p>(b) it should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.</p> <p>(2) It is noted that there is no discretion to consider any needs and constraints of activities that may require location in these areas, and provision should be made for considering these matters.</p> <p>(3) It is noted that the benefits arising from an activity are not a matter of discretion when considering such applications. Such matters should form part of consideration of the relevant issues arising.</p>	<p><u>and structures related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p> <p>(3) Add a new discretion matter h.,</p> <p><u>"h. Whether there is a locational, technical, functional or operational constraint or requirement for the facility needing to locate in the coastal severe or coastal alert overlay."</u></p> <p>(4) Add a new discretion matter i.,</p> <p><u>"i. The benefits to the community of the activity occurring."</u></p>
Coastal Tsunami Overlay	Support in Part	<p>(1) The rules in this section appear to only relate to Critical Response Facilities (CRF's). Given that intent the heading of the rule should refer to "Critical Response Facilities", as per NH-R49, and the items remain in NH-47 (i.e. 1.-3.) and NH-48 (i.e. 1.-2.) respectively</p> <p>(2) I As submitted elsewhere major dams are defined as critical response facilities and therefore it is unclear how aspects related to major dams are provided for in these rules, particularly given that a wide range of activities, buildings and structures are permitted in this overlay. As submitted elsewhere major dams are part of critical response facilities and therefore,</p> <p>(a) major dams should be defined (as previously submitted),</p> <p>(b) it should be clear that it is the dam itself that is the subject of the rule and not associated buildings.</p>	<p>(1) The term "Critical Response Facility(ies)" is be removed from each item in NH-R47 and NH-R48 and placed in the heading of each of the rules as that is what the rules are about and would ensure consistency with NH-R49 terminology.</p> <p>(3) Define "major dam" as previously submitted.</p> <p>(2) Add a note to the rules,</p> <p><u>"(note: in reference to major dams it is the dam itself and not other buildings related to, or associated with, the dam that is being referred to in this rule.)"</u></p>
NH - R50	Support	Provides for matters related to energy activities.	(1) Retain

Appendix 2 - Variation 2 (Coastal Natural Hazards Mapping – 30 August 2024)

Submission to Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan

Submitter Name: Westpower Limited

Contact Person: Martin Kennedy

Contact Email: Martink@xtra.co.nz

Coastal Hazard Mapping			
Provision	Position	Reason	Requested Decision
New Maps	Neutral	<p>Westpower is a submitter to natural hazards provisions in the pTTPP. This is because; given the topography of the Region, the spread of development and land use activities and the extent of the electricity network (2,229 circuit kilometres of lines and cables), some sections of the network fall within proposed hazard areas. Additional regulation has the potential to impact the provision of electricity to the community. Westpower has considerable experience in managing potential hazard risks as a lifelines operator for the benefit of the community.</p> <p>Whilst Westpower supports the use of accurate and up to date information it is aware that the submissions on the provisions of the pTTPP, as they relate to natural hazards, have not been heard or determined. There is potential for the activities of Westpower, in servicing the communities from Haast to Punakaiki, to be impacted by the changing provisions particularly given the complex nature of regulation for a range of activities, values and issues. Having reviewed the available on-line mapping it is apparent that there is the potential for the Westpower network to be further impacted by the proposed changes dependent on the final outcome of proposed TTPP provisions.</p> <p>Options available to Westpower may be limited by other considerations or requirements in the pTTPP. Westpower seeks to ensure a comprehensive, integrated and strategic approach to the distribution and supply of electricity throughout the areas of the West Coast within which it operates, taking into account the conditions and context of the region. This includes coastal hazard matters. In making this submission Westpower understands that the proposed mapping does not alter proposed rules and submissions already made in regard to those provisions.</p>	Ensure that the continued distribution and supply of electricity to the community, and Westpowers activities as “Regionally Significant Infrastructure” throughout the region, are appropriately recognised and provided for through pTTPP provisions.