

Appendix 2: Chapter 9 Table of Recommendations to Submissions and Further Submissions

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
38.30	The North Otaki Beach Residents Group Inc	Chapter 9	Clarify that Chapter 9 does not address coastal erosion risk or otherwise modify Chapter 9 to adopt the changes to Chapter 4 identified in this submission.	6	Reject	Chapter 9 was never intended to apply to coastal hazards. These were covered by Chapter 4 which has been withdrawn. In Chapter 4's place the coastal hazards portions of the ODP will remain in force.	No
44.09	MY and SA Blackburne	Fault Avoidance Area	Remove the Fault Avoidance Area on submitter's property. Requested that Rules 9C.1 to 9C.5 be deleted and that consequential amendments be made to policies or other rules necessary to give effect to this request	9	Reject	The technical report commissioned does not recommend a change to the fault avoidance area. amended by others submissions	No
44.10	MY and SA Blackburne	Fault Avoidance Area	Remove Rules 9C.1 to 9C.5. Consequential amendments to policies or other rules necessary to give effect to any request in this submission.	9	Reject	Rules are in accordance with the council's functions under 31(1)(b)(i), and with RPS obligations.	No
44.11	MY and SA Blackburne	Erosion and slope stability	Remove the moderate erosion susceptibility notation on submitter's property.	10	Accept	The technical report on the data used for this mapping states that the data is not	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						suitable for use in this context. However, provisions relating to erosion and slope stability are recommended to be deleted.	
44.13	MY and SA Blackburne	Contaminated Land Rules	Delete Rules 9E.1 to 9E.	12	Accept	The rules are recommended to be deleted.	Yes
85.12	Gerald Rys	Chapter 9	The Plan does not address tsunamis and volcanic eruptions. These two hazards need to be fully addressed in the Plan.	6	Reject	It is noted that the PDP uses a precautionary and risk based approach. Whilst there is a risk of Tsunamis and volcanic eruptions these issues may be most appropriately managed by methods outside the PDP, such as such as early warning system and civil defence plans. Hazard modelling includes an allowance for climate change and plan	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						will need to be amended should the scope of matters in the NES change.	
<i>FS29, FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS 61, FS 102, FS 178, FS 179, FS 180, FS 181, FS183, FS 184, FS 185, FS 186, FS 187</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	6	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
86.1	M D A & J H Klimenko and R & N Couchman	Flood Mapping	Object to natural hazards at Otaki Beach as shown on Map 01C and in s.9.2 of PDP classifying land as at risk of ponding. Requests that "ponding hazard" be removed from entire Otaki Beach area.	6	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any amendments to the hazard mapping.	No
90.2	Valerie Ballinger	Erosion and slope stability	Seek amendment to modify map 20C (area of moderate erosion susceptibility) in relation to submitter's property as shown in map attached to submission.	10	Accept	The technical report on the data used for this mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. However, erosion and slope stability provisions are recommended to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS39</i>			<i>Support</i>	10	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
92.13	Winstone	Policy 9.4	Retain Policy 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5	7	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
0	Aggregates					the provisions are retained however amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions as well as other amendments (such as those that ensure the policy meets the requirements of the RPS).	
92.6	Winstone Aggregates	Definition of hazardous activities	Request that the definition of hazardous activities be deleted	6	N/A	The provisions addressed by the submissions have been withdrawn	No
92.17	Winstone Aggregates	Definition of River Corridor	Retain the definition of River Corridor	6	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that the definition of 'river corridor' is retained in its current form. Amendments are recommended to improve clarity.	No
92.11 6	Winstone Aggregates	Rules 9.1.3, 9B.5.2, 9B.1.6, 9B.1.3, 9B.1.7, 9B.4.1, 9B.4.3, 9B.4.4, and 9B.4.5	Seeks to exclude gravel extraction activities from rules that address development, buildings, structures and earthworks within the River Corridor	8	Reject	The definition of earthworks to exclude extractive industries will more effectively address the concerns of the submitter	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
92.11 6	Winstone Aggregates	Rules 9.1.3, 9B.5.2, 9B.1.6, 9B.1.3, 9B.1.7, 9B.4.1, 9B.4.3, 9B.4.4, and 9B.4.5	Seeks to exclude gravel extraction activities from rules that address development, buildings, structures and earthworks within the River Corridor	8	Reject	The recommended amendments to the definition of earthworks to exclude extractive industries will more effectively address the concerns of the submitter	No
92.11 7	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9A.5.1	Amend Rule 9A.5.1 as follows. "1. Subdivision of or development on land (excluding extractive industries (gravel extraction)) subject to two or more.."	7	Accept in part	The Rule is not based on a risk-based approach and could inadvertently apply to many activities that may not even affect the hazard, therefore, it is recommended for deletion.	Yes
92.11 8	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 9.11, Policy 9.12, Policy 9.13, New Policy	Retain Policies 9.11, 9.12 and 9.13 on the basis that a new policy is inserted as follows. "Enable extractive industries (gravel extraction), recognising its contribution to flood and hazard management and mitigation." And any consequential amendments	8	Reject	It is inappropriate to recognise or elevate one particular activity above all others and consider a new policy is not required.	No
92.11 9	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9.2.3	Amend Rule 9.2.3 consistent with the relief sought for Rule 9.1.3 and Rule 9.1.4 and. "Exclude buildings and structures associated with extractive industries (gravel extraction) from the standards in Rule 9B.1.2, 9B.1.3, 9B.1.4 (so these are permitted);	8	Accept in part	Recommend that an exception is added to the rule 9B.1.2 (which is now 9A.1.1). A new RD activity	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						is also proposed for permanent buildings in the River Corridor associated with gravel extraction activities. Gravel extraction is excluded from Rule 9B.1.4 (renumbered 9A.1.4) via recommended amendments to exclude extraction industries from the definition of earthworks.	
92.120	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.1.8.2	Delete standard 2 for Rule 9B.1.8.2. Seeking to exclude gravel extraction activities from rules that address development, buildings, structures and earthworks within the River Corridor in terms of Rule 9B.1.2.	8	Accept in part	Agree that buildings that are permitted under the gravel extraction Rule 9B.1.8 should be exempted from Rule 9B.1.2.	Yes
92.121	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.1.8	Amend the title of Rule 9B.1.8 as follows. "Extractive industries (gravel extraction) activities in the River Corridor."	6	Reject	The only extractive industry that is permitted in the River Corridor is gravel extraction. The change to the rule would imply that all extractive industries are permitted.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
92.12 2	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.1	Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows. "Extractive industries (gravel extraction) in Quarry Zone I Quarry Policy Area (or equivalent.)" Cross reference to the performance standards proposed above for the Quarry Zone / Quarry Policy Area (or equivalent).	6	Reject	No Quarry Zone is proposed.	No
92.12 3	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.2.1	Amend Rule 9B.2.1 as follows. "Development and earthworks (excluding extractive industries (gravel extraction)) within ..."	6	Reject	The PDP provides for Gravel Extraction in the River Corridor. This rule deals with flood storage or fill control areas. It is appropriate for gravel extraction within these areas to require consent.	No
92.12 4	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.4.2	Amend Rule 9B.4.2 as follows. "In any stream corridor or river corridor fill earthworks or earthworks (excluding extractive industries (gravel extraction) that do not ..."	6	Accept	We note the correct rule reference for earthworks the submitter refers to is 9B.1.4 (recommended to be renumbered) 9A.1.4) The exclusion would be achieved by recommended amendment to exclude extraction industries from the definition of	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						earthworks.	
92.12 5	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.4.4	Amend Rule 9B.4.8 as follows. "Earthworks (excluding extractive industries (gravel extraction) within 20 metres ..."	6	Accept in part	Accept that gravel extraction activities provided for as a PA activity should be exempt from this rule. However, this would be achieved by recommended amendments to the definition of earthworks to exclude extraction industries	No
92.12 6	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.4.4	Amend Rule 9B.4.4 so that extractive industries {gravel extraction} in the river corridor or flood hazards areas or Quarry Zone / Quarry Policy Area (or equivalent, which does not meet the permitted activity standards for extractive industries (gravel extraction) [is a restricted discretionary activity].	6	Accept	Rule recommended to be deleted consequential amendment on acceptance of 92.119. Default discretionary activity applies. Recommend an amendments to Rule 9B.5.4 to recognise that some buildings are permitted for gravel extraction activities.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
92.132	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.1.6 Rule 9B.1.8	Retain Rules 9B.1.6 and 9B.1.8.1, as notified so these are permitted activities.	6	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	No
92.155	Winstone Aggregates	Erosion and slope stability	Amend Map 10C to delete the Moderate Erosion Susceptibility annotation within the Waikanae Quarry site at 15 Reikorangi Road (Lot 1 Deposited Plan 26401).	10	Accept in part	The technical report on the data used for this mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. However, erosion and slope stability provisions are recommended to be deleted.	Yes
138.6	Bride Coe	Whole of Chapter	Requests that all reference to ERMA are removed as the agency no longer exists.	6	Reject	There are no references to ERMA recommended to be deleted.	No
157.2	Jill & Marcus O'Connor [ex J Hassan & Waihopai Family Trust]	Flood mapping	Remove the flood hazard restrictions on submitter's property. Any other decision that would remedy submitter's concerns.	8	Accept in part	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any amendments to the hazard mapping but recommend minor refinements are made to more accurately reflect the topography and	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						extent of flooding	
<i>FS167</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
157.3	Jill & Marcus O'Connor [ex J Hassan & Waihopai Family Trust]	Flooding	Added recognition that flooding is the Council's responsibility where it is due to insufficient stormwater systems and that property owners do not suffer the cost of Council's actions/inactions in managing its stormwater system. Any other decision that would remedy submitter's concerns.	8	Reject	Concerns relate to issues that are outside of the scope and/or control of the PDP.	No
<i>FS167</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
157.4	Jill & Marcus O'Connor [ex J Hassan & Waihopai Family Trust]	Flooding	Seek consultation to discuss alternative stormwater management, to manage flood risk. Any other decision that would remedy submitter's concerns.	8	Reject	Concerns relate to issues that are outside of the scope and/or control of the PDP.	No
<i>FS167</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
172.9	Richard Heerdegen & Johanna Rosier	Erosion and slope stability	Oppose the identification of the areas adjoining the Waitohu Stream as "very high" in terms of its susceptibility to erosion and amend to "moderate".	10	Reject	Submitter has misread the maps. The notation related to coastal hazards and has since been withdrawn, and erosion and slope stability provisions are recommended to be deleted.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
176.1	Kerry Dalton	Flood mapping	Amend Map 16C to remove the ponding layer from 8 Tangahoe Street.	8	Accept in part	The expert report commissioned recommends a change to the ponding area on the site.	Yes
191.12	Landlink Ltd	Definition of Natural Hazard	Seek amendment to add the definition of "natural hazard" from the RMA.	6	Accept	The definition in the PDP is similar but the RMA definition is more appropriate.	Yes
191.50	Landlink Ltd	Rule 9A.5.1	Oppose non complying activity rule where 2 kinds of hazard exist and seek that this be deleted.	7	Accept	Section 106 of the RMA applies to subdivisions and other activities are covered by other parts of the chapter. The rule is unnecessary and is recommended to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS41, FS142, FS167</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
198.N	Helen Punton	Policy 9.1	Oppose Policy 9.1	7	Reject	Policy 9.1 assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS which requires regional and district plans to identify areas at high	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						risk from natural hazards	
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
198. P	Helen Punton	Policy 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The policy is recommended to be amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS, which may address some of the submitters concerns.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	
198. Q	Helen Punton	Policy 9.5	Oppose Policy 9.5 amend so that it reads amendment so that it read 'enabling restoration of natural systems where reasonable and in agreement with affected property owners'.	7	Accept in part	" <i>undertaking and encouraging restoration</i> " is more appropriate than " <i>enable</i> " and better reflects that this Policy can be achieved through processes outside the PDP.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
202. RR	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 after sub clause e) to read "Hazard risk categories will be developed for flood, earthquake and erosion hazards to guide minimising the risk of harm from these hazards, while allowing	7	Accept in part	The wording is recommended to be revised to provide a more appropriate balance, with	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			appropriate use in lower risk areas"			the focus on harm to people and property rather than the higher bar of loss of life and damage to property.	
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			Oppose	7	Reject	As above	No
FS234			Oppose in part	7	Reject	As above	No
202. UU	Department of Conservation	Introduction 9.1.1	Support	6	Accept	The introduction is appropriate.	No
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			Oppose	6	Reject	As above	No
202. RR	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.2	Amend wording of Policy 9.2 Seeks that the words "loss of life and damage to property due to these hazards" be replaced with "harm from these hazards"	7	Accept in part	The wording is recommended to be revised to provide a more appropriate balance, with the focus on harm to people and property rather than the higher bar of loss of life and damage to property.	Yes
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230,			Oppose	7	Reject	As above	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS239							
FS234			<i>Oppose in part</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
202.T T	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.3	Support Policy 9.3	7	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may be recommended as a result of other submissions such as those that the policy meets the requirements of the RPS.	No
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
202.VV	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.4	Amend Policy 9.4 to read "A precautionary approach will be taken to subdivision and development where there is uncertainty about the potential effects of a hazard and where the effects are potentially <u>significantly adverse</u> until further detailed information on the extent and nature of the hazard becomes available"	7	Accept in part	Policy 9.4 is recommended to be amended to be more in line with the intention of the NZCPS including adding in the term significantly adverse.	Yes
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS234			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
202. WW	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.5	Amend Policy 9.5 to read "Natural features which have the effect of reducing hazard risk by buffering development from natural hazards will be protected through development controls, including through the use of minimum setbacks; from the coast, rivers and streams for new and relocated buildings. Council will also undertake and encourage the restoration of such natural features"	7	Accept in part	" <i>undertaking and encouraging restoration</i> " is more appropriate than " <i>enable</i> " and better reflects that this Policy can be achieved through processes outside the PDP	Yes
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
205.10	Margaret Bilisland	Flood mapping	That the ponding flood area be removed on 61 Moana Street and the surrounding areas.	8	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any amendments to the hazard mapping.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	8	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
205.10	Margaret Bilisland	Flood mapping	Support all relief sought in the submission by North Otaki Beach Residence Assoc. (submission 38) and the submission by Rob Crozier and Joan Allin (submission 451).	8	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any amendments to the hazard mapping.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	8	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
208.45	Transpower	Rule 9A.5.1	Oppose amend to "exclude the National Grid" from the non-complying rule and add a discretionary activity rule for "For the National Grid, on land subject to two or more of the following natural hazards areas (identified on natural hazard maps)". Any consequential amendments.	7	Accept in part	Section 106 of the RMA applies to subdivisions and other activities are covered by other parts of the chapter. Rule is not based on a risk-based approach and could inadvertently apply to many activities that may not even affect the hazard on the site or the surrounding area and is recommended to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS106, FS125, FS130</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
208.50	Transpower	Policy 9.3	Support Policy 9.3	7	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may be recommended as a result of other submissions such as those that ensure the policy meets the requirements of the RPS.	No
208.4	Transpower	Rule 9B.5.4	Oppose Rule 9B.5.4 and amend to "exclude buildings	8	Accept in part	Recommend amendments	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
8			associated with the National Grid” and provide a discretionary activity rule for “The National Grid in the River corridor or stream corridor”. Any consequential amendments.			to the definition of building to be amended to exclude network utilities and the rules relevant to network utilities in hazard areas are now considered in Chapter 11.	
<i>FS125, FS130</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
212.49	Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board)	Other Matters	Amend the overly restrictive Objectives and Policies so that they provide a balanced approach to enabling rural landowners to provide for their economic wellbeing and recognise the value to the Kapiti community of doing so, while avoiding, remedying, or mitigating adverse environmental effects.	6	Reject	This submission refers to the whole of the plan and should have been coded as such to the whole of plan chapter.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS139, FS142, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
212.50	Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican	Rule 9C.3.1	Oppose in part Rule 9C.3.1 and delete matters of discretion 2-6.	9	Reject	Review of subdivision rules throughout the Plan shows that this approach is consistent throughout the PDP. Amending it in this	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Church Pension Board)					one instance would be confusing.	
			<i>Support</i>	9	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
212.5 1	Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board)	Policy 9.14	Oppose in part Rule 9C.3.2 and delete all but the first sentence of standard 1 to Rule 9C.3(1).	9 & 6	Reject	Identifying the location and depth of the Fault Trace is necessary in determining that the building platform is clear of the Fault Trace.	No
			<i>Support</i>	9	Reject	As above	No
212.5 2	Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board)	Policy 9.14	Support Policy 9.14. Retain without amendment.	6	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form albeit with minor amendments recommended as a result of other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Board)						
			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
212.53	Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board)	Rule 9C.1(2)	Support Rule 9C.1(2). Retain without amendment.	6	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form albeit with minor amendments recommended as a result of other submissions	No
			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
216.10	Graham Halstead	Flood Mapping Map 11C	Map 11C - seek amendment to delete or modify the designated fill control zone, in respect of the land of 1.9ha on Kapiti Road (as per submission).	8	Reject	The expert report commissioned confirms that the extent of the fill control area is appropriate.	No
218.67	Coastlands Shoppingtown Ltd	Rule 9A.5.1	Oppose Rule 9A.5.1 and seek that the activity status of two hazards on one site be changed to a restricted discretionary activity, with Council's discretion being restricted to managing the effects of the two hazards	7	Accept in part	Section 106 of the RMA applies to subdivisions and other activities are covered by other parts of the	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			identified			chapter. The rule is unnecessary and is recommended to be deleted.	
<i>FS51, FS125</i>			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>As above</i>		Yes
218.69	Coastlands Shoppingtown Ltd	Rule 9B.4.1	Oppose Rule 9B.4.1 as it relates to land disturbance for on land with ponding areas or an overflow path over it, and non-compliance with Rule 9B.1.4, and seek for Council to change the activity status for non-compliance to restricted discretionary, with Council restricting its discretion to the matter of non-compliance.	8	Accept in part	Restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate for activities not meeting one or more standards in a permitted or controlled activity.	Yes
219.02	Horticulture New Zealand	Definition of code of practice	Amend the definition of "code of practice" to apply to any guideline or best practice on a specific topic. This plan specifically includes references to codes of practice relating to hazardous substances.	6	Reject	The provisions which refer to code of practice were withdrawn in October 2014. The generic definition proposed by the submitter is a commonly understood meaning, and a definition is not required.	No
219.08	Horticulture New Zealand	Definition of Hazardous activity	Delete the definitions of Hazardous activity and Hazardous facility.	6	N/A	The definition of hazardous facility has been withdrawn. The definition of hazardous activity was	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						only relevant in conjunction with the 'hazardous facility' definition. As the definition has no use or context it should be deleted.	
219.12	Horticulture New Zealand	Definition of potentially contaminated land	Either amend the definition of "potentially contaminated land" or the provisions in Chapter 9 so that existing horticultural land is not classed as potentially contaminated land. Horticulture NZ does not support the use of HAIL.	6	Reject	The definition is based partly on the HAIL which includes as item 10. 'Persistent pesticide bulk storage or use including sports turfs, market gardens, orchards, glass houses or spray sheds'. NES does have exemptions for farm / horticulture use	No
219.65	Horticulture New Zealand	Definition of potentially contaminated land	Concerned about Rule 9E.1.3 Disturbing the soil of contaminated or potentially contaminated land. Either, amend the definition of potentially contaminated land, or, the provisions in Chapter 9 so that existing horticultural land is not classed as potentially contaminated land.	6	Reject	The rule referred to is recommended to be withdrawn. The definition of potentially contaminated land is in line with the NES.	No
229.6, 7 &	Gordon and Sylvia Moller	Stream and River clearance	Amended to the rules to provide clarity and certainty that river and stream clearance, including mouth	8	Accept in part.	Stream and river clearance and mouth cutting is under	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
8			straightening and other maintenance activities, when undertaken by the relevant authorities, is a permitted activity.			the jurisdiction of the GWRC as it occurs in the waters or bed of a waterway. However, some of the related wording is recommended to be amended to be clearer.	
FS229			<i>Support</i>	8	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
252.1 7	Regional Public Health	Policy 9.4	Support the adoption of a precautionary and risk based approach to hazard management, in particular, the avoidance of new development in areas subject to high risk from hazards, if risk cannot be mitigated.	7	Accept in part	Some amendments are recommended to the Policy in response to other submissions to give effect to the NZCPS.	No
252.1 8	Regional Public Health	Whole of Chapter	Support the consideration given to the effects of climate change and the vulnerability of the districts coastal hazards	6	Accept	Accept to the extent that it supports the chapter, and to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may be recommended as a result of other submissions. Whilst there is a risk of Tsunamis and volcanic eruptions these issues may	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						be most appropriately managed by methods outside the PDP, such as such as early warning system and civil defence plans	
262.1 2	Bunnings Ltd / Our Lady of Kāpiti	Rule 9B.1.4	Delete rule 9B.1.4 to the extent that it applies to lot 1 DP441854.	8	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to the ponding area on the site (refer below) but not to the earthworks rules.	Yes
262.2 4	Bunnings Ltd / Our Lady of Kāpiti	Map 11C	Delete the "ponding area" on map 11C affecting lots 1 and 2 DP441854.	8	Accept in part	The expert report commissioned recommends a change to the ponding area on the site.	Yes
263.2 5	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Rule 9A.5.1	Remove Rule 9A.5.1	8	Accept in part	Section 106 of the RMA applies to subdivisions and other activities are covered by other parts of the chapter. The rule is unnecessary and is recommended to be deleted.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
263.26	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Various	Amend Rule 9B.2.1, 9B.4.1, 9B.1.3, 9B.1.4, 9B.3.1, 9B.3.2, 9B.4.1 (Ponding Area provisions) so it is clear that they do not apply to any activity within an identified Neighbourhood Development Area that is in accordance with a Council-approved Neighbourhood Development Plan granted under Rule 5C.4.2 or within the Ngarara Precinct.	8	Accept in part	The Neighbourhood Development Area process has been identified as ultra vires. There could also be instances where the hazard information has changed between consents, therefore it is necessary that these issues be re-considered.	Yes
263.28	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Various	Amend Rules 9B.1.2, 9B.1.4, 9B.1.5, 9B.2.2, 9B.4.2, 9B.5.3, and 9B.5.4 so it is clear that the Ngarara Zone and Precinct are exempted from the Stream Corridor provisions	8	Accept in part	See above.	Yes
263.27	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Policy 9.12	Remove Policy 9.12 The policy sets a very high threshold for development on areas in the river and stream corridor, and flood storage areas, which is not justified based on the current defined overlay areas, particularly in the Ngarara Zone and Precinct areas.	8	Accept in part	Removing the word "completely" recognises that there will be residual risk	Yes
263.37	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Stream Corridor, Storage Areas and Ponding Areas	Delete the following from Map series 6, 7 and 9 (and any associated references in the Proposed District Plan), insofar as they are not identified in the existing District Plan: c) Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay;	8	Reject	These layers are appropriate and applications for these areas should address hazard effects.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			d) Ecological Sites Overlays; e) Dominant ridgelines and Dominant Dunes; f) Priority Areas for Restoration Overlay; g) Stream Corridor Areas; h) Storage Areas; and i) Ponding Areas. As they relate to the areas in the Ngarara Zone and/or Ngarara Precinct (G.P.5).				
266.5	Alex Metcalfe	Other Matters	Amend to ensure that residential development on 12 Otaihanga Road fully takes into account the effects of a future widening of Mazengarb Stream and the possibility that development would increase the risk of flooding to adjacent properties and specifically to the property at 16, 18 & 20 Otaihanga Road.	8	Reject	Relevant assessment will occur as part of any subdivision and development application. It is not appropriate to amend the plan specifically.	No
FS4, FS12, FS17, FS18, FS30, FS31, FS36, FS37, FS47, FS50, FS105, FS144, FS149, FS151, FS152, FS159, FS160, FS161, FS162, FS163, FS171, FS173			Support	8	Reject	As above	No
FS147			Support in part	8	Reject	As above	No
FS80, FS128			Oppose	8	Accept	PDP contains rules to control earthworks and	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						<i>subdivision within flood prone areas and this level of control is appropriate</i>	
266.6	Alex Metcalfe	Fire Hazards General	Add policy and rules to address fire prevention in all zones especially with regard to the urban rural interface.	11	Reject	Policy and rules relate to facilitating fire fighting not fire prevention	No
<i>FS17, FS18, FS36, FS149, FS151, FS152, FS162, FS163</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
266.7	Alex Metcalfe	Fire Hazards General	Add policy and rules to specifically prohibit. - the build-up of vegetation around power lines - the retention of pruning/trimming slash and general rubbish in sections that contain or adjoin areas of scrub or trees including shelter belts - the use of fireworks and the lighting of bonfires within 2km of any Rural Zone or Open Space Zone.	11	Reject	Clearance around power lines and sale of fireworks are handled by legislation. Fire bans are better handled by bylaws.	No
<i>FS17, FS18, FS36, FS149, FS151, FS152, FS162, FS163</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
267.3	Lyndon Enterprises Ltd	Other matters	Support the comments made by the NZ Farm Forestry Association regarding the treatment of erosion susceptibility.	10	Reject	Seeks no relief in its own right. However, all provisions relating to erosion and slope stability are recommended to be deleted.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS1, FS9, FS10, FS16, FS33, FS41, FS42, FS54, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS93, FS102, FS126, FS142, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186.			Support	10	Reject	As above	No
276.3 1	Kāpiti Coast Airport Holdings Ltd	Rule 9A.5.1	Request that subdivision and development in areas with multiple hazards be amended to be a restricted discretionary activity as opposed to Non-Complying.	7	Reject	Section 106 of the RMA applies to subdivisions and other activities are covered by other parts of the chapter. The rule is unnecessary and is recommended to be deleted.	No
FS51, FS55, FS145			Support	7	Reject	As above	No
276.4 5	Kāpiti Coast Airport Holdings Ltd	Maps 11C and 11D	Request that Maps 11C and 11D be amended to be consistent with stormwater and environmental management plans approved for the airport, to allow operation and development potential of the airport.	8	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any amendments to the hazard mapping. Alterations to future flood hazard maps would require a plan change.	No
276.4 5	Kāpiti Coast Airport Holdings Ltd	Policy 9.4, Rules 9.1.3 and 9.1.4	Amend Policy 9.4, Rules 9.1.3 and 9.1.4 to remove reference to precautionary approach and amend activity status of subdivision and development from non complying to restricted discretionary.	7	Accept in part	The precautionary approach is considered appropriate. Amendments	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						are recommended to the status of subdivision to address this submission.	
280.2 7	Bryce Wilkinson	Policy 9.3	Oppose policy 9.3 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits	7	Accept in part	Some land uses (such as underground utilities) may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue	Yes
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
280.2 7	Bryce Wilkinson	Policy 9.4	Oppose 9.4 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits, and make consequential amendments to the rules.	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. The policy is recommended to be amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
280.2 7	Bryce Wilkinson	Policy 9.5	Oppose policy 9.5 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>"Undertaking and encouraging restoration"</i>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			requirement to evaluate costs and benefits			is more appropriate than "enable" and better reflects that this Policy can be achieved through processes outside the PDP. The policy is recommended to be amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
280.28	Bryce Wilkinson	Whole of chapter	Requests that the policies and rules in the chapter be amended to permit subdivision and other activities that provide net benefits to members of the community and only to protect something to the extent that doing so provides the net benefits.	6	Reject	Some activities and land uses may be appropriate on land affected by a natural hazard, this is something that needs to be assessed on a case by case basis through the resource consent process	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
280.29	Bryce Wilkinson	Rules	Add a rule that establishes a right to injuriously affected landowners to be compensated perhaps in the manner so that they are not taxed unfairly for a measure that benefits all.	6	Reject	The council has obligations under the RMA and higher order RMA documents to address hazards.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
286.34	Waikanae North Limited	Rule 9B.3.2	Rule 9B.3.2 and amend to controlled activity status amend to include in Rule 9B.2 Controlled Activities.	8	Reject	RD status for subdivision in ponding and residual ponding areas is appropriate. CA would mean that the proposal had to be approved. In certain circumstances a subdivision may not be appropriate and may need to be declined.	No
314.4 & 5	Michael Alexander	Rule 9B.1.6	Amend rules to provide clarity and certainty that river and stream clearance, including mouth straightening and other maintenance activities, when undertaken by the relevant authorities, is a permitted activity. This requires express exemption from, or other amendment to, rules, zoning and notation that override permitted activity Rule 9B.1.6.	8	Accept in part	Accept in part to clarify that flood mitigation works complying with rule 9B.1.6 (renumbered 9A.1.6) are not subject to earthworks controls in Rule 9B.1.4 (renumbered 9A.1.4).	Yes
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	8	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
319.23	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (EI	Policy 9.12	Oppose in part Policy 9.12 and amend so that flow corridors and overflow paths shall be maintained rather than kept clear as set out in the submission.	8	Reject	These areas need to be kept clear to maintain the ability of waters to flow freely.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Rancho)						
319.23	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.4.1	Amend rule to read "Subdivision of land located within any <u>the river corridor</u> , overflow path, residual overflow path or flood erosion area and any subdivision which does not comply with any one or more of the restricted discretionary activity standards under Rule 9B.3.2 <u>and is not a non-complying activity under Rule 9B.5.3.'</u>	8	Accept in part	A new rule 9A.4.4 is recommended that allows for discretionary status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the appropriate standards.	Yes
319.23	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.5.3	Subdivision in the Stream corridor <u>and/or subdivision creating lots entirely within the River corridor zone.'</u>	8	Accept in part	Accept in part, the request is appropriate however the recommended amendments wording differ slightly to the submitter's request.	Yes
319.26 & 27	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.1.4	Amend Rule 9B.1.4 to read. "1. In an overflow path or residual overflow path (excluding fill). a) Shall not involve the disturbance of more than 20m3 of land for any activity; b) and c) retain as written d) Shall not be within 20 metres of a waterbody, including wetlands and coastal water; or e) On slopes of more than 28 degrees.	8	Reject	Recommend amendments to allow for incremental changes to the overflow path or residual overflow path that could divert the flow of floodwater.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			3. In a stream corridor or river corridor (excluding fill). a) Shall not exceed 20m ³ for any activity. This standard applies whether in relation to a particular work or as a total or cumulative; b) [delete]"				
319.28	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.1.5	Amend Rule 9B.1.5 to allow for post and wire fences in the river corridor where they do not go over or through a water body.	8	Accept	Post and wire fences within the River and Stream Corridor should be a permitted activity as they are permeable whilst being part of normal rural structures. Recommend amendment to rule 9B.1.5 (renumbered 9A.1.5).	Yes
319.29	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.1.6	Oppose in part Rule 9B.1.6 and amend Standard 1 so that it only applies to within the water body itself as follows. "Standard 1. Any works within the waterbody itself must be carried out by Wellington Regional Council, Kapiti Coast District Council, the Department of Conservation or their nominated contractors."	8	Reject	KCDC does not have any jurisdiction over works within a waterway; this is a within the jurisdiction of the regional council. The intent of the rule is to enable flood protection, erosion control and natural hazard mitigation works to be carried out by these public agencies	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
319.3 6	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	River corridor Extent	Oppose the extent of the river corridor zone over submitter's land and amend to exclude all activity areas within El Rancho including the Dell Campground and the kayak pond and shed, the horse corral and disc golf area and rezone this area Rural with a natural hazard "overflow path".	8	Reject	No technical evidence received that challenged the extent of the River Corridor Zone over the submitter's land. It includes flood and erosion prone land immediately adjacent to the river, where the risk to people and development is significant. Change to this corridor is not appropriate.	No
319.3 7	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.5.3	Concerned that subdivision is a non complying activity as part of the land is within the Rural Corridor Zone. Amend subdivision provisions so that subdivision is only non-complying where lots are entirely in the River Corridor or within the Stream Corridor as is set out in the submission.	8	Accept in part	The request is appropriate and a new rule is recommended to address submitters concerns.	Yes
340. P & Q	Bryce Moller	Policies 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5	Amend Policies 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4 to be in line with the NZCPS and the RMA.	7	Accept in part	Policy 9.2 is an appropriate approach to managing potential adverse effects, and helps fulfil Council's functions under Section 31(1)(b) of the RMA. Policy 9.4 is	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						recommended to be amended to be more in line with the intention of the NZCPS. The other policies appropriately reflect the NZCPS and the RMA.	
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
356.I	Christopher Ruthe	Policy 9.3	Oppose policy 9.3 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits	7	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation. However some amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions that may address submitter's concerns.	No
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
356.I	Christopher Ruthe	Policy 9.4	Oppose 9.4 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits, and make consequential amendments to the rules.	7	Accept in part.	The policy is recommended to be amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
356.I	Christopher Ruthe	Policy 9.5	Oppose policy 9.5 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits	7	Accept in part	" <i>undertaking and encouraging restoration</i> " is more appropriate than " <i>enable</i> " and better reflects that this Policy can be achieved through processes outside the PDP	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
358.M	Salima Padamsey	Chapter 9	That the coastal hazard provisions, including Chapters 4,2 and 9, the definitions and the maps of the PDP be withdrawn and replaced with a variation to the PDP with revised hazard lines, that identify high hazard-prone areas, objectives, policies and rules	6	N/A	As all provisions that specifically addressed coastal hazards were formally withdrawn by the Council, we cannot consider the points of submission on these matters further	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>N/A</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
358.M	Salima Padamsey	Policy 9.3	Oppose policy 9.3 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits	7	Accept in Part	Agree that the policy should give effect to the RPS, RMA and NZCPS.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	
358.	Salima	Policy 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	Recommend that the policy	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
X	Padamsey					is amended to take account of the management of risks from hazards and to clarify the purpose of the policy.	
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
358. X	Salima Padamsey	Policy 9.5	Oppose policy 9.5 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits	7	Accept in part	" <i>undertaking and encouraging restoration</i> " is more appropriate than " <i>enable</i> " and better reflects that this Policy can be achieved through processes outside the PDP.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
362. H	Gavin Bradley	Chapter 9	That the coastal hazard provisions, including Chapters 4,2 and 9, the definitions and the maps of the PDP be withdrawn and replaced with a variation to the PDP with revised hazard lines, that identify high hazard-prone areas, objectives, policies and rules	6	N/A	As all provisions that specifically addressed coastal hazards were formally withdrawn by the Council, we cannot consider the points of submission on these matters further	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>N/A</i>	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
378.5	Coastal Ratepayers Union (CRU)	River and Stream Clearance	Rules in Chapters 3, 4 and 9 should be amended to provide clarity and certainty that river and stream clearance, including mouth straightening and other maintenance activities, when undertaken by the relevant authorities, is a permitted activity. This requires express exemption from, or other amendment to, rules, zoning and notation that override permitted activity Rule 9B.1.6.	8	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to make the permitted status clearer when within KCDC and GWRC jurisdiction.	Yes
FS200, FS206, FS207, FS210, FS211, FS213, FS214, FS215, FS216, FS217, FS220, FS221, FS222, FS223, FS224, FS225, FS226, FS230, FS231, FS232, FS233, FS236, FS237, FS238, FS240			Support	8	Accept in part	As above	Yes
378. G	Coastal Ratepayers Union (CRU)	Chapter 9	That the coastal hazard provisions, including Chapters 4,2 and 9, the definitions and the maps of the PDP be withdrawn and replaced with a variation to the PDP with revised hazard lines, that identify high hazard-prone areas, objectives, policies and rules	6	N/A	As all provisions that specifically addressed coastal hazards were formally withdrawn by the Council, we cannot consider the points of submission on these matters further.	No
FS200, FS206, FS207, FS210, FS211, FS213, FS214, FS215, FS216, FS217, FS220, FS221, FS222, FS223, FS224, FS225, FS226, FS230, FS231,			Support	6	N/A	As above	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS232, FS233, FS236, FS237, FS238, FS240							
380.30	Barry, Suzanne and Timothy Mansell	Policy 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	Recommend that the policy is amended to take account of the management of risks from hazards and to clarify the purpose of the policy.	Yes
FS9, FS10, FS26, FS142, FS194			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
380.29, 30 & A	380. Barry, Suzanne and Timothy Mansell	Chapter 09. Flood Hazards	Oppose Policies 9.3 and 9.4 and some of the rules in part 9.1 of the Proposed Plan (including the associated explanations). Remove the River Corridor Zoning from Planning Map 22A as it relates to land owned by the submitter. Alternatively amend the rules to provide for subdivision of that part of the River Corridor as a Controlled Activity. Delete various overlays from the Planning Maps as they relate to and affect the submitter's land, and in the alternative make amendments to the Proposed Plan provisions to reflect its submissions.	8	Accept in part	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any amendments to the hazard mapping. However, amendments are recommended to the subdivision rules related to land located partially within the River Corridor. Do not consider that a controlled activity status is appropriate as there may be situations where the consent should be	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						declined. Some amendments are recommended to Policies 9.3 and 9.4 as a result of other submissions that may address the submitters concerns.	
394. K	Anthony Reeve	Chapter 9	That the coastal hazard provisions, including Chapters 4,2 and 9, the definitions and the maps of the PDP be withdrawn and replaced with a variation to the PDP with revised hazard lines, that identify high hazard-prone areas, objectives, policies and rules	6	N/A	As all provisions that specifically addressed coastal hazards were formally withdrawn by the Council, we cannot consider the points of submission on these matters further	No
FS229			Support	6	N/A	As above	No
411.3 9	Land Matters Ltd	Policy 9.3 & 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.3 and 9.4	7	Accept in part	Some amendments are recommended to Policies 9.3 and 9.4 as a result of other submissions that may address the submitters concerns	Yes
FS9, FS10, FS142			Support	7	Accept in part	As above	Yes
411.4	Land Matters	Rules in 9B.4	Oppose Rules in 9B.4 requires subdivision in any	8	Accept in part	A new rule is	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
0	Ltd		overflow path or residual overflow path, and not complying with a restricted discretionary standard, is treated as fully discretionary. This could be inconsistent with other provisions in the plan (for instance the Otaki South Precinct) and needs to be amended to take into account specific areas where these matters have already been addressed.			recommended that provides for discretionary activity status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the appropriate standards	
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
411.4 1	Land Matters Ltd	Rule 9B.5.2	Oppose Rule 9B.5.2 require that all new buildings in overflow or residual overflow paths is non-complying. Again this could be inconsistent with specific areas that have addressed the matter in other provisions. The rule should be deleted, or relocated to a controlled activity rule9.3 and 9.4	6 & 8	Reject	The policies support avoiding buildings in the residual overflow path.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
412.1	Oliver Meehan	Rule 9B.2.1	Oppose Rule 9B.2.1 relating to fill control areas.	8	Reject	The rule is appropriate, it ensures that when flood storage or fill control areas are altered by a development that equivalent compensatory storage or other solution is provided	No
412.2	Oliver Meehan	Chapter 09. Flood Hazards	Delete the fill control area from the submitter's property.	8	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		- Map 14C				recommend any amendments to the hazard mapping.	
416.22 & B	Hamish and Leigh Wells	Policy 9.3 & 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.3 and 9.4	3.7 & 3.8	Reject	This matter is more effectively addressed through rules in this chapter but amendments recommended in response to other submissions may address submitters concerns.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
416.23	Hamish and Leigh Wells	Rules in Chapter 9	Oppose some of the rules in part 9.1.	6	Reject	Submission does not state which rules so no action can be taken.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
416.24	Hamish and Leigh Wells	Subdivision	Amend rules to provide for subdivision of the River Corridor as a Controlled Activity.	8	Accept in part	A new rule is recommended that provides for discretionary activity status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						appropriate standards.	
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	8	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
420.03	David Hedger	Site Specific Flood hazards	Requests that the ponding area identified on sloping land on the submitters property be removed.	8	Accept in part	The technical report commissioned recommends creating a new flood hazard category Shallow Surface Flow for this area and others that experience this flood hazards. However we do not have scope provided by submissions to include all of Waikanae as recommended by Mr Fountain.	Yes
425.20	Lutz Brothers Limited and C E Lutz	Policy 9.3	Oppose Policy 9.3 as it unfairly 'taints' all subdivisions that include hazard areas.	7	Accept in part	Policy 9.3 is not recommended to be amended as requested but the rules for subdivisions in hazard areas are recommended to be altered and this may address submitters concerns.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
425.20	Lutz Brothers Limited and C E Lutz	Rules	Oppose Rules in 9.1 that lead to subdivisions that include any hazard area being non complying.	8	Reject	A controlled activity status would need to be granted by Council but there may be situations where the consent should be declined	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
425.21	Lutz Brothers Limited and C E Lutz		Remove the River Corridor Zoning from Planning Map 22A as it relates to land owned by the submitter, or alternatively amend to provide for subdivision and use of that part of the River Corridor as a Controlled Activity.	8	Accept in part	A new rule is recommended that provides for discretionary activity status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the appropriate standards. Technical evidence does not support amendments to the map.	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
425.20	Lutz Brothers Limited and C E Lutz		Oppose Policy 9.3 and some of the rules in 9.1.	7 and 8	Accept in part	The rule referred is recommended to be deleted however the policy is considered appropriate. Some amendments are	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						recommended in policy 9.3 as result of other submissions that may address the submitters concerns.	
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7 and 8</i>	<i>As above</i>		Yes
426.8 & 11	Joanna Richmond	Erosion and slope stability	Amend the moderate erosion susceptibility area identified on the submitter's land in negotiation with the submitter.	10	Accept in part	The technical report on the data used for this mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context and provisions are recommended to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS1, FS9, FS10, FS16, FS33, FS42, FS54, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS93, FS102, FS126, FS142, FS167, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186,</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
430. E	Janet Lang	Policy 9.5.	Support policy 9.5.	7	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may be recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
432. G	Stephen Lang	Policy 9.5.	Amend Policy 9.5 so that the dunes between Otaki River and Waitohu Stream be post and roped off as the Otaki lagoon area.	7	Reject	Outside of the District Plan Scope	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
440.1 1	Kapiti Coast District Council	Definition of 1 in 100-year flood event	Amend the definition of 1 in 100-year flood event to remove the words "based on information currently available".	6	Reject	The wording amendments requested are unnecessary.	No
440.1 7	Kapiti Coast District Council	Definition of Contaminated land	Amend the definition of Contaminated land to replace the words "shall have the same meaning as in" with "means the same as in section 2 of" and add the words "For sites on the Wellington Regional Council's Selected Land Use Register, it is limited to that part of a site(s) that is identified as being contaminated and is registered as 'Contamination Confirmed' (report provided)." Contaminated land	6	Accept in part	Do not agree with the need for the additional wording as is not appropriate to modify the RMA definition. The other minor wording change is supported in part as it is a simpler turn of phrase.	Yes
FS191			<i>Support in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
440.2 2	Kapiti Coast District Council	Definition of Hazardous substances	Amend the definition of Hazardous substance(s) to add "or" at the end of clause f) and change "(a)" to "(1)".	6	N/A	These amendments are minor corrections However the provisions relating to hazardous substances were withdrawn in October 2014.	No
440.2 9	Kapiti Coast District	Definition of Potentially contaminated	Amend the definition of potentially contaminated land to add the words "any of the land uses identified" prior to the words "on the HAIL".	6	Accept	This clarifies the definition.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Council	land					
<i>FS191</i>			<i>Support in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
440.3 2	Kapiti Coast District Council	Definition of Adjacent area	Add new definitions as follows. "Adjacent area means, in relation to hazardous substances, an area within 30m of a common boundary." And "Upgrading, as it applies to a network utility other than electricity or telecommunication lines, means the replacement, repair or removal of existing network utilities but does not extend to any increase in height or size or change in location whereby such work would not comply with a permitted activity standards or any condition of a resource consent for that network utility."	6	Reject	Withdrawal of the hazardous substances provisions mean it is not appropriate to add the 'adjacent area' definition. This can be further considered in conjunction with a subsequent variation or plan change.	No
<i>FS191</i>			<i>Oppose in part</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
440.5 6	Kapiti Coast District Council	Rule 9A.5.1	Requests significant wording amendments to Rule 9A.5.1 and the addition of several notes regarding applicability to other chapters.	7	Reject	The rule is proposed to be deleted in response to other submissions.	No
<i>FS177</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
440.5 7	Kapiti Coast District Council	Rule 9C.4.1	Amend Rule 9C.4.1 to delete the words" Subdivision within Fault Avoidance Areas" at the beginning of the rule and add the words" under rule 9C.3.1" at the end of the rule.	6	Accept	The wording change is appropriate.	Yes
440.5 8	Kapiti Coast District	Rule 9C.3.3	Request that reference be added in other chapters of	6	Accept	Reference to this rule is appropriate however these	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Council		the PDP to Rule 9C.3.3.			references need to occur in other chapters.	
440.5 8	Kapiti Coast District Council	Contaminated land explanatory text	Amend explanatory text [P.9-56], paragraph 1 to change "managing" to manage"	6	Accept	The change request is to correct a minor error	Yes
440.5 8	Kapiti Coast District Council	Contaminated land explanatory text	Amend in paragraph 4 of the explanatory text to correct "siub" to "sub" replace the words "for the plan" with "as well as the site and zone standards" and replace "area" with "zone"	6	Reject	This paragraph is recommended to be deleted as there are no longer any rules in this section of the chapter.	No
441.2 8	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.7	Support policy 9.7 in principle and amend by deleting the words "and the avoidance or mitigation of hazards".	7	Accept	The proposed wording is appropriate, there is often no way to avoid extreme natural hazard events	Yes
FS239			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
441.2 9	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.1	Support the policy but add a capital H to the heading	7	Accept in part	The change is appropriate. However, amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.	Yes
FS239			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>Amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.</i>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<i>Oppose in part</i>	7	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>Amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.</i>	Yes
441.30	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.5	Support Policy 9.5	7	Accept in part	Accept in part as we recommend amendments in response to other submissions.	No
			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>Amendments are recommended as a result of other submissions.</i>	Yes
441.32 & 33	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Section 9.2.1	Amend the introduction text to add " <i>Buildings in ponding areas are also susceptible to damage from flooding</i> " before the sentence beginning "New development". Amend the third paragraph of the introduction to add the words " <i>However, damage from floodwaters in ponding, residual ponding and fill control areas is likely to be caused by floodwaters entering buildings (and also mud, sewage and debris in floodwaters).</i> " to the end of the paragraph	6	Accept	The requested wording amendments are appropriate.	Yes
441.34	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Rule 9B.1.7	Seek clarification as to whether minor additions are a permitted activity in residual overflow paths, residual overflow paths or flood erosion areas and seek that they not be permitted.	8	Accept	Agree incremental additions by owners could cause flood hazard effects recommending changing	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						status to RD.	
441.3 5	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.8, 9.9, 9.10 and 9.13	Support	8	Accept	No amendment recommended in response to this submission.	No
<i>FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	8	<i>Reject</i>	<i>Incremental additions by owners could cause flood hazard effects recommending changing status to RD.</i>	<i>No</i>
441.3 6	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.11	Amend policy 9.11 to ensure that it includes all flood areas including residual overflow paths in order to be consistent with policy 9.13, by deleting "direct and residual high risk hazard" before "flooding areas." Also add "residual overflow paths" after "stream corridors, overflow paths," delete "lower risk areas including" after "lesser level of restriction in", add "residual ponding and" before "fill control areas and delete "and residual ponding" after "fill control areas".	8	Accept	The wording amendments requested are appropriate and clarify the intent of the policy.	Yes
441.3 7	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.12	Support policy 9.12 and amend to delete the word "completely" before "mitigated" and add the following words to the explanation text "... as a result of any proposed development. The applicant also needs to consider the effects on the development from the	8	Accept	The wording amendments requested are appropriate. A flood risk is unlikely to ever be 'completely' mitigated	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			residual risk that remains as a consequence of an overdesign event.				
			<i>Oppose</i>	8	<i>Reject</i>	<i>A flood risk is unlikely to ever be 'completely' mitigated</i>	No
441.38	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Flood Hazard Rules	Supports the flood hazard rules in general.	8	Accept	Some amendments may be recommended as a result of other submissions.	No
			<i>Oppose</i>	8	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>Some amendments may be recommended as a result of other submissions.</i>	No
441.39	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Rule 9B.1.3	Amend rule 9B.1.3 to include that “floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or slab” and clarity that this applies to all new buildings.	8	Accept	The wording amendments requested are appropriate and make the rule clearer.	Yes
			<i>Oppose</i>	8	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
441.40	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Rule 9B.2.2	Request that rule 9B.2.2 be amended to delete the words “overflow path, residual overflow path” as the rule appears to be a duplication of Rule 9B.1 (5)	8	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended to clarify the permitted activity rule, and	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Council		fences.			to default to restricted discretionary if the permitted activity standards are not met.	
<i>FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	8	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
441.4 2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.15	Support policy 9.15 and amend this policy to refer to "100 years" instead of "50 years".	9	Reject	ODP refers to 'within a person's lifetime'. 50 years is consistent with the life of a building under the Building Act.	No
441.4 2	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.16-9.18	Support policies 9.16-9.18.	9	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments are recommended to improve clarity.	No
<i>FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	9	<i>Accept in part.</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
441.4 3	Greater Wellington	Rules 9C.1-9 C.5	Support rules 9C.1-9 C.5.	6 & 9	Accept in part	Accept support however amendments are	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Regional Council					recommended in response to other submissions.	
441.4 4	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Erosion and slope stability	Support policy 9.18 and 9.19.	10	Reject	The technical report on the data used for the Erosion and Slope stability mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. All erosion and slope stability provisions are recommended to be deleted.	No
441.4 5	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Erosion and slope stability	Amend policy 9.18 to replace the word "risk" with "hazard".	10	Reject	The technical report on the data used for the Erosion and Slope stability mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. All erosion and slope stability provisions are recommended to be deleted.	No
441.4 6	Greater Wellington	Erosion and slope stability	Support rules 9D.1 to 9D.3.	10	Accept in part	The technical report on the data used for the Erosion	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Regional Council					and Slope stability mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. All provisions are recommended to be deleted.	
441.47	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.21	Seek amendment to policy 9.21 to add a clause d) "requiring a 5m clear of vegetation zone around habitable buildings on rural zoned land".	11	Reject	The PDP focuses on provision of water for fire fighting and access for fire appliances.	No
441.48	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Man-Made Hazards	Seek amendment to the title of the sub-chapter to "be human-included hazards. Hazardous substances/Contaminated Land or Hazards. Hazardous substances/Contaminated Land.	11	Accept in part	Man-made is not a good term. With the withdrawal of hazardous facilities provisions, the title " <i>Contaminated Land</i> " is a more accurate reflection of the content - consequential amendments are recommended throughout the chapter.	Yes
441.50	Greater Wellington	Policies 9.23, 9.25, 9.27, 9.30, 9.33,	Support policies 9.23, 9.25, 9.27, 9.30, 9.33, and 9.34.	6 & 11	Accept in part	Accept support provided however we recommended	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Regional Council	and 9.34.				amendments in response to other submissions. Policies 9.23, 9.25 and 9.27, were withdrawn in October 2014.	
441.5 5	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.29	Support Policy 9.29 to change the policy title to "identification of contaminated and potentially contaminated land" and amend to delete "risk to" and replace with "adverse effects on" before the words "the environment"	12	Accept in part	Recommend amendments to wording of heading, however, reject the wording change regarding effects as it is not in line with the NES.	Yes
<i>FS131</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>Accept in Part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
441.5 6	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.32	Support 9.32 and amend to delete "risk to" and replace with "adverse effects on".	12	Reject	The wording change regarding effects is not in line with the NES. However, some minor changes are recommended to make the policy clearer.	No
<i>FS131</i>			<i>Oppose</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
441.5 7	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Rules 9E.1 to 9E.5	Support rules 9E.1 to 9E.5 with an amendment to the numbering in 9E.1	6	Reject	These rules are recommended to deleted or withdrawn in response to other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
441.T T	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.3	Amend Policy 9.3 to read "New subdivision, land use and development activities will be located to avoid natural hazards, identified on the District Plan Maps... of natural hazards on other people and properties, including residual risks".	7	Accept	Consider that subdivision and development is a more accurate term and that "highly hazard prone areas" is not an appropriate term, given that these are not mapped.	Yes
FS29			Support	7	Accept	As above	Yes
FS227, FS239			Oppose	7	Reject	As above	No
FS234			Oppose in part	7	Reject	As above	No
441.V	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.4	Amend Policy 9.4 so that the Policy intent is clearer by adding a comma.	7	Accept	The policy is recommended to be amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS as a result of other submissions.	Yes
442.2 7	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	Policy 9.3	Amend Policy 9.3 to read "New subdivision and <u>inappropriate</u> land use..."	7	Accept in part	Some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						issue.	
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>As above</i>		Yes
443.24	Allan A Smith	Erosion and slope stability	Amend Rule 9C.1.2 to replace "15% of the total floor space of the existing room or 20m in any 10 year period" with "40m of total additional floor space in any 3 year period".	6 & 10	Reject	We assume the submitter is referring to rule 9D.1.2. The technical report on the data used for the Erosion and Slope stability mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. All provisions relating to erosion and slope stability are recommended to be deleted.	No
FS9, FS10, FS142			<i>Support</i>	10	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
444.14	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	Policy 9.3	Amend Policy 9.3 to read "New subdivision and <u>inappropriate</u> land use..."	7	Accept in part	Some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and we recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
451.II & FF	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Introduction 9.1.1	Amend introduction of Chapter 9, 9.1.1 to address the submitter's concerns	6	Reject	The introduction is considered appropriate	No
<i>FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
451.1 12	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Rule 9B.1.6	Amend provisions relating to the clearing of rivers and streams (including mouth straightening and other mitigation activities) where that occurs by or on behalf of relevant authorities should be a permitted activity, notwithstanding various zoning and other notations on the maps and notwithstanding any rules in different Chapters. In addition, any zoning or notation which interferes with the above should be removed from the maps, or the relevant rules amended to ensure that there is no restriction on river or stream clearance (including mouth straightening and other mitigation activities), and that the rules permitting such activities apply notwithstanding any other provisions of the PDP.	8	Accept in part	Accept in part to clarify that flood mitigation works complying with rule 9B.1.6 are not subject to earthworks controls in Rule 9B.1.4. Also recommend inclusion of stream corridor in rule 9B.1.6 (renumbered as Rule 9A.1.6).	Yes
<i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	8	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
451.1 13	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Whole of chapter	Request that zonings or notations be removed from maps that complicate the task of determining which rules apply to rivers or streams.	6	Accept in part	Accept in part in that some map layers that are unnecessary or found not to be justified are recommended for removal in the Section 42A report.	No
<i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
451.1 14	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Rule 9B.1.4	Amend earthworks Rule 9B.1.4.a) i) to clarify its meaning or provide a defined term. Ensure that rules in other chapters (including but not limited to Chapters 3 and 4) do not contain rules that effectively override the permitted activity Rule 9B.1.6 and consider if Rule 9B.1.6 should also refer to the relevant activities being permitted in Stream Corridors.	8	Accept in part	Recommend amendments to rule 9B.1.4 and 9B.1.6 to improve clarity, also recommend amendment to Chapters 3 Natural and 4 Coastal Environment to ensure that works carried out under Rule 9B.1.6 (renumbered as Rule 9A.1.6) are exempt from the appropriate rules regarding earthworks.	Yes
<i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
451.1 20	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Flood mapping	Remove Rural Dunes zoning from Mangaone Stream. Rural activities are not appropriate in the stream. Sub does not specify rezoning to River Corridor - just removal of inappropriate zoning.	6	Accept in part	The stream has rural dunes zoning but also stream corridor and overflow path overlays. The rules for these overlays are appropriate for a stream. However, some map layers that are unnecessary or found not to be justified are recommended for removal	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229			Support	6	Accept in part	As above	Yes
451.J J	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which were withdrawn in October 2014. The policy is considered appropriate but recommend additions to the Explanation to this policy so as to provide clarity for the Policy and to direct users of the Plan to Council's GIS maps.	No
FS224, FS229			Support	7	As above		No
451.J J	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.1	Delete Policy 9.1	7	Reject	Hazards need to identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230			Support	7	As above		No
451.	Rob Crozier	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	7	Accept in part	Policy is appropriate but	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
KK	& Joan Allin					recommend amendments to remove reference to erosion and slope stability and provide a more appropriate balance, with the focus on harm to people and property rather.	
<i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
451.L	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated, so recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
<i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
451. GG & MM	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.4	Delete Policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	Recommend amendments to the policy to focus on risk management rather	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						than risk assessment and be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	
FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230			Support	7	Accept in part	As above	Yes
451. NN	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.5	Amend Policy 9.5 to clarify what is meant by "new", to include a concept of e.g. reasonableness, and to distinguish between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred.	6	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
cvvFS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230			Support	6	Reject	As above	No
453.2	Lowell Manning	Stormwater and flood hazard modelling	Concerned with how KCDC's stormwater policies and how they affect flooding as well as flood modelling and the data this is based on.	8	N/A	Updating the PDP flood hazard maps to reflect the modelling work falls outside of the scope of the submission, however we consider it would be appropriate to update the Council's GIS based flood hazard maps to be used in the Council's decision making.	N/A
453.2	Lowell Manning	Site specific flooding	Concerned with how KCDC's stormwater policies and how they affect flooding as well as flood modelling and the data this is based on. Also has particular concerns about his sites at Vera Lane and Redwood Close.	8	N/A	Updating the PDP flood hazard maps to reflect the modelling work falls outside of the scope of the submission, however we	N/A

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						consider it would be appropriate to update the Council's GIS based flood hazard maps to be used in the Council's decision making.	
458.9	Waitohu Stream Care Group	Erosion and Slope Stability	Opposes the lines outlined on Map 01C which indicate that areas adjoining the Waitohu Stream are "Very High" in terms of their susceptibility to erosion. Seeks to have that area reclassified to "moderate" susceptibility to erosion. In this matter, submitter supports the recommendations made by the North Otaki Beach Residents Group and the remedies sought by that group.	10	Reject	The submitter has misread the maps. The notation related to coastal hazards and has since been withdrawn. Erosion and slope stability provisions are also recommended to be deleted.	No
474.1 & 2	John Harding	Flood Hazard Mapping	Requests that the Waimeha Stream Corridor width be reduced and moved off the submitters property	8	Accept in part	GWRC agree that the stream corridor should be amended on the submitter's property.	Yes
480.4 2	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Chapter 9	Request that Rule 9C.4 be amend to ensure people who are affected by development are notified and given the opportunity to approve or object.	9	Reject	Do not consider that public notification is necessary for consent applications made under Rule 9C.4.1 (renumbered 9B.4.2) to be publicly	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						notified. No other parties will be affected by a consent application made under this rule.	
480.43	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Chapter 9	Request that the whole of chapter 9 be amended to add identification numbers and correct typo etc.	6	Accept in part	The chapter is recommended to be amended to correct typos and correct numbering is required. However, most minor typos are attributed to Clause 16 (2) of schedule 1 of the RMA.	Yes
480.43	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Policy 9.4	Support Council's precautionary approach to natural hazard management and avoiding new development if high risk cannot be mitigated.	7	Accept in part	Some amendments are recommended to the Policy in response to other submissions	Yes
480.44	Kapiti Coast Grey Power Association Inc	Policy 9.5, 9.6 & 9.7	Support Council's precautionary approach to natural hazard management and avoiding new development if high risk cannot be mitigated.	7	Accept	Accept to the extent that it supports the chapter, and to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments are recommended to Policies 9.5 and 9.7 as a result of other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
496.2 & 3	M J Page	Site specific Flood hazard mapping	Requests that the ponding shown on the submitter's land be removed or any similar or consequential relief.	8	Accept	The technical report commissioned recommends amended the ponding areas as requested.	Yes
498.7	Riverbank Orchards Limited and Kennott Trust Company	General	Oppose some provisions in Chapter and seeks it is amended to give effect to the settled outcome of Operative Plan Amendments 78 and 81 or is amended to enhance development opportunities for the land subject to Plan Change 81.	6	Reject	Chapter 9 of the PDP is not significantly different to the provisions of the ODP that relate to the submitters site. Therefore, no amendments to the chapter are required.	No
501.8	Land and Infrastructure Management Ltd	Flood Hazard rules	New rules have to be development to allow housing in the flood zone provided they are suitably mitigated - that is above the minimum flood level.	8	Reject	This would increase the potential risk to people and property and not be in accordance with Objective 2.5 of the PDP	No
511.8	Mari Housiaux	Flood mapping	Amend flood hazard maps for Te Hapua Road and the wetlands on Map 18C to include weather/seasonal based ephemeral occurrence of ponding areas.	8	Reject	It is noted that the flood maps have been updated to reflect the ground contours based on the LIDAR. Overlays and section 106 should allow for all issues to be considered.	No
<i>FS197</i>			<i>Support</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
512.1 5	The Oil Companies		Amend the paragraphs under the heading section 9.6.4 Hazardous Substances and Contaminated land Rules and Standards to remove duplication with the Regional Council functions and to include NES in the District Plan as an appendix, by deleting the text "disturbance or use of contaminated or potentially contaminated land, or" and "The District Plan rules apply to managing other effects, including the effects of contaminants on eco systems." and adding the text "and is included in Appendix X", as set out in the submission.	6	Accept in part.	Rules recommended to be deleted to meet requirement not to duplicate NES. NES not included as an appendix as this is unnecessary.	Yes
512.1 6	The Oil Companies	Contaminated Land Rules	Remove rules which duplicate those in the NES, i.e. Rules 9E.1.3-9E.1.6, 9E.2.2, 9E.3.1 and 9E.3.2.	12	Accept	Rules which duplicate NES deleted.	Yes
512.1 7	The Oil Companies	Contaminated Land Policies	Support Policies 9.22, 9.23 and 9.25 and retain without further modification. Retain without modification the text under the heading Section 9.6.3 Contaminated and Potentially Contaminated Land.	12	N/A	Policies were withdrawn in October 2014.	No
512.1 8	The Oil Companies	Contaminated Land Policies	Retain without modification Policies 9.29, 9.30, 9.31, 9.32, 9.33 and 9.34.	12	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may be recommended as a result of other submissions. Note Policy 9.34 is	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						recommended to be deleted. This is a recommended consequential amendment in response to submissions 512-15 & 16 – The Oil Companies.	
512.0 2	The Oil Companies	Definitions of Contaminated Land & Potentially Contaminated land	Support the definitions of 'contaminated land' and 'potentially contaminated land'.	6	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form but amendments are recommended in response to other submissions.	No
531.1	Les Church	Site specific flood hazard mapping	Requests that Planning Map 01C be amended by removing overflow path and ponding flood notations as they apply to 5 Hewson Crescent, Otaki Beach.	8	Accept in part	The technical report commissioned recommends amending the over flow path on the submitters property and surrounding properties.	Yes
545. E	Hilary Peterson Family Trust	Chapter 9	That the coastal hazard provisions, including Chapters 4,2 and 9, the definitions and the maps of the PDP be withdrawn and replaced with a variation to the PDP with revised hazard lines, that identify high hazard-prone areas, objectives, policies and	6	N/A	As all provisions that specifically addressed coastal hazards were formally withdrawn by the	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			rules			Council, we cannot consider the points of submission on these matters further	
547.10	Tina Pope	Flood Hazard rules	Amend rules so that no rural subdivision is permitted within areas of flood ponding and overflow paths or stream corridors.	8	Reject	This would not reflect the situations where only part of the site was affected by one of these overlays. Discretionary and non-complying activity status is more than adequate to test flooding issues	No
547.11 & 15	Tina Pope	Erosion and slope stability	Amend the moderate erosion susceptibility area identified on the submitter's land in negotiation with the submitter.	10	Reject	The technical report on the data used for the Erosion and Slope stability mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. All erosion and slope stability provisions are recommended to be deleted.	No
FS92			<i>Support</i>	10	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
547.1 2	Tina Pope	Erosion and slope stability	Amend the moderate erosion susceptibility area identified on the submitter's land in negotiation with the submitter.	10	Reject	The technical report on the data used for the Erosion and Slope stability mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context. Erosion and slope stability provisions are recommended to be deleted.	No
550.4 7	Cuttriss Consultants Ltd	Rule 9C.3.3	Amend Rule 9C.3.3 to include the following text "except boundary adjustments and subdivisions not creating additional allotments".	9	Accept	Agree that this is appropriate.	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS178</i>			<i>Support</i>	9	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
582. H	Suzanne Chetwin	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS.	No
582. H & I	Suzanne Chetwin	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;			prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	
586. I	Frank & Catherine Wafer	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
586. I	Frank & Catherine Wafer	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
586. I	Frank & Catherine Wafer	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
590. G	Peter and Lynda Wood	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
590. G	Peter and Lynda Wood	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
590.G	Peter and Lynda Wood	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
617.J	Stewart & Catherine Fraser	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
617.J	Stewart & Catherine Fraser	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
617.J	Stewart &	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Catherine Fraser					on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	
618.J	David & Helen Walshaw	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
618.J	David & Helen Walshaw	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
618.J	David & Helen	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Walshaw					rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	
631.8	Michael Alexander	Rule 9B.1.6	Amend Rule 9B.1.6 to make river and stream clearance, including mouth straightening and other maintenance activities, when undertaken by the relevant authorities, exempt from this Rule to allow it as a permitted activity.	8	Accept in part	Accept in part to clarify that flood mitigation works complying with rule 9B.1.6 (renumbered 9A.1.6) are not subject to earthworks controls in Rule 9B.1.4 (renumbered 9A.1.4).	Yes
637.1	Susan Jane Baird	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
637.1	Susan Jane Baird	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided,	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	
637.I	Susan Jane Baird	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
638.I	Patrick Murray	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
638.I	Patrick Murray	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	
638.I	Patrick Murray	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
641.I	Barbara & Murray Scott	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
641.I	Barbara & Murray Scott	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						wording to address the issue.	
641.1	Barbara & Murray Scott	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
644.5, 6 & 7	Ian Sheen	Chapter 9	Oppose entire chapter where it. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is contrary to, does not give effect to or does not have adequate regard for the RMA, NZ Coastal Policy Statement, Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement. - has not been subject to appropriate section 32 evaluations\includes terms that are defined in Chapter 1 that have not been italicised and the use of those terms is unclear. - includes italicised terms where no definition has been provided in Chapter 1 and the appropriateness of the definition is therefore not apparent 	6	Accept in part	Amendments are recommended where appropriate to ensure consistency with higher order documents.	Yes
653. BB	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						of the RPS	
653. CC	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	7	Accept in part	Policy is appropriate but recommend amendments to remove reference to erosion and slope stability and provide a more appropriate balance, with the focus on harm to people and property rather	Yes
653. DD	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
653. EE	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	
653.F F	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.5	Amend Policy 9.5 to clarify what is meant by "new", to include a concept of e.g. reasonableness, and to distinguish between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred.	6	Reject	We consider the word 'new' is sufficiently clear.	No
653. HH	Quentin Poole	Rules	Amend all rules [in Chapter 9] by deleting and replacing with new rules	6	Reject	The recommended rules that remain within Chapter 9 are appropriate.	No
653.L & AA	Quentin Poole	Chapter 9	Delete Chapter 9 in its entirety.	6	Reject	Remaining provisions in Chapter 9 are based on robust scientific information.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>As above</i>		<i>No</i>
674. D	Brian Pegler	Chapter 9	Oppose parts of sections 9	6	Reject	No specific remedy is sought.	No
699.3	Rosalind Poole	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS193			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
699.4	Rosalind Poole	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	7	Accept in part	Policy is appropriate but recommend amendments to remove reference to erosion and slope stability and provide a more appropriate balance, with the focus on harm to people and property rather	Yes
FS193			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
699.5	Rosalind Poole	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
FS193			<i>Oppose</i>	7	Accept in part	Some changes are recommended to the policy in response to other	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						submission but not all.	
699.6	Rosalind Poole	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
FS193			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>Accept to the extent that further submitter supports the policy but amendments are recommended in response to the submission.</i>	No
699.7	Rosalind Poole	Policy 9.5	Amend Policy 9.5 to clarify what is meant by "new", to include a concept of e.g. reasonableness, and to distinguish between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred.	6	Reject	We consider the word 'new' is sufficiently clear.	No
FS193			<i>Oppose</i>	6	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	No
699.1 & L	Rosalind Poole	Chapter 9	Delete Chapter 9 in its entirety.	7	Reject	Remaining provisions in Chapter 9 are based on robust scientific information.	No
FS193			<i>Oppose</i>	7	<i>Accept</i>	<i>As above</i>	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
699.8	Rosalind Poole	Rules	Amend all rules [in Chapter 9] by deleting and replacing with new rules	6	Reject	The rules that remain of chapter 9 are appropriate.	No
705.L	Neil Butler	Chapter 9	That the coastal hazard provisions, including Chapters 4,2 and 9, the definitions and the maps of the PDP be withdrawn and replaced with a variation to the PDP with revised hazard lines, that identify high hazard-prone areas, objectives, policies and rules	6	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions.	No
715.S	Sharif Family Trust	Chapter 9	Oppose the parts of Chapter 9 that relate to coastal hazard management.	6	Reject	The coastal hazard provisions were withdrawn, the basis for the remaining provisions appears to us to be based on robust and defensible scientific information.	No
738.A	Denis & Jan Toohey	Policy 9.4	Oppose precautionary approach identified in Chapter 9 policies	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
756.L	Pascal Odijk	Chapter 9	Oppose the parts of Chapter 9 that relate to coastal hazard management.	6	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
756. A	Pascal Odijk	Policy 9.3	Oppose policy 9.3 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits	7	Accept in part	Some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
756. A	Pascal Odijk	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
756. A	Pascal Odijk	Policy 9.5	Oppose policy 9.5 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits	7	Accept in part	<i>"undertaking and encouraging restoration"</i> is more appropriate than <i>"enable"</i> and better reflects that this Policy can be achieved through processes outside the PDP.	Yes
757.L	Marianne	Chapter 9	Oppose the parts of Chapter 9 that relate to coastal hazard management.	6	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Tavenier					coastal hazard provisions.	
757.L	Marianne Tavenier	Policy 9.3	Oppose policy 9.3 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits.	7	Accept in part	Some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	Yes
757.A	Marianne Tavenier	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
757.L	Marianne Tavenier	Policy 9.5	Oppose policy 9.5 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits.	7	Accept in part	<i>"undertaking and encouraging restoration"</i> is more appropriate than <i>"enable"</i> and better reflects that this Policy can be achieved through processes outside the PDP.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
762.0 5 & UU	Lydia Johnston	Introduction 9.1.1	Amend introduction of Chapter 9, 9.1.1 to address the submitter's concerns	6	Reject	The introduction is considered appropriate.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
762.7 & VV	Lydia Johnston	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
762.0 6 & 8	Lydia Johnston	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	7	Accept in part	Policy is appropriate but recommend amendments to remove reference to erosion and slope stability and provide a more appropriate balance, with the focus on harm to people and property rather	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	Accept in part	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
762.6 , 9 &	Lydia Johnston	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity,	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
XX			and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;			but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the issue.	
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
762.6 10 & YY	Lydia Johnston	Policy 9.4	Delete Policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>	7	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>Yes</i>
762.0 6 & 11	Lydia Johnston	Policy 9.5	Amend Policy 9.5 to clarify what is meant by "new", to include a concept of e.g. reasonableness, and to distinguish between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred.	6	Reject	We consider the word 'new' is sufficiently clear.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Reject</i>	<i>As above</i>	<i>No</i>
762.T T	Lydia Johnston	Chapter 9 General	Amend chapter to use consistent terminology in references to terms such as "coastal hazards", "coastal erosion" and "coastal erosion hazard".	6	Accept in part	Consistency of terminology is important.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS229			<i>Support</i>	6	<i>Accept in part</i>	<i>As above</i>	Yes
769. K	Denise Church & Michael Veneer	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	7	Reject	Hazards need to be identified. The policy is appropriate and assists KCDC in meeting the requirements of Policy 29 of the RPS.	No
769. K	Denise Church & Michael Veneer	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues.	7	Accept in part	Policy is appropriate but recommend amendments to remove reference to erosion and slope stability and provide a more appropriate balance, with the focus on harm to people and property.	Yes
769. K	Denise Church & Michael Veneer	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	7	Accept in part	The word 'new' in the policy provides this clarity, but some land uses may be appropriate in hazard prone areas where the effects can be avoided, remedied or mitigated and recommend alternative wording to address the	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of Panel's Report	Panel's Recommendation	Panel's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						issue.	
769. K	Denise Church & Michael Veneer	Policy 9.4	Delete Policy 9.4	7	Accept in part	The Policy should focus on risk management rather than risk assessment. Recommend amendments to the policy to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS.	Yes