

## Section 5. Recommendations to Submissions and Further Submissions

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer'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.	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 was never intended to apply to coastal hazards which were covered by Chapter 4 which has been withdrawn.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.	3.33	Reject	The technical report commissioned does not recommend a change to the fault avoidance area.	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.	3.22	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.	3.34	Accept	The technical report on the data used for this mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						context.	
44.13	MY and SA Blackburne	Contaminated Land Rules	Delete Rules 9E.1 to 9E.	3.34	Accept	All of the provisions referred to have been withdrawn or are proposed to be deleted in response to other submissions.	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.	3.3	Reject	Tsunami is a low level risk, best addressed outside the PDP with early warning system and civil defence plans. Volcanic eruptions not a high risk.	No
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>Oppose</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.	3.30	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes 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	3.34	Accept	The technical report on the data used for this mapping	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			submitter's property as shown in map attached to submission.			states that the data is not suitable for use in this context.	
FS39			Support				
92.11 30	Winstone Aggregates	Policy 9.4	Retain Policy 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and 9.5	3.8	Accept in part	Accept that the policies are appropriate but make changes in response to other submissions.	No
92.6	Winstone Aggregates	Definition of hazardous activities	Request that the definition of hazardous activities be deleted	3.39	Accept	Agree delete as there is no context for the definition.	Yes
92.17	Winstone Aggregates	Definition of River Corridor	Retain the definition of River Corridor	3.39	Accept	Accept to the extent that the definition of 'river corridor' is retained in its current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	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	Seeks to exclude gravel extraction activities from rules that address development, buildings, structures and earthworks within the River Corridor	3.28	Accept in part	It is not necessary to specifically exclude gravel extraction from all of these rules as the amended definition of earthworks now excludes extractive industries. Specific	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		9B.4.5				exclusion has been added where considered necessary and appropriate.	
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	3.28	Accept in part	Exceptions have been added to these rule where appropriate and not covered by changes to the definition of earthworks to exclude extractive industries. However, some of the rules are appropriate as notified.	Yes
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.."	3.28	Accept in part	Deleting the entire rule is considered appropriate.	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 changes	3.12, 3.14, 3.15, 3.17	Reject	The policy proposed is not appropriate.	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);	3.28	Accept in part	An exception has been added to the standard 9B.1.2 (which is now 9A.1.1). A new RD activity	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						is also proposed for permanent buildings in the River Corridor associated with gravel extraction activities. Gravel extraction should be excluded from Rule 9B.1.4 but this has been achieved by excluding 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.	3.28	Reject	It is considered appropriate that permanent buildings and plant associated with gravel extraction in the River Corridor require consent.	No
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."	3.28	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

<b>Sub. No.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Section of this Report</b>	<b>Officer's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer's Reasons / Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Amendments to PDP?</b>
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).	3.28	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 ..."	3.28	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 ..."	3.28	Accept	This has been achieved by excluding extraction industries from the definition of earthworks.	No
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 ..."	3.28	Accept in part	Accept that gravel extraction activities provided for as a PA activity should be exempt from this rule. However, this has been achieved by	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						amendments to the definition of earthworks to exclude extraction industries	
92.126	Winstone Aggregates	Rule 9B.4.4	Amend Rule 9B.4.s 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].	3.28	Accept	Rule deleted consequential on acceptance of 92.119. Default discretionary activity applies. Amend Rule 9B.5.4 to recognise that some buildings are permitted for gravel extraction activities.	No
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.	3.28	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).	3.34	Accept	The technical report on the data used for this mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context.	Yes
138.6	Bride Coe	Whole of Chapter	Requests that all reference to ERMA are removed as	3.3	Reject	There are no references to ERMA to be deleted.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			the agency no longer exists.				
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.	3.30	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes to the hazard mapping.	No
<i>FS167</i>			<i>Support</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.	3.12	Reject	Concerns relate to issues that are outside of the scope and/or control of the PDP.	No
<i>FS167</i>			<i>Support</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.	3.12	Reject	Concerns relate to issues that are outside of the scope and/or control of the PDP.	No
<i>FS167</i>			<i>Support</i>				
172.9	Richard Heerdegen &	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".	3.34	Reject	Submitter has misread the maps. The notation	No



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Johanna Rosier					related to coastal hazards and has since been withdrawn	
176.1	Kerry Dalton	Flood mapping	Amend Map 16C to remove the ponding layer from 8 Tangahoe Street.	3.30	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.	3.39	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.	3.11	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 proposed to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS41, FS142, FS167</i>			<i>Support</i>				
198.N	Helen Punton	Policy 9.1	Oppose Policy 9.1	3.5	Reject	Identifying hazards is necessary and required by the RPS. The policy is appropriate.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
198.P	Helen Punton	Policy 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
198.Q	Helen Punton	Policy 9.4	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'.	3.9	Reject	No reasoning is given as to why this amendment is appropriate	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
202.Q Q	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.1	Amend Policy 9.1 to describe the benefits of identifying natural hazards in the explanation	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	No
202.R R	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 appropriate use in lower risk areas"	3.6	Accept in part	The policy has been amended to take into account a wider area of risk.	Yes
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS234			<i>Oppose in part</i>				
202.S S	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 explanation to read "The District Plan manages risk ... The District Plan identifies where risks from natural hazards are most significant, avoids subdivision and new development that will increase the risk of harm, and encourages redevelopment that will reduce the risk of harm over time. Specific coastal hazards policies..."	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	No
202.U U	Department of Conservation	Introduction 9.1.1	Support	3.4	Accept	The introduction is appropriate.	No
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>				
202.T T	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"	3.6	Accept in part	Have amended along the lines of those proposed but not used exact wording.	Yes
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>				
FS234			<i>Oppose in part</i>				
202.T	Department	Policy 9.3	Support Policy 9.3	3.7	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
T	of Conservation					the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			Oppose				
202.U U	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.3 explanation	Amend Policy 9.3 explanation to read "The modelling of hazard risks is based on a hazard event such as the 100-year return period flood. There is around a 63% chance of such a 100-year return period event (or a 1% annual exceedance probability event) occurring within a 100-year timeframe. It is important to understand that mitigation of, or protection from, the modeled event does not mean that a property is safe from the risk of harm from natural hazards. Hazard events larger than the modeled event can and will happen - for example, there is around a 33% chance of a 250-year return period event (or 0.4% AEP event) occurring within a 100-year timeframe" (source: Coastal Hazards and Climate Change MfE 2008)	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	No
202.V V	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	3.8	Accept in part	Policy 9.4 has been amended to be more in line with the intention of	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			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”			the NZCPS including adding in the term significantly adverse.	
FS29, FS113, FS200, FS227, FS230, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>				
FS234			<i>Oppose in part</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”	3.9	Accept in part	Policy 9.4 has been 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>				
202.X X	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.5 explanation	Amend Policy 9.5 explanation to acknowledge beaches as another natural feature that serve an important buffering function against erosion, and that this function was recognised in the Kapiti Coast District when Paraparaumu Beach was renourished in the 1990s	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
202.Y Y	Department of Conservation	Policy 9.6 explanation	Amend Policy 9.6 explanation to address the impact of natural hazards on the availability into the future of open space so as not to compromise the ability of future generations to have access to public open space.	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	No
205.1 0	Margaret Bilisland	Flood mapping	That the ponding flood area be removed on 61 Moana Street and the surrounding areas.	3.30	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes to the hazard mapping.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
205.1 0	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).	3.40	Reject	Reject. Seeks no relief in its own right. Functions as a further submission.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
208.4 5	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.	3.11	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 proposed to be deleted.	Yes
FS106, FS125, FS130			<i>Oppose</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
208.50	Transpower	Policy 9.3	Support Policy 9.3	3.7	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	No
208.48	Transpower	Rule 9B.5.4	Oppose Rule 9B.5.4 and amend to "exclude buildings 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.	3.27	Accept in part	The definition of building has been amended to exclude network utilities and the rules relevant to network utilities in hazard areas are now considered in Chapter 11.	No
FS125, FS130							
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.	3.40	Reject	This submission refers to the whole of the plan and should have been coded as such to the whole of plan chapter.	No
FS9, FS10, FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS139, FS142, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186			Support				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
212.50	Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board)	Rule 9C.3.1	Oppose in part Rule 9C.3.1 and delete matters of discretion 2-6.	3.32	Reject	Review of subdivision rules throughout the Plan shows that this approach is consistent throughout the PDP. Amending it in this one instance would be confusing.	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>				
212.51	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).	3.32	Reject	The information requirement is the same as in the ODP, as inserted by PC61.	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>				
212.5	Quicksilver Enterprises	Policy 9.14	Support Policy 9.14. Retain without amendment.	3.31	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained	No



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
2	(Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board)					in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	
<i>FS9, FS10, FS42, FS57, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS102, FS139, FS142, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186</i>			<i>Support</i>				
212.5 3	Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board)	Rule 9C.1(2)	Support Rule 9C.1(2). Retain without amendment.	3.31	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	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>				
216.1 0	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).	3.30	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes to the hazard mapping.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
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 identified	3.11	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 proposed to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS51, FS125</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.20	Accept in part	Accept. This type of proposal is appropriate for RD rather than D.	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.	3.39	Reject	The provisions which refer to code of practice have been withdrawn. The generic definition proposed by the submitter is a commonly understood meaning, and a definition is not required.	No
219.0	Horticulture	Definition of	Delete the definitions of Hazardous activity and	3.39	Accept	The definition of	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
8	New Zealand	Hazardous activity	Hazardous facility.			hazardous facility has been withdrawn. The definition of hazardous activity was only relevant in conjunction with the 'hazardous facility' definition. As the definition has no use or context it should be deleted.	
219.1 2	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.	3.39	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
219.6 5	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	3.39	Reject	The rule referred to has been withdrawn. The definition of potentially contaminated land is in	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			that existing horticultural land is not classed as potentially contaminated land.			line with the NES.	
229.6, 7 & 8	Gordon and Sylvia Moller	Stream and River clearance	Amended to the 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.	3.20	Accept in part.	Stream and river clearance and mouth cutting is under the jurisdiction of the GWRC as it occurs in the waters or bed of a waterway. However, some of the related wording has been amended to be clearer.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
252.17	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.	3.8	Accept in part	Some changes are being made to the Policy in response to other submissions	Yes
252.18	Regional Public Health	Whole of Chapter	Support the consideration given to the effects of climate change and the vulnerability of the districts coastal hazards	3.3	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 result from other submissions.	No
262.1	Bunnings Ltd	Rule 9B.1.4	Delete rule 9B.1.4 to the extent that it applies to lot 1	3.20	Accept in part	Changes are	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
2	/ Our Lady of Kāpiti		DP441854.			recommended to the ponding area on the site (refer below) but not to the earthworks rules.	
262.24	Bunnings Ltd / Our Lady of Kāpiti	Map 11C	Delete the "ponding area" on map 11C affecting lots 1 and 2 DP441854.	3.30	Accept in part	The expert report commissioned recommends a change to the ponding area on the site.	Yes
263.5	Maypole Environmental Ltd	Rule 9A.5.1	Remove Rule 9A.5.1	3.11	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 proposed to be deleted.	Yes
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.	3.18 & 25	Accept in part	The Neighbourhood Development Area process under Chapter 5 is comprehensive and would consider flood hazard issues in an integrated manner. <del>Agree that the consent processes should not be</del>	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						<del>duplicated. However, there could be instances where the hazard information has changed between consents, therefore it is necessary that these issues be re-considered. Agree that if the NDP process is amended to fully consider flood hazards then this assessment does not need to be repeated.</del>	
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	3.18 & 3.25	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.	3.15	Reject	The wording change proposed by GWRC mitigates these concerns and I believe the policy is now appropriate.	No
263.37	Maypole Environmental	Stream Corridor,	Delete the following from Map series 6, 7 and 9 (and any associated references in the Proposed District	3.30	Reject	These layers are appropriate and	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	I Ltd	Storage Areas and Ponding Areas	Plan), insofar as they are not identified in the existing District Plan: c) Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay; 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).			applications for these areas should address hazard effects.	
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.	3.40	Reject	Relevant assessment will occur as part of any subdivision and development application. Not appropriate to amend 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				
		FS147	Support in part				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS80, FS128			<i>Oppose</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.	3.35	Reject	Policy and rules relate to facilitating firefighting. Not on fire prevention	No
FS17, FS18, FS36, FS149, FS151, FS152, FS162, FS163			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.35	Reject	Clearance around power lines and sale of fireworks are handled by legislation. Fire bans are better handled by bylaws.	No
FS17, FS18, FS36, FS149, FS151, FS152, FS162, FS163			<i>Support</i>				
267.3	Lyndon Enterprises Ltd	Other matters	Support the comments made by the NZ Farm Forestry Association regarding the treatment of erosion susceptibility.	3.40	Reject	Seeks no relief in its own right.	No
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.			<i>Support</i>				



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
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.	3.11	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 proposed to be deleted.	Yes
<i>FS51, FS55, FS145</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.30	<u>Reject Accept in part</u>	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes to the hazard mapping. <u>However, have recommended an amendment to the explanation of Policy 9.1 and in the introduction to the flood hazard provisions to note that there may be more up to date maps of hazard extents.</u>	<u>NoYes</u>
276.4	Kāpiti Coast	Policy 9.4, Rules 9.1.3	Amend Policy 9.4, Rules 9.1.3 and 9.1.4 to remove reference to precautionary approach and amend	3.8 &	Accept in part	The precautionary	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
5	Airport Holdings Ltd	and 9.1.4	activity status of subdivision and development from non complying to restricted discretionary.	3.11		approach is considered appropriate. Changes have been made to the status of subdivision although they are not exactly as requested. The changes proposed are appropriate.	
280.27	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	3.7	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
280.27	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 changes to the rules.	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
280.27	Bryce Wilkinson	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	3.9	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
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.	3.3	Reject	The term net benefits is undefined and could possibly be very wide ranging. Proving such a concept of net benefit would be extremely onerous, complicated and expensive for applications.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</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.	3.40	Reject	The council has obligations under the RMA and higher order RMA documents to address hazards.	No
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.29	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	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						to be declined.	
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.	3.20	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.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
319.23	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	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.	3.15	Reject	These areas need to be kept clear to maintain the ability of waters to flow freely.	No
319.23	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.4.1	Amend rule to read "Subdivision of land located within <del>any</del> <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>	3.29	Accept in part	Accept in part a new rule is proposed that allows for D status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the appropriate standards.	Yes
319.23	Waikanae Christian	Rule 9B.5.3	Subdivision in the Stream corridor <u>and/or subdivision creating lots entirely within the River corridor zone.'</u>	3.29	Accept in part	Accept in part, the request is appropriate however it	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)					has been worded differently.	
319.26 & 27	Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho)	Rule 9B.1.4	<p>Amend Rule 9B.1.4 to read. "1. In an overflow path or residual overflow path (excluding fill).</p> <p>a) Shall not involve the disturbance of more than 20m3 of land for any activity;</p> <p>b) and c) retain as written</p> <p>d) Shall not be within 20 metres of a waterbody, including wetlands and coastal water; or</p> <p>e) On slopes of more than 28 degrees.</p> <p>3. In a stream corridor or river corridor (excluding fill).</p> <p>a) Shall not exceed 20m3 for any activity. This standard applies whether in relation to a particular work or as a total or cumulative;</p> <p>b) [delete]"</p>	3.20	Reject	The proposed changes would allow for incremental changes to the overflow path or residual overflow path that could divert the flow of floodwater.	No
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.	3.22	<del>Reject</del> Accept	<del>Private works within the river corridor should require a more thorough consenting regime as they are not generally carried out as part of an agreed river scheme or floodplain</del>	<del>No</del> <u>Yes</u>

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						<del>management plan.</del> <u>Agree with the expert evidence of Sharyn Westlake of GWRC that a permitted activity is appropriate as provided for in the PDP.</u>	
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."	3.22	Reject	Fences in river corridors, even if post and wire, will act to trap debris and may effectively constrict the flood flow and divert the flow of floodwater.	No
319.29	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".	3.30	Reject	The River Corridor is the minimum area able to contain a flood of up to the 1%AEP magnitude and enable flood water to pass safely to the sea. It includes flood and erosion prone land immediately adjacent to the river, where the risk to people and development is	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						significant. Change to this corridor is not appropriate.	
319.37	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.	3.29	Accept in part	Accept in part, the request is appropriate however it has been worded differently.	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.	3.5, 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8	Accept in part	Policy 9.4 has been amended to be more in line with the intention of the NZCPS. The other policies are considered to appropriately reflect the NZCPS and the RMA.	Yes
<i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i>			<i>Support</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	3.7	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation	No
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</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	3.8	Amend policy but do not	The policy has been amended to be more in	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			requirement to evaluate costs and benefits, and make consequential changes to the rules.		delete	line with the intentions of the NZCPS	
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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	3.9	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions	No
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</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	3.7	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation	No
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
358.X	Salima Padamsey	Policy 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of	Yes



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						the NZCPS	
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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	3.9	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.20	Reject in part	Amendments have been made to make the permitted status clearer when within KCDC jurisdiction.	Yes
FS200, FS206, FS207, FS210, FS211, FS213, FS214, FS215,			<i>Support</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS216, FS217, FS220, FS221, FS222, FS223, FS 224, FS225, FS226, FS230, FS231, FS232, FS233, FS236, FS237, FS238, FS240</i>							
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	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions	No
<i>FS200, FS206, FS207, FS210, FS211, FS213, FS214, FS215, FS216, FS217, FS220, FS221, FS222, FS223, FS 224, FS225, FS226, FS230, FS231, FS232, FS233, FS236, FS237, FS238, FS240</i>							
380.30	Barry, Suzanne and Timothy Mansell	Policy 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS26, FS142, FS194</i>							
380.2	380. Barry,	Chapter 09.	Oppose Policies 9.3 and 9.4 and some of the rules in	3.7, 3.8,	Accept in part	The expert report	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
9, 30 & A	Suzanne and Timothy Mansell	Flood Hazards	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.	3.30		commissioned does not recommend any changes to the hazard mapping. However, changes are recommended to the subdivision rules related to land located partially within the River Corridor	
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	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions	No
<i>FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
411.3 9	Land Matters Ltd	Policy 9.3 & 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.3 and 9.4	3.7 & 3.8	Accept in part	The part of the submission point that relates to Policy 9.4 is no longer relevant as it relates to the withdrawn CHMAs. Policy 9.3 has not been amended as requested but the rules for subdivisions in hazard	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						areas have been altered.	
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>				
411.40	Land Matters Ltd	Rules in 9B.4	Oppose Rules in 9B.4 requires subdivision in any 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.	3.29	<u>Reject</u> <u>Accept in part</u>	<del>It is appropriate to considered flood hazards at all stages of development as the effects may have changed over time. The plan Change for the Otaki South Precinct was comprehensive and considered flood hazards in detail, therefore development that is inline with this plan change should be exempt from the requirements of Chapter 9.</del>	<del>No</del> <u>Yes</u>
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>				
411.41	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 rule 9.3 and 9.4	3.26	<u>Reject</u> <u>Accept in part</u>	<del>The policies support avoiding buildings in the residual overflow path. As above</del>	<del>No</del> <u>Yes</u>
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
412.1	Oliver Meehan	Rule 9B.2.1	Oppose Rule 9B.2.1 relating to fill control areas.	3.20	Reject	Reject. The rule is appropriate.	No
412.2	Oliver Meehan	Chapter 09. Flood Hazards - Map 14C	Delete the fill control area from the submitter's property.	3.30	Reject	The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes to the hazard mapping.	No
416.22 & B	Hamish and Leigh Wells	Policy 9.3 & 9.4	Oppose Policy 9.3 and 9.4	3.7 & 3.8	Accept in part	The part of the submission point that relates to Policy 9.4 is no longer relevant as it relates to the withdrawn CHMAs. Policy 9.3 has not been amended as requested but the rules for subdivisions in hazard areas have been altered.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
416.23	Hamish and Leigh Wells	Rules in Chapter 9	Oppose some of the rules in part 9.1.	N/A	Reject	Submission does not state which rules so no action can be taken	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
416.24	Hamish and Leigh Wells	Subdivision	Amend rules to provide for subdivision of the River Corridor as a Controlled Activity.	2.29	Accept in part	Accept in part a new rule is proposed that allows for	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						D status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the appropriate standards	
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
420.03	David Hedger	Site Specific Flood hazards	Requests that the ponding area identified on sloping land on the submitters property be removed.	3.30	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.	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.	3.7	Accept in part	Policy 9.3 has not been amended as requested but the rules for subdivisions in hazard areas have been altered.	No
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</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.	3.5	Accept	This rule has been deleted as it was not effects based.	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
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.	3.30	Accept in part	Accept in part a new rule is proposed that allows for D status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the appropriate standards	
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>				
425.20	Lutz Brothers Limited and C E Lutz		Oppose Policy 9.3 and some of the rules in 9.1.	3.7 & 3.11	Accept in part	The rule referred to has been deleted however the policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
<i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.34	Accept	The technical report on the data used for this mapping states that the data is not suitable for use in this context.	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>				
430.E	Janet Lang	Policy 9.5.	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from	3.9	Accept	Accept to the extent that	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			other submissions.			the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.9	Reject	Outside of the District Plan Scope	No
FS229			<i>Support</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".	3.39	Accept	The wording proposed to be deleted is unnecessary.	Yes
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	3.39	Accept in part	Reject 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.	
FS191			<i>Support in part</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)".	3.39	Accept	These changes are minor corrections.	Yes



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
440.29	Kapiti Coast District Council	Definition of Potentially contaminated land	Amend the definition of potentially contaminated land to add the words "any of the land uses identified" prior to the words "on the HAIL".	3.39	Accept	This makes the definition make more sense.	Yes
<i>FS191</i>			<i>Support in part</i>				
440.32	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."	3.39	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>				
440.56	Kapiti Coast District Council	Rule 9A.5.1	Requests significant wording changes to Rule 9A.5.1 and the addition of several notes regarding applicability to other chapters.	3.11	Reject	The rule is proposed to be deleted in response to other submissions.	No
<i>FS177</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
440.57	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	3.32	Accept	The wording change is appropriate.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			of the rule.				
440.58	Kapiti Coast District Council	Rule 9C.3.3	Request that reference be added in other chapters of the PDP to Rule 9C.3.3.	3.32	Accept	Reference to this rule is appropriate however, these references need to occur in other chapters.	No
440.58	Kapiti Coast District Council	Contaminated land explanatory text	Amend explanatory text [P.9-56], paragraph 1 to change "managing" to manage"	3.36	Accept	The change request is to correct a minor error	Yes
440.58	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"	3.36	Reject	This paragraph has been deleted as there are no longer any rules in this section of the chapter.	No
441.28	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".	3.10	Accept	Accept the proposed wording is appropriate.	Yes
FS239			<i>Oppose</i>				
441.29	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.1	Support the policy but add a capital H to the heading	3.5	Accept	The change is appropriate	Yes
FS239			<i>Oppose</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189			Oppose in part				
441.30	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.5	Support Policy 9.5	3.9	Accept	Accept in so far as other submissions may request changes to wording.	No
FS239			Oppose				
441.31	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.6 Explanation	Support Policy 9.6 and amend so that sea level rise as well as climate change are also given as reasons to acquire land for open space. Amend explanation text to add "the effects of sea level rise as well as climate change" after "associated with natural hazards, and".	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	No
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	3.12	Accept	The wording changes are appropriate.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
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.	3.23	Accept	Agree incremental additions by owners could cause flood hazard effects recommending changing status to RD.	Yes
441.35	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.8, 9.9,9.10 and 9.13	Support	3.13 & 3.16	Accept	No amendment recommended. Supports.	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>				
441.36	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".	3.14	Accept	The wording changes are appropriate.	Yes
441.3	Greater	Policy 9.12	Support policy 9.12 and amend to delete the word	3.15	Accept	The wording changes are	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
7	Wellington Regional Council		"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 residual risk that remains as a consequence of an overdesign event.			appropriate.	
FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189			<i>Oppose</i>				
441.3 8	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Flood Hazard Rules	Supports the flood hazard rules in general.	3.18	Accept	Accept the proposed wording is appropriate.	Yes
FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189			<i>Oppose</i>				
441.3 9	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.	3.21	Accept	The wording changes are appropriate.	Yes
FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178,			<i>Oppose</i>				

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189</i>							
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) fences.	3.25	Accept in part	The rule is not a duplication as it allows for where the standards of 9B.1.5 cannot be met. However, amendments are proposed to make this relationship clearer.	Yes
<i>FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189</i>							
441.41	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.15	Support policy 9.15 and amend this policy to refer to "100 years" instead of "50 years".	3.31	Reject	ODP refers to 'within a person's lifetime'. 50 years is consistent with the life of a building under the Building Act.	No
441.41	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.16-9.18	Support policies 9.16-9.18.	3.31	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<i>Oppose</i>				
			<i>FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189</i>				
441.4 3	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Rules 9C.1-9 C.5	Support rules 9C.1-9 C.5.	3.32	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	No
441.4 4	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Erosion and slope stability	Support policy 9.18 and 9.19.	3.34	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 provisions are to be deleted.	Yes
441.4 5	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Erosion and slope stability	Amend policy 9.18 to replace the word "risk" with "hazard".	3.34	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	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						provisions are to be deleted.	
441.4 6	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Erosion and slope stability	Support rules 9D.1 to 9D.3.	3.34	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 provisions are to be deleted.	Yes
441.4 7	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".	3.35	Reject	The PDP focuses on provision of water for firefighting and access for fire appliances.	No
441.4 8	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Man-Mad 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	3.36	Accept in part	Agree in part. Man-made is not a good term. Now just changed to Contaminated Land – consequential changes are made throughout the chapter.	Yes
441.5	Greater	Policies 9.23, 9.25,	Support policies 9.23, 9.25, 9.27, 9.30, 9.33, and 9.34.	3.37	Accept in part	Accept to the extent that	No



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
0	Wellington Regional Council	9.27, 9.30, 9.33, and 9.34.				the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions. Policies 9.23, 9.25 and 9.27, have been withdrawn.	
441.55	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"	3.37	Accept in part	Accept proposed wording changes to heading however reject the wording change regarding effects as it is not in line with the NES.	Yes
<i>FS131</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
441.56	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.32	Support 9.32 and amend to delete "risk to" and replace with "adverse effects on".	3.37	Reject	The wording change regarding effects is not in line with the NES.	No
<i>FS131</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
441.57	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	3.38	Reject	These rules have been deleted or withdrawn in response to other submissions.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer'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".	3.7	Accept		Yes
FS29			<i>Support</i>				
FS227, FS239			<i>Oppose</i>				
FS234			<i>Oppose in part</i>				
441.U	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.3 explanation	Amend Policy 9.3 explanation to read "... as a larger event than the modeled event may occur which is what is known as residual risk. The residual risk will also need to be appropriately managed"	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	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.	3.8	Accept	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
441.W	Greater Wellington Regional Council	Policy 9.4 explanation	Amend explanation of Policy 9.4 to read "... In relation to hazard provisions and mapping in this plan, the precautionary approach has been considered when undertaking hazard modeling and creating development restrictions to manage natural hazards", and paragraph 3 to read "A precautionary approach will be applied when further site specific investigations identify that the activity proposed is	N/A	Reject	The explanations to policies are proposed to be deleted in line with a whole of plan direction.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			appropriate to the natural hazard risks on the site. This approach will be taken to natural hazards that are present in the district but are not mapped in the District Plan maps as there is poor information about the scale and extent of the hazard risks for those hazards. This includes potential liquefaction risk and fire risk."				
442.27	Chorus New Zealand Ltd	Policy 9.3	Amend Policy 9.3 to read "New subdivision and <u>inappropriate</u> land use..."	3.7	Reject	The policy goes on to note that mitigation can occur so doesn't assume total avoidance.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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".	3.34	Accept	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 are to be deleted.	Yes
FS9, FS10, FS142			<i>Support</i>				
444.14	Telecom New Zealand Ltd	Policy 9.3	Amend Policy 9.3 to read "New subdivision and <u>inappropriate</u> land use..."	3.7	Reject	The policy goes on to note that mitigation can occur so doesn't assume total avoidance.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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	3.4	Reject	The introduction is considered appropriate	No
FS224, FS229			<i>Support</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.	3.20	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	Yes
FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229			<i>Support</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.	3.20	Accept in part	No relief granted in specific response to this submission in this chapter. Accept in part in that map layers have been removed.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.20	Reject	Reject as sub relates to matters covered by the Regional Freshwater Plan.	No
<i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</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.	3.30	Reject	The stream has rural dunes zoning but also stream corridor and overflow path overlays. The rules for these overlay are appropriate for a stream.	No
<i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			appropriate.			submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	
<i>FS224, FS229</i>			<i>Support</i>				
451.J J	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.1	Delete Policy 9.1	3.5	Reject	Hazards need to identified	No
<i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</i>			<i>Support</i>				
451.K K	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	3.6	Accept in part	The wording of the policy has been amended to be more appropriate in one of the ways suggested by the submitter.	Yes
<i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</i>			<i>Support</i>				
451.L 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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
<i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</i>			<i>Support</i>				
451.G G & MM	Rob Crozier & Joan Allin	Policy 9.4	Delete Policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
<i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</i>			<i>Support</i>				
451.N N	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.	3.9	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
<i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</i>			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.30	Reverse recommendation until further information is available at the hearing.	The expert report commissioned recommends a change to the flood hazard modelling near the submitters site. However further information is required.	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.	3.30	Reverse recommendation until further information is available at	The expert report commissioned recommends a change to the flood hazard modelling near the submitters site.	N/A

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
					the hearing.	However further information is required.	
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.	3.34	Reject	The submitter has misread the maps. The notation related to coastal hazards and has since been withdrawn	No
474.1 & 2	John Harding	Flood Hazard Mapping	Requests that the Waimeha Stream Corridor width be reduced and moved off the submitters property	3.30	Accept in part	GWRC agree that the stream corridor should be amended on the submitters 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.	3.32	Reject	It is appropriate that the effects associated with matters arising from the Fault Trace rule be considered without the need for written approval or public notification.	No
480.4 3	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	3.3	Accept in part	The chapter has been amended to correct typos etc. However, this has been attributed to Clause	NO?



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						16 (2) of schedule 1 of the RMA	
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.	3.8	Accept in part	Some changes are being made 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.	3.9, 3.10 & 3.11	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 result from other submissions.	No
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.	3.30	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 Changes 78 and 81 or is amended to enhance development opportunities for the land subject to Plan Change 81.	3.3	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	Flood Hazard rules	New rules have to be development to allow housing in the flood zone provided they are suitably mitigated	3.18	Reject	The rules as proposed are appropriate and have a	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Infrastructure Management Ltd		- that is above the minimum flood level.			good balance between risk mitigation and encouragement of development.	
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.	3.30	Reject	This is a rural area and council do not generally carry out flood hazard mapping in these areas. The area also contains multiple overlays that will restrict development. These overlays and section 106 should allow for all issues to be considered.	No
FS197			Support				
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	3.37	Accept in part.	Rules deleted to meet requirement not to duplicate NES. NES not included as an appendix as this is unnecessary.	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			"and is included in Appendix X", as set out in the submission.				
512.16	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.	3.38	Accept	Rules which duplicate NES deleted.	Yes
512.17	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.	3.37	Accept	Policies withdrawn. Accept regarding section 9.6.3 to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions.	No
512.18	The Oil Companies	Contaminated Land Policies	Retain without modification Policies 9.29, 9.30, 9.31, 9.32, 9.33 and 9.34.	3.37	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions. Note Policy 9.34 has been deleted. This is consequential on response to 512-15 & 16.	No
512.02	The Oil Companies	Definitions of	Support the definitions of 'contaminated land' and 'potentially contaminated land'.	3.39	Accept	Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
		Contaminated Land' & Potentially Contaminated land				in their current form	
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.	3.30	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 rules	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions	No
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.	3.18	Reject	Would be unreasonable not to provide for some subdivision.	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.	3.34	Reject	The technical report on the data used for the Erosion and Slope stability mapping states that the	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						data is not suitable for use in this context. All provisions are to be deleted.	
FS92			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.34	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 provisions are 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".	3.32	Accept	This is a reasonable request.	Yes
FS9, FS10, FS142, FS178			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	
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 provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</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	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			community and on individuals;				
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
586. I	Frank & Catherine Wafer	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
590. G	Peter and Lynda Wood	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						the NZCPS	
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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
617.J	Stewart & Catherine Fraser	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have	Yes



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	
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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
618.J	David & Helen Walshaw	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
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.	3.20	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.	Yes
637.I	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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	
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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
637.1	Susan Jane Baird	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
638.1	Patrick Murray	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
638.1	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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No

<b>Sub. No.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Section of this Report</b>	<b>Officer's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer's Reasons / Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Amendments to PDP?</b>
			provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;				
638.I	Patrick Murray	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended 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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
641.I	Barbara & Murray Scott	Policy 9.4	Delete policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
644.5, 6 & 7	Ian Sheen	Chapter 9	Oppose entire chapter where it. - 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	3.3	Accept in part	Accept but no specific amendments made in response to this submission	Yes
653.B B	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
653.C C	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	3.6	Accept in part	The wording of the policy has been amended to be more appropriate in one of the ways suggested by the submitter.	Yes
653.D	Quentin	Policy 9.3	Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
D	Poole		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;			enough already.	
653.E E	Quentin Poole	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
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.	3.9	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
653.H H	Quentin Poole	Rules	Amend all rules [in Chapter 9] by deleting and replacing with new rules	3.3	Reject	The rules that remain of chapter 9 are appropriate.	No
653.L & AA	Quentin Poole	Chapter 9	Delete Chapter 9 in its entirety.	3.3	Reject	What remains of Chapter 9 is based on robust scientific information and appropriate.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
674. D	Brian Pegler	Chapter 9	Oppose parts of sections 9	3.3	Reject	No specific remedy is sought	No
699.3	Rosalind	Policy 9.1	Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not	3.5	Reject	The majority of the	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
	Poole		appropriate.			concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	
<i>FS193</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
699.4	Rosalind Poole	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	3.6	Accept in part	The wording of the policy has been amended to be more appropriate in one of the ways suggested by the submitter.	Yes
<i>FS193</i>			<i>Oppose</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;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
<i>FS193</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
699.6	Rosalind Poole	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						the NZCPS	
<i>FS193</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
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.	3.9	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
<i>FS193</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
699.1 & L	Rosalind Poole	Chapter 9	Delete Chapter 9 in its entirety.	3.3	Reject	What remains of Chapter 9 is based on robust scientific information and appropriate.	No
<i>FS193</i>			<i>Oppose</i>				
699.8	Rosalind Poole	Rules	Amend all rules [in Chapter 9] by deleting and replacing with new rules	3.3	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	3.3	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.	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions	No

<b>Sub. No.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Section of this Report</b>	<b>Officer's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer's Reasons / Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Amendments to PDP?</b>
738.A	Denis & Jan Toohey	Policy 9.4	Oppose precautionary approach identified in Chapter 9 policies	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended 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.	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard provisions	No
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	3.7	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation	No
756.A	Pascal Odijk	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended 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	3.9	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation	No
757.L	Marianne Tavenier	Chapter 9	Oppose the parts of Chapter 9 that relate to coastal hazard management.	3.3	Reject	Chapter 9 does not include coastal hazard	No



Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						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	3.7	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation	No
757.A	Marianne Tavenier	Policy 9.4	Oppose policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended 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	3.9	Reject	The policy is consistent with the purpose of the RMA and has had an appropriate s32 evaluation	No
762.0 5 & UU	Lydia Johnston	Introduction 9.1.1	Amend introduction of Chapter 9, 9.1.1 to address the submitter's concerns	3.4	Reject	The introduction is considered appropriate	No
FS229			<i>Support</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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The	Yes

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
						policy is considered appropriate.	
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
762.06 & 8	Lydia Johnston	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	3.6	Accept in part	The wording of the policy has been amended to be more appropriate in one of the ways suggested by the submitter.	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
762.6, 9 & XX	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 and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals;	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
762.610 & YY	Lydia Johnston	Policy 9.4	Delete Policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
762.06 &	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	3.9	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No

Sub. No.	Submitter	Topic	Decision Sought	Section of this Report	Officer's Recommendation	Officer's Reasons / Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
11			and areas where development has not occurred.				
FS229			<i>Support</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".	3.3	Reject	These terms are not used in the chapter.	No
FS229			<i>Support</i>				
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.	3.5	Reject	The majority of the concerns in this submission relate to the Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate.	Yes
769.K	Denise Church & Michael Veneer	Policy 9.2	Amend Policy 9.2 to address a range of issues	3.6	Accept in part	The wording of the policy has been amended to be more appropriate in one of the ways suggested by the submitter.	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	3.7	Reject	The word 'new' is clear enough already.	No

<b>Sub. No.</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Section of this Report</b>	<b>Officer's Recommendation</b>	<b>Officer's Reasons / Comments</b>	<b>Recommended Amendments to PDP?</b>
			community and on individuals;				
769.K	Denise Church & Michael Veneer	Policy 9.4	Delete Policy 9.4	3.8	Amend policy but do not delete	The policy has been amended to be more in line with the intentions of the NZCPS	Yes