

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3.3 | Reject | Chapter 9 was never intended to apply to coastal hazards which were covered by Chapter 4 which has been withdrawn.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 | 3.34 | Accept | All of the provisions referred to have been withdrawn or are proposed to be deleted in response to other submissions.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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 92.12 2 | Winstone Aggregates | Rule 9B.1 | Insert a new permitted activity rule as follows. "Extractive industries (gravel extraction) in Quarry Zone I Quarry Policy Area (or equivalent.)" Cross reference to the performance standards proposed above for the Quarry Zone / Quarry Policy Area (or equivalent). | 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.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> | | | | |
| FS234 | | | <i>Oppose in part</i> | | | | |
| 202.U U | Department of | Introduction 9.1.1 | Support | 3.4 | Accept | The introduction is appropriate. | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|------------|----------------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | Conservation | | | | | | |
| | | | <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 |
| | | | <i>Oppose</i> | | | | |
| | | | <i>Oppose in part</i> | | | | |
| 202.T T | Department of Conservation | Policy 9.3 | Support Policy 9.3 | 3.7 | Accept in part | Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions. | No |
| | | | <i>Oppose</i> | | | | |
| 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 hazard and where the effects are potentially <u>significantly adverse</u> until further detailed information | 3.8 | 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 | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|---|----------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | on the extent and nature of the hazard becomes available” | | | 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> | | | | |
| 205.10 | 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> | | | | |
| 205.10 | Margaret Bilisland | Flood mapping | Support all relief sought in the submission by North Otaki Beach Residence Assoc. (submission 38) and | 3.40 | Reject | Reject. Seeks no relief in its own right. Functions as | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------------------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | the submission by Rob Crozier and Joan Allin (submission 451). | | | a further submission. | |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 208.45 | Transpower | Rule 9A.5.1 | Oppose amend to "exclude the National Grid" from the non-complying rule and add a discretionary activity rule for "For the National Grid, on land subject to two or more of the following natural hazards areas (identified on natural hazard maps)". Any consequential amendments. | 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>FS106, FS125, FS130</i> | | | <i>Oppose</i> | | | | |
| 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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--|---|---------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 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 | | | | |
| 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 |
| 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? |
|---|---|--------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 212.5 1 | Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board) | Policy 9.14 | Oppose in part Rule 9C.3.2 and delete all but the first sentence of standard 1 to Rule 9C.3(1). | 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 2 | Quicksilver Enterprises (Replaces The NZ Anglican Church Pension Board) | Policy 9.14 | Support Policy 9.14. 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> | | | | |
| 212.5 | Quicksilver Enterprises | Rule 9C.1(2) | Support Rule 9C.1(2). 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? |
|---|---|-----------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 3 | (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> | | | | |
| 216.10 | Graham Halstead | Flood Mapping Map 11C | Map 11C - seek amendment to delete or modify the designated fill control zone, in respect of the land of 1.9ha on Kapiti Road (as per submission). | 3.30 | Reject | The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes to the hazard mapping. | No |
| 218.67 | Coastlands Shoppingtown Ltd | Rule 9A.5.1 | Oppose Rule 9A.5.1 and seek that the activity status of two hazards on one site be changed to a restricted discretionary activity, with Council's discretion being restricted to managing the effects of the two hazards 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 | 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 | 3.20 | Accept in part | Accept. This type of proposal is appropriate for | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | n Ltd | | 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. | | | RD rather than D. | |
| 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 |
| 219.08 | Horticulture New Zealand | Definition of Hazardous activity | Delete the definitions of Hazardous activity and Hazardous facility. | 3.39 | Accept | The definition of 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. | Yes |
| 219.1 | Horticulture | Definition of potentially | Either amend the definition of "potentially | 3.39 | Reject | The definition is based | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--------------|--------------------------|---|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 2 | New Zealand | contaminated land | 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. | | | 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 | |
| 219.65 | Horticulture New Zealand | Definition of potentially contaminated land | Concerned about Rule 9E.1.3 Disturbing the soil of contaminated or potentially contaminated land. Either, amend the definition of potentially contaminated land, or, the provisions in Chapter 9 so that existing horticultural land is not classed as potentially contaminated land. | 3.39 | Reject | The rule referred to has been withdrawn. The definition of potentially contaminated land is in line with the NES. | No |
| 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 |

| 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> | | | | |
| 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 |
| 262.12 | Bunnings Ltd / Our Lady of Kāpiti | Rule 9B.1.4 | Delete rule 9B.1.4 to the extent that it applies to lot 1 DP441854. | 3.20 | Accept in part | Changes are recommended to the ponding area on the site (refer below) but not to the earthworks rules. | No |
| 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 Environmenta | Rule 9A.5.1 | Remove Rule 9A.5.1 | 3.11 | Accept in part | Section 106 of the RMA applies to subdivisions | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|---------------------------|---------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | I Ltd | | | | | and other activities are covered by other parts of the chapter. The rule is unnecessary and is proposed to be deleted. | |
| 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. Agree that the consent processes should not be duplicated. However, there could be instances where the hazard information has changed between consents, therefore it is necessary that these issues be re-considered. | Yes |
| 263.28 | Maypole Environmental | 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 | 3.18 & 3.25 | Accept in part | See above. | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|---------------------------|--|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | I Ltd | | Zone and Precinct are exempted from the Stream Corridor provisions | | | | |
| 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 Ltd | Stream Corridor, Storage Areas and Ponding Areas | Delete the following from Map series 6, 7 and 9 (and any associated references in the Proposed District Plan), insofar as they are not identified in the existing District Plan: c) Outstanding Natural Landscapes Overlay; 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). | 3.30 | Reject | These layers are appropriate and applications for these areas should address hazard effects. | No |
| 266.5 | Alex Metcalfe | Other Matters | Amend to ensure that residential development on 12 Otaihangā Road fully takes into account the effects of a future widening of Mazengarb Stream and the | 3.40 | Reject | Relevant assessment will occur as part of any subdivision and | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|---------------|---|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | possibility that development would increase the risk of flooding to adjacent properties and specifically to the property at 16, 18 & 20 Otaihanga Road. | | | development application. Not appropriate to amend plan specifically. | |
| | | FS4, FS12, FS17, FS18, FS30, FS31, FS36, FS37, FS47, FS50, FS105, FS144, FS149, FS151, FS152, FS159, FS160, FS161, FS162, FS163, FS171, FS173 | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| | | FS147 | <i>Support in part</i> | | | | |
| | | 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| FS17, FS18, FS36, FS149, FS151, FS152, FS162, FS163 | | | Support | | | | |
| 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. | | | Support | | | | |
| 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 |
| FS51, FS55, FS145 | | | Support | | | | |
| 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 | 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? |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 276.45 | Kāpiti Coast Airport Holdings Ltd | Policy 9.4, Rules 9.1.3 and 9.1.4 | Amend Policy 9.4, Rules 9.1.3 and 9.1.4 to remove reference to precautionary approach and amend activity status of subdivision and development from non complying to restricted discretionary. | 3.8 & 3.11 | Accept in part | The precautionary 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. | Yes |
| 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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <i>FS108, FS110, FS139, FS229</i> | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 280.28 | Bryce Wilkinson | Whole of chapter | Requests that the policies and rules in the chapter be amended to permit subdivision and other activities that provide net benefits to members of the community and only to protect something to the extent that doing so provides the net benefits. | 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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------|---|-------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | appropriate and may need 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> | | | | |
| 319.2 3 | 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 |
| 319.2 3 | Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho) | Rule 9B.4.1 | Amend rule to read "Subdivision of land located within any <u>the river corridor</u> , overflow path, residual overflow path or flood erosion area and any subdivision which does not comply with any one or more of the restricted discretionary activity standards under Rule 9B.3.2 <u>and is not a non-complying activity under Rule 9B.5.3.</u> " | 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 |
| 319.2 | Waikanae | Rule 9B.5.3 | Subdivision in the Stream corridor <u>and/or subdivision</u> | 3.29 | Accept in part | Accept in part, the request | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-------------|---|-------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 3 | Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho) | | <u>creating lots entirely within the River corridor zone.'</u> | | | is appropriate however it has been worded differently. | |
| 319.26 & 27 | Waikanae Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho) | Rule 9B.1.4 | Amend Rule 9B.1.4 to read. "1. In an overflow path or residual overflow path (excluding fill). a) Shall not involve the disturbance of more than 20m3 of land for any activity; b) and c) retain as written d) Shall not be within 20 metres of a waterbody, including wetlands and coastal water; or e) On slopes of more than 28 degrees. 3. In a stream corridor or river corridor (excluding fill). a) Shall not exceed 20m3 for any activity. This standard applies whether in relation to a particular work or as a total or cumulative; b) [delete]" | 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 | Reject | 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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|---|-----------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | river scheme or floodplain management plan. | |
| 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 significant. Change to this corridor is not appropriate. | No |
| 319.3 | Waikanae | Rule 9B.5.3 | Concerned that subdivision is a non complying | 3.29 | Accept in part | Accept in part, the request | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 7 | Christian Holiday Park Inc (El Rancho) | | 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. | | | is appropriate however it has been worded differently. | |
| 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 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>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? |
|--------------|-------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 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 the NZCPS | Yes |
| <i>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? |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 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 |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 |
| <i>FS200, FS206, FS207, FS210, FS211, FS213, FS214, FS215, FS216, FS217, FS220, FS221, FS222, FS223, FS 224, FS225,</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? |
|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| <i>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> | | | <i>Support</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> | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 380.29, 30 & A | 380. Barry, Suzanne and Timothy | Chapter 09. Flood Hazards | Oppose Policies 9.3 and 9.4 and some of the rules in part 9.1 of the Proposed Plan (including the associated explanations). Remove the River | 3.7, 3.8, 3.30 | Accept in part | The expert report commissioned does not recommend any changes | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | Mansell | | 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. | | | 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 |
| FS229 | | | <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 areas have been altered. | No |
| FS9, FS10, FS142 | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 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 | Reject | It is appropriate to considered flood hazards at all stages of development as the effects may have changed over time. | No |
| <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 rule9.3 and 9.4 | 3.26 | Reject | The policies support avoiding buildings in the residual overflow path. | No |
| <i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i> | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 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 & | 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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| B | | | | | | 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. | |
| <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 D status for land located partly within the stream and / or river corridor with the appropriate standards | No |
| <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 | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | this area and others that experience this flood hazards. | |
| 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> | | | | |
| 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 | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | appropriate. | |
| <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 other submissions. | 3.9 | Accept | Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. Amendments may result from other submissions. | No |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 440.1 | Kapiti Coast District | Definition of 1 in 100- | Amend the definition of 1 in 100-year flood event to remove the words "based on information currently | 3.39 | Accept | The wording proposed to be deleted in | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|-------------------------------|---|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Council | year flood event | available". | | | unnecessary. | |
| 440.17 | 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> | | | | |
| 440.22 | 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 |
| 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 |
| FS191 | | | <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 | 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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | 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.” | | | with a subsequent variation or plan change. | |
| <i>FS191</i> | | | <i>Oppose in part</i> | | | | |
| 440.5 6 | 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> | | | | |
| 440.5 7 | Kapiti Coast District Council | Rule 9C.4.1 | Amend Rule 9C.4.1 to delete the words” Subdivision within Fault Avoidance Areas” at the beginning of the rule and add the words” under rule 9C.3.1” at the end of the rule. | 3.32 | Accept | The wording change is appropriate. | Yes |
| 440.5 8 | 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 |
| 440.5 8 | 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 |
| 440.5 8 | Kapiti Coast District Council | Contaminated land explanatory | Amend in paragraph 4 of the explanatory text to correct “siub” to “sub” replace the words “for the plan” | 3.36 | Reject | This paragraph has been deleted as there are no | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | Council | text | with "as well as the site and zone standards" and replace "area" with "zone" | | | longer any rules in this section of the chapter. | |
| 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> | | | | |
| FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189 | | | <i>Oppose in part</i> | | | | |
| 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 | | | <i>Oppose</i> | | | | |
| 441.3 | Greater | Section 9.2.1 | Amend the introduction text to add "Buildings in | 3.12 | 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? |
|----------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 2 & 33 | Wellington Regional Council | | <i>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 | | | appropriate. | |
| 441.3 4 | 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 |
| 441.3 5 | 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> | | | | |
| 441.3 6 | Greater Wellington | Policy 9.11 | Amend policy 9.11 to ensure that it includes all flood areas including residual overflow paths in order to be | 3.14 | 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? |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | Regional Council | | 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". | | | | |
| 441.37 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Policy 9.12 | Support policy 9.12 and amend to delete the word "completely" before "mitigated" and add the following words to the explanation text "... as a result of any proposed development. The applicant also needs to consider the effects on the development from the residual risk that remains as a consequence of an overdesign event. | 3.15 | Accept | The wording changes are 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> | | | | |
| 441.38 | 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, | | | <i>Oppose</i> | | | | |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189 | | | | | | | |
| 441.39 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Rule 9B.1.3 | Amend rule 9B.1.3 to include that "floor level is to the bottom of the floor joists or slab" and clarify 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, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189 | | | | | | | |
| 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 |
| FS42, FS47, FS58, FS59, FS60, FS61, FS74, FS102, FS153, FS178, FS179, FS180, FS181, FS182, FS183, FS184, FS185, FS186, FS188, FS189 | | | | | | | |
| 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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | Council | | | | | the life of a building under the Building Act. | |
| 441.4 1 | 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 |
| <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> | | | | |
| 441.4 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 | 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 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 provisions are to be deleted. | Yes |
| 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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|-------------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 441.48 | 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 |
| 441.50 | Greater Wellington Regional Council | Policies 9.23, 9.25, 9.27, 9.30, 9.33, and 9.34. | 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 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. | No |
| 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 |
| FS131 | | | <i>Oppose</i> | | | | |
| 441.56 | Greater Wellington | 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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | Regional Council | | | | | line with the NES. | |
| FS131 | | | <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 |
| 441.TT | 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.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 |
| 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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | avoidance. | |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 |
| <i>FS9, FS10, FS142</i> | | | <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 |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 |
| <i>FS224, FS229</i> | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 451.12 | 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 | 3.20 | Accept in part | Accept in part to clarify that flood mitigation works complying with rule 9B.1.6 are not subject to | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | 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. | | | earthworks controls in Rule 9B.1.4 | |
| <i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</i> | | | <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 |
| <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 | 3.20 | Reject | Reject as sub relates to matters covered by the Regional Freshwater Plan. | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | Corridors. | | | | |
| | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| | | | <i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</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>Support</i> | | | | |
| | | | <i>FS24, FS25, FS26, FS27, FS28, FS113, FS148, FS194, FS224, FS229</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 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 |
| | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| | | | <i>FS224, FS229</i> | | | | |
| 451.J J | Rob Crozier & Joan Allin | Policy 9.1 | Delete Policy 9.1 | 3.5 | Reject | Hazards need to identified | 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.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 |
| <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 | 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? |
|----------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|---|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | and areas where development has not occurred. | | | | |
| | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| | | | <i>FS113, FS128, FS200, FS227, FS229, FS230</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 hearing. | The expert report commissioned recommends a change to the flood hazard modelling near the submitters site. However further information is required. | N/A |
| 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 | John Harding | Flood | Requests that the Waimeha Stream Corridor width | 3.30 | Accept in part | GWRC agree that the | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|------------|---|-----------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| & 2 | | Hazard Mapping | be reduced and moved off the submitters property | | | stream corridor should be amended on the submitters property. | |
| 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 16 (2) of schedule 1 of the RMA | NO? |
| 480.4 3 | 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 |
| 480.4 4 | 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. | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------|--|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Amendments may result from other submissions. | |
| 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 submitter's site. Therefore, no amendments to the chapter are required. | No |
| 501.8 | Land and Infrastructure Management Ltd | Flood Hazard rules | New rules have to be development to allow housing in the flood zone provided they are suitably mitigated - that is above the minimum flood level. | 3.18 | Reject | The rules as proposed are appropriate and have a good balance between risk mitigation and encouragement of development. | No |
| 511.8 | Mari Housiaux | Flood mapping | Amend flood hazard maps for Te Hapua Road and the wetlands on Map 18C to include weather/seasonal based ephemeral occurrence of ponding areas. | 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. | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|------------|-------------------|----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | These overlays and section 106 should allow for all issues to be considered. | |
| 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 "and is included in Appendix X", as set out in the submission. | 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 |
| 512.1 6 | The Oil Companies | Contaminated Land Rules | Remove rules which duplicate those in the NES, i.e. Rules 9E.1.3-9E.1.6, 9E.2.2, 9E.3.1 and 9E.3.2. | 3.38 | Accept | Rules which duplicate NES deleted. | Yes |
| 512.1 7 | The Oil Companies | Contaminated Land Policies | Support Policies 9.22, 9.23 and 9.25 and retain without further modification. Retain without modification the text under the heading Section 9.6.3 Contaminated and Potentially Contaminated Land. | 3.37 | Accept | Policies withdrawn. Accept regarding section 9.6.3 to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form. | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|-------------------|---|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Amendments may result from other submissions. | |
| 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 Contaminated Land' & Potentially Contaminated land | Support the definitions of 'contaminated land' and 'potentially contaminated land'. | 3.39 | Accept | Accept to the extent that the provisions are retained in their current form | No |
| 531.1 | Les Church | Site specific flood hazard mapping | Requests that Planning Map 01C be amended by removing overflow path and ponding flood notations as they apply to 5 Hewson Crescent, Otaki Beach. | 3.30 | Accept in part | The technical report commissioned recommends amending the over flow path on the | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | submitters property and surrounding properties. | |
| 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 data is not suitable for use in this context. All provisions are to be deleted. | No |
| FS92 | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 547.12 | 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. | |
| 550.47 | 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 |
| <i>FS9, FS10, FS142, FS178</i> | | | <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 provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate. | Yes |
| 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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--------------|-------------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 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 |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 community and on individuals; | 3.7 | Reject | The word 'new' is clear enough already. | No |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|----------|----------------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate. | |
| 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 the NZCPS | Yes |
| 617.J | Stewart & Catherine Fraser | Policy 9.1 | Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate. | 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 & | 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? |
|-----------------|----------------------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | Catherine Fraser | | 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. | |
| 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 been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate. | Yes |
| 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 | Policy 9.4 | Delete policy 9.4 | 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? |
|----------|-------------------|-------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | Walshaw | | | | delete | line with the intentions of the NZCPS | |
| 631.8 | Michael Alexander | Rule 9B.1.6 | Amend Rule 9B.1.6 to make river and stream clearance, including mouth straightening and other maintenance activities, when undertaken by the relevant authorities, exempt from this Rule to allow it as a permitted activity. | 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 |
| 637.1 | Susan Jane Baird | Policy 9.1 | Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate. | 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 |
| 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 | 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? |
|----------|------------------------|------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | delete | line with the intentions of the NZCPS | |
| 638.I | Patrick Murray | Policy 9.1 | Oppose policy 9.1 because it is too expansive and unqualified. To overstate areas at risk is not appropriate. | 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.I | Patrick Murray | Policy 9.3 | Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals; | 3.7 | Reject | The word 'new' is clear enough already. | No |
| 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 | 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. | |
| 641.1 | 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 |
| 641.1 | 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 |
| 644.5, 6 & 7 | Ian Sheen | Chapter 9 | <p>Oppose entire chapter where it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is contrary to, does not give effect to or does not have adequate regard for the RMA, NZ Coastal Policy Statement, Regional Policy Statement and Proposed Regional Policy Statement. - has not been subject to appropriate section 32 evaluations\includes terms that are defined in Chapter 1 that have not been italicised and the use of those terms is unclear. - includes italicised terms where no definition has been provided in Chapter 1 and the appropriateness of the definition is therefore not apparent | 3.3 | Accept in part | Accept but no specific amendments made in response to this submission | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------------|------------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 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 D | Quentin Poole | Policy 9.3 | Amend policy 9.3 to provide wording that is less extreme; clarify reference to "New" and draw a distinction between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred; provide recognition that inappropriately restrictive provisions can impose unreasonable costs on the community and on individuals; | 3.7 | Reject | The word 'new' is clear enough already. | No |
| 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 | Quentin | Policy 9.5 | Amend Policy 9.5 to clarify what is meant by "new", to include a concept of e.g. reasonableness, and to | 3.9 | 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? |
|---------------|----------------|------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| F | Poole | | distinguish between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred. | | | enough already. | |
| 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 |
| <i>FS229</i> | | | <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 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 |
| <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 | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------|----------------|------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | more appropriate in one of the ways suggested by the submitter. | |
| FS193 | | | <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 |
| FS193 | | | <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 the NZCPS | Yes |
| FS193 | | | <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 |
| FS193 | | | <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 | No |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|--------------|---------------------|------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| | | | | | | appropriate. | |
| <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 |
| | | | | | | | |
| 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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| 756.A | Pascal Odijk | Policy 9.3 | Oppose policy 9.3 because it is inconsistent with the wellbeing purpose of the RMA and its section 32 requirement to evaluate costs and benefits | 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 provisions | No |
| 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 |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 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 policy is considered appropriate. | Yes |
| FS229 | | | <i>Support</i> | | | | |
| 762.0 6 & 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> | | | | |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 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> | | | | |
| 762.6 10 & 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> | | | | |
| 762.0 6 & 11 | Lydia Johnston | Policy 9.5 | Amend Policy 9.5 to clarify what is meant by "new", to include a concept of e.g. reasonableness, and to distinguish between areas that are already developed and areas where development has not occurred. | 3.9 | Reject | The word 'new' is clear enough already. | No |
| 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 | 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 | Yes |

| Sub. No. | Submitter | Topic | Decision Sought | Section of this Report | Officer's Recommendation | Officer's Reasons / Comments | Recommended Amendments to PDP? |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | Veneer | | | | | Coastal Hazards provisions which have been withdrawn. The policy is considered appropriate. | |
| 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 community and on individuals; | 3.7 | Reject | The word 'new' is clear enough already. | No |
| 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 |