

# Proposed Waikato District Plan

## Stage 2 – Natural Hazards and Climate Change

Summary of Decisions Requested

And

Notification of Further Submissions



# Contents

Ian & Desiree McDonald (#2001)	6
Malcolm Beattie (#2002)	6
Jason & Kim Borich & Osborne (#2003)	7
Glenn & Marion Hunter (#2004)	8
Brent Fowler (#2005)	9
Margaret Clough (#2006)	10
Hamish Imrie & Dr. Isabelle Miclette (#2007)	10
Jamie Burrows (#2008)	11
Jadam Trust (2009)	11
Neal Gordon & Teresa Mary Phillips (#2010)	12
Donald Graeme Hogg (#2011)	13
Dorothy Wray (#2012)	13
Sarina Gouws (#2013)	14
Raymond Brown (#2014)	14
Matt Connor (#2015)	15
Rodger & Heather Savill (#2016)	15
Mary-Rose Speakman (#2017)	16
Wini Paekau (#2018)	16
Kaaren Alma Lipsy Wieser (#2019)	17
Megan & Stuart Pearson (#2020)	17
Horongarara Community Group (#2021)	18
Terry Yorston (#2022)	18
William Bruce Baverstock (#2023)	19
Elaine & Eric Wright (#2024)	19
Kerry Johansen (#2025)	20
Betsy & Noel Smith (#2026)	20
Jayson & Fulisia Tanaki (#2027)	22
Ewen Brunskill (#2028)	22
Darryl Sait (#2029)	23
Gary Fraser (#2030)	23
Tyler Barry (#2031)	24
Blair Everett (#2032)	25
Steve Finer (#2033)	25
Ann Waugh (#2034)	26
Boston Six Ltd (#2035)	27
Hamilton City Council (#2036)	27
Will Phelps (#2037)	28
Peter Ross Buckley (#2038)	28
Nicol Beeby (#2039)	29

Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (#2040) .....	29
N.L Van Der Voorden (#2041) .....	35
Spencer L Drinkwater (#2042).....	35
Irvine Raymond Udy (#2043).....	36
Frances Graham (#2044) .....	37
Eugene Smith (#2045).....	38
Rachel Smith (#2046).....	38
Joyce Elisabeth Davis-Goff (#2047).....	39
Susanne Juliane Giessen-Prinz (#2048) .....	40
Andreas Broring (#2049) .....	41
Ward Ranch Ltd (#2050).....	42
Paul Wood (#2051).....	43
Barry Wayne Ford (#2052) .....	43
Mercury NZ Limited (#2053) .....	44
Ruth & Shane Walden and Jane Lee-Smith (#2054).....	77
Eric Messick (#2055).....	77
Stanley Russell Walker (#2056).....	79
Silvia and Peter Mark Fowler (#2057).....	79
Andrew & Karen Lovelock (#2058) .....	80
Renald Furer (#2059).....	80
Kevin Vince (#2060).....	81
Terry Quilty (#2061) .....	81
Karl Phillip Beaver (#2062).....	82
Maria Timmermans (#2063).....	83
Tamara Paireau (#2064).....	84
P & M Taylor (#2065) .....	84
Andrew Wilson (#2066) .....	85
Barratt Davies Family Trust (#2067).....	85
Rachael Brown (#2068).....	86
Brett Curle (#2069) .....	87
Helen Ritchie (#2070).....	87
Tyrone Murphy (#2071).....	88
Allen Fabrics Ltd (#2072).....	89
Kate Dermer (#2073).....	89
Whaingaroa Environment Defence (#2074).....	90
Fleming Ranch Trust (#2075).....	91
Peter & Kerry Santner (#2076) .....	92
Dominic Friskney (#2077) .....	92
David & Karina Cooper (#2079).....	93
Trish Waugh (#2080).....	94

Jane West (#2081).....	94
Peter & Natalie Steens (#2082).....	95
Sofia Andreen (#2083).....	96
Ron Miller(#2084).....	96
Daniel Parker (#2085) .....	97
Ministry of Education (#2086).....	98
Alex Staheli (#2087).....	98
Diana Rangipuehu Hoete (#2088).....	99
Daks Development (#2089).....	100
Scott Foster (#2090).....	100
Pokeno Community Committee (#2091) .....	101
Bianca Angel (#2092).....	102
TaTa Valley Limited (#2093) .....	103
Kainga Ora Homes and Communities (#2094).....	111
Aaron Henderson (#2095).....	147
Te Whaanga 2B3B2 & 2B1 Ahu Whenua Trust (#2096).....	147
Tainui Hapu Environmental Management Committee & Tainui o Tainui Charitable Trust (#2097).....	148
Christopher John Mitchell (#2098).....	151
NZTE Operations Limited (#2099).....	153
Powerco Limited (#2100).....	154
Transpower New Zealand Ltd (#2101) .....	155
Waikato Regional Council (#2102) .....	167
Fire and Emergency New Zealand (#2103).....	218
Genesis Energy Limited (#2104).....	233
Perry Group Limited (#2105).....	237
WEL Networks Limited (#2106).....	241
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (#2107).....	251
Lou Sanson, Director General of Department of Conservation (#2108).....	262
Brett Beamsley (#2109) .....	269
Nathan & Amy Spitzer (#2110).....	269
Sally Lark (#2111).....	270
Arnold Craig & Dianne Helen Trigg (#2112).....	271
Christine Lyons (#2113) .....	271
Mark Ian de Lautour (#2114).....	272
Rangitahi Limited (#2115).....	272
David Wharmby (#2116).....	277
John Harrison (#2117) .....	277
Russell Davis (#2118).....	278
Robin Michael N Hood (#2119).....	280
Sushil Kumar (#2120) .....	281

Ian & Karen McLeay (#2121).....	281
Graham & Ingrid Rusbach (#2122).....	282
Counties Power Limited (#2123).....	283
Georgina O'Brien (#2124).....	288
Simon Porter (#2125).....	288
Geoff Hutchison (#2126).....	290
Jeremy, Nicola O'Rourke, and O'Rourke family (#2127).....	290
Chris & Sue Harris (#2128).....	291
Juliet & Ian Sunde (#2129).....	294
Chris, Kathryn, and Williams family (#2130).....	295
Howard, Helen, and Forlong family (#2131).....	296
The Raglan Collective Incorporated Society (#2132).....	297
Adam Marsh & Carol McColl (#2133).....	297
Jacqui Graham & Julie Nelson (#2134).....	299
The Raglan Collective Incorporated Society (#2135).....	300
Shand Properties Ltd (#2136).....	305
Sue Wood (#2137).....	306
RG de Leeuw Construction Limited (#2138).....	307
Ports of Auckland Limited (#2139).....	309
MG Solutions Ltd (#2140).....	315
Grant & Ros Brady (#2141).....	316
Steve & Jan Godley (#2142).....	317
Avant Developments Limited (#2143).....	318
Grant Faulkner (#2144).....	321
Sushil Kumar (#2145).....	322
Waikato District Council (#2146).....	323
Pokeno Village Holdings Limited (#2147).....	329
Terra Firma Resources Limited (#2148).....	332
Horticulture New Zealand (#2149).....	333
Meremere Dragway Incorporated (#2150).....	342
Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated (#2151).....	343
Juliet & Ian Sunde (#2152).....	351
Cindy & Phillip Quilty (#2153).....	351
Joytishna Arti Devi (#2154).....	352
Vivienne H de Thierry (#2155).....	353
Auckland Waikato Fish and Game (#2156).....	354
Lorraine Webber, John Lenihan, Michael Rodger, Alex KirbyLo (#2157).....	356
Peninsula Farm Ltd (#2158).....	357
Murray Henderson (#2159).....	358
Vianney Friskney (#2160).....	361

Dilworth Trust Board (#2161) .....	362
Glenn & Marion Hunter (#2162).....	368
P & T Boyle, R Youmans, P & S Scott, W Sutton, I Farrelly (#2163).....	369
Amanda & Max Ravlich (#2164) .....	369
Jade McCormack (#2165).....	370
Fraser & Rachel, Jacqueline, & Terence McNutt, Keelan-Peebles, & Peebles (#2166).....	370
Judi Gallagher (#2167) .....	371
Hayden Vink (#2168) .....	372
Jason Vink (#2169).....	373
The Raglan Collective Incorporated Society (#2170).....	374
Philip Leather (#2171) .....	375
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (#2172).....	376
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (#2173).....	377
Wayne Green (#2174) .....	411
Te Kopua Trust & Te Kopua 2b3 Incorporation (#2175).....	413
Jane Bethell (#2176) .....	416
Dennis Warrick Young (#2177).....	418
Graham & Di McBride (#2178) .....	420
Ambury Properties Limited (#2180) .....	420
Aaron West (#2181).....	422
Louise Davis (#2182) .....	423
Falesa & Leitu Fesolai Sila (#2183) .....	424
Charles Verstappen (#2184) .....	425
Falesa & Leitu Fesolai Sila (#2185) .....	426
Falesa & Leitu Fesolai Sila (#2186).....	427
Mark Mathers (#2187) .....	428
Huntly Community Board (#2188).....	429
Huntly Community Board (#2189).....	430

## Report: Summary of Submissions by Submitter Number/Name

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2001	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ian & Desiree McDonald
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 1377, Hamilton, New Zealand 1377		
<b>Point Number</b>	2001.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) overlay on 9 Ryan Road, Te Akau South by undertaking detailed investigation and mapping of land based on local soil and rock formations.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Varying soil and rock formation need to be identified.</li></ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2001.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the High Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area from 9 Ryan Road, Te Akau South.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 9 Ryan Road has a substructure of limestone 200 metres from the water, is protected from the wind and wave action by natural land contours and is above 35m sea level.</li><li>• The area of Ryan Road is thought to be on Ota rock group (refer Doc #2 in original submission).</li><li>• No erosion has occurred in 76 years (refer Doc #3 in original submission).</li><li>• Ryan Road lithology – Major Siltstone and Minor Sandstone (refer Doc #4 in original submission).</li></ul>		
<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2002	<b>Submitter:</b>	Malcolm Beattie
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Sunset Heights (Port Waikato) Ltd.		

<b>Address:</b>	3 Lochview Terrace, Pukekohe, New Zealand 2120		
<b>Point Number</b>	2002.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11 Waikato Heads South and Map 11.1 Port Waikato		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) overlay on properties at 213 and 215 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato as shown on Map 11 Waikato Heads South and Map 11.1 Port Waikato.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The residences are well beyond the 200m zone.</li> <li>• There is a gully and ridge line between the coast cliff face and the residences.</li> <li>• The residences are built 200m above sea level and not affected by coastal erosion.</li> <li>• The residences are built on a solid clay base and no land movement has occurred since construction 20 years ago.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2003	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jason & Kim Borich & Osborne
<b>Address:</b>	56 Mount Albert Road, Mount Albert, Auckland, New Zealand, 1025		
<b>Point Number</b>	2003.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.5 Raglan Town Centre		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area overlay to remove the overlay from all properties along Norrie Ave, Raglan, in particular number 24 Norrie Ave.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The only justification for considering the property at high risk is its location at the top of a slope in the general vicinity of the estuary.</li> <li>• High risk of erosion is based on current (short term) risk of toe erosion. This is unlikely as there is a footpath, the road and a grass verge (at least 9m in total) between the estuary and the base of the slope below Norrie Ave.</li> </ul>		



- There is a 5m high embankment on the seaward side of Wainui Road that drops down to the estuary. At high tide the water does not reach the base of this embankment.
- The Coastal Hazard Assessment provides no justification for considering Norrie Ave properties at high risk.
- Given the distance from the sea and a sheltered estuary environment, erosion risk would be low.
- There is no historical evidence of erosion over the past century.
- The house at 24 Norrie Ave has not moved since it was built, yet more than half the property is included in the overlay area.

**Point Number** 2003.2

**Plan Chapter** Map 23.5 Raglan Town Centre

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) overlay to remove it from all properties along Norrie Ave, Raglan, in particular number 24 Norrie Ave.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Properties at the top of a slope above Wainui Rd, which is a major access route to Raglan West and is likely to be protected by Council. This would mean there is little to no erosion risk to Norrie Ave properties on the landward side of Wainui Rd.
- The bank on the estuary side of Wainui Rd is approx. 5m high and at high tide the water does not reach the base of this embankment.
- Coastal Hazard report recognises that there is generally a high level of uncertainty around future coastal erosion, stating that it is not possible to reliably and accurately define the areas vulnerable to coastal erosion over the next 100 years.
- The defined coastal sensitivity erosion areas therefore represent the maximum area that could potentially be affected by erosion with up to 1m of SLR.
- Information is subjective and lack of evidence justify the removal of the hazard overlay from Norrie Ave properties.

**Submitter Number:** 2004 **Submitter:** Glenn & Marion Hunter

**Address:** 64 Glenvale Way RD4, Pukekohe, New Zealand 2679

**Point Number** 2004.1

**Plan Chapter** Map 11.1 Port Waikato

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 11.1 Port Waikato, by deleting the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) from 211 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property is elevated at least 20 – 25 m above the road and protected from the coast by a steep hill. Houses at a lower elevation are not included in this area.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2005	<b>Submitter:</b>	Brent Fowler
<b>Address:</b>	68 McKenzie Road, Mangere Bridge, Auckland, New Zealand 2022		

<b>Point Number</b>	2005.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.3 to allow for building in a High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in line with the Coastal Sensitivity Area Rule 15.7.2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seems illogical that building is allowed on erosion prone land but not in the High Risk Coastal (Inundation) Area without a non-complying resource consent. Rule 15.7.1 allows for additions to an existing building as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2005.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.1 to permit additions to existing buildings in line with rule 15.7.1
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rule 15.7.1 allows for additions to an existing building as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>

--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2006	<b>Submitter:</b>	Margaret Clough
<b>Address:</b>	2253 Tuakau Bridge Road RD5, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand,2695		
<b>Point Number</b>	2006.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11 Waikato Heads South		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) overlays from the property at 2253 Tuakau Bridge Road, Port Waikato.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There has been no erosion or inundation on this property or the neighbouring properties for the past 40 years.</li></ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2007	<b>Submitter:</b>	Hamish Imrie
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Hamish Imrie & Dr. Isabelle Milette		
<b>Address:</b>	19 Cordyline Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand 2095		
<b>Point Number</b>	2007.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area on 19 Cordyline Road, Port Waikato.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The land is naturally at a high level.</li></ul>		

--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2008	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jamie Burrows
<b>Address:</b>	40 Cordyline Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand 2695		
<b>Point Number</b>	2008.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area from 40 Cordyline Road in Port Waikato and review the overlays on properties at 38 and 42 Cordyline Road in Port Waikato.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The house is roughly two stories above the road level.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2009	<b>Submitter:</b>	Michelle & John Major
<b>Organisation:</b>	Jadam Trust		
<b>Address:</b>	620 Redoubt Road, Manukau, Auckland, New Zealand 2019		
<b>Point Number</b>	2009.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.5 Raglan Town Centre		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.5 Raglan Town Centre to remove the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area overlay from properties at 22, 24 and 26 Norrie Ave Raglan as shown on the map provided in our submission.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The inlet and Te Kopua reserve offer protection from storm surges.</li> <li>The current high tide level is many metres lower than the grass verge and road.</li> </ul>		

- Our bach has not experienced any slipping, or movement since its construction in 1955.
- There has only been slight land movement on the bank over the last 21 years despite numerous severe weather events that have caused extensive flooding and land instability elsewhere in the country.
- Extensive native planting and weed control has been established over the last 10 years on the slope in front of our property. Plants have been selected for coastal conditions and erosion control.
- Previous expert advice on the stability of the bank has suggested that the bank was sound and not at any risk.
- Overlays don't seem to follow land contours.
- Other properties on Norrie Ave lie much closer to sea level and do not have the same level of vegetation (erosion protection) but are not considered at risk.

**Point Number** 2009.2

**Plan Chapter** Map 23.45 Raglan Town Centre

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Map 23.45 Raglan Town Centre, to remove the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) overlay from properties at 22, 24 and 26 Norrie Ave Raglan as shown on the map provided in our submission.

**Decision Reasons:**

- 1 metre of sea level rise will not reach the elevated properties on Norrie Ave.
- Wainui Road and the bridge provide critical access to Raglan West. If the road is threatened by erosion, the Council will likely protect it, and this will provide more protection to our properties.
- Council's coastal expert suggested that given the presence of the road (which forms a bench in the slope), it may be appropriate to modify the map where there is a road to the seaward side of the properties.
- Overlays don't seem to follow land contours.
- Other properties on Norrie Ave lie much closer to sea level and don't have the same level of erosion protection but are not considered at risk.

**Submitter Number:** 2010

**Submitter:** Neal Gordon & Teresa Mary Phillips

**Address:** 31A Ponganui Road, RD2, Tuakau, New Zealand 2697

**Point Number** 2010.1

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 11.1 Port Waikato by removing the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) from the property at 209 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An extremely high rocky headland protects the property.</li> <li>• Any rise in sea level will not affect the property.</li> <li>• Sea would need to rise 35m above current level.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2011	<b>Submitter:</b>	Donald Graeme Hogg
<b>Address:</b>	69 Bowman Road, Whatawhata, Hamilton, New Zealand 3289		
<b>Point Number</b>	2011.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Not specified		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Provide</b> a trickle feed water supply to the west of Hamilton city, including Howden Road, Rowe Road and Bowman Road and extending as far as Whatawhata.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in new dwellings in the area, and changes to the climate resulting in dry periods becoming a regular feature.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2012	<b>Submitter:</b>	Dorothy Wray
<b>Address:</b>	42 Lily Street, Raglan, New Zealand 3225		
<b>Point Number</b>	2012.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West		

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	Submitter requests that council look at reserve next to property at the end of Lily Street Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reserve adjacent to submitters property at 42 Lily Street, Raglan, has eroded, affecting their property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2013	<b>Submitter:</b>	Sarina Gouws
<b>Address:</b>			
<b>Point Number</b>	2013.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.3 Huntly South		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> defended area on property at 10 Chisholm Street, Huntly.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Defended area on property not connected to any other flood area. Submitter suggests this may be a blip in the biodata.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2014	<b>Submitter:</b>	Raymond Brown
<b>Address:</b>	106L Greenslade Road, Raglan, New Zealand 3295		
<b>Point Number</b>	2014.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 Raglan East		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion), Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation), High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area and High Risk Coastal (Inundation) Area from 106L Greenslade Road, Raglan. Submitter suggested Council visit the property and meet with the owner.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Land is protected by a wall, house is on poles, and steep section. Existing wall can be further strengthened.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2015	<b>Submitter:</b>	Matt Connor
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 148, Raglan, New Zealand 3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2015.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area and Coastal Sensitivity Area on Map 23.3 Raglan West, in so far as it affects the submitter's property and Rangitahi Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recent subdivision and new road which should have a Geotechnical report.</li> <li>Map could affect the building site.</li> <li>Documents provided for the subdivision should be taken into account.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2016	<b>Submitter:</b>	Rodger & Heather Savill
<b>Address:</b>	335A Ngaruawahia Road, RD8 Te Kowhai, Hamilton, New Zealand 3288		

<b>Point Number</b>	2016.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 25 Waipa River
<b>Late:</b>	NO



<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Flood Plain Management Area in so far as it effects 335A Ngaruawahia Road, Te Kowhai.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter's property is above 9 metres.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2017	<b>Submitter:</b>	Kane Ongley
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Mary-Rose Speakman		
<b>Address:</b>	31 Bay View Road, Raglan, New Zealand 3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2017.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard Erosion Area as it relates to 31 Bay View Road, Raglan. Submitter requests a site visit.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter believes there has been no true investigation that relates to their property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2018	<b>Submitter:</b>	Wini Paekau
<b>Address:</b>	169 Hakarimata Road, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand 3720		

<b>Point Number</b>	2018.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map - High Risk Flood Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> High Risk Flood Area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The awa is a taonga. The flood area helps to protect our taonga.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2019	<b>Submitter:</b>	Kaaren Alma Lipsy Wieser
<b>Address:</b>	441 Bedford Road, RD8 Te Kowhai, Hamilton, New Zealand 3288		

<b>Point Number</b>	2019.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.2 Te Kowhai
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the High Risk Flood Mapping on 441 Bedford Road, Te Kowhai. <i>(Note: 441 Bedford Road is subject to the Flood Plain Management Area only)</i>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The greater proportion of the submitter's property is not so low lying as on the Waikato District Council High Flood Risk Map. See attachments to original submission showing topographical characteristics of the property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2020	<b>Submitter:</b>	Megan & Stuart Pearson
<b>Address:</b>	604 Te Akau Wharf Road, RDI Ngaruawahia, New Zealand 3793		

<b>Point Number</b>	2020.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from 604 Te Akau Wharf Road.

**And**

**Improve** mapping specific to our area.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Recent building work proves property is on limestone rock.
- Balance of submitter's property is under a conservation covenant.

**Submitter Number:**

2021

**Submitter:**

Megan Pearson

**On behalf of:**

Horongarara Community Group

**Address:**

604 Te Akau Wharf Road, RDI Ngaruawahia, New Zealand 3793

**Point Number**

2021.1

**Plan Chapter**

Map 23.3 Raglan West

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Map 23.3 Raglan West – Coastal Sensitivity Areas relating to Ryan Road subdivision by individually mapping parcels after a detailed investigation.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Varying soil and rock lands need to be identified more rigorously.

**Submitter Number:**

2022

**Submitter:**

Terry Yorston

**Address:**

28 Government Road, Raglan, New Zealand 3225

**Point Number**

2022.1

**Plan Chapter**

Map 23.3 Raglan West

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 Raglan West to remove High Risk Coastal (Erosion) Area from 28 Government Road, Raglan. Submitter requests site visit from council engineer or planner.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A recent geo-tech report found stable ground.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2023	<b>Submitter:</b>	William Bruce Baverstock
<b>Address:</b>	151 Plantation Road, Te Kauwhata, New Zealand 3782		

<b>Point Number</b>	2023.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 14.1 Rangiriri
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 14.5 Rangiriri to reduce the Flood Plain Management Area on 151 Plantation Road, Te Kauwhata as shown on map attached to submission.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons provided.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2024	<b>Submitter:</b>	Elaine & Eric Wright
<b>Address:</b>	81 Bailey Street, Huntly, New Zealand 3700		

<b>Point Number</b>	2024.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 Huntly East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.2 Huntly East to remove Mine Subsidence Risk Area off 81 Bailey Street, Huntly.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigations were done when the house when built in 2006.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2025	<b>Submitter:</b>	Kerry Johansen
<b>Address:</b>	8 Tamihana Avenue, Huntly East, Huntly, New Zealand 3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2025.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.3 D1 Defended Area (Residual Risk) to not restrict building on the two sections at 3806 State Highway 1, Huntly.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitters proposed new house projects could be done without damaging the stop bank.</li> <li>The property boundary is within 50 meters of the stop bank (pt lots 18 pt lots 19).</li> <li>The proposed rules will restrict building on their two sections.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2026	<b>Submitter:</b>	Betsy & Noel Smith
<b>Address:</b>	394A Ngaruawahia Road, RD8, Hamilton, New Zealand 3288		
<b>Point Number</b>	2026.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.7 Ngaruawahia South		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.7 Ngaruawahia South to correctly show the Flood Plan Management Area with respect to 394A Ngaruawahia Road and 372 Ngaruawahia Road		

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The flood plain management area is shown on elevated land not subject to flooding. Refer to aerial map 4/3/2004 in original submission.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2026.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 25 – Waipa River
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 25 Waipa River to correctly show the Flood Plan Management Area with respect to 394A Ngaruawahia Road and 372 Ngaruawahia Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The flood plain management area is shown on elevated land not subject to flooding. Refer to aerial map 4/3/2004 in original submission.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2026.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.7 Ngaruawahia South, and Map 25 Waipa River
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.7 Ngaruawahia South and Map 25 Waipa River to remove elevated land from the Flood Plain Management Area over the entire property at 353 Ngaruawahia Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The dwelling and outbuildings are not in the flood plain. Refer aerial photo 4.3.2004.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2026.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.12.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduces potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains.</li> </ul>

- Development should be above the 1%AEP level (plus freeboard).

**Point Number** 2026.5

**Plan Chapter** 15.4

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.4.1 Permitted activities as proposed.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Few buildings should be built in this area of the District.

**Submitter Number:** 2027 **Submitter:** Jayson & Fulisia Tanaki

**Address:** 80 Rayner Road, Huntly, New Zealand 3700

**Point Number** 2027.1

**Plan Chapter** Map 20.4 Huntly Town Centre

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Map 20.4 Huntly Town Centre to remove the Defended Area (Residual Risk) overlay from 80 Rayner Road, Huntly.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The Town plan shows the property is not within the defended area.
- The property is disconnected from the defended area by at least 100 meters by an arterial road.
- Council staff agreed that the defended area on our property should be considered for removal.

**Submitter Number:** 2028 **Submitter:** Ewen Brunskill

**Address:** 28 Cordyline Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand 2014

<b>Point Number</b>	2028.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>No specific decision sought</b> , however, the submitter generally opposes the rules on new buildings and addition to existing buildings.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter considers this regulation will significantly reduce the value of his property.</li> <li>• The WDC needs to do regular work maintaining the existing network of flood drains that drain stormwater and the flat reserve areas.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2029	<b>Submitter:</b>	Darryl Sait
<b>Organisation:</b>	ITpos Limited		
<b>Address:</b>	43 Cornwall Park Avenue, Epsom, Auckland, New Zealand 1051		

<b>Point Number</b>	2029.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.4 Huntly Town Centre
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.4 Huntly Town Centre to accurately show the Flood Plan Management Area and High-Risk Flood Area outlined at 12, 14, 16, and 18 Main Street Huntly.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legend maps that the submitters have received from the council do not seem to represent the lay of the land.</li> <li>• Submitter requests Council to visit sites.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2030	<b>Submitter:</b>	Gary Fraser
--------------------------	------	-------------------	-------------



<b>Address:</b>	64B Houghton Road, Whatawhata, Hamilton, New Zealand 3290		
<b>Point Number</b>	2030.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 25 Waipa River		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 25 Waipa River to accurately reflect the Flood Plain Management Area at 64B Houghton Road, Whatawhata.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area for the proposed flood plain management area is not true to plan e.g. on the Western boundary of the submitters property there is a steep bank that would prevent any flooding as predicted on the plan.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2031	<b>Submitter:</b>	Tyler Barry
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 50, Raglan, New Zealand 3265		
<b>Point Number</b>	2031.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.1 – Manu Bay		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) on Map 23.1 Manu Bay to accurately reflect the risk at 9 Tohora Close, Whale Bay.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is very solid and elevated above sea level.</li> <li>The land underneath is solid volcanic rock that has been there for thousands of years.</li> <li>The submitter has occupied the land for 30 years and has not seen any erosion or water rise up to the bank.</li> <li>The proposed line crossing through Tohora Close properties would be over 6 metres above MHWS.</li> <li>The map does not provide measurement to boundary.</li> </ul>		

<b>Point Number</b>	2031.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.1 Manu Bay
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) area on Map 23.1 Manu Bay to accurately reflect the risk at 9 Tohora Close, Whale Bay.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area does not justify the trend of the land.</li> <li>• The point of Whale Bay spikes in front of number 9, that area should be less likely to erode being lava.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2032	<b>Submitter:</b>	Blair Everett
<b>Address:</b>	1372 Great South Road, Ramarama RD3 Drury, Auckland, New Zealand 2579		

<b>Point Number</b>	2032.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 - Huntly East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Mine Subsidence Risk Area overlay on Map 20.2 Huntly East by removing the overlay area entirely from the property at 201 Hakanoa St.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The mine subsidence risk area runs through the middle of the submitters property and they wish for it to be moved over 10 metres to exclude their property.</li> <li>• The submitter is concerned about their ability to subdivide in the future. They feel this is causing unnecessary stress on their family.</li> <li>• The submitters insurance company have indicated that they will refuse to insure their property if this goes ahead due to it not meeting the terms and conditions of the mortgage. This will force the submitter to sell urgently.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2033	<b>Submitter:</b>	Steve Finer
<b>Address:</b>	87 Huntington Drive, Hamilton, New Zealand 3210		

<b>Point Number</b>	2033.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.3 DI (Defended Area- Residual Risk) as follows:  <u>b) Where a waterway of at least 1.5m width and 1.5m depth exists near a stop-bank within private land, construction of a new building or new accessory building within 10m from the edge of that waterway on the side furthest from the stop-bank.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where a significant waterway sits between a new building and a stop-bank, the new building would have no impact of the integrity of the stop-bank. The integrity of the stop-bank will be a function of zone from the stop-bank toe through to the edge of that waterway.</li> <li>• Where a waterway runs parallel near a stop-bank, it is significantly better for access tracks to be located alongside the waterway. This means the ground will be elevated and sealed. The displacement of silt during heavy rainfall would be minimised along the waterway, and the access track would provide a barrier which would reduce water and sediment flow into the waterway.</li> <li>• The alternative is to locate buildings in the middle of fertile land, and continue to cultivate land alongside waterways but this would make it hard to manage runoff on cultivated land and would be converse to WRP Plan Change 1.</li> <li>• Locating buildings within a reasonable distance from waterways will enable tracks to be logically located, reduce runoff, and increase the utilisation of fertile soil found away from waterways.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2034	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ann Waugh
<b>Address:</b>	2037A River Road, RDI, Hamilton, New Zealand 3281		

<b>Point Number</b>	2034.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26 – Hamilton Environs
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> High Risk Flood Area and Flood Plain Management Area on Map 26 Hamilton Environs to accurately show areas at risk on 2037A River Rd, Horsham Downs.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The map does not follow the current contour of the land, as alterations on the Horsham Downs golf course have changed the flood plain from the creek.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2035	<b>Submitter:</b>	John Grant
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Boston Six Ltd		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 102189, Auckland, New Zealand 0745		

<b>Point Number</b>	2035.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.3 Whatawhata		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Flood Plain Management Area, including the High Risk Food Area shown on map 26.3 Whatawhata by removing excessive coverage of property at 1174C Horotiu Rd, Whatawhata.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed map indicating the flood plan management area is excessive and does not reflect the property contours.</li> <li>Development and use of the land should be permitted as present and under current ownership.</li> <li>There is no evidence showing that flooding has ever occurred, as indicated on the map attached to the original submission.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2036	<b>Submitter:</b>	Wendy O'Neill
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Hamilton City Council		
<b>Address:</b>	Private Bag 3010, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, New Zealand 3240		
<b>Point Number</b>	2036.1		

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26 – Hamilton Environs
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Flood Plain Management Area shown on map 26 Hamilton Environs in so far as it relates to 2483 River Road, Horsham Downs.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contour information for the site is outdated. The area for clean fill is no longer a depression as the area has been recontoured and is no longer flood prone.</li> <li>• The submitter has attached information that shows the gradient and topography, indicating that there is no risk of future flooding.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2037	<b>Submitter:</b>	Will Phelps
<b>Address:</b>	11 Mangatea Road, Te Hoe, Ohinewai, New Zealand 3784		
<b>Point Number</b>	2037.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Proposed Waikato District Plan – Stage 2 Natural Hazards and Climate Change		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> all reference to climate change from rates assessments. <i>(Note: decision sought does not apply to the Proposed District Plan (Stage 2)).</i>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter denies that humans have an impact on the climate and that rates should not include references to climate change.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2038	<b>Submitter:</b>	Peter Ross Buckley
<b>Address:</b>	1036 Island Block Road, RD2 Te Kauwhata, Hamilton, New Zealand 3782		
<b>Point Number</b>	2038.1		

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.2 RDI Subdivision that creates one or more additional lot(s), to include provision to be a permitted activity if a contingency plan is developed that allows access to the property when the property is above the flood plain.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter's property is in a flood plain, and has a contingency plan to be able to access the house via an easement over adjoining land above the protected area. Refer to map attached to the submission.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2039	<b>Submitter:</b>	Nicol Beeby
<b>Address:</b>	27 Primrose Street, Raglan, New Zealand 3225		
<b>Point Number</b>	2039.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 - Raglan West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) on Map 23.3 Raglan West to reflect the actual contour at 27 Primrose St, Raglan, as shown on plan attached to submission.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development has changed the contour as shown in the attached plan.</li> <li>The LiDAR used is out of date.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2040	<b>Submitter:</b>	Graeme McCarrison
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited		
<b>Address:</b>	Private Bag 92028, Auckland, New Zealand 1010		

<b>Point Number</b>	2040.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 such that it covers both new and upgrading of infrastructure and utilities (to the extent it is not minor upgrading). The use of terminology such as ‘significant’ or ‘substantial’ may be suitable.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy provides an appropriate framework for constructing new infrastructure in areas at significant risk from natural hazards where certain criteria apply including functional/ locational/ operational constraints, mitigation of any increased risk to people property and the environment, design considerations.</li> <li>• There appears to be a policy gap which also flows through to the rules framework as there is no reference to upgrading that does not fall within minor upgrading as provided for in Policy 15.2.1.5.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2040.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.5.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy provides for the ongoing operation maintenance and minor upgrading of infrastructure and utilities in areas subject to natural hazards. However, the submitter also notes that limiting policy to minor upgrading leaves a policy gap in Policy 15.2.1.4 in regard to upgrading that is not minor.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2040.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Section 15.3 - How to use and interpret the rules
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> 15.3 by adding new clause:  <u>(e) Where the rules table for any particular hazard area does not include rules for earthworks, then only relevant zone or district wide earthworks rules apply.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some rules for hazard areas include rules for earthworks, whilst others do not. It is assumed that where the activity table is silent on earthworks they are not further controlled in the hazard rules and rely on the zone rules to regulate earthworks.</li> <li>• Assuming this is the case, a new clause needs to be added to the interpretation rule to clarify this.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2040.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P5 and P6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rules 15.4.1 P5 and P6
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are no activity specific conditions and accordingly only the district wide rules in Chapter 14 need to be considered for network utilities.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2040.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 PI (2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.1 PI (2), to cover both new and upgrading of infrastructure and utilities to the extent it is not minor upgrading.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> PI (2) to read:</p> <p>Operation, construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading or upgrading of <del>New</del> telecommunication lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 1 of the rule provides for repair, maintenance or minor upgrading of all existing utilities, whilst Clause 2 provides for specified new telecommunications equipment. Clause 2 needs to be amended to also provide for upgrading that does not fall within the defined limits of <i>minor upgrading</i>.</li> </ul>



- There is no rule for ancillary earthworks and it is assumed that earthworks are not specially controlled in this hazard area for the activities enabled by this rule.

**Point Number** 2040.6

**Plan Chapter** 15.6.3 D1 and D2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.6.3 D1 and D2 such that the rules do not apply to network utilities and ancillary earthworks within road reserves, and that all other network utility equipment and ancillary earthworks is a permitted activity where the written approval of the authority managing the stop bank has been obtained.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Whilst equipment regulated under the NESTF is exempt from natural hazards rules, there may be some instances where telecommunications equipment falls outside of the NESTF regulations (e.g. a new pole supporting antennas in a zone other than a rural zone, a new pole supporting antennas in a road not within 100m of an existing utility pole, new overhead lines supported by poles.) A new pole supporting antennas could fall within the definition of “*building*”, and all of these works may also require ancillary earthworks.
- At a minimum, Spark requests that any utilities and ancillary earthworks in a road reserve is exempt from these provisions, as roads may be located within 50m of stop banks, particularly where river crossings occur.
- There should also be a pathway to obtain the written approval of the authority responsible for the stop bank to avoid the unnecessary cost of obtaining a resource consent for network utility works that are not unduly vulnerable to flood risk and will not impact on the integrity of the stop bank.

**Point Number** 2040.7

**Plan Chapter** 15.7.1 P3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.7.1 P3

**Decision Reasons:**

- The rule provides for the construction, upgrading, minor upgrading, replacement, repair or maintenance of utilities with no activity specific conditions.

- There is no rule for ancillary earthworks and it is assumed that earthworks are not specially controlled in this hazard area for the activities enabled by this rule.

**Point Number** 2040.8

**Plan Chapter** 15.8.1 P3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.8.1 P3

- Decision Reasons:**
- The rule provides for the construction, upgrading, minor upgrading, replacement, repair or maintenance of utilities with no activity specific conditions.
  - There is no rule for ancillary earthworks and it is assumed that earthworks are not specially controlled in this hazard area for the activities enabled by this rule.

**Point Number** 2040.9

**Plan Chapter** 15.9.1 P2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.9.1 P2 (2) to cover both new and upgrading (to the extent it is not minor upgrading) of infrastructure and utilities. P2(2) should be amended to read:

Operation, construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading or upgrading of New telecommunication lines, poles, cabinets and masts/ poles supporting antennas.

- Decision Reasons:**
- Clause 1 of the rule provides for repair, maintenance or minor upgrading of all existing utilities, whilst Clause 2 provides for specific new telecommunications equipment. Clause 2 needs to be amended to also provide for upgrading that does not fall within the defined limits of *minor upgrading*.
  - There is no rule for ancillary earthworks and accordingly it is assumed that earthworks are not specially controlled in this hazard area for the activities enabled by this rule.

<b>Point Number</b>	2040.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.1 P2 (2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.1 P2 (2) to cover both new and upgrading of infrastructure and utilities.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> P2(2) to read:</p> <p><u>Operation, construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading or upgrading of New</u> telecommunication lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 1 of the rule provides for repair, maintenance or minor upgrading of all existing utilities, whilst Clause 2 for provides for specific new telecommunications equipment. Clause 2 needs to be amended to also provide for upgrading that does not fall within the defined limits of <i>minor upgrading</i>.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2040.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Rule 15.10.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.1 P4 such that it does not apply to utility trenches/bore holes or pole foundations for utilities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rule includes earthworks controls for activities enabled by other rules in this hazard area including network utilities under P2. The rule limits excavation to a 0.5m depth. This may result in minor foundation works for poles or trenches that don't meet the permitted activity standards and cause unnecessary resource consents.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2040.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.11.1 P4 such that it does not apply to telecommunications utilities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Whilst construction, replacement, repair, minor upgrading or maintenance of utilities is a permitted activity without standards in P3, earthworks in P4, that may be ancillary to utilities works, are subject to standards which could be exceeded for utility works e.g. pole foundations.</li> <li>• Regulated activities under the NESTF are already exempt from any natural hazard rules (e.g. pole and ancillary earthworks in rural zone). However, activities that are not regulated (e.g. a pole in a non-rural zone) would be subject to the district plan controls. Mapping of the mine subsidence risk area is sufficient for telecommunications networks to appropriately take into account risks is siting and designing equipment.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2041	<b>Submitter:</b>	N.L Van Der Voorden
<b>Address:</b>	209 Ohautira Road, RDI Te Uku, Raglan, New Zealand 3295		

<b>Point Number</b>	2041.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 24 Te Uku
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 24 so that both the Coastal Sensitive Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) do not apply to the properties located at 209 and 201 Ohautira Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The map does not take into account the elevation of properties located at 209 and 201 Ohautira Road and is inaccurate.</li> <li>• The submitter is concerned about the negative consequences resulting from inaccurate or incomplete information ending up on the submitters property file. All buildings and infrastructure on site are on limestone rock and are 10 or 15 meters above high tide mark. (See photos attached to submission).</li> <li>• Sea level rise will not be issue for subject sites. High tide water does not affect our side of the river and the 100-year flood in January 2006 resulted in minimal inundation on property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2042	<b>Submitter:</b>	Spencer L Drinkwater
--------------------------	------	-------------------	----------------------

<b>Address:</b>	16 Green Acres Drive, RD2 , Te Kauwhata, New Zealand 3785		
<b>Point Number</b>	2042.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2 - Objectives and Policies		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> section 15.2 Objectives and Policies to include Poplars, Willows, Alders, Maples and other fast-growing exotic softwood trees as a natural hazard.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Large exotic, fast growing softwood trees are a hazard resulting in blocked roads and damage to powerlines and other property during storms.</li> <li>• These trees are self-seeding into native bush and riverbanks and farmers still plant exotic softwood trees as bank stabilisers when native trees make better alternatives. Exotic trees provide food and habitat for rats and possums and are expensive to fell.</li> <li>• Saturated trees are heavy in a storm and make them more likely to break or blow over completely which is a greater safety hazard than leaving them dead/dehydrated.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2043	<b>Submitter:</b>	Irvine Raymond Udy
<b>Address:</b>	3824 State Highway 1, RDI, Huntly, New Zealand 3771		
<b>Point Number</b>	2043.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 DI - Defended Area (Residual Risk)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> section 15.6.3 DI - Discretionary Activities to read:  Construction of a new building or new accessory building, located within <del>50m</del> <u>10m</u> of the toe of a stop-bank where the stop-bank is under the responsibility of the Council.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50m building restriction creates unnecessary difficulties for all properties situated along State Highway 1 near the Waikato River stop bank and will mean lengthy,</li> </ul>		

- unclear, expensive and onerous processes for any potential buyers of these properties.
- Submitters family has lived on the property located at 3824 State Highway 1 Huntly, in a house that may be over 80 years old for 43 years and has had no flooding issues in this time.
- The submitter understands that precautions are necessary but believes a 50-meter building restriction would make building on adjoining properties completely impossible.

**Point Number** 2043.2

**Plan Chapter** 15.6.3 D2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** section 15.6.3 D2 Discretionary Activities to read:

Earthworks located within ~~50m~~ 10m of the toe of a stop-bank where the stop-bank is under the responsibility of the Council

**Decision Reasons:**

- 50m building restriction creates unnecessary difficulties for all properties situated along State Highway 1 near the Waikato River stop bank and will mean lengthy, unclear, expensive and onerous processes for any potential buyers of these properties.
- Submitters family has lived on the property located at 3824 State Highway 1 Huntly, in a house that may be over 80 years old for 43 years and has had no flooding issues in this time.
- The submitter understands that precautions are necessary but believes a 50-meter building restriction would make building on adjoining properties completely impossible.

**Submitter Number:** 2044

**Submitter:** Frances Graham

**Address:** 43 Paterson Street, Arataki, Mount Manganui, New Zealand 3700

**Point Number** 2044.1

**Plan Chapter** Map 20.1 Huntly West

**Late:** NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> any proposed natural hazards controls on the property located at 124 Te Ohaki Road, Huntly.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development has been enabled where natural hazards have been identified and have been appropriately managed.</li> <li>• The submission states that the area is safe because the site is on the same level as the existing Highway to the north of the district.</li> </ul> <p><i>(Note: Although not specifically mentioned in the submission, the property is subject to the Flood Plain Management Area, the High-Risk Flood Area and the Defended Area)</i></p>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2045	<b>Submitter:</b>	Eugene Smith
<b>Address:</b>	124 Te Ohaki Road, Huntly ,New Zealand 3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2045.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.1 Huntly West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> ability to continue residing on the property at 124 Te Ohaki Road, Huntly.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trustees and Whanau inheritors should be able to continue residing on property located at 124 Te Ohaki Road.</li> <li>• The property has not flooded in the last 20 years.</li> </ul> <p><i>(Note: Although not specifically mentioned in submission, the property is subject to the Flood Plain Management Area, the High-Risk Flood Area and the Defended Area).</i></p>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2046	<b>Submitter:</b>	Rachel Smith
<b>Address:</b>	82 Riverview Road, Huntly, New Zealand 3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2046.1		

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.3 Huntly South
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> section 15.4 so that Flood Plain Management Area does not apply to property located at 124 Te Ohaki Road Huntly.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Property has no risk of flooding as it has not been flooded over previous years.</li> <li>• Council moved existing building to the site, and it hasn't flooded there since.</li> <li>• Site area is on same height level as the main road to Auckland.</li> </ul> <p><i>(Note: Property to which the submission relates is not stated in the submission but the submitter subsequently confirmed that the submission relates to 124 Te Ohaki Road, Huntly)</i></p>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2047	<b>Submitter:</b>	Joyce Elisabeth Davis-Goff
<b>Address:</b>	58a Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand 3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2047.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Amend</b> provisions in Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change to allow for protection of the property at 58a Wallis Street, Raglan prior to adoption of any adaptive management strategies developed in partnership with stakeholders.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structures are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> </ul>



- Submitter has lived at 58a Wallis Street, Raglan for over 30 years and has not experienced any change in the harbour. The properties seawall has lasted a long period of time and survived extreme weather events.
- Supports adaptive management strategies developed in partnership with stakeholders, but until these strategies are adopted, there is a need to protect subject site.
- Support submission of Raglan Collective #2135 and seeks the remedies it sets out.

**Submitter Number:** 2048 **Submitter:** Susanne Juliane Giessen-Prinz  
**Address:** 56 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand 3225

**Point Number** 2048.1

**Plan Chapter** Chapter 15

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.

And

**Amend** provisions in Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change to allow for protection of the property at 56 and 58 Wallis Street, Raglan prior to adoption of any adaptive management strategies developed in partnership with stakeholders.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structures are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.
- Site located at 56 Wallis Street is significant for the residential owner.
- Submitter also owns the site at 58 Wallis Street, the historic Raglan Dairy factory, built in 1915. The sea wall in front of the property was possibly built around the same time.
- Raglan harbour has no big water surges near the subject site.
- No structural changes in the seawall has been observed in the last 20 years despite big weather events.
- Supports adaptive management strategies developed in partnership with stakeholders, but until these strategies are adopted, there is a need to protect subject site.

- Support submission of Raglan Collective #2135 and seeks the remedies it sets out.

**Submitter Number:** 2049 **Submitter:** Andreas Broring  
**Address:** 56 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand 3225

**Point Number** 2049.1

**Plan Chapter** Chapter 15

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.

And

**Amend** provisions in Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change to allow for protection of the property at 56 and 58 Wallis Street, Raglan (including by sea walls) prior to adoption of any adaptive management strategies developed in partnership with stakeholders.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structures are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.
- Submitter has lived on property for over 20 years and owns the adjoining property at 58 Wallis Street (See submission 2048) for almost 30 years.
- The properties seawall was built by the previous owner has concreted steps leading down to the water. 4-5 of these steps are covered by water at high tide.
- No decay or changes in the sea wall has been noticed.
- Seawall is well built and has character amenity.
- Old dwelling was demolished and rebuilt; however, it was set a few meters further back from the High-Water Mark unlike the old house that was close to the harbourside boundary.
- Supports adaptive management strategies developed in partnership with stakeholders, but until these strategies are adopted, there is a need to protect subject site.
- Support submission of Raglan Collective #2135 and seeks the remedies it sets out.

--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2050	<b>Submitter:</b>	Evelyn Ward
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Ward Ranch Ltd		
<b>Address:</b>	206 Swan Road, RD1, Te Kauwhata, New Zealand 3718		

<b>Point Number</b>	2050.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Generic All Points
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>No clear decision sought</b> - Opposes the Department of Conservation Weir System.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The DoC and Fish &amp; Game weir system has caused high water levels to encroach onto high pasture creating boggy mess and danger to livestock and fences.</li> <li>• Weir system has destroyed the natural ecology and health of submitters farmland located at 206 Swan Road, Te Kauwhata by high water levels.</li> <li>• Weir system has reduced the capacity for any water catchment in this area.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2050.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to the plan provisions to protect the Swan Road stop bank, including by demolishing or lowering the DoC and Fish & Game weir system.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Weir system is making water levels too high causing erosion on the stop bank located at Swan Road.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2050.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 14.2 Te Kauwhata East

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Waikare Golf Course walkway.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Walkway through Golfclub Course is major health and safety risk and is dangerous.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2051	<b>Submitter:</b>	Paul Wood
<b>Address:</b>	26 Westside Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand 2695		

<b>Point Number</b>	2051.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard (inundation) Area on Map 11.1 from 26 Westside Road (Port Waikato).</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p>Compensate section holders in the Sunset Beach Ltd subdivision for Council's change of opinion on our land.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter bought the property at 26 Westside Road, Port Waikato only 5 years ago and at that time it was part of a new Subdivision signed off by the Waikato District Council. For this reason, the submitter considers that section holders should either be compensated for their properties now being identified in a flood inundation area, or the at-risk area should be removed from these properties.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2052	<b>Submitter:</b>	Barry Wayne Ford
<b>Address:</b>	66 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand 3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2052.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> 15.8.1 Coastal Sensitivity Area (inundation).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests further discussion on mapped area and what this means to affected property owners.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2053	<b>Submitter:</b>	Fraser Graafhuis
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Mercury NZ Limited	<b>Organisation:</b>	Mercury
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 445, Hamilton, New Zealand 3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2053.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps - Flood Plain Management Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> the approach to management of high risk flood areas.</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Flood Plain Management Area to include areas affected by high risk flood hazards.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the approach to management of high risk flood areas as required through Waikato Regional Policy Statement Method 13.2.5.</li> <li>• Submitter is of the view that the Proposed District Plan fails to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement Policy 13.2. The Proposed District Plan is required to identify the locations of areas affected by high risk flood hazard and floodplains.</li> <li>• Submitter also does not consider the PDP has given effect to RPS Policy 13.2.6, which requires appropriate assessment of risk and that land use management within the flood plain ensures that risk does not exceed acceptable levels.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2053.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 to reconcile significant risk associated with natural hazards with land use and development including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) mapping to show spatially significant natural hazard risk areas. Areas of significant risk would include the floodplain and the specific areas described around Lake Waikare. Spatial overlays should characterise the location, probability, magnitude and consequences of flood risk; and</li> <li>2) provisions reflecting the “existing environment”, which includes existing land uses as well as activities provided for as permitted activities; and</li> <li>3) strategic management of future growth areas, which includes those PWDP submissions or subsequent private plan changes/resource consents that relate to the rezoning or development of land for activities that are sensitive to flood hazard.</li> </ol>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers the identification of “high risk” flood areas, is not the same as understanding “significant” flood risk within the Flood Plain.</li> <li>• An area may be outside of the “high risk flood overlay”, but still within an area of significant risk, and this could present intolerable effects for some land uses or future growth areas.</li> <li>• This gap in policy approach represents unmanaged natural hazard risk, including flood event consequences of less than 99cm inundation or 1.99 m<sup>3</sup>/s flow within the Flood Plain, and could have significant consequences for people and communities in the future.</li> <li>• The RPS defines “high risk” flood consequence as 2m<sup>3</sup>/s flow x 1m inundation, which clearly represents effects which are intolerable for most land uses.</li> <li>• Submitter supports the representation of high-risk flood areas as an overlay in accordance with the RPS definition.</li> <li>• When identifying areas of significant flood risk there needs to be specific recognition of the function of the Lower Waikato Flood Protection Scheme, by managing land use activities in a way that does not compromise the functional storage capacity of the flood plain.</li> <li>• Giving effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps - Flood Plain Management Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Flood Plain Management Area on the District Plan Maps to include Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment where ground levels are below 8m RL (Moturiki datum).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the absence of completing a comprehensive risk assessment, the submitter seeks, as a minimum, that Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment where ground levels are below 8m RL (Moturiki datum) is included as a Floodplain Management Area overlay within the District Plan.</li> <li>• Required to give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Undertaking a comprehensive Waikato River catchment wide flood risk assessment, utilising the best available information (including climate change assumptions), to evaluate risks associated with flood events and anticipated land use change and development; and</li> <li>2) Using the outcomes of the risk assessment to support the revision to the Proposed District Plan framework.</li> </ol>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk needs to be better understood and represented if significant risk from natural hazards is to be managed in accordance with Section 6(h) RMA, and also satisfy fundamental health and safety requirements.</li> <li>• Regional Policy Statement Policy 13.1 Natural Hazard Risk Management Approach, and methods, including 13.1.1 Risk Management Framework, requires district plans to incorporate a risk-based approach to natural hazards into the management of subdivision, use and development.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 to recognise of the effects and consequences within the wider flood plain provisions of the Proposed Waikato District Plan through the implementation of a risk-based approach.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Generic All Points
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	The outputs of the risk assessment should be made available to all Stage 1 submitters (and the Hearing Commissioners).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Outputs should be made available to address potential natural justice issues for Stage 1 PWDP submitters.</li> <li>General – Risk Based Approach – Risk Assessment</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 to include vulnerability as an attribute to all land use activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter seeks to ensure vulnerability criteria is included within the district plan framework to ensure land use is not exposed to intolerable outcomes.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Mapping – significant risk and residual risk
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support



<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to and develop further the spatial mapping of significant risk and residual risk areas within the Proposed Waikato District Plan framework.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(1) Introduction
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1, paragraph (1), first sentence as follows:  The Natural Hazards chapter <u>identifies risks associated with natural hazards and manages land use in areas subject to the risk from natural hazards.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is seeking a district wide risk assessment process, including spatial reconciliation of risk vs land use, and the application of standards for risk assessment (AS/NZ ISO31000 2009) to provide a clear decision-making framework around risk management within the PWDP.</li> <li>Wording changes are suggested to better reflect a risk based approach.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(3) Introduction
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 to ensure the principles articulated in 15.1(3) are implemented in the plan and make better use of spatial tools to ensure the principles are implemented.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a lack of evidence with regard to how a risk based approach has been undertaken.</li> <li>Submitter requests that the risk assessment be provided as part of the supporting evidence for the PWDP.</li> <li>This should be included in a framework that includes the s32 report, mapping tools and provisions that clearly show a logical risk based decision-making process supporting the provisions in the PWDP.</li> <li>Submitter seeks a district wide risk assessment process, including spatial reconciliation of risk vs land use, and the application of standards for risk</li> </ul>

assessment (AS/NZ ISO31000 2009) to provide a clear decision-making framework around risk management within the PWDP.

**Point Number** 2053.11

**Plan Chapter** 15.1(4) Introduction

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 15 to ensure the principles articulated in paragraph 4 are implemented in the plan and make better use of spatial tools to ensure the principles are implemented.

**Decision Reasons:**

- As per comments on 15.1(3) (point #2053.10) above.

**Point Number** 2053.12

**Plan Chapter** 15.1(5) Introduction

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Chapter 15.1, paragraph (5).

**Decision Reasons:**

- No reason given.

**Point Number** 2053.13

**Plan Chapter** 15.1(7) Introduction

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Chapter 15.1, paragraph (7).

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter supports the avoidance of unnecessary duplication of regulation which is external to the District Plan.

<b>Point Number</b>	2053.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(8) Introduction
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15, paragraph (8) to include reference to the use of existing relevant evidence to inform land use planning and management within the flood plain including historical flood data, and photographic evidence of flood or high flow events.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the approach set out in Chapter 15.1(8), which is fundamental to effective management of natural hazard risk. Given uncertainties with future climate change scenarios, and development interests within flood affected area, it is important that planning responses to risk matters are timely.</li> <li>• Submitter seeks the use of existing relevant science to inform landuse within the flood plain. This would include the use of historical flood data, and photographic evidence of flood or high flow events. This appears to be lacking as evidenced by not including Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment where ground levels are below 8 m RL (Moturiki datum) in the Floodplain Management Area overlay.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(9) Introduction
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Chapter 15.1, paragraph (9).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reason given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps – Floodplain Management Area, and 15.1(10) Introduction
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Floodplain Management Area overlay include the full extent of the flood plain, so that Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment, where ground levels are below 8m RL (Moturiki datum), are included as a Floodplain Management Area overlay within the District Plan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the inclusion of 1% AEP flood modelling as described in Chapter 15.1(10) and considers the use of evidential data, including historical flood data and photographic evidence of flood or high flow events justifies the inclusion of Lake Waikare and surrounding catchment below 8m RL as Flood Plain within the District Plan maps, and requests the inclusion of this area in the Floodplain Management Area overlay.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(11), and Maps – Flood Ponding Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Flood Ponding Areas overlays on the planning maps;  <b>And</b>  <b>Amend</b> the Flood Plain Management Area overlay on the planning maps to include the full extent of the flood plain in the District Plan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the identification of flood ponding areas but seeks mapping for full extent of flood plain.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 definition – Flood Ponding Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> 15.14 definitions for Flood Ponding Area to make it clear that the flood ponding area overlay forms part of the flood plain.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Definitions should provide clarification on whether the flood ponding areas form part of the flood plain.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.19

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps – Defended Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> identification of residual risk areas that are protected by stop banks.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports identification of areas protected by stop banks.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.20
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> and <b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.1 to ensure it provides a clear link between areas subject to flooding, including the Flood Plain Management Area and the High Risk Flood Area and other chapters relating to land uses that are at significant risk from flooding, and rules controlling these activities in the Flood Plain Management Area and High Risk Flood Areas.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks stronger linkages between Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change and other chapters relating to land uses such as residential and subdivision.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 5.2.1.1(a) to ensure significant risk from flood events is managed including within flood plain management areas, by splitting this objective into two to create:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· One objective to manage significant risk, and</li> <li>· One objective to manage high risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks acknowledgment and management of significant flood risk, which includes representation of the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> </ul>

- Consequences within significant risk areas which has associated consequences, which are potentially intolerable to some land use.
- Submitter acknowledges that a higher policy test must be applied for high risk flood areas and would support splitting this objective into two to create new objective.

**Point Number** 2053.22

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.2(a) as follows:

(a) In areas of High Risk Flood, Flood Plain Management Area High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation), ensure that when changes to existing land use activities and development occur, people and communities are not exposed to intolerable levels of risk from natural hazards and a range of risk reduction options are assessed, and development that would increase risk to people’s safety, wellbeing and property is avoided.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter seeks acknowledgment of significant flood risk, which includes representation of the Flood Plain Management Area.

**Point Number** 2053.23

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.3(a) as follows:

(a) Avoid locating new emergency service facilities and hospitals in areas which are at significant risk from natural hazards, including High Risk Flood, Flood Plain Management Area, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion), unless, considering engineering and technical constraints or functional and operational requirements, they cannot be reasonably located elsewhere and will not increase the risk to or vulnerability of people or communities.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter seeks acknowledgment of significant flood risk, which includes representation of the Flood Plain Management Area.

<b>Point Number</b>	2053.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4(a)(ii) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Enable the construction of new infrastructure and utilities in areas at significant risk from natural hazards, including High Risk Flood, <u>Flood Plain Management Area</u>, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) areas only where:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>(ii) any increased risks to people, property and the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated <del>to the extent practicable;</del> and</p> <p>[...]</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks acknowledgment of significant flood risk, which includes representation of the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.25
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.5
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reason given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.26
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.6(a) as follows:  Provide for rezoning, subdivision, use and development outside High Risk Flood, <u>Flood Plain Management Area</u> , High Risk Coastal Hazard  (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Areas where natural hazard risk has been appropriately identified and assessed and can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated and does not transfer or exacerbate risk to adjoining properties.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks acknowledgment of significant flood risk, which includes representation of the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.27
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.9.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reason given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.28
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> and <b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.10 to include information and spatial data on risk in the plan to assist assessment of risk in defended areas.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks clarity in this policy as to how any risk assessment could be reasonably completed when this would need to be based on the entire stopbank system. Stopbank management and maintenance is not a landowner responsibility.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.29
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.11



<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.11(a as follows:  (a) Avoid locating new subdivision, use and development in High Risk Flood, <u>Flood Plain Management Area</u> , High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Areas where a demand or need for new structural protection works will be required to reduce the risk from natural hazards to acceptable levels.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks acknowledgment of significant flood risk, which includes representation of the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.30
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>No specific relief sought</b> - However the submission seeks clarity as to how significant risk which presents potentially intolerable levels of risk have been assessed in a risk based manner.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks clarity as to how significant risk which presents potentially intolerable levels of risk have been assessed in a risk based manner. For example, a combination of inundation and flow which is 99cm x 1.99m<sup>3</sup>/s would not be considered high risk, however, this still needs to be managed from a consequence perspective.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.31
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Policy 15.2.1.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Flood Plain Management Area overlay on the planning maps to include the flood plain surrounding Lake Waikare that is represented by ground levels less than 8m RL.  And that

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Infill development is documented and recorded over time to ensure that infill volumes and cumulative loss of the storage capacity of the Lower Waikato Flood Protection Scheme is managed and displacement of water is understood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is currently unclear how this risk is being managed, or mitigation implemented with insufficient identification of spatial risk associated with the flood plain.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.32
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Policy 15.2.1.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.14(a) as follows:</p> <p><del>(a) Avoid Ensure that the location and storage of hazardous substances in areas within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas which are at significant risk from natural hazards, including High Risk Flood, Flood Plain Management Area, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion), unless, considering engineering and technical constraints or functional and operational requirements, they cannot be reasonably located elsewhere and do not create an unacceptable hazard to people, property or the environment will not increase the risk to or vulnerability of people or communities.</del></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stronger policies are required in relation to storage of the hazardous substances in flood plain management areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.33
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.15(a) - Flood Ponding areas and overland flow paths as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><del>Manage stormwater hazards by requiring n</del> <u>New</u> subdivision and development that is within a flood ponding area <del>s</del> and/or overland flow path <del>s</del> <u>to should</u> adopt an integrated catchment plan based stormwater <del>management methods</del> <u>methodology</u> which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>maintains</u> the flood storage capacity of natural floodplains, wetlands and ponding areas; and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- retains the function and capacity of overland flow paths to convey stormwater runoff; and
- does not transfer or increase risk elsewhere; and
- promotes low impact stormwater management practices with reference to the Waikato Stormwater Management Guideline and the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (RITS); and
- minimises impervious surfaces.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Wording changes are required to clarify this policy.

**Point Number** 2053.34

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Objective 15.2.2.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter supports objectives that build community awareness about, and improve responses to, natural hazard events.
- It is noted that these aspirations need to also be supported by a robust regulatory land use planning framework through the PWDP.
- Submitter seeks transparency around identification of risk, which needs to identify location, probability, magnitude and consequence.

**Point Number** 2053.35

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.2.1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.2.1.

**Decision Reasons:**

- PWDP planning framework is a key part of the "information on natural hazards".
- Submitter seeks transparency around identification of risk, which needs to identify location, probability, magnitude and consequence.

<b>Point Number</b>	2053.36
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.2.2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports objectives that build community awareness about, and improve responses to, natural hazard events.</li> <li>• It is noted that these aspirations need to also be supported by a robust regulatory land use planning framework through the PWDP.</li> <li>• Submitter seeks transparency around identification of risk, which needs to identify location, probability, magnitude and consequence.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.37
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.3.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports objectives that build community awareness about, and improve responses to, natural hazard events.</li> <li>• It is noted that these aspirations need to also be supported by a robust regulatory land use planning framework through the PWDP.</li> <li>• Submitter seeks transparency around identification of risk, which needs to identify location, probability, magnitude and consequence.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.38
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires all subdivision and development to undertake climate change assessments.</li> <li>• Although no specific relief sought, submitter notes that potentially significant equity issues exist with this policy in relation to cost of assessments.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.39
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PWDP planning framework is a key part of the "information on natural hazards".</li> <li>• Submitter seeks transparency around identification of risk, which needs to identify location, probability, magnitude and consequence.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.40
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.3(a) to limit the burden of responsibility and limit the extent of the policy to areas where valid data sets exist.</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Add</b> a Council funded risk assessment within the Waikato River Catchment and within proposed land use zones and areas that are the subject of submissions for up zoning, and base risk upon available data sets including modelled effects, as well as photographic evidence, event reporting, and other relevant information.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The significance and potential impact of this policy needs to be further tested - it will likely impact development in most of the District. This also contradicts a</li> </ul>

range of other policies which allow for development where effects are mitigated e.g., 15.2.3.5.

- Submitter considers Council has an obligation to utilise best information available and ensure timely planning response to natural hazards.
- Risk assessment will allow for reconciliation of all of the areas within the Waikato River catchment within proposed land use zones and areas that are the subject of submissions for up zoning.

**Point Number** 2053.41

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.4

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.3.4.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter supports the intent of this policy.

**Point Number** 2053.42

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.5

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.3.5 to limit the burden of responsibility and limit the extent of policy to areas where valid data sets exist.

And

**Add** a Council funded risk assessment within the Waikato River Catchment and within proposed land use zones and areas that are the subject of submissions for up zoning, and base risk upon available data sets including modelled effects, as well as photographic evidence, event reporting, and other relevant information.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The significance and potential impact of this policy needs to be further tested - it will likely impact development in most of the District. This also contradicts a range of other policies which allow for development where effects are mitigated e.g. 15.2.3.5.
- Submitter considers Council has an obligation to utilise best information available and ensure timely planning response to natural hazards.
- Submitter seeks Council undertakes risk assessment, and bases risk upon available data sets including modelled effects, as well as photographic evidence,

event reporting, and other relevant information. This will allow for reconciliation of all of the areas within the Waikato River catchment within proposed land use zones and areas that are the subject of submissions for up zoning.

**Point Number** 2053.43

**Plan Chapter** 15.3 - How to use and interpret the rules

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** additional text to Chapter 15.3 How to use and interpret the rules that provides a clear link between areas subject to flooding, including the Floodplain Management Area and High Risk Flood Areas and other chapters relating to land uses that are at significant risk from flooding, and rules controlling these activities in the Floodplain Management Area and High Risk Flood Areas.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter seeks stronger linkages between Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change and other chapters relating to land uses such as residential/subdivision.

**Point Number** 2053.44

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1, and Maps covering Lake Waikare and surrounding catchment below 8m RL

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Planning Maps to include the flood extent for Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment below ground level of 8m RL in the Flood Plain Management Area overlay on the Planning Maps.

**Decision Reasons:** Submitter notes the exclusion of Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment below ground level of 8m RL from the Floodplain Management Area and requests the inclusion of this area in the overlay as per previous comments.

**Point Number** 2053.45

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1

**Late:** NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.4.1 Permitted Activities within Land Use Zones which could be affected by the Flood Plain need to be identified and rationalised in the risk based manner.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	General comment on section 15.4.1 - refers to activities, but only controls structures. This needs to be clarified in the plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.46
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P1 as follows:  Construction of a new building or an addition to an existing building, <del>unless specified in P2 – P5 in Rule 15.4.1,</del> where the minimum floor level is at least 0.5m above the 1% AEP flood level.  Compliance with <u>rule 15.4.1</u> shall be demonstrated by a suitably qualified engineer with experience in hydrology.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minor changes. Reference to rules P2- P5 could be interpreted as they are excluded from PA rules.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.47
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Rule 15.4.1 P2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rule conflicts with requirements not to increase risk.</li> <li>• Manage extensions under rule revised 15.4.1 P1 as above.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.48



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P3.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.49
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P4.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.50
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P5.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.51
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P6

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P6 to include an activity specific condition to manage scale as follows:  (a) <u>A maximum volume of filling above natural ground level of 10m<sup>3</sup> per site, and a maximum cumulative volume of filling and excavation of 20m<sup>3</sup>;</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Earthworks associated with this have the potential for adverse effects on flood management infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.52
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P7.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.53
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P8 to ensure that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· infill earthworks volumes within the flood plain below relevant 1% RL levels protect the storage capacity of the Lower Waikato Flood Protection Scheme; and</li> <li>· earthworks provisions relevant to the flood plain take precedence over any land use zone provision; and</li> <li>· a Council process is established to ensure consent information is provided to managers of flood risk data at Waikato Regional Council upon approval.</li> </ul>

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter does not oppose the earthwork limits within bespoke land use zones. However, policies need to manage cumulative effects on derogation of storage capacity and should be agnostic to land use.</li> <li>• It is important consent information is provided to managers of flood risk data at Regional Council upon approval.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.54
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2(c)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> 15.4.2(c)</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><del>(c) Any application arising from this rule shall not be limited or publicly notified.</del></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WRC and Mercury are potentially affected parties and should have the opportunity to be involved in applications associated with Flood Plain Management Areas. RMA notification requirements should be retained.</li> <li>• Submitter notes the exclusion of Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment from the Floodplain Management Area and requests the inclusion of this area in the overlay as per previous comments.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.55
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.4.3 Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.56

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 D1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.3 D1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.57
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.3 D2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.58
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 D3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.3 D3.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.59
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Maps to include the flood extent for Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment below ground level of 8m RL in the Flood Plain Management Area overlay on the Planning Maps as requested above.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter notes the exclusion of Lake Waikare and the surrounding catchment from the Floodplain Management Area and requests the inclusion of this area in the overlay as per previous comments.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.60
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.5.1 Permitted Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.61
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 P1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.1 P1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.62
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.1 P2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.63
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.5.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.64
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> a new matter of discretion as follows:  (g) cumulative effect on the storage capacity of the Lower Waikato Flood Protection Scheme.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to assess any effect on the storage capacity of the Lower Waiakto Flood Plan Scheme.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.65
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RD2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Rule 15.5.2 RD2 and include this activity as a Discretionary Activity.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an overly complicated rule for extensions in the high risk areas.</li> <li>• Submitter is concerned about the potential for cumulative impacts overtime if discretion is restricted to the matters identified.</li> <li>• Any extensions to existing buildings should be assessed as a discretionary activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.66
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.5.3 Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.67
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.3 DI.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.68
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.5.4 Non Complying Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.69
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NCI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.4 NCI.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.70
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NC2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.4 NC2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.71
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NC3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.4 NC3.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No reasons given.</li> </ul>



<b>Point Number</b>	2053.72
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.6.1 Permitted Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.73
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> 15.6.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Given the complexity of residual risk areas, full discretion should be retained.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.74
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.2 by increasing the activity status to a Discretionary Activity and include the current Matters of Discretion (a) to (h) as assessment criteria within the discretionary rule.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires a complicated assessment for any activity to meet the requirements of this rule that are highly likely to create equity issues for applicants.</li> <li>• The matters for discretion reference a range of considerations that at outside the control of the consent applicant, without accurate information/modelling on these aspects the assessment will be a huge hurdle.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2053.75
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.6.3 Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.76
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 D1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.3 D1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.77
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.3 D2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.78

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13.1 – Information requirements for all resource consent applications addressing natural hazards
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.13.1 General.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No reasons given.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.79
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13.4 - Information requirements for all resource consent applications addressing natural hazards
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> 15.13.4 Defended Areas.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks to delete Rule 15.6.2 RDI and replace it as a Discretionary Activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.80
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Flood Plain Management Area following a risk assessment that ensures correct attributes are mapped.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural Hazard risk should clearly define location, probability, magnitude and consequences.</li> <li>• Undertaking a risk assessment will ensure correct attributes are mapped.</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the Flood Plain should also include other flood affected areas, including High Risk Flood area, and Flood Ponding Area.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2053.81
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> High Risk Flood Area following a risk assessment that ensures correct attributes are mapped.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Natural Hazard risk should clearly define location, probability, magnitude and consequences. Undertaking a risk assessment will ensure correct attributes are mapped.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.82
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.14 - Definitions of Utility.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter supports inclusion of flood management infrastructure including stop banks and erosion protection structures associated with flood management where owned or operated by the Waikato Regional Council, the Waikato District Council or the Crown.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2053.83
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Section 32 Report - Natural Hazards and Climate Change – Paragraph 36
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> paragraph 36 of the Natural Hazards and Climate Change Section 32 Report as follows:</p> <p>For those hazards that do need a district plan response, the district plan will need to follow the direction set out in the Waikato Regional Policy Statement, including:</p>

- identifying the areas potentially affected by flooding during a 1% AEP flood event and coastal hazards, prioritising the areas at high risk, which are subject to development pressure;
- manage risk to ensure tolerable land use outcomes associated with all land use development and controlling subdivision in areas identified as within the flood plain, high risk flood zones and high risk coastal hazard areas to avoid the demand for new protection structures;
- controlling the use and development (including habitable structures, significant community infrastructure such as hospitals and emergency services, and lifeline utilities) in flood plain, high risk flood zones and high risk coastal hazards risk areas;
- ensuring risk to people and development within the floodplain or a coastal hazard area is appropriately assessed and any adverse effects either avoided, remedied or mitigated;
- allowing for essential infrastructure where it cannot be located elsewhere or where it will not increase natural hazard risk;

[...]

**Decision Reasons:**

- No reasons provided.

**Point Number**

2053.84

**Plan Chapter**

Proposed District Plan – Stage 2 – Planning Maps

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Proposed District Plan – Stage 2 – Planning Maps to include Lake Waikare and its surrounding catchment, where ground levels are below 8m RL (Moturiki datum), within the Flood Plain Management Area.

Mapping changes to include:

- spatially significant natural hazard risk areas. These areas of significant flood risk would include the floodplain and the specific areas described around Lake Waikare. Spatial overlays should characterise the location, probability, magnitude and consequences of flood risk;
- the “existing environment”, which includes actual existing land uses as well as activities provided for as permitted activities;
- future growth areas, which includes any plan change/ resource consent submissions that relate to the rezoning of land, where that rezoning provides for activities that are sensitive to flood hazard.

**Decision Reasons:**

- No reasons given.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2054	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ruth Walden
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Ruth & Shane Walden and Jane Lee-Smith		
<b>Address:</b>	129 Clarkin Road, Fairfield, Hamilton, New Zealand,3214		
<b>Point Number</b>	2054.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 – Raglan East		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area on Map 23.4 as shown on the submission to take into account the stabilization and anti-erosion measures carried out on the property at 39 Bay View Road, Raglan.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments requested on basis that major structural engineering work has been completed including significant stabilisation and anti-erosion measures have already been undertaken to ensure future stability of the site. (Notes and diagram enclosed with submission).</li> <li>• Proposed area should follow the contour of shoreline rather than stretching diagonally as currently shown. Suggested erosion line is shown in the submission.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2055	<b>Submitter:</b>	Eric Messick
<b>Address:</b>	12 Ryan Road,RDI Te Akau, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand,3793		
<b>Point Number</b>	2055.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 so that the boundary of the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) does not extend inland beyond the Horongarara Esplanade.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some projected inundation boundaries along Horongarara Esplanade, extend too far inland. These should end on Waikato District Council esplanade.</li> <li>• Geography doesn't match the map.</li> </ul>		

<b>Point Number</b>	2055.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the boundary of the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) in Horongarara Esplanade on Map 23.3.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend erosion boundaries along Horongarara Esplanade, they extend too far inland.</li> <li>• Erosion in a calm bay should be less than in other areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2055.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.2 RD1 to permit ancillary dwellings up to 30m <sup>2</sup> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current rule is too restrictive.</li> <li>• Usual building rules should apply.</li> <li>• Allowing ancillary dwelling follows the spirit of restriction.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2055.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.2 RD1 to permit ancillary dwellings up to 30m <sup>2</sup> outside inundation zone.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current rule is too restrictive.</li> <li>• Usual building rules should apply.</li> </ul>

- Can be on the property but outside the inundation zone.
- Allowing ancillary dwelling follows the spirit of restriction.

**Submitter Number:** 2056 **Submitter:** Stanley Russell Walker  
**Address:** 177 Waeranga Road, RD1, Te Kauwhata, New Zealand, 3781

**Point Number** 2056.1  
**Plan Chapter** Map 14.2 Te Kauwhata East  
**Late:** NO  
**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose  
**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** area shown as Defended Area on Map 14.2 Te Kauwhata East pertaining to the property located at 177 Waeranga Road so that it is shown as only partially defended.  
**Decision Reasons:**

- The Defended Area as shown on the planning maps is incorrect (Swan Road Scheme).
- The Swan Road scheme is only partially protected (it is B class rated) and has to be pumped out since the DoC and Fish & Game weir was installed.
- There is a stopbank but there is also a spillway at the west end of Lake Waikare foreshore required to take the excess volume of water passing across the spillway on SH1 at Rangiriri and is the relief for the Balemi and Lumsden Road area.

**Submitter Number:** 2057 **Submitter:** Silvia Fowler  
**On behalf of:** Silvia and Peter Mark Fowler  
**Address:** 257 Collie Road, RD8, Te Kowhai, New Zealand, 3288

**Point Number** 2057.1  
**Plan Chapter** Map 25 Waipa River



<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 25 Waipa River - Flood Plain Management Area so that it accurately aligns with existing ground contours the property located at 257 Collie Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flood modelling is inaccurate and does not align with land contours.</li> <li>• Property consists of mostly flat, high lying ground with a gully area along the eastern boundary.</li> <li>• The map shows some of the high lying area (including part of the existing dwelling) as flood risk area.</li> <li>• Could adversely affect insurance property resale value.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2058	<b>Submitter:</b>	Andrew & Karen Lovelock
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 56-217, Dominion Road, Auckland, New Zealand, 1446		

<b>Point Number</b>	2058.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) on Map 23.3 (Raglan West) so that high water mark is removed from the property located at 3B Lily Street, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsatisfied with the model-based approach to mapping.</li> <li>• WDC reasoning for model-based approach lacks scientific rigor.</li> <li>• The model-based approach is unfair, and it is contrary to natural justice to impose something that may negatively impact on the desirability of the subject property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2059	<b>Submitter:</b>	Renald Furer
<b>Address:</b>	154 Flat Road, RD5 Te Awamutu, Te Awamutu, New Zealand, 3875		

<b>Point Number</b>	2059.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> or <b>delete</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) on Map 23.3 (Raglan West) so that the overlays no longer apply to 27 Lily Street Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overlays may have effect on the resale value of the identified property or impact on any future building consent applications.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2060	<b>Submitter:</b>	Kevin Vince
<b>Address:</b>	708 Whiriwhiri Road, Otaua, New Zealand, 2682		

<b>Point Number</b>	2060.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to Section 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) so that operating vehicles on sand dunes and below high tide mark is regulated and enforced on Karioitahi Beach.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitter concerned that vehicles will physically destroy sand dunes, which provide major protection to the coast.</li> <li>Vegetation will be unable to recover.</li> <li>Suggests signs and education.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2061	<b>Submitter:</b>	Terry Quilty
<b>Address:</b>	156 Misa Road, Otaua, Waiuku, New Zealand, 2682		

<b>Point Number</b>	2061.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Franklin Section – 23A.2.1.6 Separation Distance where Animals kept within Buildings or Enclosures, and Proposed District Plan – General
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Proposed District Plan to retain Franklin section Rule 23A.1.3(c) that applies a 12 metre yard setback from the boundary.</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> Proposed District Plan to amend Rule 23A.1.3(c) to apply a 50 metre yard setback from the boundary.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a proximity issue for neighbours with animals including cattle and horses.</li> <li>• Smell, noise, and effluent in proximity to a dwelling needs to be prevented.</li> <li>• The boundary restrictions are not enough.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2061.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Proposed District Plan - General
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to the Proposed District Plan a restriction on the distance between animal enclosures including cattle, horses, or other and a dwelling of a minimum of 50 meters.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a proximity issue for neighbours of animals including cattle and horses.</li> <li>• Smell, noise, and effluent that are in proximity of a dwelling needs to be prevented.</li> <li>• The boundary restrictions are not enough.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2062	<b>Submitter:</b>	Karl Phillip Beaver
<b>Address:</b>	964 Churchill Road, RD I, Tuakau, New Zealand, 2696		

<b>Point Number</b>	2062.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 13 Lake Whangape
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 13 Lake Whangape to reduce the Flood Plain Management Area, in particular at 964 Churchill Road, Pukekawa.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area depicted on the maps is excessive.</li> <li>• In the past 15 years there has been no flooding in the areas depicted on the map.</li> <li>• The topography has not been properly considered.</li> <li>• Submitter suggests that a physical inspection of the land should be made.</li> <li>• The flood maps as proposed will have an adverse impact on the value and saleability of the submitters land.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2063	<b>Submitter:</b>	Maria Timmermans
<b>Address:</b>	82 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato, New Zealand, 2695		

<b>Point Number</b>	2063.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Rule 15.8.1 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) - Permitted Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It restricts the alterations that the submitters can do to their property.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2063.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	Delete Rule 15.9 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The council should not have the right to add this when no action is taken to stop the Maretai Bay reserve from having its bank levels lowered by day-trippers making new road paths onto the bay.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2064	<b>Submitter:</b>	Tamara Pairaudeau
<b>Address:</b>	15 Russell Road, Huntly, New Zealand, 3700		

<b>Point Number</b>	2064.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 Huntly East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.2 Huntly East to exclude 15 Russell Road, Huntly from the Mine Subsidence Risk Zone.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The property was built and established in the early 1940s and did not have any historic underground coal mining activities undertaken on the land.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2065	<b>Submitter:</b>	Peter Taylor
<b>On behalf of:</b>	P & M Taylor		
<b>Address:</b>	81 Waipa Heights, RD1, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand, 3793		

<b>Point Number</b>	2065.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 Raglan West to revise the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) at 11D Ryan Road, Te Akau following a detailed study of the property.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This was an arbitrary assessment and Council should carry out a detailed study of the property at 11D Ryan Road, Te Akau.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2066	<b>Submitter:</b>	Andrew Wilson
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 119, Raglan, New Zealand, 3265		
<b>Point Number</b>	2066.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> map to remove Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from the submitter's property at 2E Ryan Road, Te Akau South.		
	<i>(Note: property address was supplied by submitter on 3.11.20).</i>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	An area specific investigation is required as council have admitted to oversight in mapping.		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2067	<b>Submitter:</b>	Pauline & Matthew Davies
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Barratt Davies Family Trust		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 38, Raglan, New Zealand, 3265		
<b>Point Number</b>	2067.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 Raglan East – Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion), and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area, and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area, and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation)		

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area, Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion), High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) from 95B Lorenzen Bay Road, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed overlays are based on false assumptions.</li> <li>• In 50 years since the land was first cleared and built upon it has never flooded nor become inundated.</li> <li>• There has been more land reclamation as opposed to erosion.</li> <li>• There is little to no wave action in Lorenzen Bay to cause scouring.</li> <li>• The sea walls have not been breached.</li> <li>• It is unreasonable to impose overlays for something that has never happened and is not significant risk, thereby affecting property values and insurability.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2068	<b>Submitter:</b>	Rachael Brown
<b>Address:</b>	2 Marr Road, Manukau, Auckland, New Zealand, 2102		

<b>Point Number</b>	2068.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps – High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> all High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Areas as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests an action plan that is sustainable for future growth, that decreases natural erosion and flooding areas and develop prospects for building and development.</li> <li>• The submitter supports any trials of preventative measures for future retention of hazards areas.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2068.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps – High Risk Flood Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> all High-Risk Flood Areas as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests an action plan that is sustainable for future growth, to decrease natural erosion and flooding areas and develop prospects for building and development.</li> <li>• The submitter supports any trials of preventative measures for future retention of hazards areas.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2069	<b>Submitter:</b>	Brett Curle
<b>Address:</b>	6 Nihinihi Avenue, Raglan West, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2069.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area from 6 Nihinihi Avenue, Raglan as shown on Map 23.3 Raglan West.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The detail on the plan shows High Risk Area that is a fresh water drain which flows into the sea.</li> <li>• Submitter requests that the drain should be a covered culvert to lessen the risk of their section flooding.</li> <li>• This hazard overlay will affect the property value and affect future plans.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2070	<b>Submitter:</b>	Helen Ritchie
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 104, Raglan, New Zealand,3265		

<b>Point Number</b>	2070.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23 Raglan Coast



<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23 Raglan Coast to have a consistent width of Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) between Manu/Whale Bay and Whaanga Coast.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard rock basalt geology at the base of Karioi should be considered the same risk level along this whole piece of coastline.</li> <li>• Current change to wider band is arbitrary and could reduce plan credibility.</li> <li>• This geology is more resilient than areas north of Whaingaroa Harbour, which have more sand/ sedimentary/ older ash soils.</li> <li>• The coastal basalt cliffs of Whaanga Coast are high and less susceptible to erosion.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2071	<b>Submitter:</b>	Tyrone Murphy
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 154, Raglan, New Zealand, 3265		

<b>Point Number</b>	2071.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 - Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 (Raglan West) - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) Overlay on to accurately reflect the risk at 10 Mara Kai lane, Rangitahi Peninsula, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter says the assessment seems excessive without justification and that it will have significant adverse effect on the property.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2071.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 (Raglan West) - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area Overlay and section 15.9 on to accurately reflect the risk at 10 Mara Kai lane, Rangitahi Peninsular, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter says the assessment seems excessive without justification and that it will have significant adverse effect on the property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2072	<b>Submitter:</b>	Murray Allen
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Allen Fabrics Ltd		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 241, Huntly, New Zealand, 3740		

<b>Point Number</b>	2072.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata and Map 20.2 Huntly East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata and Map 20.2 Huntly East by removing the Defended Area overlay from 239 East Mine road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lake on the submitter's property will be 8.2m above the river level. Therefore, the land in the defended area is well above 100 year flooding risk.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2073	<b>Submitter:</b>	Kate Dermer
<b>Address:</b>	64 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2073.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.

**And**

**Amend** Policy 15.2.1.8 (b) to provide for protection of properties until adaptive management plans are adopted, including sea walls at Wallis St and Lorenzen Bay, Raglan.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structures are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.
- The seawall at end of property (64 Wallis Street Raglan) has withstood king tides, storms and winds for the 12 years of residency on the property.
- The submitter supports the submission of the Raglan Collective and seeks the remedies it sets out. [Submission no. 2135].

**Submitter Number:**

2074

**Submitter:**

John Lawson

**On behalf of:**

Whaingaroa Environment Defence

**Address:**

51 Cliff Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225

**Point Number**

2074.1

**Plan Chapter**

15.2 Objectives and policies

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Chapter 15 to better integrate with Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan by incorporating the WDC Climate Response and Resilience Policy 2020, specifically including points 7.3, 7.5 and 7.9 from the Policy.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter supports stage 2 whilst requesting that there needs to be better integration with stage 1 policies.
- Specifically sections of Waikato District Council's Climate Response and Resilience Policy 2020 need to be incorporated into chapter 15.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2075	<b>Submitter:</b>	Simon & Teresa Fleming
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Fleming Ranch Trust		
<b>Address:</b>	63 Sunshine Avenue, Te Rapa, Hamilton, New Zealand,3200		
<b>Point Number</b>	2075.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.12 to clarify future subdivision and building codes pertaining to the Flood Plain Management Area.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Clarification needs to be provided on future subdivision and building codes pertaining to the Flood Plain Management Area as no information has been given on this matter.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2075.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1 Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 to clarify changes this will make to building code beyond those required around heights over the Motariki Datum.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submission seeks further clarification and outlining of the changes this section will make to building code beyond what is already required. Specifically concerned with the heights of buildings around the Motariki Datum Line.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2075.3		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 – Natural Hazards and Climate Change		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 to clarify what compensation and financial support will be given to land owners in the Flood Plain Management Area (as opposed to high risk areas) when changes require greater reliance on engineers etc.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests clarification for what compensation the Council may provide to the owners of property that is now identified to be within the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> <li>• What financial support can be provided for property owners who seek development after the plan variation has been accepted and 'require greater reliance on engineers.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2076	<b>Submitter:</b>	Peter & Kerry Santner
<b>Address:</b>	31 Lily Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2076.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.4 (Raglan East) by removing the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from the property located at 31 Lily Street, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There has been no significant change to the stability of the area identified as a natural hazard area.</li> <li>• There are no signs of erosion at the sea edge below the property line of 31 Lily Street Raglan.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2077	<b>Submitter:</b>	Dominic Friskney
<b>Address:</b>	82 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand,2695		

<b>Point Number</b>	2077.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> rules in Section 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (erosion).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The rules in this section restrict what can be built within the identified areas and the building process will increase in cost due to legal requirements of these policies. The submitter expects a reduction in rates if the changes go ahead.

<b>Point Number</b>	2077.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> rules in section 15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rules in this section restrict what can be built within the identified areas and the building process will increase in cost due to legal requirements of these policies.</li> <li>• Submitter expects reduction in rates if the changes go ahead.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2079	<b>Submitter:</b>	David & Karina Cooper
<b>Address:</b>	22 Westvale Lane, Te Kowhai, Hamilton, New Zealand,3288		

<b>Point Number</b>	2079.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.2 - Te Kowhai
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the Flood Plain Management Area from 22 Westvale Lane, Te Kowhai as shown on Map 26.1 Te Kowhai.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no geographical evidence supporting the identified floodplain in this area of Te Kowhai.</li> <li>• The plan is invalid and should not be included in the District Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the 16 years residing on property 22 Westvale Lane the submitter has never experienced any flooding.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The stream would need to rise 8m and 30m wide and that would never happen.</li> </ul>
--------------------------	--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2080	<b>Submitter:</b>	Trish Waugh
<b>Address:</b>	2C Ryan Road, Te Akau South, Te Akau, New Zealand,3793		

<b>Point Number</b>	2080.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3- Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 Raglan West by improving the accuracy of the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) at Ryan Road area, Te Akau South.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The blanket zone depicting the Coastal Sensitivity Area (erosion) hazard in the identified area is not accurate enough.</li> <li>• Submitter suggests that some properties should be exempt.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2081	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jane West
<b>Address:</b>	66 Bruntwood Road, RDI, Cambridge, New Zealand,3493		

<b>Point Number</b>	2081.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.4 Raglan East, to remove the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from the property at 7 Daisy Street, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitter is concerned that the projected areas of coastal erosion are unnecessarily exaggerated.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2081.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.4 Raglan East, to remove the High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The submitters are concerned that the projected areas of coastal erosion are unnecessarily exaggerated.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2082	<b>Submitter:</b>	Peter & Natalie Steens
<b>Address:</b>	564B Horotiu Road, Te Kowhai, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3288		
<b>Point Number</b>	2082.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change, and Map 25 Waipa River		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change.  <b>Or</b>  <b>Delete</b> Flood Plain Management Area from Map 25 Waipa River.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The map sent of properties around Waipa River is inaccurate.</li> <li>None of the properties are near the Waipa River so have no chance of becoming flooded.</li> </ul>		



<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2083	<b>Submitter:</b>	Sofia Andreen
<b>Address:</b>	19 Kellyville Road, Mercer, New Zealand 2474		
<b>Point Number</b>	2083.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.6 - Managing natural hazard risk generally, to secure slope stability, especially risks due to trees by the Kellyville Road intersection on Koheroha Road, Mercer.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pines have been poorly maintained and left to pose danger to people, property and high voltage powerlines over the road.</li> <li>• The council should have a plan to prevent these risks.</li> <li>• The 2017 tree risk report lodged with council needs to be taken seriously.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2084	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ron Miller
<b>Address:</b>	92C Te Onetea Road, Rangiriri, Huntly, New Zealand, 3771		
<b>Point Number</b>	2084.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6, and Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.6 Managing natural hazard risk generally as proposed.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> to Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change to allow the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilising coal under Lake Waikare using Underground Coal Gasification technology.</li> </ul>		

- Cryo-generate gas to supply Huntly Power Station and/or produce hydrogen
- Create a charcoal-based sinkhole to both deepen and clean lake water fed from the Waikato River via Te Onetea Stream and other tributaries.
- Possible clean water source to supply future development in the North Waikato region with added water treatment facilities.

**Decision Reasons:**

- It will utilise coal.
- Can supply Huntly Power Station.
- It could produce Hydrogen for future government planned energy source development.
- To deepen and clean lake water.
- To supply future development with added water treatment facilities.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2085	<b>Submitter:</b>	Daniel Parker
<b>Address:</b>	5 Flemings Way, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand, 3720		

<b>Point Number</b>	2085.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RD2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.2 RD2 High Risk Flood Area – Restricted Discretionary Activities, to increase the maximum floor area 15m2 to 80m2;</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Delete</b> Rule 15.5.2 RD2 High Risk Flood Area – Restricted Discretionary Activities.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter has plans to extend in the future and feel that they should be allowed to a suitable floor height.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2085.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NC1
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Rule 15.5.4 NCI High Risk Flood Area – Non-Complying Activities.  <b>Or</b>  <b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.4 NCI High Risk Flood Area – Non-Complying Activities to allow for rebuilding in the case of something such as a fire.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitters have an existing house on a property affected by this rule.</li> <li>• It is unclear if they would be allowed to rebuild in the case of something such as a fire.</li> <li>• The submitters should be allowed to rebuild like for like.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2086	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ministry of Education
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand, 3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2086.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change as proposed, specifically Section 15.2 Objectives and Policies, rules sections 15.4 through to 15.13 and accurate mapping.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed objectives and policies are considered to be appropriate and sufficient for managing development in areas subject to natural hazard risk.</li> <li>• The proposed rules are considered sufficiently robust to ensure proposed objectives and policies can be achieved.</li> <li>• Accurate and robust mapping and high quality and up to date information is important to communicate hazard risk to the Ministry of Education and the community.</li> <li>• The submitter supports any improvements on the accuracy of information relating to areas subject to natural hazards and climate change effects.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2087	<b>Submitter:</b>	Alex Staheli
--------------------------	------	-------------------	--------------

<b>Address:</b>	29 Lily Street, Raglan, New Zealand 3225		
<b>Point Number</b>	2087.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> the High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area from 29 Lily Street, Raglan.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Delete</b> the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from 29 Lily Street, Raglan.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will adversely affect selling the property in the future and add to building costs and inflation.</li> <li>• The property values will be significantly lower.</li> <li>• There has been no study of the bank at the submitter's property.</li> <li>• Other hazards in the area should be prioritized.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2088	<b>Submitter:</b>	Nicolette Hoete
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Diana Rangipuehu Hoete		
<b>Address:</b>	10 York Road, Papatoetoe, Auckland, New Zealand,2104		
<b>Point Number</b>	2088.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11 Waikato Heads South - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) from 2277 Tuakau Bridge-Port Waikato Road, Tuakau and allow the operative regulations to remain.</p> <p><b>And</b></p>		

**Delete** the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from 2277 Tuakau Bridge-Port Waikato Road, Tuakau and allow the operative regulations to remain.

**Decision Reasons:**

- There is no historical evidence of flooding. The submitter is 82 years old and has never seen this area flood.
- The road is 5m from the section, the river is 40m from the road which is elevated 2-3m above the river.
- The house a permanent fixture as has a concrete base and block construction. It sits 0.5m from the ground.
- The section is approx. ¼ acre and there is nowhere to move the house to.
- Under the Ti Tiriti O Waitangi the submitters claim the right to allow the current regulations to remain.

**Submitter Number:**

2089

**Submitter:**

Dave Cooper

**On behalf of:**

Daks Development

**Address:**

22 Westvale Lane, Te Kowhai, New Zealand,3288

**Point Number**

2089.1

**Plan Chapter**

Map – Flood Plain Management Area

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Delete** the Flood Plain Management Area from the maps.

**Decision Reasons:**

- This proposed flood plain is illogical and has no evidence to support it.
- The plans are incorrect and invalid.

**Submitter Number:**

2090

**Submitter:**

Scott Foster

**Address:**

New Zealand,3240

**Point Number**

2090.1

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 Huntly East – Mine Subsidence Risk Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Clarification sought</b> on the determination of the Mine Subsidence Risk Area boundary within 42 Bailey Street Huntly.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p>Potentially <b>amend</b> the Mine Subsidence Risk Area within 42 Bailey Street, Huntly.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter seeks information on the determination of the policy area boundary.</li> <li>• The submitter seeks further information confirming why the location of the new policy area is different from the operative plan.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2091	<b>Submitter:</b>	Helen Clotworthy
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Pokeno Community Committee		
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,2472		

<b>Point Number</b>	2091.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a Strategic Property Plan to specifically address issues relating to North Waikato. This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pokeno and Tuakau around reserves, parkland and natural areas;</li> <li>• Significant Natural Reserves identified and protected;</li> <li>• Connected and accessible walkways including during flooding;</li> <li>• Wetlands protected;</li> <li>• Pokeno Waterfalls, Wetlands and Maori Cultural Heritage Areas as areas specifically outlined and protected.</li> </ul>

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issues identified relating to North Waikato (especially Pokeno and its surrounds) are not necessarily specifically addressed in the policies of the proposed plan change.</li> <li>• A strategic Property Plan needs to address these issues in North Waikato to keep up with population growth of the area.</li> <li>• The Pokeno Community Committee requests these areas be addressed to protect biodiversity and resident's safety whilst increasing recreational accessibility (which are currently under provided for).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2091.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> a plan to support people displaced due to climate change, including Port Waikato residents impacted by climate change.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern for displaced residents in Port Waikato due to climate change issues.</li> <li>• Submission seeks guidance from a Local Government Plan on how to support these people.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2092	<b>Submitter:</b>	Bianca Angel
<b>Address:</b>	71 Bailey Street, Huntly East, Huntly, New Zealand,3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2092.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13.4		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Defended Area on the planning maps and reduce the overly conservative area.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No confidence in the conservative natural hazards and climate change areas.</li> </ul>		

- The mapped defended area is overly conservative, and it will have an unnecessary negative impact on property owners.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2093	<b>Submitter:</b>	TaTa Valley Limited
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,2163		
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2 Objectives and Policies		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the plan to relocate the objectives and policies from Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change to Chapter 11: Natural Hazards and Climate Change in Section B: Objectives and Policies.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 11 is situated in Section B: Objectives and Policies. Chapter 15 is situated within Section C: Rules, so it is considered inappropriate that this chapter would contain objectives and policies and may confuse plan users.</li> <li>• This approach is consistent with the structure of the rest of the PWDP.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Planning maps		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the plan to relocate the Floodplain Management Area from the planning maps to a non-statutory map in the Waikato Council GIS outside of the PWDP.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping the Flood Plain Management Area as a non-statutory GIS layer would be the most efficient and effective means of managing flood risk while enabling Council to regularly update and maintain the information. This will avoid the cost and time delays often associated with a Schedule 1 process.</li> <li>• Other local authorities such as Auckland Council, include hazard maps as non-statutory maps within their GIS systems.</li> </ul>		



<b>Point Number</b>	2093.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2 Policies
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies relating to High Risk Flod and Flood Plain Management Areas to clarify that not all Flood Plain Management Areas are High Risk Flood Areas
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A number of policies contain specific and directive language to "avoid" certain activities in High Risk Flood Areas (including Policies 15.2.1.1, 15.2.1.2 and 15.2.1.11).</li> <li>• Submitter supports restricting the "avoid" direction to the higher risk areas and excluding those areas with a lesser risk like the Flood Plain Management Area. However, all the policies should be amended to clarify that not all Flood Plain Management Areas are High Risk Flood Areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2 Policies
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies relating to High Risk Flod and Flood Plain Management Areas to ensure consistency in terminology between mapping, rules and policies
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure consistency between the maps and rules which refer to the Flood Plain Management Area and the policies which refer to the flood plains of the Waikato and Waipa Rivers.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.12
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the intent of Policy 15.2.1.12 as all buildings should provide for floor levels to be provided above the 1% AEP.</li> <li>• The policy provides appropriate exceptions for buildings that would not suffer material damage if they were flooded, such as farm buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.14 as follows:</p> <p>...flood ponding areas do not create a <del>an unacceptable</del> hazard to people, property or the environment <u>that cannot be appropriately managed</u></p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> the policy so the term “unacceptable” is better defined.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter oppose policy 15.2.1.14 in that the use of ‘unacceptable’ in the drafting of this policy is ambiguous and likely to result in various degrees of interpretation.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 PI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 PI by deleting activity-specific conditions (a) and (b) with new text as follows:</p> <p><del>(a) The minimum floor level is at least 0.5m above the 1% AEP flood level, and</del></p> <p><del>(b) Compliance with condition (1) shall be demonstrated by a suitably qualified engineer with experience in hydrology.</del></p>

(a)The minimum floor level is at least 0.5m above the 1% AEP flood level for more vulnerable land uses;

(b)The minimum floor level is at least 0.3m above the 1% AEP flood level for less vulnerable activities;

**And**

**Add** new definitions of "more vulnerable activities" and "less vulnerable activities", consistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter opposes the requirement that all buildings need to achieve a minimum floor level above 0.5m. The approach adopted in the Stormwater Code of Practice for Auckland has different levels for more and less vulnerable activities: 0.5m for more vulnerable activities and 0.3m for less vulnerable activities. A differentiation between more and less vulnerable activities is consistent with Policy 15.2.1.12.
- Submitter opposes the inclusion of permitted activity standard (b) as it is an overly restrictive and unnecessary cost to impose on an applicant for a Permitted Activity.

**Point Number** 2093.8

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1 P8

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.4.1 P8 (b) as follows:

(b) In the Rural Zone - a maximum volume of filling above natural ground level of 100m<sup>3</sup> ~~per site within the Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas applying to that part of a site~~, and a maximum cumulative volume of filling and excavation of 200m<sup>3</sup> ~~per site within the Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas applying to that part of this site~~;

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter opposes various elements contained within P8. In particular, the reference to 'per site' is confusing. It is uncertain whether this relates to the site (in its entirety) or the area of the site within the Floodplain Management Area.
- Alternative wording is sought to clarify that these earthwork volumes only apply to areas situated within a Flood Plain Management Area.

**Point Number** 2093.9

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.3

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the activity status of Rule 15.4.3 DI from Discretionary Activity to a Restricted Discretionary Activity</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> the following matters of restricted discretion:</p> <p><u>(a) the type of activity being undertaken and its vulnerability to natural hazard events including the consequences of a natural hazard event in relation to more or less vulnerable activities;</u></p> <p><u>(b) the likelihood of a natural hazard event occurring and the likely extent of any damage to people, property or the environment;</u></p> <p><u>(c) the effects on public access, landscape and other environmental values, caused by any works proposed in association with the building or structure, including any associated earthworks and landform modifications, to address the hazard by way of mitigation; and</u></p> <p><u>(d) the ability to relocate buildings or structures including the proposed duration of occupation of the building or structure within a hazard area, taking into account the long-term likely effects of climate change.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter oppose the Discretionary Activity status for construction of new buildings and additions to existing buildings within the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> <li>• The majority of buildings, excluding farm buildings and minor alterations to other buildings (15m<sup>2</sup>), would thus require a resource consent as a Discretionary Activity which is overly restrictive.</li> <li>• Changing the activity status to Restricted Discretionary for these buildings is more appropriate as the effects that Council should restrict their discretion to can be defined, and appropriately managed.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13.1 - Information requirements
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> 15.13.1(1)(a) (Information requirements) as follows:</p> <p><del>a) Geotechnical assessment, including identification and assessment of any potentially liquefaction-prone land and land subject to slope instability;</del></p>

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (a) is unnecessary because (b) generally covers the matters listed in (a).</li> <li>• The volume of information required is substantial and not linked to scale of activities or effects that may be generated.</li> <li>• Costs may be prohibitive, particularly for small activities such as minor earthworks.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> chapter 15 to relocate the definitions to Chapter 13 Definitions.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The definitions should be relocated to Chapter 13. Submitter supports the definition of “farm building” in particular.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> all definitions in Chapter 15 that refer to the Planning Maps in respect of the Flood Plain Management Area to make reference to the Waikato District Council GIS.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping the Flood Plain Management Area as a non-statutory GIS layer would be the most efficient and effective means of managing flood risk while enabling Council to regularly update and maintain the information. This will avoid the cost and time delays often associated with a Schedule 1 process. (Refer also submission 2093.2).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Proposed Waikato District Plan

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> PWDP with any consequential relief required to give effect to submitter's submission points including to other provisions as required to ensure a consistent approach throughout the Plan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks consequential relief to give effect to submissions.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2 - Objectives and Policies
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Chapter 15.2 objectives and policies, subject to amendments in other submissions.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports delineation of managing activities in higher and lower risk areas but seeks limiting of "avoid" terminology to high risk areas.</li> <li>• Amendments also seeks amendments to improve clarity as per other submissions.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Proposed Waikato District Plan - Stage 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the delineation between high risk and lower risk areas
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not Specified</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2093.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2 - Policies

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> the policy approach to “avoid” certain activities and effects only in high risk areas</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> policies which adopt an avoidance approach in lower risk areas where appropriate development should be allowed.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the policy approach to “avoid” certain activities and effects only in high risk areas.</li> <li>• Opposes an avoidance approach in lower risk areas like where appropriate development should be allowed.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2093.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Proposed Waikato District Plan - Stage 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> drafting of stage 2 PWDP by removing unnecessary complication, and amending to represent good drafting practice.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drafting is unnecessarily complicated and, in some instances, does not represent good practice. (Not limited to examples referred to in other submission points.)</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2093.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Proposed Waikato District Plan - Stage 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> all rules so that non-compliance with permitted activity standards does not default to discretionary activity, but to a restricted discretionary activity.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is more appropriate if non-compliance with permitted activity standard defaults to restricted discretionary activity, to provide plan users with more certainty.</li> </ul>

- The effects are well understood and can be defined, in a list of matters of discretion.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2094	<b>Submitter:</b>	Kainga Ora Homes and Communities
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 74598, Greenlane, Auckland, New Zealand, 1546		
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> stand-alone natural hazards and climate change chapter.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approach aligns with the formatting detailed in the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.1 Resilience to Natural Hazard Risk as notified		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the intent of Objective 15.2.1.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.3		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1		



<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain Policy</b> 15.2.1.1 New Development in areas at significant risk from natural hazards as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the intent of policy 15.2.1.1 specifically that the plan change should apply a general approach of seeking to ‘avoid’ establishing new development or sensitive land uses within Significant Natural Hazard risk areas identified as ‘high risk, unless it can be demonstrated the proposed subdivision will not increase risk to ‘people’s safety, wellbeing and property’.</li> <li>• This aligns with the proposed activity status sought by Submitter in relation to Section 15.5.3 (High Risk Flood Area).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.2 Changes to existing land use activities and development in areas at significant risk from natural hazards as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the intent of the Policy. Specifically supports the identification of ‘risks’ which are to be avoided. This is consistent with Policy 15.2.1.1.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.6 - Managing natural hazard risks generally as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the intent of the Policy. Specifically supports the provision for re-zoning, subdivision, use and development where a natural hazard risk has been identified and appropriately assessed.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.10 Areas defended by stopbanks adjacent to the Waikato River as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of the Policy. Specifically supports the provision for subdivision and development within proximity to 'Defended Areas', subject to relevant controls.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.11
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.11 New development that creates demand for new protection structures and works as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically avoiding subdivision that will result in need for new structural protection works.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.12 Reduce potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains and flood ponding areas as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of policy, specifically in reducing the potential for flood damage to buildings through built form and exemptions for small-scale additions to an existing building.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.9

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.13 Control filling of land within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifically supports the intent of the Policy, specifically controlling earthworks/filling in flood plains/ponding areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.15 - Flood ponding areas and overland flow paths as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the general intent of the Policy, specifically that the policy is intended to apply to flood ponding areas and overland flow paths.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.16
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.16 - Development in the Coastal Sensitivity Areas as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically to provide for subdivision, use and development in Coastal Sensitive Areas where risks can be identified and minimised through built form.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.17

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.17 - Setbacks from the coast as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically balancing risk with functional or operational need.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.18
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.18 - Residential development potentially subject to fire risk as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically providing for the establishment of new residential development within areas identified as being subject to fire risk, contingent on appropriate buffers/setbacks.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.19
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.19 - Development on land subject to instability or subsidence as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically the provision for rezoning, subdivision, use and development on land subject to instability or subsidence contingent on appropriate risk mitigation.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.22
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Policy 15.2.1.22 - Liquefaction-Prone Risk Assessment
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed approach places the onus of identifying areas subject to liquefaction risk onto applicants.</li> <li>• Submitter opposes applicants having to prepare a supporting geotechnical assessment prior to new subdivision use or development taking place, given the uncertainty and risk associated for this party.</li> <li>• The council should fund a district-wide assessment of land susceptible to liquefaction-induced ground damage.</li> <li>• Policy 15.2.1.23 is the appropriate policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.23
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.23 as follows:  Control subdivision, use and development on land <del>assessed</del> <u>identified</u> as being susceptible to liquefaction-induced ground damage...
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the intent of the Policy. Seeks to amend wording to better control subdivision land use and development on land susceptible to liquefaction-induced ground damage. (Refer to submission on Policy 15.2.1.22.).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.3 Climate Change to read:  A well-prepared community that:  a) Is <u>resilient</u> <del>able to adopt</del> to the <u>current and future</u> effects of climate change; and

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>b) <del>Supports reductions in</del> <del>Has transitioned to development that prioritises lower</del> greenhouse gas emissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of the Objective, but considers wording should be more closely aligned with terminology of objective 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 - Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports intent of the Policy, specifically to ensure adequate allowances being needed for the projection effects of climate change in the design and location of new subdivision and development.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.19
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.2(ii)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.2(ii) Future land use planning and climate change as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically reducing potential effects on communities by encouraging incorporation of sustainable design measures within new subdivision, land use and development.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.20
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.3 - Precautionary approach for dealing with uncertainty as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically acknowledging the uncertainty of the projected effects of climate change and providing a precautionary approach when dealing with this uncertainty for new subdivision land use and development.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 Provide sufficient setbacks for new development except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.4(b) to read:</p> <p>(b) Ensure that, in establishing development setbacks <u>for new development</u>, adequate consideration is given to: [...]</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of the Policy, specifically ensuring consideration of appropriate building setbacks to protect people and property when assessing new developments. Seeks that the policy be applied to 'new development' as distinct from existing development.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.22
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5 (a) and (c)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 (a) and (c) Assess the impact of climate change on the level of natural hazard risk as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the intent of clauses (a) and (c), specifically that where new development and subdivision is to be located in an area subject to a natural hazard(s), and the natural hazard(s) is likely to be exacerbated by climate change, the development should be specifically located and designed to avoid or mitigate any increased risk.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.23
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P1 except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P1 as follows:</p> <p>Construction of a new building <u>or the reconstruction of, or</u> addition to an existing building unless specified in P2 – P5 in Rule 15.4.1.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Delete</b> the activity specific conditions for Rule 15.4.1 P1.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the construction of and / or addition to buildings within the Flood Plain Management Area as a permitted activity.</li> <li>• The Building Act floor level requirements are preferable to the activity specific conditions.</li> <li>• Submitter considers the reconstruction of buildings should be included within the activity to ensure it is captured within the rule framework adequately.</li> <li>• For clarity ‘reconstruction’ is considered to mean replacement of the building in the same location and at the same/smaller scale as the previous building on the same property.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P2 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the addition to buildings that do not increase ground floor area of buildings by more than the allocated 15m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.25



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P3 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the construction of a standalone garage up to 40m<sup>2</sup> within the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.26
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P4 (1) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the construction of an accessory building without a floor within the Flood Plain Management Area as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.27
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P7 as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the provision of earthworks to create a residential building platform in the Flood Plain Management Area as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.28
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P8 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the intent that earthworks not otherwise provided for should be a permitted activity, subject to meeting the relevant depth, height and volume thresholds.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.29
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.2 RDI as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports a restricted discretionary status for earthworks which does not comply with Rule 15.4.1 P6-P8.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.30
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the activity status of Rule 15.4.3 DI to be a restricted discretionary activity rather than a discretionary activity within the Flood Plain Management Area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> “reconstruction” to the rule</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> the following matters of discretion:</p> <p>a) <u>The ability to design and construct a building or additions to an existing building so that it is resilient to natural hazards.</u></p>

b) Likely effects on public safety and property resulting from the proposed building or the addition to an existing building.

c) The ongoing ability to manage and maintain a building, or additions to an existing building

d) Any exacerbation of the natural hazard or creation of a new natural hazard as a result of the proposed building, or additions to an existing building

**Decision Reasons:**

- Restricted Discretionary Status is more appropriate for the construction of new buildings and additions to an existing building within the Flood Plain Management Area.
- The potential adverse effects of this activity are discrete and well understood. Matters of discretion can be used to set out clear framework for the assessment of applications who do not meet the permitted criteria under rule 15.4.1 PI – P5.
- The reconstruction of existing buildings should be included in the activity to ensure it is appropriately captured within the rule framework. Reconstruction is considered to mean replacement of a building on the same/similar scale as the previous.

**Point Number** 2094.31

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** the activity status of Rule 15.4.3 D2 from Discretionary Activity to Restricted Discretionary Activity.

AND

**Add** the following matters of discretion:

(a)The effects of the hazards on the intended use of the sites created by the subdivision and the vulnerability of these uses to flood hazard events.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Restricted Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate for subdivision within the Flood Plain Management Area.
- The construction of a new building, in accordance with activity specific conditions, is a permitted activity within this area. Therefore subdivision within a Flood Plain Management Area is considered more appropriate as a restricted discretionary activity.

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.32
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.1 P2 (1) as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the construction of an accessory building without a floor within the High Risk Flood Area as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.33
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RD2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.2 RD2, Restricted Discretionary Activity within the High-Risk Flood Area as follows:</p> <p><del>One-Additions and alterations to, or reconstruction of a lawfully established building existing at [date this rule becomes operative] where the addition does not increase the ground floor area of the existing building by more than 15m<sup>3</sup>, unless provided for in Rule 15.5.2 RD1</del></p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> to Rule 15.5.2 RD2 a new matter of discretion:</p> <p><u>(d)Any exacerbation of the natural hazard or creation of a new natural hazard as a result of the proposed additions to an existing building.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports providing for an addition to an existing building within the High Risk Flood Area as a restricted discretionary activity.</li> <li>• It is not considered appropriate to restrict additions to existing buildings already located within the High-Risk Flood Area of the measurements identified.</li> <li>• Additions to the existing building could be undertaken to improve their resilience to flooding.</li> <li>• The proposed set of matters of discretion and the additional clause proposed are sufficient to ensure that any additions to existing buildings within a High-Risk Flood Area do not exacerbate or create additional risk.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.34
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the activity status of Rule 15.5.3 DI from Discretionary Activity to be Restricted Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the wording of Rule 15.5.3 DI (b) as follows:</p> <p>(b) The additional lot(s) are partially within the High-Risk Flood Area and each additional Lot(s) contains a net site area capable of containing a <u>rectangle of at least 100m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum of 6m exclusive of yards complying building platform</u> entirely outside the High-Risk Flood Area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> to Rule 15.5.3 DI the following matters of discretion:</p> <p><u>(a)The effects of the hazard on the intended use of the site or sites created by the subdivision.</u></p> <p><u>(b)The vulnerability of the uses to flood hazard events.</u></p> <p><u>(c)Whether the location and design of the development, including building platforms, are located to avoid the hazard.</u></p> <p><u>(d)The extent to which changes the landform for the subdivision are necessary.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wording needs to be aligned with that of the subdivision building platform dimensions (as per the General Residential Zone and the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone).</li> <li>• Submitter considers that the potential adverse effects of subdivision that can provide for lots that contain a net site area capable of containing a complying building platform entirely outside of the High-Risk Flood Area or where lots are partially within this area and each additional lot(s) contains a net site area capable of containing a complying building platform entirely outside the High-Risk flood Area can be appropriately addressed through the Restricted Discretionary Activity pathway.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.35
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NCI

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.4 NCI as follows:  Construction of a new building <del>or additions to an existing building</del> , not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 PI – P2 or Rule 15.5.2 RDI <del>and RD2</del> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Non-complying activity status for the construction of any new buildings, within a High Risk Flood Area.</li> <li>• Seeking consequential amendments to correspond correctly with amendments sought in response to Rule 15.5.2 (additions to an existing building as a restricted discretionary activity). Note: See 2094.33.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.36
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NC2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.4 NC2 (1) as follows:  (1) Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 15.5. <del>3-2 R D +3</del>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the Non-complying activity status for subdivision within a High Risk Flood Area. However, seeks amendment to represent the change in activity status sought for rule 15.5.3 DI. Note: See 2094.34.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.37
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.2 RDI as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports Restricted Discretionary status for this activity.

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.38
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 D1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the activity status of Rule 15.6.3 D1 from Discretionary activity to Restricted Discretionary Activity</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.3 D1 as follows:</p> <p>Construction of a new building, <u>reconstruction of an existing building</u> or new accessory building, located within 50m of the toe of a stop-bank where the stop-bank is under the responsibility of the Council, the Waikato Regional Council or the Crown.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> the following matters of discretion:</p> <p>( a) <u>The potential for the construction, occupation and use of the building(s) to compromise or limit the function of flood protection structures.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>The potential for the construction, occupation and use of the building(s) to result in overtopping of flood protection structures.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>The potential for facilities associated with flood protection structures to be overwhelmed</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Restricted Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate. The potential adverse effects are discrete and well understood. Matters of discretion can be used to set out a clear framework for applications.</li> <li>• Submitter considers the reconstruction of existing buildings should be included within the activity to ensure this activity is appropriately captured within the rule framework.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.39
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the activity status of Rule 15.6.3 D2 from Discretionary activity to Restricted Discretionary activity</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> the following matters of discretion:</p> <p><u>(a)The potential for earthworks to compromise or limit the function of flood protection structures.</u></p> <p><u>(b)The potential for the earthworks to result in overtopping of flood protection structures</u></p> <p><u>(c)The potential for facilities associated with flood protection structures to be overwhelmed.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Restricted Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate.</li> <li>• The potential adverse effects are discrete and well understood.</li> <li>• Matters of discretion can be used to set out a clear framework for applications.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.40
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1 P1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.8.1 P1 as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports additions to a lawfully established building that does not exceed 15m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area as a permitted activity.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.41
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.8.1 P2 (1) as notified



<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the construction of an accessory building without a floor in this hazard area as a permitted activity.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.42
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> Rule 15.8.2 RDI except for the amendments sought below AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.2 RDI as follows:</p> <p>Construction of a new building, <u>or reconstruction of</u>, or addition to, an existing building not provided for in Rule 15.8.1 PI – P3 and not listed in Rule 15.8.3 D1.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the restricted discretionary activity status as being appropriate.</li> <li>• Submitter considers the reconstruction of existing buildings should be included within the activity to ensure it is appropriately captured within the rule framework.</li> <li>• “Reconstruction” is considered to mean the replacement of a building in the same location and at the same or similar scale as the previous building on the same property.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.43
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the activity status of Rule 15.8.3 D2 from Discretionary to Restricted Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> the following matters of discretion:</p> <p>(a) <u>The effects of the hazard on the intended use of the site or sites created by the subdivision.</u></p> <p>(b) <u>The vulnerability of the uses to coastal hazard events.</u></p>

(c)Whether the location and design of the development, including building platforms, are located to avoid the hazard.

(d)The extent to which changes to the landform for the subdivision are necessary.

**Decision Reasons:**

Submitter considers that a Restricted Discretionary Activity can appropriately address the potential adverse effects of subdivision that can provide for lots capable of containing a complying building platform entirely outside the Coastal Sensitivity Area (inundation) and each additional lot(s) contains a net site area also capable of containing a complying building platform entirely outside the Coastal Sensitivity Area (inundation).

**Point Number** 2094.44

**Plan Chapter** 15.11.1 P1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.11.1 P1 as notified

**Decision Reasons:** Supports the addition to buildings that do not increase the ground floor area of buildings by more than 15m<sup>2</sup> within the Mine Subsidence Risk Area as a permitted activity.

**Point Number** 2094.45

**Plan Chapter** 15.11.1 P2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.11.1 P2 as notified

**Decision Reasons:** Supports the construction of standalone garages up to 55m<sup>2</sup> within the Mine Subsidence Risk Area as a permitted activity.

**Point Number** 2094.46

**Plan Chapter** 15.11.1 P4

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.1 P4 as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the provision of earthworks within the Mine Subsidence Risk Area as a permitted activity, subject to meeting the permitted thresholds.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.47
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.2 RDI as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports a Restricted Discretionary activity status for earthworks which do not comply as the potential adverse effects of the activity are discrete and well understood.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.48
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the activity status of Rule 15.11.3 DI from Discretionary activity to Restricted Discretionary Activity  AND <b>Amend</b> Rule 15.11.3 DI as follows:  <u>Construction of a new building, or accessory building or the reconstruction of or additions to an existing building not provided for in Rule 15.11.1 P1 – P3.</u>  AND <b>Add</b> the following matters of discretion as follows:

(a) Construction standards and materials.

(b) Suitability of the site for development.

(c) The potential effects on health and safety.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Considers Restricted Discretionary Activity Status is more appropriate for the construction of a building or accessory building or additions to an existing building within the Mine subsidence Risk Area that does not comply with Rule 15.11.1 – P1 – P3.
- The potential adverse effects are well understood and discrete, the matters of discretion can be used to set out a clear framework for applications.
- The reconstruction of existing buildings should be included in this framework in order to captivate this activity appropriately within the rule framework. “Reconstruction” is considered to mean the replacement of a building in the same location and at the same or similar scale as the previous building on the same property.

**Point Number** 2094.49

**Plan Chapter** 15.11.3 D2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.11.3 D2 as notified, subject to re numbering as D1

- Decision Reasons:**
- Supports the Discretionary Activity Status for vacant lot subdivision of any site within the mapped Mine Subsidence area.
  - Minor amendment needed in reference to relief sought to rule 15.11.3 D1 Note: see submission point 2094.48.

**Point Number** 2094.50

**Plan Chapter** 15.12.1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Delete** Section 15.12.1 Overview of method regarding liquefaction.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly supports the approach to manage liquefaction risk but opposes the requirement for a geotechnical assessment in all cases where a restricted discretionary consent is required.</li> <li>• A Council-funded district-wide assessment of broad areas that are potentially prone to liquefaction should be undertaken to save costs of geotechnical assessment in every case.</li> <li>• The explanation within section 15.12.1 refers to Geotechnical Assessments required “where the site and proposed development is considered vulnerable to liquefaction based on site-specific characteristics”. This appears to assume a form of initial assessment yet without an explicit framework as the basis.</li> <li>• The best practice is that the council should introduce a mapped ‘Liquefaction Management Area’ or similar alongside a suite of provisions relevant to subdivision and development, constituting the most efficient and effective means of managing liquefaction risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.51
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.12.2, provided Council identifies areas susceptible to liquefaction.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly supports the approach to manage liquefaction risk but opposes the requirement for a geotechnical assessment in all cases where a restricted discretionary consent is required.</li> <li>• A Council-funded district-wide assessment of broad areas that are potentially prone to liquefaction should be undertaken to save costs of geotechnical assessment in every case.</li> <li>• The explanation within section 15.12.1 refers to Geotechnical Assessments required “where the site and proposed development is considered vulnerable to liquefaction based on site-specific characteristics”. This appears to assume a form of initial assessment yet without an explicit framework as the basis.</li> <li>• The best practice is that the council should introduce a mapped ‘Liquefaction Management Area’ or similar alongside a suite of provisions relevant to subdivision and development, constituting the most efficient and effective means of managing liquefaction risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.52
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12.3

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete Rule 15.12.3.</b>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly supports the approach to manage liquefaction risk but opposes the requirement for a geotechnical assessment in all cases where a restricted discretionary consent is required.</li> <li>• A Council-funded district-wide assessment of broad areas that are potentially prone to liquefaction should be undertaken to save coasts of geotechnical assessment in every case.</li> <li>• The explanation within section 15.12.1 refers to Geotechnical Assessments required “where the site and proposed development is considered vulnerable to liquefaction based on site-specific characteristics”. This appears to assume a form of initial assessment yet without an explicit framework as the basis.</li> <li>• The best practice is that the council should introduce a mapped ‘Liquefaction Management Area’ or similar alongside a suite of provisions relevant to subdivision and development, constituting the most efficient and effective means of managing liquefaction risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.53
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete Section 15.13.2 Liquefaction potential.</b>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed approach to liquefaction places the onus of identifying areas subject to liquefaction risk onto the applicants.</li> <li>• It is considered more appropriate for Council to initially undertake the identification of areas subject to Liquefaction risk.</li> <li>• Delete the current liquefaction rules and review the approach.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.54
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.55
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation)” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.56
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Defended Area” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.57
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Emergency Service facility” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.58
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Farm building” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.59
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support



<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Flood plain management area” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.60
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Flood ponding area” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.61
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “High risk flood area” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.62
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “High risk coastal hazard (Erosion) area” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.63
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “High risk coastal hazard (inundation) area” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.64
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Mine subsidence risk area” in section 15.14, and definition these to Chapter 13 of PWDP.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.65
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Minor upgrading” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.66
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the definition of “Risk Assessment” from chapter 15.14.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter opposes the wording used in chapter 15.14 for the Risk assessment definition as this term is already defined in Chapter 13: definitions.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.67
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Standalone garage” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.68
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 - Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of “Utility” in section 15.14, and relocate definition to Chapter 13 of PWDP.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter requests relocation; these stage 2 definitions should only be in chapter 13 for clarity and ease of use by plan users.</li> <li>• This is consistent with similar terms such as ‘High Natural Character Area’ listed in chapter 13: definitions. It is noted these defined terms are not defined within the Definitions Standard of the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.69
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Planning maps, and 15.1(8), and 15.2.1(1)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the approach taken to hazard overlay in the Planning Maps by adopting the Auckland Unitary Plan wording/approach for ‘Liquefaction Management Areas’ and for any other maps that are not sufficiently accurate to determine if a site is affected. This approach comprises non-statutory interactive maps of hazard areas outside the district plan.</p> <p>AND</p>

**Add** text to clarify that the rules of the plan are not applied on the basis of mapping where a non-statutory mapping approach is adopted.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Broadly supports the approach of mapping natural hazards areas where the spatial extent is underpinned by robust technical assessments.
- The Auckland Unitary Plan adopts a set of non-statutory flood hazard overlay maps which operate as interactive maps on the Auckland Council's website. This approach to displaying hazard overlay demonstrates they do not have regulatory effect.
- Submitter considers this to most efficiently and effectively produce the advantage of continual improvement without reliance on Schedule 1 RMA processes.
- Interactive maps can be relied upon in a legally robust manner for interpretation and evaluation within the consenting process with the rules self-contained in a legal sense.

**Point Number** 2094.70

**Plan Chapter** 12.6 (Variation 2)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Variation 2 amendments to definition for Annual exceedance probability as notified.

**Decision Reasons:** Submits support for the proposed amendment to this definition, increasing the clarity of the term for plan users.

**Point Number** 2094.71

**Plan Chapter** 1.12.8 (Variation 2)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Variation 2 Objective 1.12.8(d) Natural Hazards and Climate Change as notified.

**Decision Reasons:** Submitter supports the strategic objective relating to natural hazards and climate. Supports managing natural hazards through a suite of mapping overlays and provisions as this aligns with the formatting direction outlined in the National Planning Standards.

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.72
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	12.1 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to direction 12.1(k) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports managing natural hazards through a suite of mapping overlays and provisions as this aligns with the formatting direction outlined in the National Planning Standards.

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.73
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	16.1.3(i) (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 16.1.3(i) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.74
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	16.4.1(b)(v) (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 16.4.1(b)(v) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).

<b>Point Number</b>	2094.75
---------------------	---------

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	16.4.4(b)(v) (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to rule 16.4.4(b)(v) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.76
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	16.4.12(b)(vi) (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to rule 16.4.12(b)(vi).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.77
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	16.5.9.3(b)(viii) (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to rule 16.5.9.3(b)(viii) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.78
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	17.1.3 (Variation 2)

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 17.1.3, matter of discretion clause (ix).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.79
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	17.4.1 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 17.4.1(b)(iii) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.80
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	17.4.1.1 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 17.4.1.1 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.81
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	17.5.2 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO



<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 17.5.2, matter of discretion (viii) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.82
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	17.5.9 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 17.5.9 (f) (viii) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.83
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	18.1.3 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 18.1.3, matter of discretion (i) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.84
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	18.4.1 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 18.4.1, matter of discretion (b)(iii) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.85
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	18.4.2 (Variation 2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Rule 18.4.2, matte of discretion (b)(iv) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendment ensures clarity for plan users (provided Kainga Ora's submissions regarding the mapping of areas susceptible to liquefaction are adopted).
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.86
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Objectives and policies
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the proposed objective and policy framework to ensure clarity for plan users.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Not stated.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.87
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Rules
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the rules so that non-compliance of a permitted activity thresholds is a restricted discretionary activity rather than discretionary activity.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This provides better certainty for plan users as to the nature of effects that need to be assessed in relation to the construction of new buildings and additions to existing buildings within an identified natural hazard overlay, subdivision, and construction of buildings and earthworks within 50m of the top of a stop-bank.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.88
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 and Variation 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Stage 2 and Variation 2 provisions to clearly distinguish between "new development" and redevelopment of existing dwellings / structures, particularly within existing urban areas where development and a variety of land uses have already been established within hazard areas (such as floodplains).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers it is appropriate to apply a general approach of seeking to "avoid" establishing new development / sensitive land uses within significant natural hazard risk areas, while "managing" the effects of redevelopment of existing established activities / development in relation to hazard risks.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.89
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 and Variation 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the approach to liquefaction by Council identifying areas subject to liquefaction risk and providing a framework to appropriately manage the risk to people's safety, wellbeing and property.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The proposed approach to liquefaction, as drafted, places the onus of identifying areas subject to liquefaction risk onto the applicants.
<b>Point Number</b>	2094.90
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 and Variation 2

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 and variation 2 text to cross refer to the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) sought in submissions on Stage 1 and introduce the amendments sought by the submitter to MDRZ where relevant.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Through stage 1 of the PDP Kainga Ora has sought introduction of a new Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ).</li> <li>• Submitter requests that the stage 2 needs to cross refer to this where relevant.</li> <li>• The amendments sought in their submission must also be introduced to the MDRZ.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2095	<b>Submitter:</b>	Rebecca Chell
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Aaron Henderson		
<b>Address:</b>	124 Mahuta Station Road, RDI, Huntly, New Zealand, 3700		

<b>Point Number</b>	2095.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 Huntly East – Defended Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.2 (Huntly East) by removing the Defended Area overlay from 120 Russell Rd, Huntly.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These changes will de-value properties by creating uncertainty with regards to future building.</li> <li>• Submits that from personal experience, property 120 Russell Road Huntly has zero chance of flooding.</li> <li>• Without proof of modelling, property rights are being infringed upon.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2096	<b>Submitter:</b>	Rolande Paekau
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Te Whaanga 2B3B2 & 2B1 Ahu Whenua Trust		

<b>Address:</b>	C/O 623 Wainua Road, RD3 Whaingaroa, Raglan, New Zealand,3297		
<b>Point Number</b>	2096.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 and Variation 2		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>No specific decision sought</b>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the Tainui Hapu Environment Management Committee, Tainui o Tainui, Te Kopua 2B3 Incorporation and Te Kopua Trust Submissions (#2097).</li> <li>• Supports the ability for tangata whenua to exercise tino rangatiratanga through sustainable hazard management via appropriate planning, mitigation, and adaption e.g. an adaptive management plan.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2097	<b>Submitter:</b>	Angeline Greensill
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Tainui Hapu Environmental Management Committee & Tainui o Tainui Charitable Trust		
<b>Address:</b>	86 Riria Kereopa Memorial Drive, Raglan, New Zealand,3297		
<b>Point Number</b>	2097.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> typo in Policy 15.2.3.1(iv) Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development, so it reads “wind” instead of “win”.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Typographical error.		

<b>Point Number</b>	2097.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> policy 15.2.3.4 (b)(iii).  <b>Or</b>  <b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 to enable tangata whenua to maintain tino rangatiratanga over Maori Freehold land regarding foreshore access.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public continue to trespass on Maori Freehold land at high tide.</li> <li>• Part B (iii) reads as though it will provide accessibility rights to the public under the changing coastline.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2097.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.2 to allow tangata whenua to develop and implement intergenerational adaptive management and enable tangata whenua to manage Maori Freehold Land in the face of climate change.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tangata whenua should have the ability to exercise Tino Rangatiratanga on their remaining coastal lands without excessive encumbrances.</li> <li>• The council needs to embrace strategies such as intergenerational adaptive management strategies that enable Tangata whenua to plan, mitigate and adapt to current and future hazards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2097.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.1 PI to increase gross floor area to 30m <sup>2</sup> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submits that the proposed PI is an unnecessary restriction for the 100-year planning horizon.
<b>Point Number</b>	2097.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.1 to manage coastal hazard risk through appropriate building materials, structural or design work, engineering solutions or other appropriate mitigation measures, including the ability to relocate the building.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submits that there are other appropriate mitigation measures which could be taken. (Note: submission on Rule 15.7.2 RDI (a).
<b>Point Number</b>	2097.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.2 to permit developments which meet the RDI criteria.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submits that the proposed RDI is an unnecessary restriction for the 100-year planning horizon and developments should be changed to a permitted activity when all hazards are considered. (See submission on Rule 15.7.1).
<b>Point Number</b>	2097.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.3 to permit new buildings to be established in the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area when an appropriate adaptive management plan is in place.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submits that new buildings should be allowed when there is an appropriate adaptive management plan in place.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2098	<b>Submitter:</b>	Christopher John Mitchell
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2098.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 - Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.4 (Raglan East) to remove the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area from 95 Lorenzen Bay Road, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the addition of this overlay on their property.</li> <li>• The property has 'never become inundated' in the 50 years since the land was first cleared / built upon.</li> <li>• It is unreasonable to propose this overlay when this has never occurred and does not pose a significant risk to the property, yet will change value and insurability of the property.</li> <li>• The property owners have experienced land reclamation rather than erosion.</li> <li>• There is little wave action in Lorenzen Bay and observes that there has been a reduction in amounts of silt and sand from better stock management.</li> <li>• The sea walls have not been breached in the 50 years since building on the identified property.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2098.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 - Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose



<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.4 (Raglan East), to remove the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) from 95 Lorenzen Bay Road, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the addition of this overlay on their property.</li> <li>• The property has 'never become inundated' in the 50 years since the land was first cleared / built upon.</li> <li>• It is unreasonable to propose this overlay when this has never occurred and does not pose a significant risk to the property, yet will change value and insurability of the property.</li> <li>• The property owners have experienced land reclamation rather than erosion.</li> <li>• There is little wave action in Lorenzen Bay and observes that there has been a reduction in amounts of silt and sand from better stock management.</li> <li>• The sea walls have not been breached in the 50 years since building on the identified property.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2098.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 - Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.4 (Raglan East), to remove the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area from 95 Lorenzen Bay Road, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the addition of this overlay on their property.</li> <li>• The property has 'never become inundated' in the 50 years since the land was first cleared / built upon.</li> <li>• It is unreasonable to propose this overlay when this has never occurred and does not pose a significant risk to the property, yet will change value and insurability of the property.</li> <li>• The property owners have experienced land reclamation rather than erosion.</li> <li>• There is little wave action in Lorenzen Bay and observes that there has been a reduction in amounts of silt and sand from better stock management.</li> <li>• The sea walls have not been breached in the 50 years since building on the identified property.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2098.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 - Raglan East
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.4 (Raglan East), to remove the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from 95 Lorenzen Bay Road, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter objects to the addition of this overlay on their property.</li> <li>• The property has ‘never become inundated’ in the 50 years since the land was first cleared / built upon.</li> <li>• It is unreasonable to propose this overlay when this has never occurred and does not pose a significant risk to the property, yet will change value and insurability of the property.</li> <li>• The property owners have experienced land reclamation rather than erosion.</li> <li>• There is little wave action in Lorenzen Bay and observes that there has been a reduction in amounts of silt and sand from better stock management.</li> <li>• The sea walls have not been breached in the 50 years since building on the identified property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2099	<b>Submitter:</b>	Sam Hutchings
<b>On behalf of:</b>	NZTE Operations Limited	<b>Organisation:</b>	Greenwood Roche
<b>Address:</b>	Level 12 2 Commerce Street, Auckland, New Zealand, 1010		

<b>Point Number</b>	2099.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12 and 27.4.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>No specific relief sought</b> , but submitter wishes to be involved in the Stage 2 process as part of its wider involvement in the PWDP process with particular interest in the Te Kowhai airpark.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter is neutral in relation to the changes proposed by Stage 2 and Variation 2.</li> <li>• Submitter owns land in Te Kowhai Airpark Zone subject to liquefaction rules proposed in Chapter 15 and Variation 2.</li> <li>• The notified provisions and amendments made to Variation 2 do not unduly impact the intended development of the airpark.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2100	<b>Submitter:</b>	Powerco Limited
<b>Address:</b>	Private Bag 2061, New Plymouth, New Zealand,4340		
<b>Point Number</b>	2100.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 New infrastructure and utilities in areas subject to significant risk from natural hazards as notified.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the importance recognised by this policy for new infrastructure and utilities enabled in areas at significant risk from natural hazards where such assets are technically, functionally, or operationally required to be located in such areas.</li> <li>• At times lines businesses may have to connect a customer that chooses to locate within these areas.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2100.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.5 as notified.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter needs to be able to operate, maintain and update its existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2100.3		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P5		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P5 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing infrastructure within this area should be maintained and upgraded and new infrastructure installed without consent.</li> <li>Electricity is an essential service and is required to be located wherever a customer is.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2100.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 PI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> a new clause (3) to Rule 15.5.1 PI as follows:  <u>(3) New electricity lines, poles, transformers, and associated equipment.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New overhead electricity lines and associated equipment (including transformers) should also be permitted activities. Effects are the same as above ground communications lines and associated infrastructure which is permitted in this rule.</li> <li>The electricity distribution network is an essential service, required to connect customers located across the High Risk Flood Areas.</li> <li>Network utility infrastructure will be located in areas determined by a functional need to service growth and demand. Where development has been approved, such infrastructure should be enabled outside of the onerous standards imposed by council. Utility network operators should instead be responsible for designing infrastructure to the appropriate standard required by the hazard.</li> <li>Appropriate provisions need to be included to allow for new network utility assets as when required in hazard areas.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2101	<b>Submitter:</b>	Transpower New Zealand Ltd
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,6140		

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change as proposed except for following points made in this submission.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapter 15 recognizes and provides for the National Grid.</li> <li>• There are some amendments that would give improved effect to the NPSET and the RPS.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	14.1(1)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the proposed additional wording to 14.1(1).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This wording provides increased clarity and certainty to plan users in terms of provisions within other chapters of the plan that may apply to activities in this chapter.

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(1)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> section 15.1(1) to recognise new infrastructure with additional text as follows:</p> <p>(1) The Natural Hazards chapter manages land use in areas subject to <del>the</del> risk from natural hazards. It identifies areas where certain types of new development will be avoided because of the natural hazards present, but also recognises that there is existing development, including infrastructure and historic heritage, already located on land subject to natural hazards , and that in some circumstances <u>new infrastructure development in natural hazard areas may be required</u> . These areas [...].</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the recognition of existing infrastructure that is already located on land subject to natural hazards, and that these existing areas will</li> </ul>

require management to ensure risk of damage to property or lives is not increased.

- The National Grid cannot avoid locating in hazard areas but can be designed to manage risk.
- Submitter also seeks recognition of the locational constraints of new National Grid infrastructure.

**Point Number** 2101.4

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Objective 15.2.1 - Resilience to natural hazard risk as proposed.

**Decision Reasons:** The National Grid is linear infrastructure that cannot avoid locating in hazard areas particularly those identified flood areas but can be designed in a manner that does not place the National Grid, people, or properties at risk.

**Point Number** 2101.5

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.1.1 on the basis that Policy 15.2.1.4 and Policy 15.2.1.5 are also retained (subject to amendments requested in other submissions).

**Decision Reasons:** The submitter is supportive of Policy 15.2.1.1 on the basis that new National Grid development within areas identified as being at significant risk from natural hazards (including areas of High-Risk Flood) is recognised and provided for by Policies 15.2.1.4 and 15.2.1.5.

**Point Number** 2101.6

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.2

**Late:** NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.2 on the basis that Policy 15.2.1.4 and Policy 15.2.1.5 are also retained (subject to amendments requested in other submissions).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter is supportive of Policy 15.2.1.2 on the basis that activities associated with the National Grid within areas identified as being at significant risk from natural hazards are recognised and provided for by Policies 15.2.1.4 and 15.2.1.5.

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4 and 15.2.1.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 to provide for the development of new infrastructure and utilities in areas not considered to be of significant risk (for example, flood plain management areas and flood ponding areas).
	<b>OR</b>
	If this relief is not supported then <b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 and <b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.5 to provide for the development of new infrastructure and utilities in hazard areas not considered to be of significant risk.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy framework does not address new infrastructure and utilities in areas subject to natural hazards but are not considered to be of significant risk. The policy suggests that significant risk hazard areas include High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) areas. The following policy provides for existing infrastructure and utilities in all the natural hazard areas, but it does not apply to new infrastructure development. There is a policy gap in terms of the development of new infrastructure and utilities in areas of lesser risk.</li> <li>• Amendments are required to address the gap of new infrastructure and utilities located in areas of lesser hazard risk. Development that poses less risk should not be subject to the provisions in clauses 15.2.1.4(a)(i-iii).</li> <li>• The amended policy would give effect to policies 2 and 3 of the NPSET, and to Objective 3.5h and Policy 6.6c pf the WRPS.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5 and 15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> 15.2.1.5(a) - Existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards as proposed as follows:</p> <p>(a) Provide for the operation, <u>repair</u> maintenance, <u>replacement</u> and <del>minor</del>-upgrading of existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards.</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p>If including upgrading is not supported and the reference to ‘minor upgrading’ is to be retained, <b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 to include ‘upgrading’.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy should provide for upgrading of the National Grid in all areas subject to natural hazards to appropriately recognise and provide for the continued operation of existing assets.</li> <li>• There is a policy gap as upgrading of existing infrastructure is not provided for.</li> <li>• The addition of “replacement” and “repair,” gives clarity and consistency of plan terminology and support of plan implementation.</li> <li>• Ensures appropriate cascade between the policies applying to infrastructure and utilities through to the rules.</li> <li>• Ensures appropriate effect given to policy 2 of the NPSET and objective 3.5 of the WRPS.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.10 (a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.10(a) by adding new (iv) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Control subdivision, use and development in areas identified as Defended Areas adjacent to the Waikato River by:</p> <p>(i) [...]; <u>and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) recognising the functional needs and operational needs of the National Grid.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The policy should recognise the functional and operational needs of National Grid infrastructure to locate or be in such areas. The requested amendment ensures appropriate effect given to policy 3 of the NPSET and objective 3.5 of the WRPS.

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.10
---------------------	---------



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.22(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.22(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) On land <u>identified as</u> potentially prone to liquefaction, ensure that: (i) ...</p> <p><b>OR</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.22(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) On land <u>assessed as</u> potentially prone to liquefaction...</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the mapping of areas potentially prone to liquefaction as the identification of these areas would assist plan users and provide significant increased clarity as to the application of the related policies and rules.</li> <li>• To increase the clarity of the scope and application, wording should include reference to land that has been identified as potentially prone to liquefaction.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.23
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.23.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports Policy 15.2.1.23 as far as it directs the controlling or managing of subdivision, use and development of activities on land assessed as being susceptible to liquefaction-induced ground damage, as opposed to avoiding activities in such locations.</li> <li>• Policy provides the ability for Council to recognise why it is not always possible to locate new infrastructure in areas away from risk from natural hazards including liquefaction.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.2(ii)(D)
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.2(ii)(D) as follows:  (D) provision of renewable energy generation <u>and its connection to the National Grid</u> ; and [...].
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports this policy.</li> <li>• The recognition of the role and importance of the National Grid in a lower carbon future within the policy could be more explicit.</li> <li>• This would be consistent with policy 1 of the NPSET.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 (b)(iv) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Policy 15.2.3.4 (b)(iv) ensures that the requirements of infrastructure are considered in the establishment of development setbacks from water bodies.
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 to confine its scope of application to resource consents for activities and natural hazards that are of relevance.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter is concerned about implementation requirements given (a) requires that all resource consents for new subdivision, use and development take account of the projected effects of climate change over the next 100 years on natural hazard risk.</li> <li>• This requirement will be appropriate for some proposals but may not be appropriate for all resource consents.</li> <li>• Some hazard risks do not have a relationship with climate change, i.e. earthquake fault rupture.</li> </ul>

- Clause (a) may be onerous and irrelevant in some situations.

**Point Number** 2101.15

**Plan Chapter** 15.3(c)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** to Section 15.3(c) new (iii) as follows:

(iii) any activity which is a regulated activity under the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission 2010 (NESETA).

**Decision Reasons:**

- Clause (c) does not list the NESETA, which covers activities relating to the operation, maintenance, upgrading, relocation, or removal of existing transmission lines.
- Under Section 44A of the RMA NESETA regulates how Transpower's existing lines in the district are operated, maintained, and upgraded rather than the district plan.
- Including reference to NESETA provides certainty and clarity for plan users.

**Point Number** 2101.16

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1 P5

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.4.1 P5 as follows:

P5 - Operation, construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading or upgrading of utilities.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The rule as amended implements policies 15.2.1.4 and 15.2.1.5, ensures that the development of regionally significant infrastructure is not inappropriately constrained.
- Adding “operation” increases the clarity of the rule and consistency with the wording of policy 15.2.1.5 which specifically includes operation of existing infrastructure.
- Specific to the National Grid, the Resource Management (NESETA) Regulations 2009 provides prevailing provisions for maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid.

- The submitter supports the permitted activity as it applies to construction of new National Grid infrastructure which is not covered by the NESETA.

**Point Number** 2101.17

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1 P6

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.4.1 P6 as follows:

P6 – Earthworks associated with operation, construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading or upgrading of utilities, including the formation and maintenance of access tracks.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter seeks an amendment to the wording to ensure clarity and consistency with the amendment sought to 15.4.1 P5.
- The rule as amended implements policies 15.2.1.4 and 15.2.1.5, recognises investment made in utilities such as the National Grid, and ensures that earthworks activities associated with the development of regionally significant infrastructure is not inappropriately constrained.
- The submitter supports the permitted activity status, particularly as it also applies to earthworks not covered by the NESETA.

**Point Number** 2101.18

**Plan Chapter** 15.5.1. PI (I)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.5.1 PI (I) as follows:

PI (I) Operation, Repair, replacement, maintenance or minor upgrading of existing utilities , including associated earthworks and the formation and maintenance of access tracks .

**Decision Reasons:**

- The NESETA provides prevailing provisions for the maintenance, reconductoring, increasing voltage, structure addition or replacement, and removal, for the National Grid.

- Submitter supports the permitted activity rule status provided 15.5.1 PI (1) with amendments to include provision for associated earthworks activities including access tracks as per 15.4.1 P6.
- Amendments sought ensure clarity for plan users and consistency with the approach in 15.4.1.
- The rule as amended implements Policies 15.2.1.4 and 15.2.1.5 and recognises the requirements of infrastructure and utilities.

**Point Number** 2101.19

**Plan Chapter** 15.5.2 RDI

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.5.2 RDI as follows:

(1) New utilities not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 PI (2), including associated earthworks and the formation and maintenance of access tracks.

(2) Upgrading of existing utilities not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 PI (1), including associated earthworks and the formation and maintenance of access tracks.

**Decision Reasons:**

- This is consistent with the relief sought in relation to rule 15.5.1 PI (1) the amendment is to ensure earthworks activities associated with the construction of new utilities and the upgrading of existing activities (including access tracks) are included to ensure clarity and consistency.
- The submitter supports matter of discretion (a).
- This gives effect to policy 3 of the NPSET.

**Point Number** 2101.20

**Plan Chapter** 15.6.1(a)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.6.1(a) as notified.

**Decision Reasons:** Rule appropriately provides for activities associated with the development, operation, maintenance and upgrade of the National Grid.

<b>Point Number</b>	2101.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.3 D2
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports the discretionary activity status for earthworks located within 50m of a stop-bank where the stop-bank is under the responsibility of the Council, the Waikato Regional Council, or the Crown. This will enable a full assessment of effects.
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.22
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Neutral
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.12.1 - Liquefaction – Overview of methods to clarify that the requirement to assess and address liquefaction risk does not apply to all resource consents only to specifically identified subdivision, multi-unit, and comprehensive development activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For clarity and certainty, the proposed approach should be clarified in the introductory ‘overview of the method’ statement provided in 15.12.1, to ensure that liquefaction risk does not apply to all resource consents only specifically identified activities.</li> <li>• If the approach has a wider application (i.e., applies to a wider range of resource consent activities) then the submitter would oppose the approach on the basis it is overly onerous.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.23
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Neutral

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> rule 15.12.2 by adding matters of restricted discretion to clarify that the requirement to assess and address liquefaction risk does not apply to all resource consents only to specifically identified subdivision, multi-unit, and comprehensive development activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	See reasons above for amendments to 15.12.1, submission point # 2101.22.
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Neutral
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> rule 15.12.3 by adding matters of restricted discretion to clarify that the requirement to assess and address liquefaction risk does not apply to all resource consents only to specifically identified subdivision, multi-unit, and comprehensive development activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	See reasons above for amendments to 15.12.1, submission point # 2101.22.
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.25
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> definition for “Minor upgrading” in Section 15.14 - Definitions as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the definition of “minor upgrading” provided as it helps to provide clarity and certainty for plan users.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that the NESETA regulates the upgrading of National Grid infrastructure/assets.</li> <li>• The definition is of limited relevance when used in the rules but is of relevance when used in the policies.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2101.26
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the definition of “Utility” in section 15.14 - Definitions by adding text to para (1) (a) as follows;</p> <p>(a) transmission lines and <u>substations</u>, electricity distribution lines, and associated equipment; and [...]</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the inclusion of the National Grid within the proposed definition but seeks to include reference to substations as this will provide clarity and certainty for plan users.</li> <li>• Submitter notes that the National Grid is a defined term in the Stage I PDP and this is not directly referenced within the Utility definition.</li> <li>• Substations are a key component of the National Grid’s electricity transmission infrastructure.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2102	<b>Submitter:</b>	Miffy Foley
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Waikato Regional Council		
<b>Address:</b>	Private Bag 3038 ,Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Neutral
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a note to PWDP Stage I Section B - Objectives and Policies immediately before Chapter 2: Tangata Whenua as follows:</p> <p><u>Please note that objectives and policies contained within Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change may also apply and are located within one plan chapter at Section C Rules: Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chapters 2 to 10 are clearly identified as providing the overarching policy direction. Objectives in Chapters 15 and 14 located below the banner ‘Section C Rules’.</li> <li>• The addition is to direct users to the objectives and policies in Chapter 15.</li> </ul>



<b>Point Number</b>	2102.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 - 12.1 and 12.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> the following statement to an appropriate section or sections of Chapter 12 PWDP:</p> <p><u>The overall activity status of a proposal is that of the most restrictive rule which applies to the proposal.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be confusion for plan users regarding the application of provisions in Chapter 15 as to the importance of the objectives, policies and which rule takes precedence over another.</li> <li>• This statement clarifies that the most restrictive rule will dictate the activity status.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 - 1.4.2.3(a)(x)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> section 1.4.2.3(a)(x) as follows:</p> <p>(x) <u>Natural hazards in certain locations in the district pose a constraint on land development and urban growth in terms of reduced opportunity or cost of mitigation and acknowledgement of residual risks.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports additions to section 1.4.2.3(a) to identify natural hazard challenges.</li> <li>• Notified provisions provide for certain activities and development within hazard areas and although mitigations may be proposed this does not resolve residual risk.</li> <li>• Additional text reflects the acceptance of residual risk as an economic challenge.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 - 1.4.4(c)

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 1.4.4(c), first sentence as follows;  (c) The district plan manages activities to <del>reduce the</del> <u>manage</u> risks from natural hazards <u>through avoiding the creation of new risks and ensuring risks do not exceed an acceptable level</u> . The emphasis is on ensuring that [...]
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1.4.4 currently identifies that the district plan manages activities to reduce risks but this would require the current level of risk to be reduced overall.</li> <li>• The plan provides for some activities and development in areas affected by natural hazard risk, so this cannot be considered an overall reduction in risk.</li> <li>• It is important to identify that new risks should first be avoided and that existing risks do not become unacceptable or intolerable.</li> <li>• The amendment better reflects the direction of the RPS.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 - 1.5.2(b)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 1.5.2(b) text added by Variation 2 as follows:  (b) ... However, when preparing structure plans or spatial plans for developing urban land, consideration of the risk posed by natural hazards such as flooding, land instability, coastal hazards <del>and low probability high impact hazards such as liquefaction, and the effects of climate change</del> will be important to ensure that the land is suitable for the type of development proposed and avoids increased risk from natural hazards <u>including the future demand for protection works associated with natural hazard risks or an increase of the level of service for existing infrastructure</u> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requested changes help to give effect to Policies 13.2 and 13.3 of the RPS associated with the demand for protection works and the risk from high impact, low probability natural hazard events.</li> <li>• The submitter supports low probability hazards being considered through the structure planning process as this helps set community expectation regarding appropriate land uses as well as civil defence response, readiness and recovery planning.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.6
---------------------	--------

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 - 1.12.8(d)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Section 1.12.8(d) Strategic objectives as follows:</p> <p>(d) Objective - Natural Hazards and Climate Change <u>refer to Objectives 15.2.1, 15.2.2 and 15.2.3 at Chapter 15.</u></p> <p><del>The choice, location and design of development in the district takes into account the risks from natural hazards and potential impacts of climate change.</del></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed text does not give effect to the policy direction in the RPS in relation to natural hazard risk and climate change. It does not provide a clear direction to reduce and manage risks.</li> <li>The objectives proposed in Chapter 15 should be directly referenced at this section in the plan so that this is clearly identified as a component of the strategic policy direction.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Planning Maps - General
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Neutral
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> all planning maps (hazard areas) to clarify the location and statutory intent of the maps.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Clarification is sought that the natural hazard layers will be included alongside those notified under Stage 1.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(8)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.1(8) Introduction to reflect how the maps, definitions and non-statutory information can be utilised together.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The introduction could explain the origin and the use of the various hazard identification tools available to plan users.
- The amendments suggested could be used to improve reference to different sources of hazard information available to the district.

**Point Number**

2102.9

**Plan Chapter**

Maps – General and Proposed District Plan - General

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Neutral

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** the planning maps and/or plan provisions to address the matters raised below:

The submitter seeks to clarify the following points through amendments to the provisions under Chapter 15, the planning maps or specific definitions included in the plan including but not limited to the definitions of: Annual exceedance probability; Flood plain management area; Flood ponding area; High risk flood area; High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area; High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area; Defended Area; Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion); Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation); Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast); Risk assessment.

*1. How the provisions (both policy direction and rules) are intended to apply; through reference to defined terms and/or the planning maps.*

*2. How natural hazards will be defined to give effect to the policy direction in the plan, in particular the projected effects of climate change, and in a manner, which can be understood and consistently applied through area or site-specific assessment where hazards are not mapped in the planning maps.*

*3. Clearer representation of mapped areas in the GIS viewer.*

*4. Management of the perception of plan users that high flood hazards may exist beyond the areas mapped in the plan.*

*5. Where flood hazards are to be identified through a definition that the criteria which are to be used include but are not limited to the following:*

*(a) The area of land that is inundated by a specified, rainfall event.*

*(b) any increases in impervious areas that would arise from changes in land use enabled by the plan.*

*(c) the effects of climate change over a 100-year timeframe in respect of the frequency and duration of rain fall events.*

(d) sea level rise projections; and

(e) the effects of climate change over a 100-year timeframe in respect of the frequency and intensity of storm surge events.

6. Confirmation of how the Natural hazards portal available on the WRC website is designed to reflect the most up to date information available to the region.

7. How will the planning maps be updated where land modification may affect the spatial extent of hazards and how might any site specific or area specific changes be reflected in the application of the rules.

8. Clarification of the wording of the annual exceedance probability definition.

Clarification of the consideration of vertical land movement (subsidence) and climate change effects in relation to rainfall and sea level rise across all definitions.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Natural hazards are proposed to be mapped in the GIS viewer and definitions of these terms are also provided which include reference to areas mapped in the planning maps. The defined terms appear in the text of objectives, policies, and rules where hyperlinks to the definition are imbedded. Other hazards referred to in the chapter are not defined or mapped.
- Notes are included preceding each of the permitted activity tables (15.5.1 to 15.10.1) which specifically use the defined term and the phrase "shown on the planning maps....." in this case it is less clear how a plan user is to identify the application of the rules. This creates a particular issue where the submitters are aware that 'hazard areas' or 'risk areas' are present beyond those areas which have been mapped and identified in the planning maps.
- The definition of 'flood plain management area', for example, refers to the areas identified on the planning maps, and/or an area described as the 1% AEP floodplain. The 1% AEP floodplain is not defined.
- It is understood that there are areas within the district which may be subject to the 1% AEP floodplain and/or 1% AEP rainfall flood ponding and which would meet the criteria of the high flood risk hazard area which are not identified in the planning maps. Identification of these areas may rely on alternate information including notations on property files, more recent flood hazard modelling or local professional knowledge.

**Point Number** 2102.10

**Plan Chapter** 15.14

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 15.14 - Definitions to enable a site-specific investigation to be utilised under the following definitions:

- High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area
- High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area
- Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation)
- Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast)

**Decision Reasons:**

- High risk coastal hazard inundation and erosion areas are identified as areas mapped in the planning maps currently at risk from coastal erosion with existing sea levels and coastal processes. Specific detail around the types of coastal processes or hazard events is not provided which underpin this layer or the ability to rely on more detailed site-specific assessment.
- The ability to utilise site specific assessment or 'best available information' is provided in relation to flood hazards. The same should apply to coastal hazards, where site or area specific investigations may more accurately refine the area at risk.

**Point Number** 2102.11

**Plan Chapter** 15.1(7)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Section 15.1(7) - Introduction as follows:

(7) ~~Less frequent~~ A range of natural hazards can occur in the Waikato District, such as wildfires, tsunami, extreme wind events and drought, these hazards are generally considered as high impact low probability hazards and often have an emergency management response. may not need a district plan response. Emergency [...] role. Land use planning including a district plan response should be considered in relation to these hazards where residual risks (to life, property or the environment) are identified as unacceptable or intolerable.

**Decision Reasons:**

- 15.1(7) states that high impact low probability hazards may not require a district plan response and this is considered to be misleading.
- Amendments ensure that plan users are clear how risks are managed and the role of land use planning in reducing and managing risk.
- Provides for the consideration of tsunami hazards and liquefaction risk.
- Allows community to understand its role in response plans, the level of risk treatment these provide and that residual risk may require further management.
- Identifies the role of land use planning tools in managing risk.

**Point Number** 2102.12

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.1 - Resilience to natural hazard risk as follows:  A resilient community where the risks from natural hazards <del>on</del> <u>to</u> people, property, infrastructure and the environment from subdivision, use and development of land are <u>first avoided or appropriately mitigated or managed to acceptable levels.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the outcome of increasing community resilience; however, it is not clear what the term ‘mitigation’ means when seeking to manage risk.</li> <li>• The RPS objective 3.24 refers to increased community resilience, reducing risk to acceptable levels or and through enabling efficient and effective response.</li> <li>• As such, in seeking to achieve a more resilient community the submitter seeks to reflect that risks should be avoided or managed (in some utilising mitigations) to acceptable levels.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Neutral
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.1 introductory text to clarify whether high hazard areas are to be considered as primary hazard areas, as defined in the RPS.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Clarity sought on primary hazard area.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.1(a) as follows:  (a) Avoid new subdivision, use and development where they will increase the risk to people’s safety, well-being and property <u>and the environment in the following areas identified as being at significant risk from natural hazards:</u>

- (i) ~~High Risk Flood Area;~~
- (ii) ~~High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area;~~
- (iii) ~~High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area.~~

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter considers significant risk may be possible beyond listed areas.
- Including risk to the environment reflects both the objective and policy direction in the RPS.
- The next submission is to provide separate policy for development in High Risk Flood Area, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area.

**Point Number** 2102.15

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.1A - (new)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** a new policy 15.2.1.1A as follows:

Policy 15.2.1.1A – Identified areas at significant risk from natural hazards

(a) The following areas are identified as being at significant risk from natural hazards:

- (i) High Risk Flood Area;
- (ii) High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area;
- (iii) High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area.

**Decision Reasons:**

Splitting this policy out of 15.2.1.1 provides a strong policy directive to avoid new development in high-risk areas being those defined (subject to prior proposed amendments) as High Risk Flood Area, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area.

**Point Number** 2102.16

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support



<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.2 as follows:</p> <p>Policy 15.2.1.2 - Changes to <u>zoning</u> existing land use activities and development in areas at significant risk from natural hazards</p> <p>(a) In areas <u>of significant risk from natural hazards including High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) and High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation)</u>, ensure that when changes to existing land use activities and development occur, a range of risk reduction options are assessed, and development that would increase risk to people's safety, well-being <del>and the environment and</del> property is avoided.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the consideration of risk reduction in areas of significant risk from natural hazards when redevelopment is proposed in defined high hazard areas.</li> <li>• The policy should also be considered when proposing to rezone land.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2A - (new)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a new Policy 15.2.1.2A as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy 15.2.1.2.A - Natural hazard sensitive land uses in areas at significant risk from natural hazards (outside of the coastal environment)</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Avoid locating natural hazard sensitive land uses in areas at significant risk from natural hazards including High Risk Flood, unless risk assessment demonstrates mitigation measures will ensure such land uses will not increase the risk to vulnerable people, communities, other property, or the environment.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan defines sensitive land uses in relation to activities other than natural hazards.</li> <li>• The inclusion of policy direction is sought to specifically manage activities that are sensitive due to people being more susceptible to effects associated with natural hazard events and are less able to manage risk through emergency response.</li> <li>• This provides more directive management of natural hazards risks by increasing resilience, achieved through better regulatory controls around location of different land uses and enabling effective and efficient response and recovery from natural hazard events (Objective 3.24 of the RPS).</li> <li>• Initially rules can be implemented through the provisions relating to high-risk hazard areas.</li> <li>• Consideration of other areas at significant risk can occur through appropriate activity status or a plan change process.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2B - (new)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a new Policy 15.2.1.2B as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy 15.2.1.2.B - Natural hazard sensitive land uses in areas at significant risk from natural hazards within the coastal environment</u></p> <p><u>(a) Avoid locating natural hazard sensitive land uses in areas at significant risk from natural hazards including High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion), unless risk assessment demonstrates that the risk of social, environmental and economic harm is not increased.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gives effect to the policy direction set out in NZCPS.</li> <li>• In high coastal hazard areas and those at significant risk from natural hazards in the coastal environment this policy applies the measure of ‘not increasing the risk of adverse effects’ to reflect the direction of the NZCPS.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.19
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a new definition – ‘Natural hazard sensitive land use’ to Chapter 15.14 as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Natural hazard sensitive land use</u></b></p> <p><u>Means any residential activity, education facility (including a childcare facility, wananga and koohanga reo), papakaainga building, resthome, retirement village, travellers’ accommodation, home stay, health facility or hospital.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>New definition ensures that these activities are not provided for unless there are exceptional circumstances where the policy direction can be met in areas subject to defined high risk hazards.</p>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.20
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NC4 - (new)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> new Rule 15.5.4 NC4 - High Risk Flood Area – Non-Complying Activities as follows:  <u>NC4 Natural Hazard Sensitive Activities</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Rule is to manage the establishment of new land uses and change of land uses that accommodate activities that are more sensitive to natural hazards in high hazard areas.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.3 NC4 - (new)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> new Rule 15.9.3 NC4 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area – Non-Complying Activities as follows:  <u>NC4 Natural Hazard Sensitive Activities</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Rule is to manage the establishment of new land uses and change of land uses that accommodate activities that are more sensitive to natural hazards in high hazard areas.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.22
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.3 NC4 - (new)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> new Rule 15.10.3 NC4 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Non-Complying Activities as follows:  <u>NC4 Natural Hazard Sensitive Activities</u>

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Rule is to manage the establishment of new land uses and change of land uses that accommodate activities that are more sensitive to natural hazards in high hazard areas.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.23
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.3 - New emergency services and hospitals in areas at significant risk from natural hazards as follows:</p> <p><b>Policy 15.2.1.3</b> - New <u>critical community infrastructure or emergency services and hospitals</u> in areas at significant risk from natural hazards</p> <p>(a) Avoid locating new emergency service facilities and <u>critical community infrastructure hospitals</u> in areas which are at significant risk from natural hazards, including High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion), unless, considering engineering and technical constraints or functional and operational requirements, they cannot be reasonably located elsewhere and will not increase the risk to <del>or vulnerability of vulnerable people, or</del> <u>communities, other property or the environment.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments are proposed to ensure risk to property and the environment are also relevant considerations in relation to the location of facilities in these areas.</li> <li>• Amendment as proposed broadens the consideration of emergency services to reflect a wider range critical community infrastructure.</li> <li>• The term ‘hospitals’ can be removed of this policy and respective rules as these will be captured by the proposed new definition ‘natural hazard sensitive activities’.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the definition of Emergency service facility in Chapter 15.14 Definitions as follows:

**Emergency or critical community service facility**

Means a fire station, ambulance station, police station or an emergency co-ordination facility that functions as a critical community facility utilised for emergency response and recovery.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The scope of the definition as currently drafted is unclear as it does not suggest the inclusion of facilities other than those immediately associated with Police, Fire and Ambulance.
- Broadening the term reflects the range of critical community facilities which may be utilised for emergency response purposes.

**Point Number**

2102.25

**Plan Chapter**

15.2.1.11

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Policy 15.2.1.11 - New development that creates demand for new protection structures and works as follows:

(a) Avoid locating new and redevelopment of existing subdivision, use and development in all coastal and flood hazard areas ~~High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Areas~~ where a demand or need for new structural protection works will be required to reduce the risk from natural hazards to acceptable levels.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Consideration of the demand for protection structures or works to manage current or future risks is supported but should also apply clearly to changes of use as well as new development as a change of use may have a greater demand for structural protection works than the existing use.
- This is a relevant consideration for development or redevelopment/change of use in areas subject to natural hazards, particularly in the floodplain 1% AEP area and coastal sensitivity areas.

**Point Number**

2102.26

**Plan Chapter**

15.2.1.4A - (new)

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new Policy 15.2.1.4A as follows:</p> <p><b><u>Policy 15.2.1.4A - Small scale non-habitable structures in areas subject to significant risk from natural hazards</u></b></p> <p><u>(a) Enable the location of small-scale accessory buildings and farm buildings to be located within areas subject to significant risk from natural hazard, including High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) where risks are managed to acceptable levels and potential risk to people, property and the environment beyond the site are avoided.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This new policy provides for further investment and therefore exposure and increased risk within these areas.</li> <li>• The location of structures in these areas may also result in damage to them and displacement from the site in a hazard event, however it is appropriate to include a policy which specifically enables these activities, as policy 15.2.1.4 does for infrastructure and utilities.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.27
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> to Rule 15.5.1 P1 High Risk Flood Area - Permitted Activities to include an activity specific condition as follows:</p> <p><u>The structure is constructed and located to ensure that if damaged within a 1% AEP hazard event the structures will be contained within the site.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An activity specific conditions is needed to ensure structures are located and constructed so that they do not pose a risk to people, property and the environment beyond the site.</li> <li>• Achieves new policy 15.2.1.4A as proposed for accessory and farm buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.28
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to Policy 15.9.1 PI High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area - Permitted Activities to include an activity specific condition as follows:
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p><u>The structure is constructed and located to ensure that if damaged within a 1% AEP hazard event the structures will be contained within the site.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An activity specific conditions is needed to ensure structures are located and constructed so that they do not pose a risk to people, property and the environment beyond the site.</li> <li>• Achieves new policy 15.2.1.4A as proposed for accessory and farm buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.29
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to Policy 15.10.1 PI High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area - Permitted Activities to include an activity specific condition as follows:
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p><u>The structure is constructed and located to ensure that if damaged within a 1% AEP hazard event the structures will be contained within the site.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An activity specific conditions is needed to ensure structures are located and constructed so that they do not pose a risk to people, property and the environment beyond the site.</li> <li>• Achieves new policy 15.2.1.4A as proposed for accessory and farm buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.30
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4(a)(ii) - New infrastructure and utilities in areas subject to significant risk from natural hazards as follows:
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>(ii) any increased risks to people, property, <u>other infrastructure and utilities</u> and the environment are mitigated to the extent practicable; and..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers effects on people and the wider environment associated with the location of new infrastructure and utilities.</li> </ul>

- Flood defences are subject to design requirements and levels of service and it is important that other infrastructure does not impede or compromise of these systems.
- Specific inclusion of ‘other infrastructure and utilities’ ensure that the operation of these systems is not impeded or compromised.

**Point Number** 2102.31

**Plan Chapter** Chapters 13, 14, 15

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 13 Definitions and Chapter 15.14 Definitions to clarify the how definitions of infrastructure, utility, road network activities and telecommunication facilities interact, and which takes precedence in which situation.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Clarity is required to understand how the definitions for ‘infrastructure’ in Chapter 13 and the chapter specific definition for ‘Utilities’ in Chapter 15 and the relevant rules in Chapter 14 and 15 and other rules in the plan will interact and under what circumstances does one take precedence over another.
- The definition of road network activities and telecommunication facilities, and relationship with NES-TF also need consideration.
- The submitter notes the matter of scope, but seeks that clarification be provided.

**Point Number** 2102.32

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.5

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.5 - Existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards as follows:

(a) Provide for the operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards, provided that the hazard is not exacerbated, or risks increased to other properties.

**Decision Reasons:** Provisions for existing infrastructure and utilities should be subject to the consideration of the impact that such activities can have beyond the site.



<b>Point Number</b>	2102.33
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5A - (new)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new Policy 15.2.1.5A as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy 15.2.1.5A - New infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards</u></p> <p><u>(a) Provide for new infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards, provided that the hazard is not exacerbated or risks increased to other properties.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>While policy 15.2.1.5 provides for existing infrastructure and utilities in all hazard areas and policy 15.2.1.4 provides for new infrastructure and utilities in areas subject to significant risk from natural hazards, there appears to be a policy gap for provision of new infrastructure and utilities in natural hazard areas beyond those areas where a significant risk is identified.</p>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.34
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2 RD2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new Rule 15.7.2 RD2 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) as follows:</p> <p><u>New Infrastructure and utilities, including any associated earthworks</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>The functional and/or operational need to locate within the hazard area;</u></p> <p>(b) <u>The risk of adverse effects to other people, property and the environment including; risk to public health and safety; impacts on public access associated with the proposed activity;</u></p> <p>(c) <u>The management or regulation of other people and property required to mitigate natural hazard risks resulting from the location of the infrastructure;</u></p> <p>(d) <u>Any exacerbation of an existing natural hazard or creation of a new natural hazard as a result of the structure; and</u></p>

(e) The ability to relocate or remove structures.

**Decision Reasons:**

Clarifications are required to the rules to ensure that new infrastructure or utilities are subject to an appropriate process to confirm that they will achieve the policy direction and will not result in an exacerbation of or increased risk to other property.

**Point Number**

2102.35

**Plan Chapter**

15.10.2

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Rule 15.10.2 D4 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Discretionary activities to include specific reference to infrastructure and utilities as follows:

D4 - Construction of new infrastructure and utilities not provided for in Rule 15.10.1 P2.

**And**

**Amend** Rule 15.10.2 D5 as follows:

D5 - Upgrading of existing infrastructure and utilities not provided for in Rule 15.10.1 P2.

**Decision Reasons:**

Clarifications are required to the rules to ensure that new infrastructure or utilities are subject to an appropriate process to confirm that they will achieve the policy direction and will not result in an exacerbation of or increased risk to other property.

**Point Number**

2102.36

**Plan Chapter**

15.9.2

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Rule 15.9.2 D5 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area – Discretionary activities to include specific reference to infrastructure and utilities as follows:

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>D5 - Construction of new <u>infrastructure and</u> utilities not provided for in Rule 15.9.1 P2.</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.9.2 D6 as follows:</p> <p>D6 - Upgrading of existing <u>infrastructure and</u> utilities not provided for in Rule 15.9.1 P2.</p> <p>Clarifications are required to the rules to ensure that new infrastructure or utilities are subject to an appropriate process to confirm that they will achieve the policy direction and will not result in an exacerbation of or increased risk to other property.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.37
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.1 P3 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) - Permitted Activities to confirm the activity does not apply to new construction.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Clarifications are required to the rules to ensure that new infrastructure or utilities are subject to an appropriate process to confirm that they will achieve the policy direction and will not result in an exacerbation of or increased risk to other property.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.38
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.1 P3 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) - Permitted Activities to confirm the activity does not apply to new construction.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Clarifications are required to the rules to ensure that new infrastructure or utilities are subject to an appropriate process to confirm that they will achieve the policy direction and will not result in an exacerbation of or increased risk to other property.</p>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.39
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P5 - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas – Permitted Activities to confirm the activity does not apply to new construction.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Clarifications are required to the rules to ensure that new infrastructure or utilities are subject to an appropriate process to confirm that they will achieve the policy direction and will not result in an exacerbation of or increased risk to other property.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.40
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13 and 15.2.1.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.6 - Managing natural hazard risk generally as follows:  (a) Provide for rezoning, subdivision, use and development outside High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Areas where natural hazard risk has been appropriately identified and assessed <u>taking into account the projected effects of climate change over at least a 100 year timeframe and significant and unacceptable risks are <del>can be adequately avoided, and all other risks are appropriately managed to acceptable levels including through the use of mitigations where appropriate remedied or mitigated</del> and does not transfer or exacerbate risk to adjoining properties.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy provides the primary policy direction for plan change processes, subdivision, use and development beyond areas which are identified as 'high risk hazard areas.</li> <li>• The policy direction can be refined to provide clearer links to the RPS policy directives and to ensure that risks are managed to acceptable levels while acknowledging opportunity for risk reduction, alignment of civil defence and limit reliance of hazard protection measures.</li> <li>• The term 'appropriately identified' provides for the need for suitable expert assessment, which is further supported by information requirements in section 15.13.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.41
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6A - (new)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new Policy 15.2.1.6A - Minimising risks from high impact low probability Hazards as follows:</p> <p><u>Policy 15.2.1.6A - Minimising risks from high impact low probability hazards</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Minimise the risks to personal health and safety, critical community facilities and infrastructure and enable increased resilience through response and recovery by assessing the risks from a low probability but high potential impact events such as tsunamis, earthquake and volcanic eruptions.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed new policy gives effect to the WRPS policy direction for low probability high impact natural hazards.</li> <li>• Currently the proposed plan provisions refer to natural hazards outside of high-risk areas and require their management. · Currently there is no specific mention of tsunamis, earthquake fault lines, or volcanic features.</li> <li>• Specific consideration of low probability and high impact hazards particularly in relation to land use change and significant redevelopment or new infrastructure should be included within the policy direction.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.42
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.18
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.18 - Residential development potentially subject to fire risk as follows:</p> <p><del>Policy 15.2.1.18 - Residential Development</del> <u>and subdivision</u> potentially subject to fire risk</p> <p>(a) <u>In areas assessed or identified as being potentially subject to elevated fire risk, consider the design and layout of the subdivision or development to ensure that an</u></p>

~~appropriate buffer area or setback is provided around new residential subdivision and development the following matters are considered:~~

(i) Access for emergency service vehicles;

(ii) Provisions of and access to emergency firefighting water supply;

(iii) Separation and management of vegetation (with regard to slope, aspect, management regimes, conflicts with biodiversity; use of less flammable vegetation); and

(iv) The design and materials of any buildings.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The proposed amendments will assist in the consideration of fire risk associated with activities requiring resource consent and ensure that it is identified as being applicable to subdivisions and the development of a wider range of land uses and that a wider range of mitigations are considered through this policy.
- At the time of constructing a residential or 'natural hazard sensitive land use' and at the time of subdivision fire risk may be a relevant consideration.

**Point Number**

2102.43

**Plan Chapter**

15.14 and 15.1 (6)

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Chapter 15.14 - Definitions to confirm how liquefaction risk may be identified by plan users without the need for expert assessment.

OR

**Amend** Section 15.1 (6) - Introduction to confirm how liquefaction risk may be identified by plan users without the need for expert assessment.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter supports the need to consider land instability and liquefaction risk and accepts that these areas are challenging to define.
- The plan needs to confirm how land can be identified as prone or susceptible to liquefaction by plan users, without the need for expert assessment, and what process is proposed to be followed in practice by applicants and the council.
- The submitter notes the development of the New Zealand Geotechnical Society (NZGS) and Ministry of Business Innovation & Employment (MBIE) Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering Practice in New Zealand guidelines and considers that the 2019 update may be relevant to consider in further defining the approach to liquefaction risk in the plan.

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.44
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.22
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.22 - Liquefaction-prone land risk assessment as follows:</p> <p>Policy 15.2.1.22 - Liquefaction- <del>prone</del>-<u>susceptible</u> land risk assessment</p> <p>(a) On land potentially <del>prone</del>-<u>susceptible</u> to liquefaction, ensure that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">(i) an assessment by a geotechnical specialist occurs before new subdivision, use or development <del>takes place</del> <u>is provided for</u>; and</p> <p>[...]</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the inclusion of policy direction and matters of discretion where resource consent is required but questions how risks are to be managed where an activity may otherwise be permitted, particularly in relation to retaining structures.</li> <li>• Amendments are proposed to ensure consistency of terminology.</li> <li>• The submitter supports the additional matters identified in 15.12 for liquefaction and land instability where subdivision, use and developments, including multi-unit developments are proposed.</li> </ul>

---

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.45
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.23
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.23 – Control activities on land susceptible to damage from liquefaction as follows:</p> <p>Policy 15.2.1.23 – Control activities on land susceptible to <del>damage from</del> liquefaction</p> <p>(a) Control subdivision, use and development on land assessed as being susceptible to liquefaction-induced ground damage, <del>to ensure that where</del> appropriate <u>avoidance, remediation or</u> mitigation is provided so that the level of risk to people, property, infrastructure and the environment is acceptable.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the inclusion of policy direction and matters of discretion where resource consent is required but questions how risks are to be managed</li> </ul>

where an activity may otherwise be permitted, particularly in relation to retaining structures.

- Amendments are proposed to ensure consistency of terminology.
- The submitter supports the additional matters identified in 15.12 for liquefaction and land instability where subdivision, use and developments, including multi-unit developments are proposed.

**Point Number** 2102.46

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.19

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.19 - Development on land subject to instability or subsidence as follows:

(a) Avoid locating new subdivision, use and development, including rezoning, on land assessed as being subject to, or likely to be subject to, instability or subsidence, unless appropriate mitigation is provided and the activity does not increase the risk to people, property, ~~or~~ infrastructure or the environment.

**Decision Reasons:** The policy provides for the inclusion of land instability hazards and the policy approach that ensures risk is not increased but should also consider the risk to the environment.

**Point Number** 2102.47

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.21

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.21 - Stormwater management in areas subject to risk of land instability or subsidence as follows:

Policy 15.2.1.21 - Stormwater management in areas subject to risk of land instability ~~or~~ subsidence and other high-risk coastal hazard areas

(a) Avoid discharge of stormwater directly to ground on land that is potentially at risk of land instability ~~or~~ subsidence and other high-risk coastal hazard areas unless:

[...]



<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the consideration of the effects of on site (or reticulated) servicing on where there is identified land instability, noting this is also applicable in many instances to coastal areas which are prone to instability.</li> <li>• The amendments to the policy and inclusion of a new rule ensures the activity is not undertaken in areas subject to high-risk natural hazards without assessment of the impact of the activity.</li> <li>• This policy is given effect to by the rules controlling utilities in the high-risk coastal hazard areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.48
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 - Protection from risks of coastal hazards as follows:</p> <p>(a) Recognise the importance of natural features and buffers, <del>and soft hazard protection works,</del> and prefer them wherever practicable over hard protection structures.</p> <p>(b) <u>Provide for the landward movement of natural coastal systems which function as coastal hazard defences; and</u></p> <p>(c) <del>Where where</del> new hazard mitigation measures and/or works are required to protect people, property infrastructure and the environment from the risks of coastal hazards , <u>consider first the use of enhancement and support of natural features and soft engineering solutions.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preference and maintenance of natural systems as defences against coastal hazards is supported.</li> <li>• Amendments as proposed recognise the importance of natural systems, provide for their continued function and indicate a preference for soft engineering solutions where further intervention is required.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.49
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Policy 15.2.1.8(a) - Limitations on hard protection works for coastal hazard mitigation as follows:

(a) Ensure that where ~~new~~ hard protection structures and works are ~~necessary~~ proposed to protect existing development on public or privately- owned land from coastal hazards that the following is achieved, they are appropriately assessed and controlled and:

(i) ~~they provide a demonstrated significant~~ have primarily a public and/or environmental benefit when located on public land;

(ii) they are effective considering a range of coastal hazard events including the effects of climate change and the activities or development they are designed to protect;

(iii) ~~the economic, social and environmental benefits outweigh costs; and~~

(iii) the economic, cultural and/or social importance of the physical resources to be protected are identified and transition mechanisms and timeframes for moving to more sustainable approaches are provided and reflected in the tenure of the proposal; and

(iv) ~~do risk is not transferred~~ or increase risk to other people, property, infrastructure, the natural environment, historic heritage or Maori Sites and Areas of Significance.;

(v) structures are located as far landward as practicable;

(vi) public access both to and along the coastal area and to the coastal marine area are provided for;

(vii) the temporary nature or tenure of the structure is considered with respect to actual and potential adverse effects associated with the structure on coastal processes, values and the natural environment over the life of the structure and opportunities to remove, relocate or adapt a structure;

(viii) the ongoing cost of maintenance of the structure; and

(ix) residual coastal hazard risk and how risks are to be managed with reference to civil defence or other relevant plans.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter supports limitations on the use of hard protection structures and identifying important considerations to be had where consent is sought for such a structure.
- Amendments are proposed to strengthen the assessment framework.
- Provides scope for consideration of design and locational considerations, extended as well as new structures and the management of effects overtime where subject to the effects of climate change.

**Point Number**

2102.50

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.8(b) and (c) – Limitations on hard protection works for coastal hazard mitigation as follows:</p> <p>(b) <del>Encourage the development of</del> <u>Ensure that when new hard protection structures are to be located in an area where an adaptive management strategy strategies which consider limited tenure and best practice design and location where coastal protection structures are identified as desirable and identify longer term risk reduction options available to a community has been prepared to manage coastal hazards, they are consistent with that strategy.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Where adaptive management strategies have been prepared in accordance with 15.2.1.8 (b) regard should be had to these strategies through a plan change or resource consent process.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal management strategies are being developed with communities throughout the Waikato region. It is noted that many of these are focused on community values and the outcomes sought. In many cases these involve the use of hard protection structures to protect a mix of public and private assets.</li> <li>• The long-term viability and adverse effects of these structures is often not well understood.</li> <li>• With plans and strategies being developed through non statutory processes, they may not be consistent with the NZCPS and the WRPS.</li> <li>• Policy amendments ensure that adaptive management plans should be carried out through a Schedule 1 process or which identify the requirement to give effect to higher order planning document.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.51
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> to Policy 15.2.1.9 Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection, new para (b) as follows:</p> <p>(b) <u>In giving effect to (a) have regard to the need for natural systems to adapt and respond to natural coastal processes including the effects of climate change.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Amendments ensure alignment with policy 15.2.3.2 in relation to providing for the inland migration of indigenous biodiversity through recognising the need to allow

natural coastal processes to occur, many of which will provide habitats to indigenous fauna and flora.

**Point Number** 2102.52

**Plan Chapter** 15.7

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Section 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) to add new rules that provide for the beach nourishment and dune stabilisation as a permitted activity subject to specific conditions and discretionary activity where these conditions are not achieved.

**Decision Reasons:**

- There are limited provisions for activities such as beach nourishment.
- Provision is required for the protection, maintenance, and where appropriate enhancement of the integrity of natural features and buffers which provide a natural defence.
- The amendments will ensure that maintenance and enhancement of natural defences will be promoted through the plan in accordance with policy 13.2(f) of the RPS and policy 15.2.1.7.

**Point Number** 2102.53

**Plan Chapter** 15.8

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Section 15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) to add new rules that provide for the beach nourishment and dune stabilisation as a permitted activity subject to specific conditions and discretionary activity where these conditions are not achieved.

**Decision Reasons:**

- There are limited provisions for activities such as beach nourishment.
- Provision is required for the protection, maintenance, and where appropriate enhancement of the integrity of natural features and buffers which provide a natural defence.
- The amendments will ensure that maintenance and enhancement of natural defences will be promoted through the plan in accordance with policy 13.2(f) of the RPS and policy 15.2.1.7.

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.54
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.9 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area to add new rules that provide for the beach nourishment and dune stabilisation as a permitted activity subject to specific conditions and discretionary activity where these conditions are not achieved.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are limited provisions for activities such as beach nourishment.</li> <li>• Provision is required for the protection, maintenance, and where appropriate enhancement of the integrity of natural features and buffers which provide a natural defence.</li> <li>• The amendments will ensure that maintenance and enhancement of natural defences will be promoted through the plan in accordance with policy 13.2(f) of the RPS and policy 15.2.1.7.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.55
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.10 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area to add new rules that provide for the beach nourishment and dune stabilisation as a permitted activity subject to specific conditions and discretionary activity where these conditions are not achieved.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are limited provisions for activities such as beach nourishment.</li> <li>• Provision is required for the protection, maintenance, and where appropriate enhancement of the integrity of natural features and buffers which provide a natural defence.</li> <li>• The amendments will ensure that maintenance and enhancement of natural defences will be promoted through the plan in accordance with policy 13.2(f) of the RPS and policy 15.2.1.7.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.56

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> two new definitions to Chapter 15.14 Definitions as follows:</p> <p><u>Beach Nourishment</u></p> <p><u>The deposition of any sand, shingle, shell, or other natural material for enhancing or maintaining natural beach or shoreline systems.</u></p> <p><u>Dune Stabilisation</u></p> <p><u>Soft engineering works to stabilise dunes. Includes: revegetation; wind fencing; and dune reshaping.</u></p> <p><u>Excludes: coastal protection structures.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Definitions support new rules for beach nourishment and dune stabilisation.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.57
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1 P4, 15.8.1 P4, 15.9.1 P3 and 15.10.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rules 15.7.1 P4, 15.8.1 P4, 15.9.1 P3 and 15.10.1 P3 – by adding activity specific conditions applicable to maintenance and repair of coastal protection structures as follows:</p> <p><u>(1) The work must maintain the structure or building in a good and safe condition.</u></p> <p><u>(2) The work must not change the area occupied by the structure.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintenance or repair of an existing lawfully established coastal protection structure is permitted, including in some cases earthworks associated with these works.</li> <li>• Permitted rules support reliance on existing structures, which may not be well located or constructed to act as a defence against coastal hazards and may have increasing adverse effects on coastal processes and result in increasing level of residual risk where they are not appropriately engineered for specific hazard events, including the effects of climate change.</li> <li>• This provision enables the ongoing renewal through maintenance in perpetuity.</li> </ul>

- The assessment of all relevant matters is essential to give effect to the policy direction in the NZCPS and the WRPS and enables the consideration of alternatives and the setting of conditions and monitoring requirements.

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.58
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.3 15.8.3 15.9.3 and 15.10.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new Discretionary Activity rules to Sections 15.7.3, 15.8.3, 15.9.3 and 15.10.3 to confirm the status of extensions to existing coastal protection structures as follows:</p> <p><u>Extension (including repair or maintenance that increases the area occupied by the structure) or alteration of existing lawfully established hard protection structures not provided for in Rule 15.X.1 PX.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rules applicable to new protection structures are included in 15.7- 15.10 as discretionary activities. The “maintenance or repair of an existing lawfully established coastal protection structure” are provided for in those chapters as a permitted activity.</li> <li>• This provision addresses the ongoing renewal through maintenance in perpetuity.</li> <li>• The assessment of all relevant matters is essential to give effect to the policy direction in the NZCPS and the WRPS and enables the consideration of alternatives and the setting of conditions and monitoring requirements.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.59
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1 P3, 15.8.1 P3, 15.9.1 P3, and 15.10.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Permitted Activity Rule 15.7.1 P3, Rule 15.8.1 P3, Rule 15.9.1 P3 and Rule 15.10.1 P3 to include an activity specific condition for activities relating to operation, construction, upgrading, minor upgrading, replacement, repair and maintenance of utilities as follows:</p> <p><u>The works do not involve coastal protection structures even where associated with flood management infrastructure including stopbanks and erosion protection structures associated with flood management where owned or operated by the Waikato Regional Council, the Waikato District Council or the Crown.</u></p>

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Provision for the continued repair of structures or their complete replacement may be appropriate in some cases, however this should not be enabled without the need for an assessment of adverse effects and consideration of the policy direction and consideration of alternatives, additional mitigations or the design and likely effects over the proposed tenure of the structure when considering climate change.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.60
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new definition for Coastal Protection Structure by considering the definition suggested as follows:</p> <p><b>Coastal protection structure</b></p> <p><u>Means any hard protection structure (as defined in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement) located on land or within the Coastal environment.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard protection structures are defined in the NZCPS, and Chapter 15 refers to coastal protection structures.</li> <li>• Policy direction and rules seeking to manage these structures and defences should be adequately defined to ensure resource consent is sought and structures can be assessed appropriately.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.61
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> provisions (rules and assessment matters) in Section 15.5 High Risk Flood Area subject to amendments by the submitter.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports the inclusion of provisions to control subdivision use and development (including changes of land use through a plan change process).
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.62



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1 (10)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Section 15.1(10) – Introduction (subject to other amendments sought by the submitter) as follows:</p> <p>[...] High Flood Risk Areas have also been identified. These are areas within the flood plain where the depth of flood water in a 1% AEP flood event exceeds 1 metre <u>or</u> <del>and</del> the speed of flood water exceeds 2 metres per second [...]</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The High Flood Risk Area in the Section 15.1 paragraph 10 is not consistent with the definition for High Flood Risk Area in Section 15.14. The submitter considers the definition is correct as this should be a one or the other scenario.</li> <li>• The “and” needs to be replaced with “or” to be consistent with the definition.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.63
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.12 - Reduce potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains and flood ponding areas as follows:</p> <p><b>Policy 15.2.1.12 - <del>Reduce potential for flood damage to buildings</del> <u>Managing flood risk for subdivision, use and development located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains in the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas</u></b></p> <p>(a) <del>Reduce</del> <u>Mitigate</u> the potential for flood damage to buildings located on <del>the Waikato and Waipa River 1% AEP</del> floodplains and flood ponding areas by ensuring that the minimum floor level of building development is above the design flood levels / ponding levels in a 1% AEP flood event, plus an allowance for freeboard, unless:</p> <p>(i) the building <del>design development</del> is of a type that is not likely to suffer material damage during a flood; or</p> <p>(ii) [...]</p> <p>(iii) [...]</p> <p>(b) <u>The establishment of new natural hazard sensitive land uses and changes of use to accommodate natural hazard sensitive land uses are assessed and mitigations are provided to ensure that risks to people and property are managed to acceptable levels.</u></p>

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of a policy to reduce potential for flood damage in flood ponding areas is supported.</li> <li>• Subject to the submitters discussion on the definition of and spatial identification of hazard areas, including the flood plain 1% AEP and flood ponding areas, the use of terms in this policy further complicates the understanding of its application.</li> <li>• Companion Policy 15.2.1.6 seeks to manage risks to acceptable levels and ensure risk is not transferred to adjoining properties, whereas policy 15.2.1.12 appears to only apply to the management of risk to a building located within the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains and flood ponding areas but does not address the use or subdivision.</li> <li>• Amendments are sought to confirm that the policy applies to the 1% AEP floodplain associated with the Waikato and Waipa Rivers and 1% AEP flood ponding areas (as mapped) and areas which may be identified as the 1% AEP floodplain but which are beyond the mapped extent.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.64
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> two new discretionary activities to Rule 15.4.3 - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas – Discretionary Activities as follows:</p>
	<p><u>D4 - Emergency or critical community service facility</u></p>
	<p><u>D5 - Natural hazard sensitive activities</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Required to implement the policy direction in policies 15.2.1.12 and 15.2.1.6 (as per decisions sought by the submitter).</li> <li>• Allows for consideration of activities or uses alongside buildings, subdivision, and earthworks.</li> <li>• As identified in high risk hazard areas activities which are more vulnerable to natural hazard risks and those which are integral to response and recovery from hazard events, may require additional assessment of risk.</li> <li>• Ensures that risks and proposed mitigations are considered for emergency or critical community service facilities and for sensitive land uses located in the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.65
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.13

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.13 - Control filling of land within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas as follows:</p> <p><b>Policy 15.2.1.13</b> - Control filling <u>and structures of land</u> within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas</p> <p>(a) Control filling of land <u>and the location of structures</u> within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas to ensure that the potential adverse effects on flood storage capacity, overland flows, run-off volumes on surrounding properties on infrastructure, are avoided or mitigated.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration and protection of the function of flood plains and ponding areas is supported as earthworks and the location of structures within these areas can displace water and affect flood flows and can result in adverse effects on adjoining properties and the receiving environment.</li> <li>• A minor amendment addresses the effect of structures on the flood plain function.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.66
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.15 - Flood ponding areas and overland flow paths as follows:</p> <p>(a) Manage <u>the exacerbation of flood stormwater</u> hazards by requiring new subdivision and development within <u>the 1% AEP</u> flood ponding areas and overland flow paths to adopt integrated catchment plan-based <u>stormwater</u> management methods which:</p> <p>(i) maintain the <u>function of flood storage capacity</u> of natural floodplains, wetlands and ponding areas , <u>including storage capacity</u>; and</p> <p>(ii) retain the function and capacity of overland flow paths <u>and 1% AEP floodplains</u> to convey <u>rainfall events stormwater</u> run-off; and</p> <p>(iii) do not transfer or increase risk elsewhere <u>within the catchment</u>; and</p> <p>(iv) promote <u>best practice approaches to maintaining and enhancing natural systems which function as a defence against flood hazards</u> <u>low impact stormwater</u></p>

management practices with reference to the Waikato Stormwater Management Guideline and the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (RITS); and

(v) minimise impervious surfaces.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The policy supports the holistic consideration of flood hazards and stormwater or freshwater management at a catchment scale.
- The introduction of the term ‘stormwater hazard’ and ‘overland flow path’ complicates the provisions.
- Amendments proposed for clarification of the relationship to the natural hazard provisions and identify the role of maintaining natural systems as a defence against flood hazards.
- Amendments to subsection (iv) ensure that continued best practice can be followed and that a particular publication is not codified in the plan through incorporation by reference.

**Point Number** 2102.67

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1 P7

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Delete** Rule 15.4.1 P7 - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas – Permitted Activities.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter does not support this rule.
- Providing for unlimited earthworks to enable the elevation of buildings above floodplain depths as a permitted activity will not allow for adequate assessment of the potential for the displacement of flood flows on to the neighbouring properties or for the consideration of the effect on the function of the flood plain.

**Point Number** 2102.68

**Plan Chapter** Table 15.4.1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Table 15.4.1 - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas – Permitted Activities to further consider the activity specific conditions to ensure the effects are appropriately managed and mitigations are provided.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provisions for additional structures, infrastructure and utilities, garages, and buildings within the 1% AEP flood plain and ponding area may not achieve the policy direction of maintaining the function of the flood plain and avoiding and mitigating effects on neighbouring properties.</li> <li>• The submitter seeks further consideration of activity specific conditions in Table 15.4.1 to ensure that effects are appropriately managed, and mitigations are provided.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.69
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.10(a) - Areas defended by stopbanks adjacent to the Waikato River as follows:</p> <p>(a) Control <u>land use change</u>, subdivision, use and development in areas identified as Defended Areas adjacent to the Waikato River by:</p> <p>(i) assessing the potential risk of overtopping or structural failure of the stopbanks, and overwhelming of associated flood protection structures, before <u>land use change</u>, subdivision and development <del>occurs</del>; <u>is enabled</u> and</p> <p>(ii) requiring <del>that consideration be given to</del> appropriate mitigation to reduce any residual risk <u>to acceptable levels identified</u>; and</p> <p>(iii) ensuring that any residual risk is not transferred to neighbouring sites; <u>and</u></p> <p><u>(iv) Requiring assessment of the ongoing function and efficacy of flood defence systems, and the identification of associated economic and social costs and benefits associated with these.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of defended areas is supported.</li> <li>• The minor amendments proposed for this policy are to reflect the introductory statement suggesting this policy would be considered for proposals to change land use within defended areas, alongside the potential for subdivision, use and development to occur subject to the existing plan provisions.</li> <li>• Where further developments proposed or uses intensified within defended areas, particularly the subdivision of land which can create community expectations for ongoing maintenance and efficacy of flood defences, that this is a relevant consideration in relation to these activities.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.70

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> a new discretionary activity to Rule 15.6.3 Defended Area (Residual Risk) – Discretionary Activity as follows:  <u>D4 - Emergency or critical community service facility</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To achieve the policy direction, set in 15.2.1.10, it is relevant to control emergency or critical community service facilities when they are proposed to be located within defended areas.</li> <li>• This will enable the same level of consideration of location and management of residual risks and the implementation of any appropriate mitigations.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.71
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> new rules to Section 15.6 - Defended Area (Residual Risk) to implement an appropriate consideration of residual risk when locating more intensive and vulnerable land uses within defended areas.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To achieve the policy direction, set in 15.2.1.10, it is relevant to consider how risks are managed when locating more intensive and vulnerable land uses within defended areas.</li> <li>• While this consideration can be had through a plan change process there is currently no mechanism for this to be specifically considered when natural hazard sensitive land uses are proposed to be established in new or repurposed buildings.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.72
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.2 Objective and policies to consider the layout of the objectives and policies to increase the consideration of Objective 15.2.3 and associated policies when undertaking the assessment of discretionary or non-complying activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When considering the risk in high-risk coastal hazard areas (being those which are subject to coastal hazard risk in present day conditions) it is important to ensure that there is a consideration of the projected effects of climate change.</li> <li>• This can address uncertainty through the consideration of a range of Representative Concentration Pathways (that may result in a differing extent of sea level rise and storminess) that may be considered dependent on the activity or development proposed.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.73
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7 and 15.8 and 15.2.1.16 and 15.2.1.17
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the provisions under 15.7 and 15.8, and associated policies 15.2.1.16 and 15.2.1.17 to address the concerns raised in the submission on these provisions.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Understanding of the inclusion of climate change and sea level rise in the identification of coastal sensitivity areas is important as it supports future adaptability.</li> <li>• The proposed definition of coastal sensitivity area (erosion and inundation) refers to “an area identified on the planning maps that is potentially vulnerable to coastal inundation over the period to 2120, assuming sea level rise of 1.0 m.”</li> <li>• The submitter supports the inclusion of a consideration of climate change over a period of at least 100 years but notes that an area which is potentially vulnerable over at least a 100-year timeframe may be subject to greater (or less) than 1m of sea level rise over that timeframe.</li> <li>• In accordance with the MfE’s Coastal Hazards and Climate change guidance and as identified in the WRPS, a range of RCPs are identified and may be considered dependent on the activity or development proposed. Spatially identifying areas allows for rules to be triggered, which then require further assessment. However, there needs to be clarity between the methodology (and supporting policy) for the identification of areas for assessment and the need to consider different sea level rise scenarios where more detailed assessment is required. Further consideration is needed to clarify how this may be included in the provisions for coastal sensitivity areas and any subdivision, use and development proposed within these areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.74

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.16
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.16 - Development in the Coastal Sensitivity Areas as follows:</p> <p>(a) In Coastal Sensitive Areas <del>identified on the planning maps</del>, control subdivision, use and development by ensuring that the subdivision, use or development is:</p> <p>(i) [...]</p> <p>(ii) designed, constructed and located to <del>minimise</del> <u>not increase</u> the level of risk to people, property and the environment.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Minor amendment to (a)(ii) to ensure the policy direction of the NZCPS is given effect to.

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.75
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.17
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.17 - Setbacks from the coast to address the concerns the submitter has with the way the numbers for the setbacks have been determined.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A policy which identifies the need for setbacks is supported. However the submitter questions the manner in which a numerical number has been selected for those setbacks.</li> <li>• The mapped coastal hazard areas extend further landward than these notional setbacks.</li> <li>• The application of this policy should be further considered and the ability to amend and increase these setback requirements be identified.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.76
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support



<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.2 RDI - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) - Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows:
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Construction of a new building or additions to an existing building <u>and establishment of a natural hazard sensitive land use</u> not provided for in Rule 15.7.1 PI-P3 and not listed in Rule 15.7.3 DI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of this activity status and the consideration of relocation, provisions of services and adverse effects beyond the site is supported.</li> <li>• The rule as currently drafted captures the potential for existing buildings to be repurposed to accommodate more sensitive activities. The proposed amendment this change in land use is included with the development or addition to a building.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.77
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.2 RDI Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) - Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows:
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Construction of a new building or addition to an existing building <u>and establishment of a natural hazard sensitive land use</u> not provided for in Rule 15.8.1 PI- P3 and not listed in Rule 15.8.3 DI.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of this activity status and the consideration of relocation, provisions of services and adverse effects beyond the site is supported.</li> <li>• The rule as currently drafted captures the potential for existing buildings to be repurposed to accommodate more sensitive activities. The proposed amendment this change in land use is included with the development or addition to a building.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.78
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.14 – Hazardous substances located within floodplain and flood ponding areas as follows:

**Policy 15.2.1.14** - Hazardous substances located within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas, defended areas, high risk flood hazard area, high risk coastal hazard area (inundation and erosion) Coastal sensitivity areas, and areas subject to land instability, subsidence and liquefaction risk

(a) Ensure that the location and storage of hazardous substances within the ~~1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas~~ does not create an unacceptable hazard to people, property infrastructure or the environment.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The storage and use of hazardous substances in areas affected by hazards requires consideration of risk and may require additional measures to mitigate those risks.
- Hazardous facilities are identified as an activity requiring resource consent in the 1% AEP flood plain and flood ponding areas. While these areas extend to include the high risk flood hazard area, it is suggested that the high risk flood area be specifically include in the policy for clarity.
- Hazardous facilities may also require consideration and appropriate mitigations for risk in defended areas subject to residual risks, in coastal hazard areas, areas subject to land instability subsidence or liquefaction.
- Reference to infrastructure is also included for consistency across policies and the objective.

**Point Number** 2102.79

**Plan Chapter** 15.6.3, 15.7.3, 15.8.3, 15.9.2 and 15.10.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** new rule to include hazardous facilities as a discretionary activity in -

- 15.6.3 D5 - Defended Area (Residual Risk);
- 15.7.3 D5 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast);
- 15.8.3 D5 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation);
- 15.9.2 D10 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area;
- 15.10.2 D9 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Where located within the flood plain and flood ponding area hazardous facilities are subject to a rule (which is considered applied to the high-risk flood hazard area).
- There are no specific rules included for defended areas or coastal hazard areas. In order to implement the policy, rules are sought for those hazard areas as well.

**Point Number** 2102.80

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.2 - Awareness of natural hazard risks by relocating it to sit with Objective 15.2.1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objective is supported as it recognises the role that increased understanding has in building community resilience and enabling effective response and recovery from hazard events.</li> <li>• It is essential for communities to understand natural hazard risk in order to determine their risk tolerance and ensure that acceptable risk is collectively determined.</li> <li>• The submitter considers that this objective is broadly relevant to the suite of policies identified as being under 15.2.1 and suggests the relocation of this objective to the 'top' of the policies so that it may be clearly considered when assessing applications against the objectives and policies of this chapter.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.81
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.1(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.2.1(a) - Natural hazard risk information as follows:</p> <p>(a) Enable people to be informed and have access to information on the natural hazards <u>including the projected effects of climate change</u> affecting their properties and surrounding area, including through:</p> <p>(i) [...]</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports the initiatives for providing and communicating natural hazard risk information but seeks to also include consideration of the effects of climate change in relation to natural hazard risks.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.82
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.2.2 - Awareness of Community Response Plans as follows:

**Policy 15.2.2.2 - Awareness of Consideration of Community Response Plans**

(a) Improve response to and recovery from natural hazard events by encouraging community awareness and use of information and methods contained in Community Response Plans.

Identifying and having regard to community response plans where new subdivision, use and development is proposed in areas subject to natural hazard risk.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter supports this policy and its relevance to how risk is managed and what may contribute to an understanding of acceptable risk to life, property, infrastructure and the environment.
- There are no links to specific activities requiring consent under section 15.3 however this would be a relevant policy for many applications.
- Amendments are proposed to ensure consideration of community response plans, achieving greater natural hazard risk awareness and enabling achievement of acceptable levels of risk through subdivision, use and development.

**Point Number** 2102.83

**Plan Chapter** Proposed District Plan - General

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** the plan to strengthen links to climate change objectives and policies in Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change where land use change, subdivision and development are proposed (outside of hazard areas), including reference to water storage and use and drought resistance.

And

**Amend** other chapters or strengthen links to chapter 15 to ensure that objective 15.2.3 and associated policies are considered in relation to land use change, subdivision, use and development (outside of hazard areas).

**Decision Reasons:**

- WRPS policy 3.6 identifies that adapting to climate change involves the need to consider effects from induced weather variability and sea level rise on a range of values, environments, infrastructures, health and safety.
- While climate change effects are particularly relevant to natural hazards, there are other areas of the plan where integration of projected climate change effects should be considered and through which (particularly the design of land use and the built environment) will support a community's ability to adapt.

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.84
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.3 - Climate change by relocating it to sit with Objective 15.2.1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This objective and the links to how it may be achieved through use of rules and particular policy guidance or assessment matters could be improved both within the chapter and across the plan, as well as in relation to how climate change effects are considered in relation to natural hazard risks, by relocating it to sit alongside 15.2.1 and 15.2.2.
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.85
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1(a)(i) to (iv)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 (a) (i) to (iv) - Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development to consider a range of RCPs that are projected result in a range of sea level rise effects before and beyond 2100; and to further consider the inclusion of detailed directives in clauses (i) to (iv).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Depending on the scale and nature of the activity or the development proposed, it may be relevant to consider a range of RCPs which are projected to result in a range of sea level rise effects before and beyond 2100.</li> <li>• The submitter supports the need to consider RCP 8.5 and 8.5H+ as one component of an assessment, but queries the decision to include such directive clauses in the policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.86
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.3.1 - Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development as follows:

**Policy 15.2.3.1** - Effects of climate change on new subdivision, use and development

(a) Ensure ~~that adequate allowances are made for~~ the projected effects of climate change are reflected through dynamic adaptive options in the design and location of new subdivision, use and development including new urban zoning throughout the district, including undertaking assessments where relevant that provide for:

(i) [...]

(ii) The projected increase in sea level, where relevant, as determined by national guidance and the best available information, but being not less than 1m by 2120;

(iii) [...]

(iv) [...]

(v) The ability for natural systems to respond and adapt to the projected changes included in (i) to (iv) above;

(vi) A consideration of regionally specific vertical land movement.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter supports the policy direction.
- However, the policy should include the adaptation of natural systems, and therefore the consideration of these processes when assessing subdivision, use, development and land use change, and clear inclusion of regionally specific vertical land movement alongside other temporal climate change related considerations.

**Point Number** 2102.87

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.3.2 - Future land use planning and climate change as follows:

**Policy 15.2.3.2** - ~~Future~~ Land use planning and climate change

(a) Increase the ability of the community to adapt to the effects of climate change when undertaking ~~future~~ land use planning and considering applications for subdivision, use and development by:

(i) [...]

(ii) ~~encouraging~~ requiring the incorporation of sustainable design measures within new subdivision, land use and development, including:

[...]

**Decision Reasons:**

- Minor amendments proposed to confirm the application of the policy to both plan change processes and to applications for resource consent.
- The policy suite under 15.2.3 provides the direction around consideration of a range of climate change effects, and is therefore imperative that they clearly apply to applications for resource consent as well as future land use change through a plan change process.
- There is an opportunity for larger permanent development and infrastructure to consider the sustainable design measures listed under (ii)(A) to (E), and with this, the need to consider ongoing monitoring to support adaptive processes for such development.
- Further incorporation of this policy direction throughout the whole plan is sought through future review processes and a more integrated consideration of climate change risks and responses across the management of the built and rural environment and the planning of urban form and location.
- There is also an opportunity to reflect the objective of a low carbon economy in infrastructure, energy, and transport policy directives and the potential to better manage resources, such as water through efficient use and storage to enable resilience toward drought conditions.

**Point Number** 2102.88

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.3.3 - Precautionary approach for dealing with uncertainty as follows:

(a) In areas through the district likely to be affected by climate change over at least the next 100 years, adopt a precautionary approach towards land use change, new subdivision, use and development which may have potentially significant or irreversible adverse effects, but for which there is incomplete or uncertain information.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The inclusion of a precautionary approach policy is supported.
- Amendments are proposed to ensure that a 100-year timeframe is conveyed as the 'floor' not the 'ceiling' in terms of effects over time.
- The policy is also clarified to ensure it is considered in relation to land use change or through plan changes.

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.89
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4 and Proposed District Plan - Generally
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 to further consider the implementation of this policy and the ability to amend (and increase) the setback requirements identified and actioned across the zone chapters or located in Chapter 15,</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> the setback provisions across the Proposed Waikato District Plan (primarily located in the zone chapters as well as Chapter 15) to address concerns raised in the submission.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 (b) (i) to (v).</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As identified in relation to policy 15.2.1.17, the submitter questions the way the setbacks (numerical numbers) have been determined, particularly in relation to the projected effects of climate change, noting that coastal sensitivity areas extend further landward than these notional setbacks (in many cases).</li> <li>• The implementation of this policy should be further considered along with the ability to amend and increase these setback requirements.</li> <li>• The matters set out under (b)(i) to (v) provide helpful guidance to the plan reader and should be retained.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.90
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 to ensure the policy can be more clearly applied in relation to individual policies, including through cross referencing.</p> <p><b>Or</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 - Assess the impact of climate change on the level of natural hazard risks, by locating the policy earlier in the provisions.</p>



<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The inclusion of this policy and the clarification that the effects of climate change is considered in relation to natural hazard risk is supported.</li> <li>• There are questions around the way this policy has been adopted when developing the proposed mapped hazard extents.</li> <li>• The order and layout of the chapter may assist in ensuring that the projected effects of climate change are more clearly in mind when reviewing and assessing the policies. This could in part be achieved by locating this policy earlier in the provisions.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.91
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.5(c) - Assess the impact of climate change on the level of natural hazard risks as follows:</p> <p>(c) Where the assessment required by Policy 15.2.3.5(a) and Policy 15.2.3.5(b) above indicates that natural hazards are likely to be exacerbated by climate change, ensure that subdivision and development are designed and located to <u>first</u> avoid, or <u>managed to acceptable levels</u> <del>appropriately mitigate</del>, any increased and cumulative risk <u>from natural hazards including increased risk of flooding, liquefaction, coastal inundation, coastal erosion, slope instability, fire, and drought.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specific proposed amendment implements the policy direction of objective 15.2.1 as amended, including the management of risks to acceptable levels.</li> <li>• The reference to all natural hazards is preferred over the list of specific natural hazards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.92
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> provisions in Section 15.13 requiring assessments to be undertaken by a suitably qualified person.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports the inclusion to provide an assessment undertaken by a suitably qualified person.

<b>Point Number</b>	2102.93
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the definition of risk assessment in Chapter 15.14 – Definitions, to better reflect national or regional guidance and assessment requirements. Suggested wording from the Waikato Regional Council Risk Assessment Framework as follows:</p> <p><u>A methodology to determine the nature and extent of risk by analysing potential hazards and evaluating existing conditions of vulnerability that together could potentially harm exposed people, property, services, livelihoods and the environment on which they depend.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The provision of an appropriate scale of assessment is directed by the information requirements linked to several directions in the policy, rules and assessment matters which refer to 'risk assessment'.</li> <li>• It would be helpful to include more detail within the risk assessment definition.</li> <li>• The submitter references the WRC Risk Assessment Framework, and suggests possible wording from this document.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2102.94
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.2 RD2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new Rule 15.8.2 RD2 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) as follows:</p> <p><u>New Infrastructure and utilities, including any associated earthworks</u></p> <p><u>Discretion is restricted to:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>The functional and/or operational need to locate within the hazard area;</u></p> <p>(b) <u>The risk of adverse effects to other people, property and the environment including; risk to public health and safety; impacts on public access associated with the proposed activity;</u></p>

(c) The management or regulation of other people and property required to mitigate natural hazard risks resulting from the location of the infrastructure;

(d) Any exacerbation of an existing natural hazard or creation of a new natural hazard as a result of the structure; and

(e) The ability to relocate or remove structures.

**Decision Reasons:**

Clarifications are required to the rules to ensure that new infrastructure or utilities are subject to an appropriate process to confirm that they will achieve the policy direction and will not result in an exacerbation of or increased risk to other property.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2103	<b>Submitter:</b>	Alec Duncan
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	<b>Organisation:</b>	Beca Limited
<b>Address:</b>	c/-Beca Limited PO Box 448, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2103.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.1 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The Objective promotes resilient communities and is consistent with the principles of Fire and Emergency.

<b>Point Number</b>	2103.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.1 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This policy achieves the purpose of the RMA by providing for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities and addresses the risk to property across the Waikato District.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.2 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This policy is in keeping with the principles of Fire and Emergency.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.3 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decision of where to locate infrastructure is critical.</li> <li>• Locating emergency service facilities and hospitals outside of hazardous areas, the district can reduce the risk to people and property and ensures the response capability of these services is not impaired during a disaster.</li> <li>• Ensures that Fire and Emergency can continue to meet their functional and operational requirements during major events and that the interdependencies between lifeline utilities are managed.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy recognises and provides for infrastructure that has a functional or operational requirement to be in areas subject to natural hazards while mitigating risk to the extent practicable.</li> <li>• This policy is in keeping with the principles of Fire and Emergency.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.6 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy recognises that there is also risk from natural hazards outside of High Risk Areas identified in the District planning maps and that this risk needs to be appropriately identified and assessed during rezoning, subdivision, use and development of land.</li> <li>• This is important to ensure the health, safety, and well-being of the community.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy encourages the use of hazard mitigation measures to protect people, property infrastructure and the environment from the risks of natural hazards.</li> <li>• This policy achieves the purpose of the RMA by providing for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities and is in keeping with the principles of Fire and Emergency.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.8

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.8 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The policy recognises there is a functional need for hard protection works for natural hazard mitigation, but that these structures need to be managed to ensure that such structures are effective and do not transfer or exacerbate risk to other people, property or infrastructure.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.9 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the intention to protect, maintain, and where appropriate, enhance the integrity of natural features and buffers which provide a natural defence against the effects of natural hazards and sea level rise.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.10 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimum setbacks for buildings provide a buffer to reduce the potential risk to life and damage to property.</li> <li>• This policy supports the Fire and Emergency’s overarching objective to help build resilient communities though providing and contributing to a safer environment for New Zealanders through reducing consequences from emergencies.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2103.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.11
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.11 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces demand for new protection structures and works.</li> <li>• Development in areas that require the need for new structural protection works is contrary to the Fire and Emergency's SOI to build resilient communities through reducing the risk to people, property, and infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.12 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains.</li> <li>• This policy achieves the purpose of the RMA by providing for the safety and wellbeing of people and communities and seeks to protect property from damage or the risk of flooding, in keeping with the principles of Fire and Emergency.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.13 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The filling of land has the potential to exacerbate the adverse effects of flooding on property or infrastructure.

<b>Point Number</b>	2103.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.14 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Avoids unacceptable hazard risk to people, property or the environment from hazardous substances located and stored in areas subject to flooding hazard.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.15 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Manages stormwater hazards by requiring new subdivision and development to adopt integrated catchment plan-based stormwater management methods.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.16
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.16 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the development of detailed site-specific risk assessments ensures that the effects on people, property and the environment are acceptable.</li> <li>• Controls design, construction, and location of subdivision, use or development in Coastal Sensitive Areas to minimise the level of risk.</li> </ul>



<b>Point Number</b>	2103.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.17
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.17 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Avoids increasing the risk from coastal hazards by requiring new built development to be set back from the coastal edge unless there is a functional or operational need.</li> <li>• Avoids new development in areas at risk of coastal hazards erosion and inundation supports Fire and Emergency's SOI to build resilient communities through reducing the risk to people, property and infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.18
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.18 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides appropriate buffer areas or setbacks around new residential subdivision and development in areas assessed or identified as being potentially subject to elevated fire risk.</li> <li>• This policy will safeguard the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>• Supports the purpose of Fire and Emergency in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.19
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.20
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.20 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy safeguards the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>• Supports the purpose of Fire and Emergency in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.20
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.21
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.21 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy safeguards the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>• Supports the purpose of Fire and Emergency in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.22
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.22 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy is in accordance with the purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>• Supports the purpose of Fire and Emergency in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.22
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.23
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.23 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy is in accordance with the purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>• Supports the purpose of Fire and Emergency in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.23
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.2 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Objective seeks to promote awareness of natural hazard risks.</li> <li>• The submitter supports the emphasise that to develop resilient communities, communities need to be aware of the risks of natural hazards and ensure that the consequent environmental effects are known so communities can effectively and efficiently respond to and recover from natural hazard events.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.2.1 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports provision that requires the council to enable people to be informed and for communities to have access to information on the natural hazards affecting their properties and surrounding area.</li> <li>• Also supports the policy details of how this will occur.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.25
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.2

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.2.2 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The policy encourages awareness and use of information and methods contained in Community Response Plans.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.26
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.3 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports this objective.</li> <li>• Subsequent policies effectively give effect to this objective.</li> <li>• Achieves and purpose of the RMA and the principles of Fire and Emergency by providing for the safety of people and communities across the Waikato District.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.27
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Ensures that adequate account is taken of the projected effects of climate change in the design and location of new subdivision and development.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.28
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.2

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.2 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increases the ability of the community to adapt to the projected effects of climate change.</li> <li>• Takes into consideration the potential environmental and social costs of climate change.</li> <li>• Encourages the incorporation of sustainable design measures within new subdivision and development.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.29
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports the adoption of a precautionary approach towards new subdivision, use and development in areas likely to be affected by climate change over the next 100 years where adverse effects on people, property and infrastructure are potentially significant or irreversible.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.30
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the provision of sufficient development setbacks from waterbodies and the coast.</li> <li>• Protects people, property and the environment from the projected adverse effects of climate change, including sea level rise.</li> <li>• Supports Fire and Emergency's SOI to build resilient communities through reducing the risk to people, property and infrastructure.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2103.31
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the assessment of risk that also takes into account the projected effects of climate change over the next 100 years.</li> <li>• This policy supports Fire and Emergency’s SOI to build resilient communities through reducing the risk to people, property and infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.32
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.4 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The rule framework is considered to provide sufficiently robust mechanisms to achieve the associated objectives and policies.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.33
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NC3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.5, subject to minor amendment to 15.5.4 NC3 to change “emergency services facilities” to “emergency service facilities.”
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rule framework set out in Rule 15.5 for activities within a High Risk Flood Area generally provides sufficiently robust mechanisms to ensure that the objectives and policies can be achieved.</li> </ul>

- The amendment is to align with the proposed definition for 'Emergency service facility'.
- Submitter supports the non-complying activity status for 'emergency services facilities' in High Risk Flood Areas.

**Point Number** 2103.34

**Plan Chapter** 15.6

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Section 15.6 - Defended Area (Residual Risk) as proposed.

**Decision Reasons:** The rule framework considered to provide sufficiently robust mechanisms to ensure that the associated objectives and policies can be achieved.

**Point Number** 2103.35

**Plan Chapter** 15.7

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Section 15.7 as proposed.

**Decision Reasons:** The rule framework is considered to provide sufficiently robust mechanisms to ensure that the associated objective and policies can be achieved.

**Point Number** 2103.36

**Plan Chapter** 15.8

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Section 15.8 as proposed.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The rule framework is considered to provide sufficiently robust mechanisms to ensure that the associated objective and policies can be achieved.
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.37
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9 and 15.9.3 NC3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.9, subject to minor amendment to 15.9.3 NC3 to change “emergency services facilities” to “emergency service facilities.”
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rule framework set out in Rule 15.5 for activities within a High Risk Flood Area generally provides sufficiently robust mechanisms to ensure that the objectives and policies can be achieved.</li> <li>• The amendment is to align with the proposed definition for 'Emergency service facility'.</li> <li>• Submitter supports the non-complying activity status for 'emergency services facilities' in High Risk Flood Areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.38
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.10 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rule framework is provides sufficiently robust mechanisms to achieve the associated objectives and policies.</li> <li>• The submitter supports the non-complying activity status for 'emergency services facilities' in High Risk Flood Areas.</li> <li>• Supports the submitter’s functional and operational requirements during major events and ensures that the interdependencies between lifeline utilities are managed.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2103.39
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11



<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.11 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The rule framework is considered to provide sufficiently robust mechanisms to achieve the associated objectives and policies.

<b>Point Number</b>	2103.40
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> definition for Emergency Service Facilities in Section 15.14 Definitions as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the introduction of a new definition within Rule 15.14 for 'Emergency service facility' as notified.</li> <li>• The submitter notes Stage 1 submissions, reports and hearings in relation to a new definition for 'emergency services' to be included in Chapter 13.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2103.41
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> amendments to Stage 1 provisions as proposed in Variation 2 to the Proposed District Plan (Stage 1).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variation 2 is considered to be necessary to ensure a strong degree of clarity is achieved between Chapter 15 provisions, and the wider plan.</li> <li>• Variation 2 amendments have been reviewed and are clear in their intent and statutory effect.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2104	<b>Submitter:</b>	Alice Lin
--------------------------	------	-------------------	-----------

<b>On behalf of:</b>	Genesis Energy Limited
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 17-188,Greenlane,Auckland,New Zealand,1051
<b>Point Number</b>	2104.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.1(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Avoid new subdivision, use and development where <del>they will increase</del> the risk to people’s safety, well-being and property in the following areas identified as being at significant risk from natural hazards <u>cannot be appropriately remedied or mitigated</u>: (i)...</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The objectives and policies for the High-Risk Flood Area include a general presumption to avoid activities and development.</li> <li>• The overarching avoidance framework does not reflect the RMA and does not recognise that certain activities such as infrastructure and utilities may not be able to avoid such areas.</li> <li>• Focus should be on an assessment of effects of activities in areas of natural hazards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2104.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.2(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) In areas of High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation), ensure that when changes to existing land use activities and development occur, a range of risk reduction options are assessed, and development that would increase risk to people’s safety, well-being and property is avoided <u>where the risk cannot be appropriately remedied or mitigated</u>.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Like submission point on Policy 15.2.1.1, it is considered that this policy should be amended to focus on an assessment of effects of activities in areas of natural hazards.

<b>Point Number</b>	2104.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Enable the construction of new infrastructure and utilities, <u>including any ancillary activities</u>, in areas at significant risk from natural hazards, including High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) areas only where:</p> <p>(i)...</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports this policy but considers that it should include ancillary activities associated with the operation of infrastructure.</li> <li>• The explicit reference to ancillary activities is required as ancillary activities are not currently included in the Stage I Chapter 13 Definitions.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2104.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.5(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Provide for the operation, maintenance, <del>and</del> minor upgrading <u>and rehabilitation</u> of existing infrastructure and utilities, <u>including any ancillary activities</u>, in all areas subject to natural hazards.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Similar to the relief sought on policy 15.2.1.4 the submitter considers the policy should be expanded to include ancillary activities associated with the operation of infrastructure, as well as provide for any rehabilitation activities.

<b>Point Number</b>	2104.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.13(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.13(a) as follows:  (a) Control filling of land within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas to ensure that the potential adverse effects on flood storage capacity, overland flows, run-off volumes on surrounding properties <del>on</del> <u>or</u> infrastructure, are avoided or mitigated.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	To correct a typographical error.
<b>Point Number</b>	2104.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P5 as follows:  Construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading, <del>or</del> <u>upgrading or rehabilitation of infrastructure and utilities, and their ancillary activities.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rule does not accurately reflect the intent of Policy 15.2.1.5 and the s32 assessment where a permissive framework is to be provided for existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards.</li> <li>• The permissive framework should also apply to any rehabilitation activities.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2104.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P6 as follows:  Earthworks associated with construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading, <del>or</del> <u>upgrading or rehabilitation of infrastructure and utilities, including ancillary activities and</u> the formation and maintenance of access tracks.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P6 does not adequately provide for existing infrastructure as anticipated by policy 15.2.1.5.</li> <li>• Amendments required to reference infrastructure, their ancillary activities and rehabilitation on the site when the activity is no longer required.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2104.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Rule 15.5.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.1 PI(1) and <b>add</b> new (3) as follows:</p> <p>(1) <u>Repair, maintenance, <del>or</del> minor upgrading, or rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, utilities, and their ancillary activities.</u></p> <p>(2)...</p> <p>(3) <u>Earthworks associated with activities under (1) and (2), or rehabilitation of the site occupied by the infrastructure, utilities or ancillary activities.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rule does not accurately reflect the intent of policy 15.2.1.5 and the s32 assessment where a permissive framework is provided for existing infrastructure located in all areas subject to natural hazards, including high risk areas.</li> <li>• The permissive framework should include earthworks associated with the repair, maintenance or minor upgrade activities, which would be minor in nature, and any site rehabilitation when the activity is no longer required.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2104.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.2 RDI and add new (3) as follows:</p> <p>(1) New utilities not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 PI (2).</p> <p>(2) Upgrading of existing <u>infrastructure, utilities, and their ancillary activities</u> not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 PI (1).</p> <p>(3) <u>Earthworks associated with activities under (1) and (2).</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It does not accurately reflect the intent of policy 15.2.1.4 and the s32 assessment that supports a permissive resource consent framework as a restricted discretionary activity.</li> <li>• Framework should include associated earthworks, which would likely be minor in nature, and any site rehabilitation when the activity is no longer required.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2104.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the definition for Minor Upgrading in Section 15.14 - Definitions as follows:</p> <p>Minor upgrading</p> <p>For the purposes of Chapter 15 means an increase in the capacity, efficiency or security of existing <u>infrastructure and</u> utilities where this utilises existing structures and networks and/or structures and networks of a similar scale and character.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The definition as proposed does not accurately reflect the intent of policy 15.2.1.5 and the s32 assessment where a permissive framework is provided for existing infrastructure located in all areas subject to natural hazards.</li> <li>• Amendment sought to explicitly reference infrastructure.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2105	<b>Submitter:</b>	Aaron Collier
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Perry Group Limited	<b>Organisation:</b>	Collier Consultants Ltd
<b>Address:</b>	c/o Collier Consultants Ltd PO Box 14371, Tauranga Mail Centre, Tauranga, New Zealand, 3143		

<b>Point Number</b>	2105.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1 (1)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Section 15.1 (1) - Introduction as follows:</p> <p>(1) The Natural Hazards chapter manages land use in areas subject to the risk from natural hazards. It identifies areas where certain types of new development <del>will</del> <u>should</u> be avoided, <u>or mitigated</u> because of the natural hazards present, but also recognises that there is existing development including infrastructure and historic heritage, already located on land subject to natural hazards, <u>or development which is necessary to be located in natural hazards areas.</u></p>

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all land uses at risk from natural hazards can be avoided and it may be appropriate to mitigate such risk in some circumstances.</li> <li>• There will be instances where development is necessary to be in natural hazard areas (for example critical infrastructure or pipelines).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(14)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Section 15.1 (14) - Introduction as follows:</p> <p>(14) While liquefaction areas have not been identified on the planning maps, provision in the District Plan require this seismically induced natural hazard to be assessed before <del>new zonings or</del> subdivision and development are undertaken.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Liquefaction assessment should be considered at the time of subdivision development through detailed geotechnical and ground engineering analysis.</li> <li>• The nature of development and the impacts of liquefaction on different types of development and layouts may not necessarily be known or be able to be assessed at the time of rezoning.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>A resilient community where the risks from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment from subdivision use and development of land are <del>avoided or appropriately mitigated</del> <u>minimised</u>.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risks from natural hazards will always exist and this risk can often not be avoided or mitigated to the point where it does not exist.</li> <li>• It is appropriate for the objective to seek minimisation of the risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.4

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.6(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Provide for rezoning, subdivision, use and development outside High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard , (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal (Erosion) Areas where natural hazard risk has been appropriately identified and assessed and can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated <del>and does not transfer or exacerbate risk to adjoining properties.</del></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Avoiding, remedying or mitigation of natural hazard risk may not be restricted to exacerbating that risk to "adjoining" properties, as there may be wider impacts which require consideration.
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.12(a) by replacing “reduce” by “manage” as follows:</p> <p>(a) <del>Reduce</del> <u>Manage</u> the potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains and flood ponding areas.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	There is limited potential to reduce flood damage, but rather buildings should be managed to ensure that this occurs by appropriate design floor levels.
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15(iv)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> Policy 15.2.1.15(iv) as follows:</p> <p><del>(iv) promote low impact stormwater management practices with reference to the Waikato Stormwater Management Guideline and the Regional Infrastructure Technical Specifications (RITS); and</del></p>



<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Low impact stormwater management practices have little effect in flood ponding areas and overland flow paths and in some circumstances can worsen the potential natural hazards by not facilitating the conveyance and flow of flood water.
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 to be specific to natural hazard areas as follows:  (a) Ensure that adequate allowances are made for the projected effects of climate change in the design and location of new subdivision <u>located in natural hazard areas</u> and development throughout the district, ...
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The assessment requirements which follow on in the second part of this policy should only apply when land is subject to hazards and are otherwise not required.
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Stage 2 Rules - General
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> natural hazards rules to clarify that the natural hazard rules and thus the status of an activity under the rules only applies to that area of land where the natural hazard exists, and not across an entire site. This will avoid the unintended consequence of an activity status change across a wider site area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current rule framework specifies a default discretionary or non-complying activity status for a range of activities which are located on land where a natural hazard is identified.</li> <li>• In many instances large areas of a site may not be subject to a natural hazard.</li> <li>• The unintended consequence of rules as drafted is that a default status applies to "all of the land" rather than solely to that part of the land affected to the hazard.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2105.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Stage 2 - General

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the plan to make any necessary amendments to address the submitter's concerns and additional amendments set out in submissions <b>And</b> any further relief or other consequential amendments as considered appropriate and necessary to address the concerns.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote the sustainable management of resources to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</li> <li>• Not be contrary to RMA Part 2 and other provisions.</li> <li>• Meet the foreseeable needs of future generations by enabling growth and further land for residential development.</li> <li>• To enable the social, economic, and cultural well-being of the community.</li> <li>• Represent the most appropriate means for the council to exercise its functions under the RMA.</li> <li>• Result in efficiencies and avoid unnecessary process and costs.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2106	<b>Submitter:</b>	Karleen Broughton
<b>On behalf of:</b>	WEL Networks Limited		
<b>Address:</b>	114 Maui Street PO Box 925, Te Rapa, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports the construction of new infrastructure and utilities in areas at significant risk from natural hazards, provided that the infrastructure and utilities are technically, functionally, or operationally required.

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.5(a) as follows;  (a) Provide for the operation, maintenance and minor upgrading <u>and upgrading</u> of existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The amendment provides for the upgrading of existing infrastructure in areas subject to natural hazards.</li> <li>• This amendment is consistent with the permitted activity rules P5 and P6 to provide for the upgrading of infrastructure as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This policy recognises the importance of natural features and soft hazard coastal hazard protection works over hard protection works for the protection of infrastructure.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.8 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy ensures that development will not adversely affect the efficient functioning of infrastructure such as electricity distribution.</li> <li>• Submitter supports the controls on new hard protection works to ensure that they do not cause or increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.13 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports controls on filling of land to ensure that any adverse effects infrastructure is avoided or mitigated.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.19
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.19 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports the focus on not increasing the risk to infrastructure when assessing new subdivision, use and development on land subject to instability.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports the focus on not increasing the risk to infrastructure when assessing new subdivision, use and development on land subject to natural hazards exacerbated due to climate change.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.8

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P5 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports the provision for the construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading or upgrading of utilities as a permitted activity.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P6 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports provision for earthworks associated with the construction, replacement, repair, minor upgrading and upgrading of utilities, as a permitted activity.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.3 D2 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports there being no unnecessary restrictions on the creation of utility allotments.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 P1

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.1 PI as follows:</p> <p>(1) Repair, maintenance or minor upgrading of existing utilities <u>and associated earthworks</u>.</p> <p>(2) New telecommunication <u>and electricity</u> lines, poles, cabinets and masts/ poles supporting antennas <u>and associated earthworks</u>.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The high-risk flood areas cover a sizable portion of existing residential and road areas.</li> <li>• Unreasonably limiting new electricity lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas and associated earthworks has the potential to limit essential electricity infrastructure within these areas.</li> <li>• Proposed amendments provide for new electricity infrastructure and associated earthworks as a permitted activity the same as telecommunication infrastructure.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.2 RDI subject to submitted changes being made to Rule 15.5.1 PI.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This provision currently provides for network utility development not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 (PI).

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.3 D2 (2) as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This provides for subdivision to create a utility allotment with no unnecessary restrictions.

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2 RDI (2)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.2 RDI (2) as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This provides for subdivision to create a utility allotment without any unnecessary restrictions.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.7.1 P3 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports provision for the construction, upgrading, minor upgrading, replacement, repair, or maintenance of utilities as a permitted activity.
<b>Point Number</b>	<b>2106.16</b>
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	<del>15.7.3</del>
<b>Late:</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	<del>Support</del>
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<del><b>Retain</b> Rule 15.7.3 D3 as proposed.</del>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<b>NOTE: Submission point withdrawn by submitter</b>
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.17

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.8.1 P3 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports provision for the construction, upgrading, minor upgrading, replacement, repair, or maintenance of utilities as a permitted activity.
<hr/>	
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.8.3 D2 as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This provides for subdivision to create a utility allotment without unnecessary restrictions.
<hr/>	
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.19
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.9.1 P2 as follows:  (1) Repair, maintenance or minor upgrading of existing utilities <u>and associated earthworks</u> .  (2) New telecommunication <u>and electricity</u> lines, poles, cabinets and masts/ poles supporting antennas <u>and associated earthworks</u> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The high-risk coastal erosion areas cover a sizable portion of existing residential and road areas.</li> <li>• Unreasonably limiting new electricity infrastructure and associated earthworks has the potential to limit essential electricity infrastructure in these areas.</li> </ul>



- Proposed amendments provide for new electricity infrastructure and associated earthworks as a permitted activity the same as telecommunication infrastructure.

**Point Number** 2106.20

**Plan Chapter** 15.9.1 P4

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.9.1 P4, subject to amendments to Rule 15.9.1 P2 as follows:

Earthworks for an activity listed in Rule 15.9.1 P1 and P3, including the maintenance and repair of access tracks.

**Decision Reasons:** Submitter seeks an exclusion for network utility activities from Rule 15.9.1 P4 as the installation of cables and pole foundations require depths greater than 0.5m for health and safety purposes.

**Point Number** 2106.21

**Plan Chapter** 15.9.2 D5 and D6

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.9.2 D5 and D6, subject to the amendment sought to Rule 15.9.1 P2.

**Decision Reasons:**

- This rule currently provides for network utility development not provided for in Rule 15.9.1 (P2) as a discretionary activity.
- Submitter seeks D5 and D6 be retained subject to amendments to Rule 15.9.1 P2.

**Point Number** 2106.22

**Plan Chapter** 15.9.2 D7 (2)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.9.2 D7 (2) as proposed.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This provides for subdivision to create a utility allotment without any unnecessary restrictions.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.23
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.1 P2 as follows:</p> <p>(1) Operation, repair, maintenance or minor upgrading of existing utilities <u>and associated earthworks</u>.</p> <p>(2) New telecommunication <u>and electricity</u> lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas <u>and associated earthworks</u>.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The high-risk coastal erosion areas cover a sizable portion of existing residential and road areas.</li> <li>• Unreasonably limiting new electricity lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas and associated earthworks has the potential to limit essential electricity infrastructure within these areas.</li> <li>• Proposed amendments provide for new electricity infrastructure and associated earthworks as a permitted activity the same as telecommunications.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.1 P4, subject to the amendments to Rule 15.10.1 P2 as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks for an activity listed in Rule 15.10.1 P1 <u>and</u> P3, including the maintenance and repair of access tracks.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter seeks an exclusion for network utility activities from Rule 15.10.1 P4 as the installation of cables and pole foundations are required at depths greater than 0.5m for health and safety purposes.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.25

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.2 D4 and D5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.10.2 D4 and D5 subject to the amendment sought to 15.10.1 P2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This rule currently provides for network utility development not provided for in Rule 15.10.1 P2 as a discretionary activity.</li> <li>• Submitter seeks D5 and D6 be retained subject to amendments to Rule 15.10.1 P2.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.26
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.11.1 P3 as follows:  Construction, replacement, repair, minor upgrading, upgrading or maintenance of utilities <u>and associated earthworks</u> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Earthworks associated with the construction, upgrading, minor upgrading, replacement, repair, or maintenance of utilities should be included as a permitted activity.
<b>Point Number</b>	2106.27
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.1 P4, subject to the amendment sought in 15.11.1 P3.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter requests that Council exclude earthworks associated with network utilities the installation of cables and pole foundations are required at depths greater than 1m for health and safety purposes.

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.28
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions – Minor upgrading
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition for minor upgrading in Section 15.14 Definitions as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The definition as proposed is supported as it includes an increase in the capacity, efficiency, or security of existing utilities where this utilises existing structures and networks and/or structures and networks of a similar scale and character.

<b>Point Number</b>	2106.29
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions - Utility
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition for utility in Section 15.14 Definitions as proposed.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The definition as proposed is supported as it includes electricity distribution lines and associated equipment and telecommunication facilities.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2107	<b>Submitter:</b>	Carolyn McAlley
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		
<b>Address:</b>	Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office, PO Box 13339, Tauranga, New Zealand, 3141		

<b>Point Number</b>	2107.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> section 15.1 paragraph 1 as follows:</p> <p>(1) The Natural Hazards chapter manages land use in areas subject to the risk from natural hazards. It identifies areas where certain types of new development will be avoided because of the natural hazards present, but also recognises that there is existing development, including infrastructure and historic heritage, <u>and sites and areas of Significance to Maaori</u> already located on land subject to natural hazards. These areas will require management through mitigation and adaptation to ensure that the risk of damage to property, <u>historic heritage or sites and areas of Significance to Maaori</u> or injury or loss of lives is not increased.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the recognition that historic heritage is located on land subject to natural hazards.</li> <li>• Amendments are to recognise that those sites that are subject to hazards will have to be managed at the time of any works to ensure risk is not increased.</li> <li>• The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(18)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> section 15.1 (18) as follows:</p> <p>(18) Methods to increase resilience to projected changes in climatic conditions will increasingly be incorporated into all aspects of land use planning and natural hazard management. Further to this, there will be an increased focus on environmental protection and facilitating inland migration of biodiversity. <u>Historic heritage and sites and areas of Significance to Maaori will also require sensitive consideration and management.</u> Methods in this district plan will include promoting low impact urban design and green infrastructure, and increased coastal hazard setbacks to provide a more sustainable and adaptive approach to development.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> separate headings for Hazards and Climate change within the introduction section.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no recognition of historic heritage within the climate change section of the Introduction starting at paragraph (9).</li> <li>• HNZPT considers that the final paragraph (18) should include consideration that climate change can/will have on historic heritage.</li> <li>• The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> <li>• Separate headings in the introductory section would be beneficial as they are covered under separate Objectives in Chapter 15.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2107.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> section 15.1 (18) and other parts of the introduction as relevant by adding an explanation of the purpose and place of adaptive management strategies in relation to the District Plan and the administration and implementation of Chapter 15.</p> <p><b>and</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> a new section within the chapter entitled "<u>Other methods</u>" that discusses adaptive management strategies and any other methods to manage hazards and climate change, including a discussion of all historic heritage as the District Plan only provides protection to scheduled items.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The introduction would benefit from an explanation of the purpose and place of adaptive management strategies in relation to chapter 15.</li> <li>• Adaptive management is a recognised method of addressing climate change but has been referred to differently in several instances, i.e. Policy 15.2.1.8 and Policy 15.2.3.2.</li> <li>• The outcomes of an adaptive management strategy impact on historic heritage.</li> <li>• The Plan should explain how these strategies will be given effect to and how these and other methodologies may impact the protection of historic heritage.</li> <li>• It would also be useful to provide an 'other methods' section in Chapter 15 to provide clarity on other processes that may be applicable.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a new objective and policy to Chapter 15.2 as follows:</p> <p><u>New Objective</u></p> <p><u>Ensuring that the effects of any hazard related works avoids effects on historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori.</u></p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><u>New Policy</u></p>

That any hazard or climate change related works that potentially impact on historic heritage and Sites and Areas of significance to Maaori demonstrate consideration of a range of appropriate alternatives to avoid adverse effects on these finite resources.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Historic heritage and sites of significance to Maaori are vulnerable to hazards and climate change.
- Chapter 15 should provide for the consideration of the impact that any resolution to hazard and climate change matters may have on historic heritage and Sites and Areas of significance to Maaori.

**Point Number** 2107.5

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Objective 15.2.1 as follows:

A resilient community where the risks from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure, historic heritage, sites and areas of significance to Maaori and the environment from subdivision, use and development of land are avoided or appropriately mitigated.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Amendments ensure the consideration of finite heritage resources throughout the objective, policy and rule cascade.
- The proposed amendment help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).

**Point Number** 2107.6

**Plan Chapter** 15.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** a new policy as follows:

Policy 15.2.1.2a - Changes to existing land use activities and development in areas that are at significant risk from natural hazards in locations containing historic heritage

(a) In areas of High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation), ensure that when changes to existing land use activities and development occur, a range of risk reduction options are assessed, and development that would increase risk to Historic heritage and sites and areas at Significance to Maaori is avoided.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new policy gives consideration to historic heritage when proposing to change existing land use activities in areas at significant risk of natural hazards.</li> <li>• The new policy would fill a gap in the suite of policies that currently do not address the consideration of historic heritage and its vulnerability not only to hazards and climate change themselves but also to the variety of solutions that may be developed to resolve issues arising from hazards and climate change in numerous locations.</li> <li>• The proposed new policy will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4(a)(ii) as follows:</p> <p>(ii) And increased risks to people, property and the environment, <u>including historic heritage and sites and areas of Significance to Maaori</u> are mitigated to the extent practicable; and...</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that amendments are required to specifically recognise historic heritage and sites and areas of Significance to Maaori.</li> <li>• The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.6(a) - Managing natural hazard risk generally as follows:</p> <p>(a) Provide for the rezoning, subdivision, use and development outside High Risk Flood, High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) and High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Areas where natural hazard risk has been appropriately identified and assessed and can be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated and does not transfer or exacerbate risk to adjoining properties, <u>including any historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori that may be located within the property.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter considers amendments necessary as the word "properties" may not be sufficient to trigger consideration of historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori.</li> </ul>



- The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).

**Point Number** 2107.9

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.7

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.7(a) as follows:

(a) Recognise the importance of natural features and buffers, and soft hazard protection works, and prefer them wherever appropriate and practicable over hard protection structure, where new hazard mitigation measures and / or work are required to protect people, property infrastructure and the environment including historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori from the risks of coastal hazards.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter recognises that in some instances, particularly in relation to historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori, a soft protection option may not be appropriate.
- The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).

**Point Number** 2107.10

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.8

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.1.8.

**Decision Reasons:** This policy will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).

**Point Number** 2107.11

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.9

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15 .2.1.9.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the natural areas and buffer locations itemised in this policy are locations of historic heritage.</li> <li>• The use of the word "appropriate" is supported when considering any protection, maintenance or enhancement works.</li> <li>• Inappropriate works may cause adverse effects to historic heritage.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.16
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.16(a)(ii) as follows:
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Designed, constructed and located to minimise the level of risk to people, property and the environment, <u>including on historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maori.</u></li> <li>• Submitter proposes amendments to ensure risk to historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maori are minimised at the time of subdivision, use and development.</li> <li>• The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.19
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.19(a) - as follows:
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>(a) Avoid locating new subdivision, use and development, including rezoning, on land assessed as being subject to, or likely to be subject to, instability or subsidence, unless appropriate mitigation is provided and the activity does not increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure <u>or historic heritage sites and areas of significance to Maori.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amendments ensure that when subdivision, use and development occurs, the risk to historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maori are minimised.</li> </ul>

- Amendment recognises that historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori can be located on unstable land and on land immediately adjacent to unstable land.
- There is potential for subdivision, use and development to adversely impact historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori when avoiding the risk of instability.
- The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).

**Point Number** 2107.14

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.3.2

**Decision Reasons:** This policy gives effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).

**Point Number** 2107.15

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.4

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** new Policy 15.2.3.4(b)(vi) as follows:  
(vi) the location and retention of historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter proposes amendments to ensure that the location of new development minimises the risk to historic heritage sites and areas of significance to Maaori.
- The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).

**Point Number** 2107.16

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.5

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3 .5(a) as follows:</p> <p>(a) For all new subdivision, use and development requiring rezoning or a resource consent, ensure that account is taken of the natural effects of climate change over the next 100 years when assessing any identified risks from natural hazards, and their effects on people, property, infrastructure and the environment <u>including on historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter proposes amendments to ensure that the location of new development minimises the risk to historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori.</li> <li>• The proposed amendment will help to give effect to RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Section 15.3 – when the plan is altered to reflect the requirements of the National Planning Standards, to reflect that Chapter 15 will be subject to the new district wide historic heritage chapter, as these rules will be relocated from the zone chapters to a district wide chapter.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports the inclusion of Section 15.3 as the rules relating to earthworks in Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori and works related historic heritage items are currently located within the zone chapters of the plan.</li> <li>• Proposed amendment required to provide clarity that Chapter 15 will be subject to the new district wide historic heritage chapter, to reflect the National Planning Standards.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.3 - How to use and interpret the rules, (and its final version of the Plan as per the National Planning Standards) as follows:  <u>Advice note</u>  <u>Effects on archaeological sites, both recorded (identified by the New Zealand Archaeological Association) and unrecorded, are regulated under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga must be contacted regarding development and the need to undertake an archaeological assessment to determine the need for an archaeological authority. In the event of an accidental discovery Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Lower Northern Office must be contacted immediately on 07 577 4530.</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the inclusion of Section 15.3.</li> <li>• Advice note to ensure plan users are aware of their obligations under the HNZPT Act 2014 with regards to the protection of archaeology.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.19
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.2 RDI - Matter of Discretion (f) as follows:  (f) <u>The adverse effects to people and property and historic heritage and Sites and Areas of Significance to Maaori</u> and overall vulnerability from potential failure or overwhelming of the structural defences and associated flood protection works relevant to the proposed new lot(s);
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter seeks amendments to ensure that the assessment of any activity considers Sections RMA s6(e) and (f).
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.20
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.2 RDI - Matter of Discretion (f) as follows:  (f) <u>The adverse effects to people and property and Historic heritage and sites of significance to Maaroi</u> and overall vulnerability from the establishment of the new

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>building or additions to an existing building and any mitigation measures to reduce risk.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter seeks to amend the matters of discretion to ensure the assessment of any activity considers RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the full discretionary activity status of Rule 15.7.3 DI.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the discretionary activity status of the construction of a new coastal protection structure as it will enable the consideration of the impacts on Historic heritage and sites and areas of significant to Maaori.</li> <li>• This ensures that assessment of any activity includes consideration of RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2107.22
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.2 RDI - Matter of Discretion (f) as follows:</p> <p>(f) <u>The adverse effects to people and property and Historic heritage and sites and areas of significance to Maaori</u> and overall vulnerability from the establishment of the new building or additions to an existing building and any mitigation measures to reduce risk.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This addition will ensure that the assessment of any activity includes consideration of RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> <li>• (Error in rule number corrected – sub content indicates 15.8.2 intended.)</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2107.23
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the full discretionary activity status of Rule 15.8.3 DI.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the discretionary activity status of the construction of a new coastal protection structure as it will enable the consideration of the impacts on Historic heritage and sites and areas of significant to Maaori.</li> <li>• This status will ensure that the assessment of any activity includes consideration of RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2107.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the full discretionary activity status of Rule 15.9.2 DI – D7.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The submitter supports the discretionary activity status of Rules 15.9.2 DI to D7 as this will enable the consideration of the impacts on Historic heritage and sites and areas of significant to Maaori.</li> <li>• The status of these rules will ensure that the assessment of any activity includes consideration of RMA s6(e) and (f).</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2108	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ray Scrimgeour
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Lou Sanson, Director General of Department of Conservation		
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,3241		

<b>Point Number</b>	2108.1
---------------------	--------

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to Chapter 15 policies or <b>amend</b> existing policies to respond when new development may compromise the ability to respond to climate change or implement actions that restore natural flood regimes.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Additional provision is necessary to expand the ability to restrict new development where it may compromise the ability to respond to climate change or implement actions that restore natural flood regimes.

<b>Point Number</b>	2108.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.1 as follows:  A resilient community where the risks from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment from subdivision, use and development of land are avoided or <del>appropriately</del> mitigated and remedied.  <b>OR</b>  <b>Any</b> alternative relief that may be appropriate.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter is supportive of the proposed objective, however, requests wording changes to increase its effectiveness.

<b>Point Number</b>	2108.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.1 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports this objective as consistent with the NZCPS 2010 policy 25.



<b>Point Number</b>	2108.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.2 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports this objective as consistent with the NZCPS 2010 policy 25 and policy 27.
<b>Point Number</b>	2108.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.3 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports this objective as consistent with the NZCPS 2010 policy 27.
<b>Point Number</b>	2108.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 as follows: (a) <u>Provide for</u> <del>Enable the</del> construction of new infrastructure ... where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) the infrastructure and utilities are technically, functionally or operationally required to locate in areas subject to natural hazards, <del>or it is not reasonably practicable to be located elsewhere;</del> and</li> <li>(ii) any <u>unavoidable</u> increased risks to people, property and the environment are mitigated <del>to the extent practicable;</del> and</li> </ul>

(iii) the infrastructure and utilities are designed, maintained and managed, including provision of hazard mitigation works where appropriate, to function ~~to the extent practicable~~ during and after natural hazard events.

**OR**

**Any** alternative relief that may be appropriate

**Decision Reasons:**

The submitter is supportive of the objective however requests wording changes to increase effectiveness and consistency with the NZCPS 2010.

**Point Number** 2108.7

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.5

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.5 as follows:

(a) ~~Provide for~~ Recognise the need for the operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards and take into account the need for long-term risk reduction.

**OR**

Any alternative relief that may be appropriate

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter considers the proposed policy contrary to other proposed policies and emphasis should be on relocation or removal of existing development in areas of natural hazard risk.
- The current policy wording is inconsistent with NZCPS policy 25 and policy 27.

**Point Number** 2108.8

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.7

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.1.7 - Protection from risks of coastal hazards as follows:

(a) ~~Recognise the~~ Provide for importance of natural features and buffers, and soft hazard protection works, and prefer them ~~wherever practicable~~ over hard protection structures, where new hazard mitigation measures and/or works are required to

protect people, property infrastructure and the environment from the risks of coastal hazards.

**OR**

**Any** alternative relief that may be appropriate

**Decision Reasons:**

The submitter supports the intent and providing for natural defences, however requests wording changes to increase its effectiveness and consistency with NZCPS 2010 policy 26.

**Point Number** 2108.9

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.8

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.1.8 as notified.

**Decision Reasons:** The submitter supports this objective as it is consistent with the NZCPS 2010 policy 27.

**Point Number** 2108.10

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.9

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.1.9 as notified.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The submitter supports this objective as it is consistent with the NZCPS 2010 policy 26.
- Resilient catchments are reliant on natural features and buffers.

**Point Number** 2108.11

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.11

**Late:** NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.11 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submitter supports this objective as consistent with the NZCPS 2010.
<b>Point Number</b>	2108.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 (a)(i) to include a more appropriate measure for rainfall.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	A temperature trigger has been used for rainfall in this policy. Clarification is required to ensure this policy makes sense.
<b>Point Number</b>	2108.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.1(a)(iv) to complete the sentence.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This sentence is unfinished. The submitter assumes that this is intended to read 'wind' and supports this provision with appropriate correction.
<b>Point Number</b>	2108.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Planning Maps – High Risk Flood Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> planning maps to ensure all High Risk Flood Areas adjacent to lakes, wetlands and other flood infrastructure (e.g., Rangiriri spillway) are accurately mapped, and consider flood risk (1% AEP) under climate change projections.</p> <p>Base flood management area at Lake Waikare on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the current design flood level (RL 7.37m); and</li> <li>2) include provision for changes in flood areas in response to climate change and catchment management programmes.</li> </ol>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>The planning maps do not include all floodplain management areas (i.e., with 1% AEP) in the Waikato District. For example, flood management areas at the Rangiriri Spillway and at Lake Waikare are not within the Planning Maps.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2108.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 PI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 PI to make construction of new building in flood management areas a restricted discretionary activity, with matters of discretion to include risk that development will compromise catchment management objectives.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of new buildings in flood management areas should not be a permitted activity.</li> <li>• Ensures new developments do not compromise potential catchment management actions that may be needed to restore significant water ways.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2108.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Planning Maps – Flood Plain Management Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> planning maps to ensure all Flood Plain Management Areas adjacent to lakes, wetlands and other flood infrastructure (e.g., Rangiriri spillway) are accurately mapped, and consider flood risk (1% AEP) under climate change projections.</p> <p>High flood risk areas at Lake Waikare should be based on both:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the current design flood level (RL 7.37m); and</li> </ol>

- 2) include provision for changes in flood areas in response to climate change and catchment management programmes.

**Decision Reasons:**

The planning maps do not include all high risk flood areas in the Waikato District. For example, high flood risk areas are not mapped at the Rangiriri Spillway and at Lake Waikare.

**Submitter Number:**

2109

**Submitter:**

Brett Beamsley

**Address:**

41 Rose Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225

**Point Number**

2109.1

**Plan Chapter**

Chapter 15

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change to undertake a more detailed and relevant process around defining the risk assessment and to apply a joint probability extreme analysis to the evaluation of the inundations level, rather than a maximum.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The inundation levels within the Raglan environs is overly conservative and potential inundation levels are based on limited data and flawed methodology.
- Submission contains detailed technical analysis and criticism of the plan approach, particularly in regard to the summed maxima approach for the maximum sea-level expected where a very high tide along with a very large storm surge and a very high sea-level anomaly, occur all at the same time.
- The probability of this occurring could be of the order 0.0001% AEP or at a 1:10,000-year event – which is not a significant risk.
- An overly conservative approach has direct impacts on a significant number of coastal properties, indicated in maps attached to submission.

**Submitter Number:**

2110

**Submitter:**

Amy Spitzer

**On behalf of:**

Nathan & Amy Spitzer

**Address:**

14 Coombes Road, RD8, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3288

<b>Point Number</b>	2110.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.2 - Te Kowhai – Flood Plain Management Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 26.2 Te Kowhai to remove the Flood Plain Management Area from 14 Coombes Road, Te Kowhai.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The map is not accurate.</li> <li>• This area of the property is at the top of a gully, which can be seen at a site visit and from the aerial photo (see original submission).</li> <li>• The council has advised that they are aware of the inaccurate mapping and that there is an error in the modelling.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2111	<b>Submitter:</b>	Sally Lark
<b>Address:</b>	423 Motutara Road, Muriwai, Auckland, New Zealand, 0881		

<b>Point Number</b>	2111.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> 15.10 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current restrictions severely limit the ability for the community to thrive and enhance as property prices and the general community will decline.</li> <li>• Owners will seek to leave or minimise capital investment on something that may happen in 100 years.</li> <li>• Buildings will become derelict and neglected.</li> <li>• Development should be enabled to current standards.</li> <li>• Property owners carry all the risk as there is no protection provided by council eg. Planting/barriers.</li> </ul>

--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2112	<b>Submitter:</b>	Arnold Craig & Dianne Helen Trigg
<b>Address:</b>	564c Horotiu Road, RD8 Te Kowhai, Hamilton, New Zealand,3288		
<b>Point Number</b>	2112.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.2 - Te Kowhai		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 26.2 - Te Kowhai to accurately represent the Flood Plain Management Area mapped on property located at 564c Horotiu Road, RD8, Hamilton.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Map is Incorrect.</li> <li>• The site located at 564c Horotiu Rd has zero risk of flooding where the current lines are drawn. (See maps attached to submission).</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2113	<b>Submitter:</b>	Christine Lyons
<b>Address:</b>	585 Glen Murray Road, RD2, Huntly, New Zealand,3772		
<b>Point Number</b>	2113.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 13 Lake Whangape		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 13 - Lake Whangape so that the Flood Plain Management Area is removed from the bottom of the lake at 585 Glen Murray Road.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter has a lake located within the Flood Plain Management Area. (See map attached to submission).</li> </ul>		



- Submitter has had property for over 25 years and the lined area has never flooded.

**Point Number** 2113.2

**Plan Chapter** Map 13 Lake Whangape

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Planning Map 13 - Lake Whangape so that the Flood Plain Management Area is removed from properties located at 547 and 545 Glen Murray Road.

**Decision Reasons:** The Flood Plain Management Area covering 545 and 547 Glen Murray Road should be deleted as they are elevated blocks and not prone to flooding.

**Submitter Number:** 2114 **Submitter:** Mark Ian de Lautour

**Address:** PO Box 971, Taupo, New Zealand,3377

**Point Number** 2114.1

**Plan Chapter** Map 20.7 - Ngaruawahia South

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Planning Map 20.7 - Ngaruawahia South so that it excludes property located at 46 Jackson Street from the natural hazard area.

**Decision Reasons:**

- A tiny portion of property identified by plan as natural hazard risk.
- Subject site is 82 meters from the stream and significantly above it.
- Submitter believes development should be enabled as it can be appropriately managed.

**Submitter Number:** 2115 **Submitter:** Rangitahi Limited

<b>Address:</b>	c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants, Level 2, 678 Victoria Street, London State Building, Hamilton, 3240,
<b>Point Number</b>	2115.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> section 15.1 - Introduction paragraph (1) as follows:  [...]. It identifies areas where certain types of new development will be avoided <u>or appropriately mitigated</u> because of the natural hazards present, [...]
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clause 15.1(1) does not align with the risk-based approach adopted as per clauses 15.1(3) and (4).</li> <li>• Clause 15.1(1) fails to consider cases of new development where site specific investigation determines that new development will not increase risk of property damage, injury or loss of lives within identified hazard areas.</li> <li>• This scenario should be recognised in clause 15.1(1).</li> <li>• This also aligns with proposed wording in objective 15.2.1.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2115.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 (a) – Provide sufficient setbacks for new development, as follows:  (a) Protect people, property and the environment from the projected adverse effects of climate change, including sea level rise, by providing sufficient setbacks, <u>as necessary</u> , from water bodies and the coast when assessing new development.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Subclause 15.2.3.4(a) as proposed does not account for recommendations or conclusions that are determined from site-specific investigations(s).</li> <li>• In some cases, setbacks may not be required to achieve Objective 15.2.3.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2115.3

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 -Assess the impact of climate change on the level of natural hazard risks, as follows:</p> <p>(a) [...]</p> <p>(b) Ensure that, when assessing the effects of climate change on the level of natural hazard risk in accordance with Policy 15.2.3.5(a) above, the allowances in Policy 15.2.3.1(a(i)-(iv), <u>where relevant</u>, are applied.</p> <p>(c) [...]</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Seeks amendments to subclause 15.2.3.5(b) be to better align with the proposed wording of Policy 15.2.3.1.
<b>Point Number</b>	2115.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new to Rule 15.7.1- Permitted Activities, to make provision for the construction of a new building or additions to an existing lawfully established building within the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) as a Permitted Activity. This being subject to the following Activity specific conditions:</p> <p><u>The new building or additions to an existing lawfully established building must be constructed in accordance with:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>A geotechnical report or similar professional report accepted by Council through a previous resource consent application; and</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Any conditions of a previous resource consent or subdivision consent associated with the site relating to stability or geotechnical matters.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consent for some titles have already been obtained and construction on the lots is imminent.</li> <li>• Proposed amendments recognise and provide for cases where underlying consents may have already been granted that effectively address natural hazards risk.</li> <li>• Inclusion of new provision enables development to be undertaken without having to go through additional and unnecessary regulatory process for matters already assessed by Council.</li> </ul>

- This avoids additional costs for developers or future landowners and inefficient use of Council resources.

**Point Number** 2115.5

**Plan Chapter** 15.7.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.7.2 D2 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) – Discretionary Activities, so that subdivision to create one or more additional vacant lot(s) within the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone be a Restricted Discretionary activity under Chapter 15.

- Decision Reasons:**
- Will provide a more consistent approach with the specific Rangitahi Peninsula Zone Provisions.
  - Rangitahi Structure Plan anticipates subdivision of land in the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) (refer to Attachment I of submission).
  - Under proposed provisions of Rangitahi Peninsula Zone, subdivision within the Structure Plan area requires resource consent. But where specified provisions are met, this is only as a Restricted Discretionary activity.
  - Requiring Restricted Discretionary activity resource consent under Chapter 15, still ensures that suitable specialist documents to support the application are supplied to Council as per the information requirements proposed under clause 15.13.1.

**Point Number** 2115.6

**Plan Chapter** 15.9.3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** rule 15.9.3 NC2 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area – Non Complying Activities so that subdivision to create one or more additional vacant lot(s) within the Rangitahi Peninsula Zone be a Restricted Discretionary activity under Chapter 15.

- Decision Reasons:**
- Provides consistency with specific Rangitahi Peninsula Zone provisions.
  - Similar matters of control to 15.7.2 RD1 (d) and (f) or Rule 28.4.1 RD1 (b)(vii) can be applied.
  - Requiring Restricted Discretionary activity under Chapter 15 ensures that suitable specialist documents to support the application are required to be supplied to Council as per the information requirements proposed under clause 15.13.1.

<b>Point Number</b>	2115.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new Rule 15.9.1 P5 to Rule 15.9.1 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area – Permitted Activities to include provision for the construction of a new building, additions to an existing lawfully established building, relocation of an existing building and associated earthworks as a Permitted Activity with the following Activity-specific conditions:</p> <p><u>P5 The construction of a new building, additions to an existing lawfully established building, relocation of an existing building and associated earthworks must be undertaken in accordance with:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>A geotechnical report or similar professional report accepted by Council through a previous resource consent application; and</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Any conditions of a previous resource consent or subdivision consent associated with the site relating to stability or geotechnical matters.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed inclusions recognise and provide for cases where underlying resource consents may have already been granted that effectively address natural hazards risk.</li> <li>• It avoids creating additional unnecessary barriers to development, which could lead to additional costs for developers or future landowners and inefficient use of Council resources.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2115.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 – Raglan West, and Map 23 – Raglan Coast
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Maps 23 and 23.3 so that it accurately maps erosion hazard risk on the Rangitahi Peninsula using the existing geotechnical information from the structure plan, resource consents and development.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coastal Hazard Assessment from Section 32 Report for Stage 2 does not include Rangitahi as a management area and it appears that no specific hazard assessment has been undertaken.</li> </ul>

- Extensive geotechnical information exists in relation to the Rangitahi Peninsula from previous structure planning, resource consents and development.
- Existing hazard information can assist Council with accurately mapping the erosion risk hazard on the Rangitahi Peninsula - Ref: Waikato District Council Coastal Hazards, February 2020.

**Submitter Number:** 2116 **Submitter:** David Wharmby  
**Address:** 25 Robertson Street, Raglan, New Zealand, 3225

**Point Number** 2116.1  
**Plan Chapter** Map 23.3 - Raglan West  
**Late:** NO  
**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose  
**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Map 23.3 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) so that the Coastal Sensitivity Area runs outside the property boundary at 25 Robertson Street Raglan.  
**Decision Reasons:**

- LIDAR maps show the lower boundary of 25 Robertson Street property located at worst 4.35m above datum.
- The property is already subject to building restrictions from Council sewer and stormwater system. Adding another restriction provides no additional benefits.
- Kaitoke Creek fronting property contains wetland and mangroves that will be more established in 100 years' time. Wetland and mangrove are recognised internationally as providing attenuation for storm surges.
- Modelling based on a bathtub approach to inundation and does not take into account factors that may reduce impacts.

**Submitter Number:** 2117 **Submitter:** John Harrison  
**Address:** 30A Miriama Way, Whatawhata, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3285

**Point Number** 2117.1  
**Plan Chapter** Map 26.3 - Whatawhata  
**Late:** NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 26.3 - Whatawhata so that the Flood Plain Management Area matches the natural contour of the land.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed flood plain management area does not accurately show where flood waters could rise to.</li> <li>• See submission attachment which demonstrates that possible flood lines could be drawn to match the land area contours.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2117.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.3 - Whatawhata
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> map 26.3 to specify that flood levels should be determined from a ground height above the existing river level.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed flood plain management area does not accurately show where flood waters could rise to.</li> <li>• See submission attachment which demonstrates that possible flood lines could be drawn to match the land area contours.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2118	<b>Submitter:</b>	Russell Davis
<b>Address:</b>	31 Ocean View Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand, 2965		
<b>Point Number</b>	2118.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.6 - Managing hazard risk generally.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Note: Submitter seeks amendments and additions to policy but doesn't specify what amendments or changes they seek.		

<b>Point Number</b>	2118.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 Protection from risks of coastal hazards.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Note: Submitter seeks amendments and additions to policy but doesn't specify what amendments or changes they seek.
<b>Point Number</b>	2118.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.16
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.16 Development in the Coastal Sensitivity Areas.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Note: Submitter seeks amendments and additions to policy but doesn't specify what amendments or changes they seek.
<b>Point Number</b>	2118.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> section 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Note: Submitter seeks amendments and additions to chapter but doesn't specify what amendments or changes they seek.



<b>Point Number</b>	2118.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 29 Appendices
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to Chapter 29 Appendices an appendix that lists all NZ mitigation strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan needs an appendix that lists all NZ mitigation strategies.</li> <li>• The list doesn't just talk about natural features, buffers, soft hazard protection works. It should include new hazard mitigation measures which could be listed as potential remedies to be applied as needed.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2119	<b>Submitter:</b>	Robin Michael N Hood
<b>Address:</b>	36/21 Fairview Avenue, Fairview Heights, Auckland, New Zealand,0632		

<b>Point Number</b>	2119.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from map 23.3 Raglan West in the vicinity of Horongarara and Ryan Road at Te Akau South.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area is limestone strata with stable earth overburden.</li> <li>• Submitter's house at 10E Ryan Road, Te Akau South.</li> <li>• Horongarara Reserve is adjacent to Submitters property and is 56 meters above sea level.</li> <li>• Subject site has been forested with native trees.</li> <li>• Subject site contains historically protected a pa site.</li> <li>• One half of the settlement area faces a protected inlet.</li> <li>• Horongarara is principally northward facing with a 72 meter westward rising land mass at the top of pa site.</li> <li>• Invites Council to visit site to draw their own conclusions.</li> <li>• Submitter eloquently express displeasure with the process for determining the Coastal Sensitivity Area in this location.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2120	<b>Submitter:</b>	Sushil Kumar
<b>Address:</b>	35 Russell Road, Huntly, New Zealand,3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2120.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 - Huntly East		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 20.2 - Huntly East so that Mine Subsidence Risk Area does not affect the area around the property located at 35 Russell Road Huntly.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter concerned over the effect on properties value and questions whether government will pay for the value loss of the property.</li> <li>• Submitter has not felt any movements or been affected by mine subsidence at this property for the past ten years.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2121	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ian & Karen McLeay
<b>Address:</b>	16 Totara Drive, Pukete, Hamilton, New Zealand,3200		
<b>Point Number</b>	2121.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 - Raglan West – High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 - Raglan West relating to the Rangitahi Peninsula, taking into account the information from the CMW Geotechnical Completion Report dated 8 <sup>th</sup> May 2020.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CMW Geotechnical Completion Report dated 8 May 2020, details significant remediation of coastal erosion risk for Precinct A - Rangitahi Peninsula Development.</li> <li>• The area of remediation should be surveyed and the map updated to reflect this information to ensure the hazard area is not indicating risk where it does not exist.</li> </ul>		

--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2122	<b>Submitter:</b>	Graham & Ingrid Rusbatch
<b>Address:</b>	77 Bollard Avenue, New Windsor, Auckland, New Zealand,0600		

<b>Point Number</b>	2122.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.2 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> rule 15.10.2 D2 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area, Discretionary Activities, to be a permitted activity where the replacement of the building is under insurance.</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Add</b> into the rule, assurance of the owner's permitted right to replace the building as it is.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a building burns down it should be straight forward process to reinstate.</li> <li>• Insurance unlikely to pay for resource consent and compliance costs and the situation will be unclear and difficult.</li> <li>• Any decision to raise the floor level in a replacement scenario here would be at the preference of the owner rather than mandated by Council.</li> <li>• If Council apply conditions it may make it impractical or unaffordable to replace what existed.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2122.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Not Stated
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> new rule to 15.7.1 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) Permitted Activities to allow for the replacement of an existing building that is under insurance.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If a building burns down it should be straight forward process to reinstate.</li> <li>• Insurance unlikely to pay for resource consent and compliance costs and the situation will be unclear and difficult.</li> </ul>

- Currently the only pathway to replacement is through a discretionary activity.
- There should an additional permitted activity to provide for the event of an insurance replacement.
- Replacement of something existing should not be accompanied by onerous conditions since the building stems from a past consent granted.

**Point Number** 2122.3

**Plan Chapter** 15.10.1 P2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** rule 15.7.1 P2 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) Permitted activities to allow the construction of an accessory building and farm building with a floor

**Decision Reasons:**

- The rule as proposed is overly restrictive.
- A small shed can be built relatively cheaply and could be raised above ground level to give extra assurance in event of water inundation.
- If an owner is willing to take the risk, allow a floor to be built.

**Point Number** 2122.4

**Plan Chapter** 15.10.1 P1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** rule 15.10.1 P1 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (inundation) Area - Permitted Activities to allow the construction of an accessory building and farm building with a floor.

**Decision Reasons:**

- The rule as proposed is overly restrictive.
- A small shed can be built relatively cheaply and could be raised above ground level to give extra assurance in event of water inundation.
- If an owner is willing to take the risk, allow a floor to be built.

**Submitter Number:** 2123

**Submitter:** Counties Power Limited

**Address:** New Zealand,2340

<b>Point Number</b>	2123.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	14.3.2.1 CI(c)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend rule 14.3.2.1 CI(c) - Infrastructure and energy - Controlled Activities - Matters of control to apply only to areas located within the natural hazard overlays.</b>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The council has discretion under s106 of the Resource Management Act when making decisions even when not located within the natural hazard overlay.</li> <li>• Incorporating a generic measure of control may result in extra costs for consent processing even when unnecessary.</li> <li>• The matter of control refers to Chapter 15 that will address concerns if relevant.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2123.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Not Stated
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> a new rule in Chapter 15 to address the risk from fire on existing infrastructure.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Variation 2 includes reference to fire risk as a matter of discretion in multiple rules throughout the Stage 1 zone chapters, referring users back to Chapter 15 but chapter 15 contains no rules to address fire risk on existing infrastructure.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2123.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policy 15.2.1.18 (a) - Residential Development potentially subject to fire risk to include existing utilities.

**And**

**Add** a new rule to Chapter 15 to address the risk of fire on existing infrastructure.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Chapter 15.1(17) introduction states that the risk of fire hazard is controlled by the Waikato Regional Council, the Department of conservation and the Waikato District council through Legislation other than the RMA, using both regulation and increasing public awareness.
- Variation 2 includes reference to fire risk as a matter of discretion in rules across multiple zone chapters, referring users back to Chapter 15 but chapter 15 contains no rules to address this.

**Point Number** 2123.4

**Plan Chapter** Chapter 15

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** new objectives, policies and rules to Chapter 15 that specify setbacks (10m from each side of the line) for plantation forestry activities from power lines and structures to address risk from fires.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Chapter 15 should take into account sites where existing electricity infrastructure traverses land used for forestry.
- Where clearance between power lines and trees is not adequately maintained, there is an increased risk of both fire and power outage.
- Ideally trees should not be planted within fall distance of power lines and at the very least trees should be planted at a distance where the spread of the tree doesn't interfere with the continued and safe operation of the line.
- Tree trimming to maintain clearance from power lines in forestry blocks where terrain, which is often hilly, remote, hazardous and difficult to access and requires the lines to be taken out of service, or even temporarily dismantled.
- The combination of lines in forestry blocks often leads to disputes.

**Point Number** 2123.5

**Plan Chapter** 15.5.1 P1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> 15.5.1 P1- High Risk Flood Area Permitted Activities to allow for new electricity distribution lines, poles, cabinets, masts/poles and supporting structures as permitted activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule 15.5.1 P1 does not reference new electrical infrastructure, yet these are very similar in nature to new telecommunication lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas which are permitted under 15.5.1 P1(2).</li> <li>• New electrical infrastructure may be required to traverse through High Risk Flood areas to serve new or existing developments.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2123.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> 15.5.2 RDI - High Risk Flood Area - Restricted Discretionary Activities to ensure new electricity distribution lines, poles, cabinets, masts/poles and supporting structures are not captured under this rule and are permitted activities under Rule 15.5.1 P1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	New electrical infrastructure may be required to traverse through High Risk Flood areas to serve new or existing developments.
<b>Point Number</b>	2123.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> rule 15.10.1 P2 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area to include new electricity distribution lines, poles, cabinets, masts/poles and supporting structures as permitted activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule 15.10.1 P2 does not reference new electrical infrastructure, yet these are very similar in nature to new telecommunication lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas which are permitted under 15.10.1 P2 (2).</li> <li>• New electrical infrastructure may be required to traverse through High Risk Coastal Inundation areas to serve new or existing developments.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2123.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.2 D4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> rule 15.10.2 D4 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area Discretionary Activities - upgrading of existing utilities not provided for in Rule 15.10.1 P2;
	<b>And</b>
	<b>Amend</b> rule 15.10.1 P2 - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area to include new electricity distribution lines, poles, cabinets, masts/poles and supporting structures as permitted activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electricity distribution lines and supporting structures fall within the High Risk Coastal Hazard Areas.</li> <li>• The identified rules do not reference new electrical infrastructure, yet these are very similar in nature to new telecommunication lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas which are permitted under 15.10.1 P2 (2).</li> <li>• New electrical infrastructure may be required to traverse through High Risk Coastal Inundation areas to serve new or existing developments.</li> <li>• New electrical infrastructure may be required to traverse through High Risk Coastal Inundation areas to serve new or existing developments.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2123.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.14 – Definition of Minor upgrading.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The definition supports the permitted activities proposed in Chapter 15 and provides clarity and reduces compliance costs of routine maintenance or upgrades which enables timely repairs without delay.
<b>Point Number</b>	2123.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14



<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> section 15.14 - Definitions for Utility
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The use of the terminology 'associated equipment' accurately encompasses the various types of electrical equipment that utilities include.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2124	<b>Submitter:</b>	Georgina O'Brien
<b>Address:</b>	2G Riro Street, Hamilton East, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3216		

<b>Point Number</b>	2124.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 - Raglan West – Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 - Raglan West to remove the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from the property at 10D Ryan Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The platform is 30m above sea level and is just below the reserve. It is 100m from the high water line in all directions.</li> <li>• There are neighbouring properties between the site and the coast.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2125	<b>Submitter:</b>	Simon Porter
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 21102, Rototuna, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3256		

<b>Point Number</b>	2125.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26 - Hamilton Environs
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> High Risk Flood Area and Flood Plain Management Area - Map 26 - Hamilton Environs in the vicinity of 9c River Downs, Rototuna- following a review of the modelling, including ground truthing and quality checking of the data and mapping.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The flood mapping does not align with existing land contours and indicates significant errors which presents a concerning assessment of the flood modelling (see map attached to submission).</li> <li>• Flooding to the degree shown on the maps would be extremely rare given the river is controlled by 8 hydro dams.</li> <li>• This will inhibit future development aspirations for the identified property.</li> <li>• It is concerning that the result of modelling is mailed to landowners to have them essentially ground truth the modelling.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2125.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.12 - Reduce potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River flood plains and flood ponding areas
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning maps used to determine the flood management areas is incorrect.</li> <li>• Accordingly the areas where fill can and cannot occur are incorrect and need to be amended.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2125.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.13 - Control filling of land within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The planning maps used to determine the flood management areas is incorrect.</li> <li>• Accordingly the areas where building restrictions apply need to be amended</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2126	<b>Submitter:</b>	Geoff Hutchison
<b>Address:</b>	2 Mara Kai Lane, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		
<b>Point Number</b>	2126.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.17, and Map 23.3 - Raglan West - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> Policy 15.2.1.17 - Setbacks from the coast.</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Amend</b> the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) - Map 23.3 - Raglan West, to remove the area from the property at 2 Mara Kai Lane Raglan.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projected increase in sea level is no less than 1m by 2120.</li> <li>• The RCP 8.5 scenario has already been widely discredited and is no longer relevant. RCP 4.5 is more likely and would result in a 0.4 to 0.5m rise.</li> <li>• MfE states that sea level rise will not follow any one scenario.</li> <li>• Stats.govt.nz data shows that sea level rise has been a relatively static 1.8mm per year for the last 40 years.</li> <li>• The building on the submitter's site was built in 1955 there has yet to be any evidence of erosion.</li> <li>• The Council has drawn the lines on the map without any investigation of the underlying rock or soil conditions which will have a huge impact on any future erosion.</li> <li>• The site is 10-12m above sea level and located in an area with negligible wave action affect, therefore the site is not at risk from inundation.</li> <li>• Geotechnical reports were undertaken for the property 3 years ago which detailed underlying volcanic basalt which is a dense firm foundation.</li> <li>• Arbitrary lines have an impact on property values.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2127	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jeremy O'Rourke
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Jeremy, Nicola O'Rourke, and O'Rourke family		
<b>Address:</b>	78 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		
<b>Point Number</b>	2127.1		

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair, and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The Structures are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> <li>• Submitter purchased the property with intention of retaining long-term.</li> <li>• The owners prior to 2018 completed significant restoration of the seawall to maintain integrity of the wall and dispel risk of erosion. (Photo attached to submission).</li> <li>• The submitter supports the submission and remedies set out by the Raglan Collective.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2128	<b>Submitter:</b>	Chris & Sue Harris
<b>Address:</b>	52a Lorenzen Bay Road, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2128.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 – Objectives, Policies and Rules - High Risk Coastal Hazard Areas and Coastal Sensitivity Areas
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> relevant Objectives, policies and rules in the High Risk Coastal Hazard Areas and Coastal Sensitivity Areas to support the development and implementation of site specific adaptive management plans, including such a plan for Wallis Street and the lower part of Lorenzen Bay Road as well as 8, 8A and 8B Cambrea Road, which implements, as soon as practicable, Option 2 of the Focus, 2020: Waikato District Council Hazard Assessment report (Section 32 Appendix 5(f)), namely:</p> <p>(a) Replacement of the existing structures with a well-engineered seawall capable of providing long term protection.</p>

(b) Consideration of a design that recovers some of the natural character lost with construction of the structures built in the past.

(c) Consideration of a design that allows for possible public access or similar public benefit.

**And**

**Amend** Objectives, policies and rules in the High Risk Coastal Hazard Areas and Coastal Sensitivity Areas that provide for maintenance, repair, upgrade /improvement and replacement of existing seawalls in the Wallis Street area and the lower part of Lorenzen Bay Road as well as 8, 8A and 8B of Cambrae Rd as a permitted activity, or controlled activity having regard to the long term intentions above.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Sea walls have existed for decades and houses (some dating back to the 1950s) have been built in reliance of these structures.
- The coastal development adds to the amenity and character of Raglan.
- As stated in the s32 report, existing use is located very close to the coast with little room to adapt and would be severely impacted by the removal of the current structures.
- Sea walls that have stood for decades may require maintenance which should be a permitted or controlled activity.

**Point Number** 2128.2

**Plan Chapter** 15.7; 15.8; 15.9 and 15.10 - Coastal protection structures

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** provision for the development of adaptive management strategies.

**And**

**Retain** provision to enable protection of property prior to adaptive management plans being adopted.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter has invested in structures to protect the property from both stormwater flooding and coastal flooding which have proved successful in minimising flood damage.
- Submitter would like the ability to repair and upgrade the structures to continue to provide protection.

**Point Number** 2128.3

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.8

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policy 15.2.1.8 - Limitation on hard protection works for coastal mitigation to expand policy scope to enable upgrading/future proofing where hard structures already exist.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sea walls have existed for decades and houses (some dating back to the 1950s) have been built in reliance of these structures.</li> <li>• The coastal development adds to the amenity and character of Raglan.</li> <li>• As stated in the s32 report, existing use is located very close to the coast and would be severely impacted by the removal of the current structures.</li> <li>• Sea walls that have stood for decades may require maintenance which should be a permitted or controlled activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2128.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policy 15.2.1.9 - Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection to include provision to maintain and enhance integrity of hard structures that provide current defence.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This is relevant to existing protection structure.
<b>Point Number</b>	2128.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.21
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policy 15.2.1.21 - Storm management in areas of land instability or subsidence to include impacts of stormwater magnifying risk of flooding in coastal.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Storm water often magnifies the major risk of flooding in some coastal areas.

<b>Point Number</b>	2128.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Not Stated
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policy 15.2.1.7 - Protection from risks of coastal hazard to give further clarification on what situations determine the preference for hard hazard protection or soft hazard protection.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Policy needs to determine preference of soft hazard protection vs hard protection.

<b>Point Number</b>	2128.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Policies and Rules
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Not Stated
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structures are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> <li>• Submitters support Raglan Collective.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2129	<b>Submitter:</b>	Juliet & Ian Sunde
<b>Address:</b>	126 Travers Road, RD2, Te Kauwhata, New Zealand,3782		

<b>Point Number</b>	2129.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 14.1 - Te Kauwhata West

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> the Environmental Protection Policy Area to the New Plain at 126 Travers Road, Te Kauwhata (Planning map 14.1.) See submission for highlighted map.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Natural water flow, stormwater and flooding coming from the subdivision. History of 30 years of flooding. EPPA covers half submitter's property.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2130	<b>Submitter:</b>	Chris Williams
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Chris, Kathryn, and Williams family		
<b>Address:</b>	60 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2130.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Policies and Rules
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay Areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structure are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> <li>• Need to be able to protect our property.</li> <li>• Observed very little landscape change or alteration to the sea wall protecting the property throughout the period of ownership (18 months).</li> <li>• The sea wall received inspection from an engineer who was satisfied with its strength and stability.</li> <li>• Submitter opposes any option to remove an 'ad hoc structure' if it refers to a sea wall.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2130.2
---------------------	--------



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Generic All Points
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> any provision requiring the removal ad hoc structures over time and live with erosion if this means the removal of sea walls protecting our property.  <b>And</b>  <b>Supports</b> the remedies set out in the Raglan Collective submission.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter unsure how a well-constructed sea wall can be referred to as an ad hoc structure.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2131	<b>Submitter:</b>	Howard Forlong
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Howard, Helen, and Forlong family		
<b>Address:</b>	62 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2131.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay Areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structure are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> <li>• Current sea wall on property at 62 Wallis Street, Raglan well suited, functional and in keeping with character of local area. Wish to continue maintaining wall and protect property.</li> <li>• Supports adaptive management strategies developed in partnership with stakeholders however until adopted submitter needs to be able to protect their property.</li> </ul>



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 Protection from risks of coastal hazards - generally to provide that situation and need determine the preference for hard hazard protection or soft hazard protection.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Situation and need determine preference of soft hazard protection vs hard protection.
<b>Point Number</b>	2133.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.8 - Limitation on hard protection works for coastal mitigation - to enable upgrading/ future proofing where hard structures already exist.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Where hard structures already exist scope for upgrading/future proofing these structures be considered.
<b>Point Number</b>	2133.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.9 - Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection - to allow work to maintain and enhance integrity of hard structures that provide current defence.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Maintain and enhance integrity of hard structures which provide current defence when appropriate.
<b>Point Number</b>	2133.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.21

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.21 - Stormwater management in areas subject to risk of land instability or subsidence - to include areas subject to coastal flooding.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Stormwater often magnifies major risk of flooding in some coastal areas.

<b>Point Number</b>	2133.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Policies and Rules
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.</li> <li>• The structures are effective with positive effects.</li> <li>• Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> <li>• Submitters support Raglan Collective.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2134	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jacqui Graham
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Jacqui Graham & Julie Nelson	<b>Organisation:</b>	Raglan Collective
<b>Address:</b>	54 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2134.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay Areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structure are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> <li>• Estuary is shallow at 54 Wallis St and on very high tide is barely thigh deep at the sea wall. In past ten years submitters have seen very little difference year on year</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2135	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jacqui Graham
<b>On behalf of:</b>	The Raglan Collective Incorporated Society		
<b>Address:</b>	131 Teal Valley, RD1, Nelson, New Zealand,7071		

<b>Point Number</b>	2135.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to Section 15. 1 Introduction a paragraph explaining that increased resilience to coastal hazards and projected changes in climatic conditions will include repair, maintenance and replacement of existing coastal protection structures in Raglan where longstanding subdivisions rely on them.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Seawall structures have existed in the areas represented by the Raglan Collective, being landowners in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

<b>Point Number</b>	2135.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1 - Resilience to natural hazard risk
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a new policy under Objective 15.2.1 - Resilience to natural hazard risk - that provides for repair, maintenance and replacement of some existing coastal protection structures in Raglan where longstanding subdivisions rely on them;</p> <p>And</p> <p><b>Any</b> consequential amendments to policies to reflect this policy.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Seawall structures have existed in the areas represented by the Raglan Collective, being landowners in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2135.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 – Protection from risks of coastal hazard to reflect new policy under sub 135.2.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Seawalls have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2135.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.8 – Limitations on hard protection works for coastal hazard mitigation to reflect new policy under sub 135.2.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Seawalls have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2135.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.16

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> 15.2.1.16 – Development in the Coastal Sensitivity Areas – to reflect new policy under sub 135.2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Seawalls have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.
<b>Point Number</b>	2135.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7 by adding for Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay properties a controlled activity to implement any adaptive management plans developed by the council and/or owners of two or more properties, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement of the existing structures with a well-engineered structure capable of providing long term protection.</li> <li>• Consideration of a design that recovers some of the natural character lost with construction of the structures built in the past.</li> <li>• Consideration of a design that allows for possible public access or similar public benefit.</li> </ul>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.
<b>Point Number</b>	2135.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8 by adding for Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay properties a controlled activity to implement any adaptive management plans developed by the council and/or owners of two or more properties, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Replacement of the existing structures with a well-engineered structure capable of providing long term protection.</li> </ul>

- Consideration of a design that recovers some of the natural character lost with construction of the structures built in the past.
- Consideration of a design that allows for possible public access or similar public benefit.

**Decision Reasons:** Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

**Point Number** 2135.8

**Plan Chapter** 15.9

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.9 by adding for Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay properties a controlled activity to implement any adaptive management plans developed by the council and/or owners of two or more properties, including:

- Replacement of the existing structures with a well-engineered structure capable of providing long term protection.
- Consideration of a design that recovers some of the natural character lost with construction of the structures built in the past.
- Consideration of a design that allows for possible public access or similar public benefit.

**Decision Reasons:** Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

**Point Number** 2135.9

**Plan Chapter** 15.10

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.10 by adding for Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay properties a controlled activity to implement any adaptive management plans developed by the council and/or owners of two or more properties, including:

- Replacement of the existing structures with a well-engineered structure capable of providing long term protection.
- Consideration of a design that recovers some of the natural character lost with construction of the structures built in the past.



- Consideration of a design that allows for possible public access or similar public benefit.

**Decision Reasons:** Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

**Point Number** 2135.10

**Plan Chapter** 15.7

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend Rule 15.7** to provide for maintenance, repair and upgrade/ improvement (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas in the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion), as a permitted activity, or controlled activity having regard to the medium term intention for the development and implementation of site specific adaptive management plans.

**Decision Reasons:** Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

**Point Number** 2135.11

**Plan Chapter** 15.8

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend Rule 15.8** to provide for maintenance, repair and upgrade/ improvement (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas in the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation), as a permitted activity, or controlled activity having regard to the medium term intention for the development and implementation of site specific adaptive management plans.

**Decision Reasons:** Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

**Point Number** 2135.12

**Plan Chapter** 15.9

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.9 to provide for maintenance, repair and upgrade/ improvement (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas in High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area, as a permitted activity, or controlled activity having regard to the medium term intention for the development and implementation of site specific adaptive management plans.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

<b>Point Number</b>	2135.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10 to provide for maintenance, repair and upgrade/ improvement (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas in High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area, as a permitted activity, or controlled activity having regard to the medium term intention for the development and implementation of site specific adaptive management plans.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Seawall structures have existed in these areas for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2136	<b>Submitter:</b>	Shand Properties Ltd
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2136.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Add** a new rule under Section 15.11 Mine Subsidence Risk Area for Controlled Activities as follows:

CI: The construction or alteration of a building that is not provided for under District Plan Rule 15.11.1 where a Consent Notice is registered against the Record of Title confirming that a geotechnical assessment has been approved at the time of subdivision and the approved geotechnical report confirms that the ground is suitable for development and the development is in accordance with any recommendations of the geotechnical report.

Control is restricted to:

- The requirements and recommendations of the geotechnical report approved at the time of subdivision.
- That confirmation is provided from a suitably experienced and qualified geotechnical engineer that confirms the proposed development is consistent with the recommendations and requirements of the geotechnical report approved at the time of subdivision.

**AND**

**Amend** rule 15.11.3 Discretionary Activities, D1 to read “Construction of a building or additions to an existing building not provided for in Rule 15.11.1 P1-P3 or CI”,

**AND**

**Any** consequential and subsequent amendments, including renumbering, as required.

**OR**

**Amend** Section 15.11 Mine Subsidence Risk Area for Controlled Activities to reflect similar drafting relief that avoids the inefficiencies of a duplicate discretionary activity status between subdivision and land use consenting stages.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitter submitted on zoning of their properties, sub#778. Maps attached to sub.
- Requiring a Discretionary resource consent for the construction of all buildings that are not otherwise provided for through Rules 15.11.1 P1-P3 triggers the same requirement as Rule 15.11.3 D2 which requires a Discretionary resource consent for all subdivision within the Mine Subsidence Risk Area.
- Where a geotechnical report is provided and approved at the time of subdivision that confirms the ground conditions are suitable for development that should also cover subsequent development.
- A Consent Notice can be imposed stating that the construction of a building on the lot is a Controlled activity.
- Considers this provides for a more efficient planning process for both the land developer and for Council.

**Submitter Number:**

2137

**Submitter:**

Sue Wood

<b>Address:</b>	10 Pokohui Avenue, Raglan, New Zealand,3225
<b>Point Number</b>	2137.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 23.3 Raglan West Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) line on 10 Pokohui Avenue, Raglan to a lower level, more in line with the risk assessment and survey information provided.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building consent was issued after a report from Wainui Environmental on Coastal inundation and Flood risk assessment BLD0812/19.</li> <li>• See attachment to submission for full details of the Coastal Inundation and Flood Risk Assessment of the property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2138	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jeff de Leeuw
<b>Organisation:</b>	RG de Leeuw Construction Limited		
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2138.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.2 Defended Area (Residual Risk), Restricted Discretionary Activities to clearly state that a private landowner responsibility is not to determine the efficacy of existing flood protection works.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Rule 15.6.2 places a responsibility on private development to resolve catchment wide flood risk potential. This should be a central and local government function.

<b>Point Number</b>	2138.2
---------------------	--------

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.11.1 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Permitted Activities to include single dwellings as a permitted activity.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The PDP places additional restrictions on very minor works including establishment of a dwelling on an infill site. It places unnecessary uncertainty on future development potential at submitter's site at 84 Bailey Street and Meadows Lane, Huntly.
<b>Point Number</b>	2138.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.11.2 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities to include subdivision as a restricted discretionary activity and retain the identified matters to which discretion is restricted.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the current RMA framework provides appropriate scope to consider natural hazards when undertaking a subdivision consent (s106) and that additional development restrictions are not required.</li> <li>• Should be enabling provisions where it can be adequately demonstrated that risk can be managed appropriately.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2138.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Rule 15.11.3 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PDP places additional restrictions on very minor works, including a dwelling on an infill site which is a discretionary activity.</li> <li>• PDP rule framework provides a general discouragement to development and subdivision in policy overlay areas.</li> </ul>

- Should be enabling provisions where it can be adequately demonstrated that risk can be managed appropriately.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2139	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ports of Auckland Limited
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand,1010		
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.1 Introduction except as set out in submission.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports most of introduction as notified.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	Amend Section 15.1(11) by deleting the last sentence as follows:  <del>Other 1% AEP ponding areas will be required to be identified by a suitably qualified and experienced professional as part of an application for resource consent or a plan change.</del>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers it inappropriate to require applicants to identify the extent of the 1% AEP ponding areas outside of the mapped areas.</li> <li>• Applicant would need to engage significant technical expertise to determine whether the associated rule applies.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.3		

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.2 Objectives and policies except as set out in submission.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports objectives and policies except where identified in its submission.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.15 - Flood ponding areas and overland flow paths - as follows (a) Manage stormwater hazards by requiring new subdivision and development within flood ponding areas and overland areas <del>and overland flow paths</del> to adopt integrated catchment plan-based stormwater management methods which:...
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	District Plan Maps do not identify any overland flow paths. The "trigger" to assess the effects is contained within the Matters of Discretion for earthworks within the Flood Plain Management Area or Flood Ponding Area. Therefore, first reference to overland flow paths should be deleted.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.3 How to use and interpret the rules as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter supports this Rule as notified.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.6

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Permitted Activities except as set out in submission.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports rule, except where identified in its submission, and provided that the Rule relates to the mapped Flood Plain Management and Flood Ponding Areas of the District Plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1(a) Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Permitted Activities as follows:  (a) The activities listed below are permitted activities within the Flood Plain Management Area <u>or the Flood Ponding Area</u> shown on the Planning Maps <del>or in a Flood Ponding Area</del> , if they meet the activity-specific conditions set out in this table.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers it inappropriate to require applicants to identify the extent of the 1% AEP ponding areas outside of the mapped areas.</li> <li>• Applicant would need to engage significant technical expertise to determine whether the associated rule applies.</li> <li>• Rule needs clarification that it applies only to the mapped areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.2 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Restricted Discretionary Activities, except as set out in submission.



<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports rule, except where identified in its submission, and provided that the Rule relates to the mapped Flood Plain Management and Flood Ponding Areas of the District Plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.2(a) Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows:</p> <p>(a) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities within the <u>Flood Plain Management Area or the Flood Ponding Area</u> shown on the Planning Maps <del>or in a Flood Ponding Area</del>, if...</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter considers that it is inappropriate to apply this rule outside of the mapped areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2, and 15.4.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.2 to include activities identified in D1, D2, and D3 of Rule 15.4.3,</p> <p><b>And</b></p> <p><b>Delete</b> Rule 15.4.3 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Discretionary Activities.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Default discretionary activity status for those activities identified in D1, D2, and D3 requires applicants to undertake a full assessment of the effects of the activity on the environment, which in the context of flooding is an unnecessary and unduly onerous requirement. Submitter considers a restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.11

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5 High Risk Flood Area as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports this Rule as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports this Rule as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.12 Liquefaction as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports this Rule as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.13 Information requirements - as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports this Rule as notified.

<b>Point Number</b>	2139.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.14 Definitions as notified, except as set out in submission
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports the definitions except where identified in its submission.

<b>Point Number</b>	2139.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the definition of Flood Ponding Area in Section 15.14 Definitions as follows:  Means an area shown on the planning maps as an identified flood ponding area <del>or an</del> area that experiences floodwater ponding in a 1% AEP rainfall event.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter opposed to the application of the Flood Ponding Area to areas not identified on the Planning Maps. Amendment to definition required.

<b>Point Number</b>	2139.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 Natural Hazards and Climate Change.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports Variation 2 as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2139.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26 Hamilton Environs - Map 26.1 Horotiu
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 Planning Maps for Horotiu.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports the PDP Maps (Stage 2) mapped for Horotiu.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2140	<b>Submitter:</b>	Grant & Nicol Ruffell & Beeby
<b>On behalf of:</b>	MG Solutions Ltd		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 9379, Whitiara, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3240		
<b>Point Number</b>	2140.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Earthworks Rules		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> rules to increase volume of earthworks permitted within the Residential Zone for sites affected or partially affected by natural hazard areas.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The current volumes of earthworks permitted in the Residential Zone are too restrictive, especially when natural ground remains unchanged.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2140.2		

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the activity status for the construction of a new building and additions or alterations to an existing building to a Restricted Discretionary activity, including matters of discretion (subject to Council's review).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The activity status is too restrictive for new buildings or existing additions or alterations, where compliance can be met with the relevant District Plan standards.

<b>Point Number</b>	2140.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the activity status for any new subdivision that can accommodate a compliant building platform clear of the applicable natural hazard area to a Restricted Discretionary activity, including matters of discretion (subject to Council's review).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The activity status proposed is too restrictive for subdivisions that can accommodate a compliant building platform clear of the applicable natural hazard area.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2141	<b>Submitter:</b>	Grant Brady
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Grant & Ros Brady		
<b>Address:</b>	68 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand, 3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2141.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation).
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 Raglan West to remove the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) from 68 Wallis Street, Raglan.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter feels the assessment is incorrect for their property at 68 Wallis Street, Raglan. Properties height is high above current high tide level and is protected if predicted sea levels rise another metre in 100 years. Submission includes photos of the site and measurements.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2142	<b>Submitter:</b>	Steve & Jan Godley
<b>Address:</b>	1698 Rotowaro Road, RD2, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand, 3794		

<b>Point Number</b>	2142.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1(PI)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.1 PI Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation), Permitted Activities to reflect size of additions to be determined by need.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Size to be determined by need.

<b>Point Number</b>	2142.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.8.2 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation), Restricted Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	No reasons provided.

<b>Point Number</b>	2142.3
---------------------	--------

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.1 PI (building additions limited by gross floor area) to clarify the difference that size makes.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter doesn't understand the difference size makes.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2143	<b>Submitter:</b>	Avant Developments Limited
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand, 3204		

<b>Point Number</b>	2143.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(1) Introduction
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1(1) Introduction to read:</p> <p>...It identifies areas where certain types of new development will be avoided <u>or appropriately mitigated</u> because of the natural hazards present.,</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports natural hazard management by adopting a risk-based approach. However, clause 15.1(1) does not align with the risk-based approach as it fails to consider cases of new development where site specific investigation determines new development will not increase risk of property damage, injury or loss of lives within identified hazard areas.

<b>Point Number</b>	2143.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a new rule to 15.4.2 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities to include subdivision of utility allotments, access allotments and reserve allotments;</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no separate rule which sets out the activity status for the subdivision of a utility allotment, access allotment or reserve allotment within the Flood Plain Management Area.</li> <li>• This is despite Rules 15.4.1(a) P5 and P6 dealing with construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading of utilities, and associated earthworks.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2143.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.3(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.3(a) D1(I)(b) High Risk Flood Area, Discretionary Activities to read:</p> <p>The additional lot(s) are partially within the High Risk Flood Area and each additional lot(s) contains <del>a net site an</del> area capable of containing a complying building platform entirely outside the High Risk flood Area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where subdivision of a site creates lot(s) that are partially within the High Risk Flood Area, it is unclear as to the required net site area referenced in the rule.</li> <li>• The subdivision rules refer to building platform requirements without reference to "net site area".</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2143.4



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> a new rule to Chapter 15.5.2 High Risk Flood Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities to include subdivision of utility allotments, access allotments and reserve allotments;</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific provisions which address the activity status for the subdivision of utility allotments, access allotments or reserve allotments.</li> <li>• This is despite Rule 15.5.1 PI(2) and Rule 15.5.2(a) RDI(1) dealing with new telecommunication lines, poles, cabinets and masts/poles supporting antennas.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2143.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Add</b> to Chapter 15.5 High Risk Flood Area specific rules and standards for earthworks;</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are specific rules and standards for earthworks within the Flood Plain Management Area, but the activity status and standards for earthworks within the High Risk Flood Area is unclear.</li> <li>• Specific provisions should be included in Rule 15.5 for earthworks within the High Risk Flood Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2143.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 22 Hakarimata
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 22 Hakarimata in relation to flood overlays on 536 and 576A Hakarimata Road, Ngaruawahia if hydrological information to be obtained by submitter supports a different outcome for the mapping of the Flood Plain Management Area and/or High Risk Flood Area;
	AND
	<b>Any</b> additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter currently undertaking a 50 lot Country Living subdivision application for sites located at 536 and 576A Hakarimata Road, Ngaruawahia. The submitter is currently preparing a site-specific hydrological assessment with the latest available information. Outcomes likely to be known around October/November 2020.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2144	<b>Submitter:</b>	Grant Faulkner
<b>Address:</b>	22 Centreway Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand, 2695		

<b>Point Number</b>	2144.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Chapter 15.10 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area for 22 Centreway Road, Port Waikato.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Distance from beachfront is sufficient mitigate erosion risk. Property should allow additional small dwellings with floor e.g. storage/shed.

<b>Point Number</b>	2144.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) from map 11.1 for 22 Centreway Road, Port Waikato.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Distance from beachfront is sufficient to mitigate erosion risk. Property should allow additional dwellings with a floor e.g. storage/shed. Property is well above waterline so should be allowed to excavate to further depth and volume.
<b>Point Number</b>	2144.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.3(a)(NCI)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Rule 15.10.3(a)(NCI) High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation), Non-Complying Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Should be subject to standard consent process.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2145	<b>Submitter:</b>	Sushil Kumar
<b>Address:</b>	35 Russell Road, Huntly, New Zealand, 3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2145.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 - Mine Subsidence Risk Area		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.2 Huntly East so that the Mine Subsidence Risk Area is not added at 35 Russell Road, Huntly.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter concerned that subsidence will affect value of property, and questions whether the government will pay lost value of the property. Submitter has not felt sudden movements or been affected by subsidence hazard for past ten years.		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2146	<b>Submitter:</b>	Will Gauntlett
--------------------------	------	-------------------	----------------

<b>On behalf of:</b>	Gavin Ion	<b>Organisation:</b>	Waikato District Council
<b>Address:</b>	Private Bag 544, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand, 3742		
<b>Point Number</b>	2146.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps – Floodplain Management Area (Waipa River 1% AEP Flood Extent from Saalbrey Road to the Waikato District Territorial Boundary south of Whatawhata)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the Floodplain Management Area by replacing the mapped area along the Waipa River between the Waikato district boundary and Saalbrey Road, with the corrected flood extent. See Attachment I of submission for corrected flood extent;</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> consequential amendments as required;</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The section of the Floodplain Management Area between the Waikato district boundary and Saalbrey Road shown on the notified Planning Maps is presented inconsistently with the mapping of the rest of the Floodplain Management Area.</li> <li>• This section of the map is over simplified and does not adequately indicate land subject to 1% AEP flood risk.</li> <li>• The replacement map contains the necessary corrections to the flood risk areas and to implement the notified objectives, policies and rules.</li> <li>• The replacement map provides consistency of presentation with the rest of the Floodplain Management Area.</li> <li>• See Attachment I of submission for replacement map.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2146.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps – Floodplain Management Area (Waipa River 1% AEP Flood Extent west of Pioneer Road, Pokeno)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Floodplain Management Area map for the Waikato River to remove the section of the 1% AEP floodplain where it overlaps with the Defended Area. See		

Attachment 2 of submission for the Shapefile LW\_HAZ\_EXTENT\_I\_AEP\_POLY\_ALTERATION\_SEP2020;

AND

**Any** consequential amendments as required

AND

**Any** other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Decision Reasons:**

The 1% AEP flood extent should not overlap a Defended Area with a 1% AEP level of service.

**Point Number**

2146.3

**Plan Chapter**

Maps – Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) overlay area on Residential Zoned properties in Te Akau South.

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) map after undertaking a detailed slope analysis based on local shoreline around Te Akau South residential zoned properties. See attachment 3 of the submission for the location map;

AND

**Any** consequential amendments as required;

AND

**Any** other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Decision Reasons:**

Te Akau South consists of an enclave of residential zone properties. To be consistent with the approach taken in other coastal locations, a detailed slope analysis based on the shoreline type should be carried out and the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) maps amended accordingly.

**Point Number**

2146.4

**Plan Chapter**

Hazard maps

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** maps by merging the hazard overlay area polygons where adjoining polygons of the same hazard overlay area have not been merged. See attachment 4 of submissions for examples of unmerged polygons;

AND

**Any** consequential amendments as required

AND

**Any** other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Unmerged polygons of the same overlay area have occurred where the generalised overlay adjoins the detailed mapping and applies mostly to the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast).
- Merging of the hazard overlay areas at the junctions between two areas of the same hazard overlay provides a continuous polygon and reduces confusion.

**Point Number** 2146.5

**Plan Chapter** Hazard maps

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** maps by making changes to overlay map styles if necessary to change colours or patterns to ensure the difference between overlay areas is clear and there is no conflict between Stage 1 and Stage 2 overlay map styles;

AND

**Any** consequential amendments as required;

AND

**Any** other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Decision Reasons:**

- It is difficult to tell the difference between the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast).
- Also changes to Stage 1 overlay areas are to be consistent with the planning standards and this may result in styles being similar to the styles used in Stage 2.

**Point Number** 2146.6

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	All planning maps
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> maps to reference the most up to date national vertical datum NZVD2016;</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Any</b> consequential amendments as required;</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Any</b> other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From 27 June 2016 New Zealand Vertical Datum 2016 (NZVD2016) replaces NZVD2009 as the official national vertical datum for New Zealand.</li> <li>• The Waikato District Plan maps should reference NZVD2016.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2146.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	All mapped hazard areas
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Consider</b> amending the names of hazard overlay areas to make them easier to recognise;</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Include</b> any consequential amendments to the policies, rules and definition where these reference the hazard overlay areas.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The names of overlays are long and some are quite similar. This makes it difficult to readily recognise the purpose of layer and may cause confusion.</li> <li>• Long naming conventions may also cause issues for software.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2146.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.22(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** to Policy 15.2.1.22(a) - Liquefaction-prone land risk assessment a sub-section to read as follows:

(iii) the assessment confirms that the land is suitable for the proposed development,

AND

**Amend** Policy 15.2.1.22(a)(i) and (ii) - Liquefaction-prone land risk assessment to read:

(i) an assessment by a geotechnical specialist occurs before new subdivision, use or development takes places; ~~and~~

(ii) the level of assessment reflects the type and scale of the subdivision, use or development and the overall vulnerability of the activity to the effects of liquefactions. and,

AND

**Any** consequential amendments as required,

AND

**Any** other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Decision Reasons:** Sub-section (iii) makes it clear that the ultimate purpose of the assessment is to confirm that the land is suitable for the proposed development.

**Point Number** 2146.9

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1 P8 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.4.1 P8 (a), (b) and (c) to read

(a) In the Residential, Village and Country Living Zones - a maximum volume of filling above natural ground level of 10m<sup>3</sup> per site, and ~~a maximum cumulative volume of filling and excavation of the earthworks do not result in a reduction of flood water storage capacity on the site of more than 20m<sup>3</sup>; or~~

(b) In the Rural Zone - a maximum volume of filling above natural ground level of 100m<sup>3</sup> per site, and ~~a maximum cumulative volume of filling and excavation of the~~



earthworks do not result in a reduction of flood water storage capacity on the site of more than 200m<sup>3</sup> per site; or

(c) All other zones – a maximum volume of filling above natural ground level of 20m<sup>3</sup> per site, and ~~a maximum cumulative volume of filling and excavation of the earthworks do not result in a reduction of flood water storage capacity on the site of more than 50m<sup>3</sup> per site; and,~~

AND

**Any** consequential amendments as required,

AND

**Any** other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Submitted amendments build on the term “flood storage capacity” used in rule 15.4.2 RDI, that directs attention to the amount of water being displaced by the earthworks.
- The proposed rule unnecessarily controls filling above flood levels. For example, a building platform filling in a ponding area will displace water up to the flood level. Above that level, the volume of fill makes no difference.

**Point Number**

2146.10

**Plan Chapter**

Chapter 13 Definitions, and  
15.14 Definitions

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

Move all definitions in Chapter 15.14 Definitions to Chapter 13 Definitions,

AND

**Any** consequential amendments as required,

AND

**Any** other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.

**Decision Reasons:**

For consistency all definitions should be located in the same chapter.

**Point Number**

2146.11

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15.1 Introduction, paragraphs 10, 11 and 12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1 paragraph 10 introductory text to clearly identify that the 2D 1% AEP flood modelling includes climate change, i.e. 2D modelling from Horotiu and Saalbrey Road to Ohinewai identifying High Food Risk Flood Area and Flood Plain Management Area based on the RCP 6.0 scenario over a 100 year period to 2120 and that the rest of the Floodplain Management Area does not include climate change,</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1 paragraph 11 introductory text to clearly identify that the 2D 1% AEP Flood Ponding Area around Lake Puketirini also includes climate change based on the RCP 6.0 climate change scenario over a 100 year period to 2120;</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1 paragraph 12 introductory text to make it clear that the Defended Areas are defended up to the 1% AEP flood level without climate change,</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> consequential amendments as required,</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> other change necessary to give effect to the intent of this relief sought and to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Including this information in the introductory text in Chapter 15.1 helps developers know when the modelled flood extents include the effects of climate change and what climate change scenario the information is based on.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2147	<b>Submitter:</b>	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand, 1010		

<b>Point Number</b>	2147.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Provide</b> clearer guidance on how to determine the applicability of each natural hazard or the extent to which an assessment will need to address their respective effects;</p> <p><b>AND</b></p> <p>Having regard to the above, <b>provide</b> greater clarification in relation to the specific matters of discretion. In particular, the preparation of non-statutory natural hazard maps and more clear guidance on matters to be addressed in each respective assessment.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Demonstrating the relevance of the listed natural hazards to a development will be onerous for the applicant and the ambiguity is likely to result in delays in the statutory process resulting from differences in interpretation of the plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2147.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> all rules within the zone chapters that state ... “including liquefaction risk (refer to Chapter 15)”, as follows:</p> <p>... including liquefaction risk (refer Rule 15.12 Liquefaction to <del>Chapter 15</del>)</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Throughout the PWDP, "geotechnical suitability including liquefaction risk (refer to Chapter 15)" is referenced as a matter of discretion for restricted discretionary activities. Rule 15.12 of the PWDP outlines the matters to be addressed as part of a liquefaction risk assessment.</li> <li>• The provision refers to Chapter 15 in its entirety.</li> <li>• Chapter 15 is not solely related to liquefaction risk.</li> <li>• Specific reference to Rule 15.12 is required for the purposes of avoiding doubt and providing greater clarity to future resource consent applicants.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2147.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.12 Liquefaction approach to assessing effects of liquefaction to</p> <p>(a) Provide a high-level study to identify areas of likely liquefaction risk and that these are shown within a non-statutory overlay; and</p> <p>(b) Required detailed investigations into liquefaction risks for any proposed development within these identified areas.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Based on advice from submitter’s geotechnical engineer, it is understood that there are very few places within the Waikato District that would have the potential for liquefaction.</li> <li>• Requiring a liquefaction risk assessment despite low risk of geotechnical instability resulting from liquefaction will be onerous for any applicant seeking resource consent.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2147.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Flood Management
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> the Proposed Waikato District Plan approach to flooding risks to include</p> <p>(a) An acknowledgement of existing Catchment Management Plans</p> <p>(b) A catchment-wide management approach to stormwater management and flooding risks; and</p> <p>(c) Specific guidance on matters to be addressed in a flood hazard assessment.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Stormwater Catchment Management Plan (CMP) prepared for Pokeno developments by the submitter in partnership with Franklin District Council in 2010 provides a rigorous and robust solution to managing potential catchment stormwater and flooding risks.</li> <li>• Stage 2 and Variation 2 do not acknowledge existing catchment management plans.</li> <li>• Sets an expectation that flood plain management and flood ponding areas are identified and managed as part of separate plan changes or resource consent applications by a suitably qualified person.</li> <li>• Creating a “case by case” approach to addressing the impacts of land development and subdivision with no requirements to consider off- site or downstream impacts.</li> <li>• To ensure clear and effective management of flood hazards, a holistic approach to catchment management should be required.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2147.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	All maps
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> , at a minimum, non-statutory hazard maps showing areas that warrant detailed liquefaction investigations and flood assessments.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PDP references a number of hazard maps and overlays. It also notes the importance of high-quality and up to date information to manage natural hazards. However minimal hazard maps are provided in the PWDP.</li> <li>• Providing for hazard maps as non-statutory is important as it would allow the WDC to regularly update the hazard maps with new information without undertaking a plan change process every time.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2147.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 - Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development to provide greater guidance on how this policy is applied or the circumstances in which the specific requirements are provided.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy 15.2.3.1 requires an assessment of effects on climate change resulting from new subdivision and development where relevant without any guidance on its application.</li> <li>• Need greater clarification on how the policy is to be applied or the circumstances when the specific requirements are provided so the intent of the policy can be met.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2148	<b>Submitter:</b>	Craig & Lincoln Smith
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Terra Firma Resources Limited		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 67, Ngaruawahia, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand, 3742		

<b>Point Number</b>	2148.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the overall risk-based approach on which Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change is based.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The risk-based approach embodied in Chapter 15 is a well-understood and accepted means of managing actual risks posed by a hazard, including a natural hazard.

<b>Point Number</b>	2148.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Stage 2 Planning Maps for Huntly.
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the Defended Area notation on Terra Firma Resources Ltd (TFR) land south of Lake Puketirini, Huntly in Planning Maps. See submission for map of TFR land holdings.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The definition of 'Defended Area' refers to an area protected from flooding by a flood protection scheme.</li> <li>• The Defended Area shown on TFR's land is not protected via a flood protection scheme or stopbank and therefore the Defended Area is not relevant.</li> <li>• The land shown as a defended area is higher than the lake and foreshore and does not become inundated during high lake water level conditions. Therefore, submitter considers that the Defended Area notation on its land is incorrect and seeks that this is deleted from the planning maps.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2149	<b>Submitter:</b>	Lucy Deverall
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Horticulture New Zealand		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 10232, The Terrace, Wellington, New Zealand, 6143		

<b>Point Number</b>	2149.1
---------------------	--------

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.1 - - Resilience to natural hazard risk to read</p> <p><u>(a)A resilient community where the risks from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment from subdivision, use and development of land are avoided or appropriately mitigated; and</u></p> <p><u>(b)Who are able to undertake appropriate use and development in order to respond to climate change. For instance, provide water storage, or undertake different types of primary production and the practices that may support primary production.</u></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The purpose of the plan change is to address natural hazards and climate change.</li> <li>• The objective should be amended to address community resilience to respond to climate natural hazards on change.</li> <li>• Horticulture is highly vulnerable to the effects of climate change.</li> <li>• Horticulture has been identified as a land-use that supports reduced emissions.</li> <li>• Practices like water storage and covered cropping will be critical to enable the ongoing operation and development of the industry in the face of climate change.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.9 - Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some growers will utilise vegetated buffer strips along riparian margins where it is appropriate to do so.</li> <li>• Vegetated buffers need to be carefully managed on horticultural land to avoid disruption to crop roots or pest and weed incursions.</li> <li>• Any enhancement of existing buffers on horticulture land needs to be suitable to the horticultural operation and may not be appropriate in every instance.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.14 – Definitions so that the definition of farm building excludes artificial crop protection structures, **AND**

**Amend** Chapter 13 Definitions so the definition of earthworks excludes ancillary rural earthworks, **AND**

**Add** new provisions in 15.2.1.10 – Areas defended by stopbanks adjacent to the Waikato River for artificial crop protection structures and exclude artificial crop protection structures from controls for building coverage, setbacks and daylight angles.

- Decision Reasons:**
- Submitter lodged submissions and evidence to Stage 1 opposing the definitions of buildings and earthworks.
  - Submitter supports s42A reports recommending adopting a definition of building from the National Planning Standards but retains submission point to include a suite of provisions specific to artificial crop protection structures.
  - Artificial crop protection structures are unlikely to be subject to material damage but are critical for fruit.

**Point Number** 2149.4

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.12

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** 15.2.1.12 - Reduce potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains and flood ponding areas - exclusions (i)-(iii), **AND**

**Amend** 15.14 – Definitions so that the definition of farm building excludes artificial crop protection structures.

- Decision Reasons:**
- Submitter supports exclusions listed in (i) - (iii).
  - The majority of non-habitable farm buildings are unlikely to result in material damage during a flood. These structures are unlikely to be subject to material damage.
  - HortNZ supports providing for minor additions and allowing larger additions where risks can be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

**Point Number** 2149.5

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.1.15

**Late:** NO



<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.15 - Flood ponding areas and overland flow paths.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports this policy applying to new subdivision and development only.</li> <li>• Horticulture cropping is a land use managed through audited farm plans which applies a risk-based approach to ensuring appropriate practices to improve environmental outputs.</li> <li>• It is also subject to the Regional Plan and other rules within the PDP which are effective in the management of the matters addressed in this policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.2(a)(i)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.2(a)(i) - Future land use planning and climate change to read: ... effects on indigenous biodiversity (inland migration), <u>food security</u> , historic heritage, Maaori Sites...
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A rapidly change, volatile climatic world has real risks for New Zealand's long-term food security.</li> <li>• Food security is fundamental to ensuring the physical, mental, social, cultural and economic wellbeing of local communities.</li> <li>• This should be recognised in the policy.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 by adding new provisions to Policy 15.2.3.4 - Provide for artificial crop protection structures and exclude artificial crop protection structures from building overage, setback and daylight angle controls as sought in Appendix 3 of the evidence of Ms Wharfe  <b>AND</b>  <b>Amend</b> 15.2.3.4 - Provide sufficient setbacks for new development so that setback from waterbodies controls as sought in Appendix 3 of the evidence of Ms Wharfe.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This policy should only apply to development.</li> <li>• Cultivation of land is a necessary function of outdoor horticulture.</li> <li>• Submitter would oppose this policy and setbacks from applying to any artificial crop protection structures.</li> <li>• Artificial crop structures are unlikely to have any implications on the listed considerations in (b)(i)-(v).</li> <li>• Applying significant setbacks to cultivation / land use would render productive land unproductive.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P4 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Permitted Activities to read</p> <p>(1) Construction of <del>an a non-habitable</del> accessory building <del>without a floor</del>;</p> <p>(2) Construction of a farm building <del>without a floor</del>.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	S32 report does not provide a rationale for distinguishing between farm buildings with and without a floor. No sufficient analysis on the difference between habitable and non-habitable buildings. Submitter uncertain of the difference in level of risk between a farm building with and without a floor.
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	14.4.1 P8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 14.4.1 P8 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Permitted Activities on the condition that the definition of earthworks in Chapter 13 Definitions is amended to exclude ancillary rural earthworks.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Support conditional to the definition of earthworks being amended to exclude ancillary rural earthworks.
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.10

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.2 RDI Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Restricted Discretionary Activities on the condition that the definition of earthworks in Chapter 13 Definitions is amended to exclude ancillary rural earthworks.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Support conditional to the definition of earthworks being amended to exclude ancillary rural earthworks.
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 D3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	Adopt changes sought in HortNZ's submission to Stage 1 relating to hazardous substances and in the evidence of Ms Wharfe to Hearing 8A,  AND  <b>Amend</b> the definition of hazardous facility in Chapter 13 Definitions.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Opposes hazardous facilities definition which would include a tractor quad bike with a spay tank with agrichemicals, making the whole farm a hazardous facility.
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 P2, and Chapter 13 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.1 P2 High Risk Flood Area, Permitted Activities to read  (1) Construction of <del>an a non-habitable</del> accessory building <del>without a floor</del> ;  (2) Construction of a farm building <del>without a floor</del> .

AND

**Amend** Chapter 13 Definitions so that the definition of a farm building excludes artificial crop protection structures,

AND

**Adopt** other changes sought in HortNZ's submission to Stage 1 relating to buildings, particularly artificial crop protection structures.

**Decision Reasons:**

S32 report does not provide a rationale for distinguishing between farm buildings with and without a floor. Submitter uncertain of the difference in level of risk between a farm building with and without a floor. Considers design and materials of artificial crop protection means they pose minimal risk in event of a natural hazard.

**Point Number** 2149.13

**Plan Chapter** 15.5.2 RD2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.5.2 RD2 High Risk Flood Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities to read:

One addition to a lawfully established habitable building existing at [*the date this rule becomes operative*], where the addition does not increase the ground floor area of the existing habitable building by more than 15m<sup>2</sup>, unless provided for in Rule 15.5.2 RDI.

**Decision Reasons:** See 2149.19 - Matters relating to farm buildings with floors, or none and habitable buildings versus non-habitable buildings.

**Point Number** 2149.14

**Plan Chapter** 15.5.4 NCI

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.5.4 NCI High Risk Flood Area, Non-Complying Activities to read:

Construction of a new habitable building or additions to an existing habitable building, not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 PI – P2 or Rule 15.5.2 RDI and RD2.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	See 2149.19 - Matters relating to farm buildings with or without floors and habitable buildings versus non-habitable buildings.
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.1 Defended Area (Residual Risk), Permitted Activities on the condition that changes requested in submissions are adopted.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports the permitted activity status on condition of adopting changes in the submissions.
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.3 DI Defended Area (Residual Risk), Discretionary Activities to read:  Construction of a new <u>habitable</u> building or new accessory building, located within...
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	See 2149.19 - Matters relating to farm buildings with or without floors and habitable buildings versus non-habitable buildings.
<b>Point Number</b>	2149.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 13 Definitions, and Rule 15.6.3.D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.3 D2 and Chapter 13 Definitions so that the definition of earthworks excludes ancillary rural earthworks.

*Note: potentially out of scope.*

**Decision Reasons:** Submitter lodged submissions Stage 1 requesting definition of earthworks be amended. Ancillary rural earthworks are critical to the day-to-day operation of horticultural activities. A 50m setback would render high class soil and highly productive land unproductive.

**Point Number** 2149.18

**Plan Chapter** Rule 15.13.1 Information requirements for all resource consent applications addressing natural hazards

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.13.1 Information requirements for all resource consent applications addressing natural hazards, **AND**

**Amend** Chapter 13 Definitions so that the definition of earthworks excludes ancillary rural earthworks, **AND**

Adopt changes sought elsewhere in the submission relating to farm buildings or habitable/non-habitable buildings.

**Decision Reasons:** Support is conditional to the adoption of the recommended changes in the submission.

**Point Number** 2149.19

**Plan Chapter** Rule 15.13.4 Information requirements

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.13.4 Information requirements for all resource consent applications addressing natural hazards, Defended Areas, **AND**

**Amend** Chapter 13 Definitions so that the definition of earthworks excludes ancillary rural earthworks, **AND**

Adopt changes sought elsewhere in the submission relating to farm buildings or habitable/non-habitable buildings.

**Decision Reasons:** Support is conditional to the adoption of the recommended changes in the submission.

<b>Point Number</b>	2149.20
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions – Farm building
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.14 definition for farm building to read:  For the purposes of Chapter 15, means a building that supports the primary use of the site for farming. It excludes residential units <u>and artificial crop protection structures</u> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The design and nature of artificial crop protection structures means they pose very little risk in event of a natural hazard.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2150	<b>Submitter:</b>	Meremere Dragway Incorporated
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand, 2340		

<b>Point Number</b>	2150.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps – 7 Tuakau/Pokeno and Environs Maps – 8 Whangamarino
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> the Floodplain Management Area over the land that is protected by Meremere West Drainage Area and map the land as a Defended Area,  AND  <b>Any</b> consequential amendments as required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meremere West Drainage Area (not operative) is protected from Waikato River flooding by Lower Waikato Waipa Control Scheme stopbank and is drained by two pumpstations. Therefore, falls within Chapter 15.4 definition of "Defended Area". Defended Area consistent with the zoning of land protected by the Meremere East Drainage Area.</li> </ul>

- Better recognises role of flood protection and drainage schemes. Level of control over activities better correlates with the level of risk.

A copy of the Land Drainage Management Plan (29 August 2019) is attached to the original submission.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2151	<b>Submitter:</b>	Waikato-Tainui Te Kauhanganui Incorporated
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 648, Waikato Mail Centre, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3240		
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Generic All Points		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Align</b> Stage 2 with submitters positioned as contained in submissions on Stage 1		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the risk-based approach and avoidance of increasing risk to significant natural hazards, as it aligns with the direction set out in the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan (WTEP).		
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 1.4.2.3(x) and (xi)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 Amendments, Chapter 1.4.2.3(x) and (xi) Introduction, Economic Growth, Challenges,		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the heightened reference to challenges posed by natural hazards and climate change.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.3		



<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 1.4.4(c)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Variation 2 Amendments, Chapter 1.4.4(c) Introduction, The Urban Environment to include a reference to river communities in the last sentence.  ... particularly coastal hazards and flooding, will require management through appropriate mitigation and adaptation over time, taking into consideration projected sea level rise and other climate change factors; and river communities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Ensure clear direction is set for hazard assessment in regard to river communities ahead of subdivision land use and development.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 1.5.2(b)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Variation 2 amendments, Chapter 1.5.2(b) Planning for urban growth and development last sentence to read:  <del>However, when preparing structure plans or spatial plans for developing urban land, consideration of carrying out growth planning, structure planning and master planning,</del> the risk posed by natural hazards such as flooding, land instability, coastal hazards and liquefaction will be <del>important</del> <b>addressed</b> to ensure that the land is suitable for the type of development proposed and avoids increased risk from natural hazards.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Ensure hazard assessments are carried out when Council is planning for growth in all instances, and levels.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 1.12.8(d)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendment to Chapter 1.12.8(d) Introduction, Strategic objectives.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the development and inclusion of a strategic objective. This will provide higher order guidance and provide for a degree of alignment with Stage 1 provisions. Any particular feedback will be addressed at submission stage.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1 Introduction to include an overview commentary of where each hazard area is located in regard to affected communities (towns and villages) and Maaori Freehold Land and Marae,</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Add</b> in section 32 report a breakdown of affected Maaori Freehold Land and how this land is affected.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Introduction sections provides useful context, however it does not currently give an overview of the communities, or iwi, hapuu, Maaori Freehold Land and Marae affected by the hazard areas.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.1 – Resilience to natural hazard risk.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Consistent with Method (a) of Policy 17.3.1.1 of the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan. The Waikato-Tainui 5-year plan, Te Ara Whakatupuranga 2050, identifies the need to support whanau to respond to climate change impacts on marae through the implementation of climate change mitigation plans. These plans will also aid in achieving this objective.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.1 - New development in areas at significant risk from natural hazards.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Consistent with Method (a) of Policy 17.3.1.1 of the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.2 - Changes to existing land use activities and development in areas at significant risk from natural hazards.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Consistent with Policy 7.3.2.1 of the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.3 - New emergency services and hospitals in areas at significant risk from natural hazards.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Emergency services and hospitals are essential lifelines for communities and Waikato-Tainui hapuu and whanau. These services should be directed away from areas subject to a significant risk. The exceptions provided for are generally suitable.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.4(a) to reference avoidance rather than enablement.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This policy generally aligns with Policy 26.3.5.1 of the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan. However, referring to 'avoid' would be more consistent with the direction set for other activities in high risk areas.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 - Protection from risks of coastal hazards.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The preference for soft hazard protection works over hard protection structures is consistent with the direction established in the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.8 - Limitations on hard protection works for coastal hazard mitigation to include Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Support the inclusion of not transferring risk to people, the natural environment or historic heritage. Generally consistent with Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan but should reference Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance as these are mapped features in the PDP.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.2.1 - Natural hazard risk information.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Aligning efforts with other parties is key, particularly Regional Council and iwi. Waikato-Tainui 5-year plan, Te Ara Whakatupuranga 2050, includes the development of Marae Plans which are intended to address climate change and natural hazards.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.2.2 - Awareness of Community Response Plans.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Waikato-Tainui 5-year plan, Te Ara Whakatupuranga 2050, includes the development of Marae Plans which are intended to address climate change and natural hazards. Council efforts towards implementing this policy, should actively include Waikato-Tainui to incorporate and where possible align with iwi and marae response plans.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.3 - Climate change.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	A well-prepared community is of key importance. Supportive of collaborating with Council to respond to climate change.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.3.1 - Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development to clarify if it applies to current or future mapping,

AND

**Amend** Policy 15.2.3.1 - to refer to an RCP 8.5 scenario if future mapping for hazard identification applies,

OR

A worst-case scenario could be communicated in regard to implementing awareness and education rather than within planning maps per se.

**Decision Reasons:** Unclear if this policy is reflective, and hence supportive, of the existing identified hazard areas and associated technical reporting.

**Point Number** 2151.18

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.3.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Policy 15.2.3.2 (a) - to read

(a) Increase the ability of the community to adapt to the effects of climate change when undertaking future land use planning by:

(i) ~~ensuring~~ ~~Taking into consideration~~ the potential environmental and social costs of climate change, including effects on indigenous biodiversity (inland migration), historic heritage, Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance, mahinga kai, public health and safety, public access to the coast and waterway margins, and the built environment are addressed.

(ii) encouraging the incorporation of sustainable design measures within new subdivision, landuse and development, including:

(C) efficient water storage for re-use;

(D) provision of renewable energy generation; and

(E) transferring to activities with lower greenhouse gas emissions.

(iii) providing ongoing monitoring of changes to the environment due to climate change; ~~and~~

(iv) facilitating community discussion on adaptive pathways to manage the risks associated with climate change, including matters addressed in Policy 3.2.1(e), and incorporating them, where appropriate, into the district plan through plan changes.

(v) Raising community awareness of worst-case scenarios associated with climate change,

AND

**Add new clause (b) to Policy 15.2.3.2** - to include reference to the need to investigate and establish funding for adaptation efforts, including reference to Maaori Freehold Land and a reference to Council encouraging further direction and support from central government.

**Decision Reasons:**

- 'taking into consideration' is not strong enough.
- Method (b) of Policy 17.3.3.1 of the Waikato-Tainui Environmental Plan directs the management of the effects of climate change.
- Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance should be specifically referenced in the policy for avoidance of doubt.
- Support low impact design in all development and this should not simple be limited to new land use and development and should be considered against those proposal increasing the scale and intensity of land use.
- Peak and worst-case scenario modelling should be considered given uncertainty around scale and extent of the effects of climate change.

**Point Number** 2151.19

**Plan Chapter** • 15.4.1

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Add** to Rule 15.4.1 a permitted / controlled activity to enable earthworks for the establishment and re-instatement of wetland habitat and creation of eel and whitebait habitat.

**Decision Reasons:** Better aligns the proposed plan change with the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River (Te Ture Whaimana). Such structures do not generally increase risk of natural hazards and would assist in managing adverse effects of natural hazards.

**Point Number** 2151.20

**Plan Chapter** 15.11

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> 15.11 Mine Subsidence Risk Area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports ongoing investigation into mine subsidence in the Huntly area. Further investigation will clarify future land use in this area.
<b>Point Number</b>	2151.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> to s32 reporting on 15.13 Information requirements - the financial cost of preparing detailed assessments.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	General support of the approach having detailed information requirements. Concerned about the costs to the development of Maori land.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2152	<b>Submitter:</b>	Juliet & Ian Sunde
<b>Address:</b>	126 Travers Road, RD2, Te Kauwhata, New Zealand,3782		
<b>Point Number</b>	2152.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 14.1 Te Kauwhata West		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> the Environmental Protection Policy Area to the New Plain at 126 Travers Road, Te Kauwhata (Planning map 14.1). See submission for highlighted map.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Natural water flow, stormwater and flooding coming from the subdivision. History of 30 years of flooding. EPPA covers half submitter's property.		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2153	<b>Submitter:</b>	Cindy & Phillip Quilty
--------------------------	------	-------------------	------------------------



<b>Address:</b>	170 Hakanoa Street, Huntly, New Zealand,3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2153.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1 Introduction, and 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1(12) Introduction so that the title ("residual risk area") only applies to sections that are to be developed.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This title should only be applied to sections that are due to be developed.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2153.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1 Introduction, and 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1(9) and (12) Introduction so that only properties that show risk using 2D flood modelling have proposed hazard applied.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Only properties that show risk using 2D flood modelling have proposed hazard applied.		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2154	<b>Submitter:</b>	Joytishna Arti Devi
<b>Address:</b>	56 Fifth Avenue, Enderley, Hamilton, New Zealand,3217		
<b>Point Number</b>	2154.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas		
<b>Late:</b>	YES		

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> 15.4 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> Waikato District Council to take responsibility, <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> Waikato District Council to assess potential risk to submitter's property, <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> stopbank to protect land and house.</p> <p><i>Note: submitter has ticked that they could gain an advantage in trade competition.</i></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Land to be protected and subdivided, and reduce the flood damage to property and people's safety. Questions whether land can be used for development. Potential difficulty in selling land because of potential risk.

<b>Point Number</b>	2154.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk)
<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk), <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> relocation of building and structure on submitters property if risk is too bad, <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> Waikato District Council to undertake relocation of building and structure on submitters property, if there is a high risk of flooding even after a stopbank has been developed, <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Add</b> Waikato District Council to subdivide submitter's land</p> <p><i>Note: submitter has ticked that they could gain an advantage in trade competition.</i></p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Land to be protected and subdivided, and reduce the flood damage to property and people's safety. Questions whether land can be used for development. Potential difficulty in selling land because of potential risk.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2155	<b>Submitter:</b>	Vivienne H de Thierry
<b>Address:</b>	4 Amo Street, Te Kauwhata, New Zealand,3710		

<b>Point Number</b>	2155.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3(a) DI and D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.3(a) restrictions of placement of new building within 50 meters of a stop-bank.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The proposed rules would restrict earthworks and placement of buildings; and restrict potential use of submitters land to build on or develop further.

<b>Point Number</b>	2155.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Defended Area rules.
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> current Defended Area rule.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Identifies the current flood risk area but doesn't restrict development.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2156	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ben Wilson
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game		
<b>Address:</b>	156 Brymer Road, RD9, Hamilton, New Zealand,3289		

<b>Point Number</b>	2156.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9 - Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.9 - Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Wetlands are biodiversity hotspots and play a crucial role in environmental regulation. Wetlands have become a threatened ecosystem now covering only 1% of New Zealand land mass.
<b>Point Number</b>	2156.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> a new paragraph to Rule 15.4.1 P4 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Permitted Activities to read  <u>(3) Construction of a maimai with a minimum floor level at least 0.5m above the 1% AEP flood level,</u>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The right to build, tag and use maimai is fundamental to duck shooting.</li> <li>• Waikato Regional Plan permits use, erection, reconstruction, placement, alteration or extension of a maimai or structure for the purpose of gamebird hunting, subject to rules on floor area and height.</li> <li>• Maimais also allowed in Waikato Coastal Plan and Auckland Unitary Plan as permitted activities.</li> <li>• Wetland maintenance, restoration and enhancement is vital. Core principle of wetland restoration is first restoring hydrology, which usually involves earthworks.</li> <li>• Seeks to include earthworks ancillary to a conservation activity as a permitted activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2156.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P8 and P9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> a new P8 Rule to 15.4.1 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Permitted Activities to read  P8 <u>Earthworks ancillary to a conservation activity, AND</u>

**Amend** Rule 15.4.1 P8 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Permitted Activities to read

~~P8-P9~~ Earthworks not provided for under Rule 15.4.1 P6 or P 7-8.

**Decision Reasons:**

The core principle of any wetland restoration work is that hydrology must be restored first. For AWFG's wetlands this usually involved the construction of stopbanks, weirs, canals, and ponds via earthworks. Restrictions on earthworks could restrict the restoration of wetlands.

**Submitter Number:** 2157 **Submitter:** Lorraine Webber

**On behalf of:** Lorraine Webber, John Lenihan, Michael Rodger, Alex KirbyLo

**Address:** 46A Robe Street, New Plymouth, New Zealand, 4310

**Point Number** 2157.1

**Plan Chapter** Map 23.4 Raglan East, Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Map 23.4 Raglan East to remove current mapping of Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion), and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation), at 4316 State Highway 23, Raglan.

**Decision Reasons:** Concerned that scoping for erosion and inundation on property at 4316 State Highway 23, Raglan was an automated exercise, while a detailed analysis was undertaken at Raglan Town. Do not agree with approach, as it is not equitable and there is a strong likelihood of "massively over conservative" analysis.

**Point Number** 2157.2

**Plan Chapter** 26.49A Coastal Zone Rules (Operative District Plan)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Revisit** the current 100m setback in Rule 26.49A Coastal Zone Rules, Coastal building setbacks in ODP.

**Decision Reasons:** Concern about the scope for erosion and inundation on the property (4316 State Highway 23, Raglan) In light of points at 2157.1 wishes to revisit the current 100 metres setback in the current district plan.

**Submitter Number:** 2158 **Submitter:** Sherry Coulson

**On behalf of:** Peninsula Farm Ltd

**Address:** 9 Nihinihi Avenue, Raglan, New Zealand,3225

**Point Number** 2158.1

**Plan Chapter** Rule 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) to allow property owner of 7 Nihinihi Avenue, Raglan to strengthen and maintain existing sea wall.

**Decision Reasons:** Protect land and sea from erosion.

**Point Number** 2158.2

**Plan Chapter** Rule 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) to allow property owner of 9 Nihinihi Avenue, Raglan to strengthen and maintain seawall if Waikato District Council will not do so for any reasons.

**Decision Reasons:** Protect land and sea from erosion.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2159	<b>Submitter:</b>	Rebecca Chell
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Murray Henderson		
<b>Address:</b>	90 Mahuta Station Road, RDI, Huntly, New Zealand,3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2159.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, and 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata to <b>Delete</b> Flood Ponding Area overlay from 232 Ginn Road, Huntly, <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Delete</b> Defended Area overlay from 232 Ginn Road, Huntly.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not accept property being a part of Stage 2.</li> <li>• Property has swamp flat which flash floods from time to time, but submitter has management in place, and it does not cause erosion or danger.</li> <li>• Wants to continue to clean drains with machinery.</li> <li>• There is a stop-bank on the property, which is managed by submitter.</li> <li>• Undertaken 40 years of work to manage weather events and control natural hazards and storms</li> <li>• Invested in drainage and stop-bank systems to manage water on the Awaroa Stream and within property.</li> <li>• Farming and earthworks allow business to be economical and supply 7 families.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2159.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, and 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata to <b>Delete</b> Flood Ponding Area overlay from 230 Ginn Road, Huntly, <b>AND</b></p> <p><b>Delete</b> Defended Area overlay from 230 Ginn Road, Huntly.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not accept property being a part of Stage 2.</li> </ul>		

- Property has swamp flat which flash floods from time to time, but submitter has management in place, and it does not cause erosion or danger.
- Wants to continue to clean drains with machinery.
- There is a stop-bank on the property, which is managed by submitter.
- Undertaken 40 years of work to manage weather events and control natural hazards and storms.
- Invested in drainage and stop-bank systems to manage water on the Awaroa Stream and within property.
- Farming and earthworks allow business to be economical and supply 7 families.

<b>Point Number</b>	2159.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, and 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata to <b>delete</b> Flood Ponding Area line from 698 Hakarimata Road, Huntly, <b>AND</b>  <b>Delete</b> Defended Area line from 698 Hakarimata Road, Huntly.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not accept property being a part of Stage 2. Property has a stream which flash floods perhaps every 2 years, but submitter has management in place, and it does not cause erosion or danger.</li> <li>• Discourages development.</li> <li>• Wants to continue to clean drains with machinery.</li> <li>• There is a stop-bank on the property, which is managed by submitter. Invested in drainage and system to manage water on property.</li> <li>• Farming and earthworks allow business to be economical and supply 7 families.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2159.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, and 15.5 High Risk Flood Area, and 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata to <b>delete</b> High Risk Flood Area line from 698 Hakarimata Road, Huntly, <b>AND</b>  <b>Delete</b> Flood Ponding Area line from 698 Hakarimata Road, Huntly (as per 2159.3), <b>AND</b>



<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Defended Area line from 698 Hakarimata Road, Huntly (as per 2159.3).
	Submitter believes hazard indicators will devalue properties by creating uncertainty. Wishes to subdivide and build properties on site. Considers evidence is not conclusive, and changes are being forced upon them, limiting properties potential.
<b>Point Number</b>	2159.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata - Defended Area (Residual Risk)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata to <b>delete</b> Defended Area line from 83 Mahuta Station Road, Huntly
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not accept property being a part of Stage 2.</li> <li>• There is a stop-bank on the property, which is managed by submitter.</li> <li>• Undertaken 40 years of work to manage weather events and control natural hazards and storms. Invested in drainage and stop-bank systems to manage water on the Awaroa Stream and within property.</li> <li>• Farming and earthworks allow business to be economical and supply 7 families.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2159.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Defended Area (Residual Risk)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata to delete Flood Ponding Area line from 116 Mahuta Station Road, Huntly <b>AND</b>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> Defended Area line from 116 Mahuta Station Road, Huntly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not accept property being a part of Stage 2. Property flash floods from time to time on the bottom flats, but submitter has management in place, and it does not cause erosion or danger. Wants to continue to clean drains with machinery. There is a stop-bank on the property, which is managed by submitter.</li> <li>• Undertaken 40 years of work to manage weather events and control natural hazards and storms. Invested in drainage and stop-bank systems to manage water on the Awaroa Stream and Lake Waahi and within property.</li> <li>• Farming and earthworks allow business to be economical and supply 7 families.</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2159.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20 Hakarimata - Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas, Defended Area (Residual Risk)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20 Hakarimata to <b>delete</b> Flood Ponding Area line from submitters property on Weavers Crossing Road, Huntly <b>AND</b>  <b>Delete</b> Defended Area line from submitter's property on Weavers Crossing Road, Huntly.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not accept property being a part of Stage 2. Property flash floods perhaps every 2 – 3 years on the bottom flats, but submitter has management in place, and it does not cause erosion or danger. Wants to continue to clean drains with machinery.</li> <li>• There is a stop-bank on the property, which is managed by submitter. Invested in drainage and systems to manage water on the property.</li> <li>• Farming and earthworks allow business to be economical and supply 7 families.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2160	<b>Submitter:</b>	Vianney Friskney
<b>Address:</b>	PDC, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand, 2695		
<b>Point Number</b>	2160.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast).		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Chapter 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast).		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Chapter 15.7 is an added restriction and cost to any change the submitter would like on their property. (The map attached to the submission shows a property at 14 Coombes Road Te Kowhai and is subject to the flood plain management area only.)		
<b>Point Number</b>	2160.2		

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Chapter 15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Chapter 15.8 is an added restriction and cost to any changes submitter would like to make to their property (The map attached to the submission shows a property at 14 Coombes Road, Te Kowhai and is subject to the flood plain management area only.)

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2161	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jonathan Beaglehole
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Dilworth Trust Board		
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand, 1140		

<b>Point Number</b>	2161.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Chapter 15.1 Introduction paragraphs 1 to 10, and paragraphs 12 to 18 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Except for Chapter 15.1 paragraph 11 the Dilworth Trust Board supports this introduction as notified.

<b>Point Number</b>	2161.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1 Paragraph 11 by deleting the last sentence as follows:

... Other 1% AEP ponding areas will be required to be identified by a suitably-qualified and experienced professional as part of an application for resource consent or a plan change....

**Decision Reasons:**

It is inappropriate to require applicants to identify the extent of 1% AEP ponding areas outside of mapped areas, and considers that the requirement is unclear and would unreasonably add to the time and expense involved in determining the resource consent requirements under Chapter 15 of the Proposed District Plan.

**Point Number**

2161.3

**Plan Chapter**

15.2

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Retain** section 15.2 objectives and policies as notified, except as in other submissions.

**Decision Reasons:**

Except Policy 15.2.1.15, the Dilworth Trust Board supports the Objectives and Policies as notified.

**Point Number**

2161.4

**Plan Chapter**

15.2.1.15

**Late:**

NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:**

Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:**

**Amend** Policy 15.2.1.15(a) as follows:

(a)...Manage stormwater hazards by requiring new subdivision and development within flood ponding areas ~~and overland flow paths~~ to adopt integrated catchment plan-based stormwater management methods which...

**Decision Reasons:**

- The first reference to overland flow paths within this policy should be deleted as the District Plan does not identify the location of Overland Flow Paths.
- The “trigger” to assess effects of subdivision and development on the function and capacity of overland flow paths is contained within the Matters of Discretion for earthworks within the Flood Plain Management Area or Flood Ponding Area that are not a permitted activity (Rule 15.4.1 P6, P7 or P8), as opposed to a defined area on the Planning Maps.

**Point Number**

2161.5

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.3 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth supports this rule as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 as notified where the rule applies to the mapped Flood Plain Management areas and Flood Ponding Areas that are mapped, subject to other submission.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports Rule as it applies to the mapped Flood Plain Management and Flood Ponding Areas that are mapped in the District Plan.
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1.(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 Permitted Activities (a) as follows:  (a) The activities listed below are permitted activities within the Flood Plain Management Area <u>or the Flood Ponding Area</u> shown on the Planning Maps <del>or in a Flood Ponding Area</del> , if they meet the activity-specific conditions set out in this table.  (b)...
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The submission states that the rule needs to be amended to clarify that the permitted activity rule only applies only to the Flood Plain Management Area <u>or the Flood Ponding Area</u> shown on the Planning Maps. It is inappropriate and unreasonable to require applicants to identify the extent of the 1% AEP ponding areas outside the

mapped areas; and that the drafting of the rule would require an applicant to obtain technical expertise to determine whether or not the associated rule applies to them.

**Point Number** 2161.8

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.4.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities to the extent that the rule is only applied to the mapped Flood Plain Management and Flood Ponding Areas in the district plan.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Dilworth support Rule 15.4.2 provided that the rule is only applied to the mapped Flood Plain Management and Flood Ponding Areas in the district plan.
- It is inappropriate and unreasonable to require applicants to identify the extent of the 1% AEP ponding areas outside the mapped areas.

**Point Number** 2161.9

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.2.(a)

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.4.2 (a) as follows:

(a) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities within the Flood Plain Management Area or the Flood Ponding Area shown on the Planning Maps ~~or in a Flood Ponding Area.~~

**Decision Reasons:** It is inappropriate and unreasonable to apply this rule outside of the mapped areas.

**Point Number** 2161.10

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.2 and 15.4.3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.3 Discretionary Activities so that the activities identified in D1, D2 and D3 of Rule 15.4.3 are provided for as restricted discretionary activities under Rule 15.4.2
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Default discretionary activity status requiring applicants to undertake a full assessment of the effects, which in context of flooding is unnecessary.</li> <li>• A restricted discretionary activity status is more appropriate as it will reducing the scale complexity and cost of the resource consent application process; and is consistent with the policies relating to the Flood Plain Management and Flood Ponding Area.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.5 High Risk Flood Area as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth supports 15.5 as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.6 Defended Area (Residual Risk) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth supports section 15.6 as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.12 Liquefaction (whole section) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth supports section 15.12 as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.13
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 15.13 Information Requirements for all resource consent applications addressing natural hazards (whole section) as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth supports section 15.13 as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> section 15.14 Definitions as notified, except the definition of 'Flood Ponding Area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Except the definition of 'Flood Ponding Area, Dilworth supports the definitions as notified.
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Flood Ponding Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.14 Definitions Flood Ponding Area as follows:  Means an area shown on the planning maps as an identified flood ponding area <del>or an area</del> that experiences floodwater ponding in a 1% AEP rainfall event.



<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth is opposed to the Flood Ponding Area being applied to areas not identified on the Planning Maps.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.17		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 as notified.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth supports Variation 2 as notified.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2161.18		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Planning Maps		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the Planning Maps as notified, as they relate to the Rural Campus site at 500 Lyons Road, Mangatawhiri.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Dilworth supports the planning maps for Stage 2 and Variation 2 because the planning maps, as notified, do not identify any overlays for natural hazards at the Rural Campus site.		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2162	<b>Submitter:</b>	Glenn & Marion Hunter
<b>Address:</b>	211 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand,2695		
<b>Point Number</b>	2162.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 11.1 Port Waikato to remove Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from the property located at 211 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The residence would never be affected by the sea because it is 40 metres above sea level and 35 metres above the road level; with a gully and a high ridge cliff, on a rock base, between the coast and the residences.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2163	<b>Submitter:</b>	Peter Scott
<b>On behalf of:</b>	P & T Boyle, R Youmans, P & S Scott, W Sutton, I Farrelly		
<b>Address:</b>	106G Greenslade Road, Raglan, New Zealand,3295		

<b>Point Number</b>	2163.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.4 Raglan East - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 23.4 to remove High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area from the properties located at 104C, 104B, 106G, 106H, 106J Greenslade Road, Raglan OR amend Area to a more realistic and less encroaching estimation in line with a 1:1 gradient.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The current boundary line is too aggressive, lacks the evidence that support the erosions assumptions, will lower property values; impact on insurability and does not take into account location, existing and potential for future mitigation, planting; drainage and stormwater management.</li> <li>• Submission includes discussion of location, mitigation of erosion, stakeholder benefits and future plans. (See letters attached to submission).</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2164	<b>Submitter:</b>	Amanda & Max Ravlich
<b>Address:</b>	564D Horotiu Road, Te Kowhai, Hamilton, New Zealand,3288		

<b>Point Number</b>	2164.1
---------------------	--------

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.2 - Flood Plain Management Area		
<b>Late:</b>	YES		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 26.2 Te Kowhai so that Flood Plain Management Area does not affect property located at 564D Horotiu Road		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter advised by Waikato District Council that the map showing their property is incorrect; and that the building platform on subject site is elevated so not vulnerable to flooding.</li> <li>• Submitter does not want incorrect data on an LIM report for their property as it may affect their property insurance.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2165	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jade McCormack
<b>Address:</b>	154 Maunsell Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand,2695		

<b>Point Number</b>	2165.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area -Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)		
<b>Late:</b>	YES		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) from Map 11.1 Port Waikat.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measurements taken were improvised and inconsistent.</li> <li>• Current cause of erosion is still under investigation, possible causes poor infrastructure and drainage.</li> <li>• Submits there was no geotechnical data used to determine hazard areas and that there are discrepancies in the maps.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2166	<b>Submitter:</b>	Fraser & Rachel, Jacqueline, & Terence McNutt, Keelan-Peebles, & Peebles
<b>Address:</b>	3 Awatea Road, RD5, Whatawhata, New Zealand,3285		

<b>Point Number</b>	2166.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 26.3 Whatawhata - Flood Plain Management Area
<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 26.3 Whatawhata so that Flood Plain Management Area is removed entirely from property located at 3 Awatea Road.
	<b>AND</b>
	<b>Retain</b> a small portion of Flood Plain Management Area over 54 Bell Road. (Map provided – See Figure 1 of submission)
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The district plan hazard overlay is unlawful and does not reflect the built and consented environment; and has potential to impact on future site development, insurance premiums and house valuations.</li> <li>• The Council information supporting the Flood Plain Management Area is outdated and incorrect in respect of the property at Lot 36 DP 471385, 3 Awatea Road.</li> <li>• Large Culverts and stream realignments have occurred that should have been taken into account when overlaying a Flood Plain Management Area.</li> <li>• The geotechnical completion report for the site indicates the correct 100-year flood levels lie within the ambit of the finished stream alignment.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2167	<b>Submitter:</b>	Judi Gallagher
<b>Address:</b>	958 Horotiu Road, RD8, Hamilton, New Zealand,3288		

<b>Point Number</b>	2167.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 25 Waipa River - Flood Plain Management Area
<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Planning Map 25 Waipa River so that Flood Plain Management Area does not affect property located at 958 Horotiu Rd.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The maps should be drawn accurately. Communication from Council regarding this issue has been inadequate.

--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2168	<b>Submitter:</b>	Hayden Vink
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 101, Raglan, New Zealand,3265		
<b>Point Number</b>	2168.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> section 15.10 – High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) – so that there are sub-categories within each overlay, with different rules based on actual risk, e.g.:</p> <p>High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Open Coast'; High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Harbour; High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Tidal Inlet.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In respect of the subject property (Legal description PT ALLOT 244 KARIOI PSH BLK I KARIOI SD) the overlays should be based on detailed site surveys as opposed to high level modelling.</li> <li>• High Risk Coastal Hazard areas should be based on the level of risk relating to the geographic location of a site.</li> <li>• The High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) overlay area is a single generic and broad-brush overlay with generic rules that have a high level of uncertainty for the subject site. Sub-categories are needed that reflect the actual risk based on location.</li> </ul>		
<b>Point Number</b>	2168.2		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.3		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> rule 15.10.3, so that the construction of a new building within the area is a Restricted Discretionary Activity instead of the currently proposed Non-Complying Activity.</p>		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a risk to applying the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) and the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area overlays too broadly because these unnecessarily restrict activities even when consistent with zoning.</li> </ul>		

- A non-complying activity for the construction of a new building is unreasonable under the High Risk Coastal Hazard overlay.
- Council could have control over necessary factors if constructing a new building were a Restricted Discretionary Activity, as per the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) overlay rule.
- Consents already provide for buildings on site with appropriate designs and floor levels that both safeguard against any existing flooding risk, and future proof them for projected future inundation.

**Submitter Number:** 2169 **Submitter:** Jason Vink

**Address:** 5 Aroaro Lane, Raglan, New Zealand, 3225

**Point Number** 2169.1

**Plan Chapter** 15.10

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** section 15.10 – High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) – so that there are sub-categories within each overlay, with different rules based on actual risk, e.g.:

High-Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Open Coast'; High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Harbour; High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area – Tidal Inlet.

**Decision Reasons:**

- In respect of the subject property (Fee Simple I/I, Lot 3 DP 495766) the overlays should be based on detailed site surveys as opposed to high level modelling.
- High Risk Coastal Hazard areas should be based on the level of risk relating to the geographic location of a site.
- A non-complying activity for the construction of a new building is unreasonable under the High Risk Coastal Hazard overlay. Sub-categories are needed that reflect the actual risk based on location.

**Point Number** 2169.2

**Plan Chapter** 15.10.3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Oppose

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> rule 5.10.3 so that the construction of a new building within the area is a Restricted Discretionary Activity instead of the currently proposed Non-Complying Activity.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a risk that applying these overlays too broadly would unnecessarily restrict activities even when consistent with zoning.</li> <li>• It is unreasonable that under the High Risk Coastal Hazard overlay that the construction of a new building is a non-complying activity.</li> <li>• Council could have control over necessary factors if constructing a new building were a Restricted Discretionary Activity, as per the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) overlay rule.</li> <li>• The proposed rule is overly prohibitive. It is possible to manage future residential development through adjustment to the rules in the overlay.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2170	<b>Submitter:</b>	Kate & Andrew Dermer & McGregor
<b>On behalf of:</b>	The Raglan Collective Incorporated Society		
<b>Address:</b>	64 Wallis Street, Raglan, New Zealand,3225		

<b>Point Number</b>	2170.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7 15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> policies and rules as set out in Raglan Collective submission #2135, to allow maintenance, repair and upgrade (short of replacement) of existing coastal protection structures in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, having regard to the medium term intention for the development of adaptive management strategies.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seawall structures have existed in the Wallis Street and Lorenzen Bay areas, for decades and houses have been built in reliance on those structures. The structures are effective with positive effects. Seawalls will be a useful component of future adaptive management strategies.</li> <li>• Supports the use of adaptive management strategies, with the ability to protect the submission of the Raglan Collective is supported and seek the remedies it sets out. Submitter also agrees with appendix H of section 32 report that suggests seawalls might be a useful component of adaptive management strategies for Wallis Street in Raglan.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2171	<b>Submitter:</b>	Robyn Healey
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Philip Leather		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 286, Huntly, New Zealand,3740		

<b>Point Number</b>	2171.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Maps Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Delete</b> proposed hazard overlays mapped on properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9B River Downs, Rotoruna, Hamilton;</li> <li>• 516 Great South Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• 494 Great South Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• 492 Great South Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• Great South Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• 478 Great South Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• 4 Jackson Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• 101 Ohinewai South Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• 137 Ohinewai South Road, Huntly;</li> <li>• 40 George Drive, Huntly;</li> <li>• 6 Waugh Lane, Huntly; and,</li> <li>• 114 Riverview Road, Huntly,</li> </ul> <p>OR</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the relevant objectives, policies and rules, including all of Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change so they do not restrict the ability to undertake works on those properties</p> <p>AND</p> <p><b>Any</b> consequential relief to the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the above.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Opposes the proposed hazard overlays mapped on the specified properties, and in particular the provision that requires that subdivision, use and development be avoided within the hazard overlay areas.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2172	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jesse Gooding
--------------------------	------	-------------------	---------------



<b>On behalf of:</b>	Federated Farmers of New Zealand
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 447, Hamilton, New Zealand,3240
<b>Point Number</b>	2172.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 1.4.2.3(x) to(xi)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendments to chapter 1.4.2.3(x) and (xi)
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Acknowledges the need to recognise natural hazards and climate change as expressed in 1.4.2.3(x) and (xi); and submit in respect of 1.4.2.3(xi) that the impact of climate change will have a varied impact on settlements over time; and that these land uses should not be the subject of the same regulatory burden as those most at risk.
<b>Point Number</b>	2172.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 1.4.4(c)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendments to Chapter 1.4.4(c) The urban environment as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Acknowledges the impact natural hazards will have on the urban environment and any future development therein. Supports the intent of 1.4.4(c).
<b>Point Number</b>	2172.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 1.5.2(b)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendments to Chapter 1.5.2(b) Planning for urban growth and development as notified.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Where structure or spatial planning is necessary, due consideration should be given to the risk posed by natural hazards. Support inclusion of matters in 1.5.2(b).		
<b>Point Number</b>	2172.4		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 1.12.8(d)		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Variation 2 amendments to Chapter 1.12.8(d) Strategic directions and objectives for the district as notified.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Acknowledges WDC's responsibility to give weighting to the risk posed by natural hazards under higher order policy documents and to give particular regard to the effects of climate change under s7(i) of the RMA.		
<b>Point Number</b>	2172.5		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Variation 2 rules		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the Variation 2 matter of discretion for various activities requiring a controlled or restricted discretionary resource consent		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This deals with the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards, including liquefaction risk.</li> <li>• Considers the matter of discretion to be appropriate, provided the relief sought in the submission on Stage 2 is granted.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2173	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jesse Gooding
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 447, Hamilton, New Zealand,3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.1		
---------------------	--------	--	--

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the intent of Chapter 15.1 Introduction as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supports the risk-based approach, recognising that some activities or land uses are more susceptible to a natural hazard related event than others.</li> <li>• Strongly supportive of the approach taken to some rural activities, and agree that regulation should not unnecessarily restrict land use where there is an acceptable level of risk.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Objective 15.2.1 – Resilience to natural hazard risk as follows:</p> <p>A resilient community where the risks from natural hazards on people, property, infrastructure and the environment <del>from subdivision, use and development of land</del> are <u>appropriated identified and assessed to ensure they can</u> be avoided or appropriately mitigated.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadly supportive of aim of improving resilience to natural hazard risks and climate change disruptions.</li> <li>• The resilience of rural communities relies on a level of acceptable risk under which typical rural activities can be carried out.</li> <li>• Identify and assess natural hazard risks without imposing unnecessary restrictions on rural land owners and their communities.</li> <li>• The primary concerns for natural hazard management are human related.</li> <li>• The Objective and subsequent policies should reflect a focus on protecting human wellbeing, ensuring infrastructure, development utilities are appropriately sited, and structures and earthworks are sited so as not to exacerbate potential impacts of natural hazards.</li> <li>• This is an appropriate way to balance social, economic and cultural well-being, and safety of human communities</li> </ul>

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.1 – New development in areas at significant risk from natural hazard as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports avoiding new subdivision, use and development where that will increase the risk to human communities. Support is contingent upon robust assessment and identification of relevant natural hazards through the hazard overlays.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.2 – Changes to existing land use activities and development in areas at significant risk from natural hazards as follows:  ...increase risk to people’s safety, <del>or well-being and property</del> is avoided <u>and does not transfer or exacerbate risk to adjoining properties.</u>
	AND
	Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports a risk-based approach to assessing risks from erosion and inundation when changes to land use and development occur. Any land use change or development that increases risk to people’s safety or wellbeing should be avoided. In some cases, a change from one low-risk land use to another low-risk land use may be appropriate and should be a permitted activity, e.g. Rural Ancillary Earthworks in an area prone to flooding.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.5
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.3 – New emergency services and hospitals in areas at significant risk from natural hazards as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Fully supports policy.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.6
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.4 – New infrastructure and utilities in areas subject to significant risk from natural hazards as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Fully supports approach.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.7
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.5 – Existing infrastructure and utilities in all areas subject to natural hazards as follows:</p> <p>... in all areas subject to natural hazards <u>where any increased risks to people are mitigated to the extent practicable</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Generally supportive of this approach. For consistency the operation, maintenance and minor upgrading of existing infrastructure and utilities should not be enabled where increased risk to human communities cannot be practicably mitigated.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.8
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.6

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.6 – Managing natural hazard risk generally as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the risk based approach.
<hr/>	
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.9
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 – Protection from risks of coastal hazards as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports this policy as it pertains only to coastal hazards. Where flood hazards are concerned hard protection structures may be necessary and such a policy should not impede their use where they enable low-risk farming activities.
<hr/>	
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.10
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.8 – Limitation on hard protection works for coastal hazard mitigation as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the adaptive management approach.
<hr/>	
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.11
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.9 – Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports intent of the policy but advises that some natural buffers may be appropriate for other low risk activities including farming and any consequential rules should reflect this.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.12
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.10
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.10 – Areas defended by stopbanks adjacent to the Waikato River as follows:</p> <p>(a) Control subdivision, use and development in areas identified as Defended Areas adjacent to the Waikato River, <u>acceptable or tolerable levels commensurate to the risk to human life and the structural integrity of flood defences</u> by: [...]</p> <p>(b) Specify minimum setbacks for buildings and earthworks, <u>excluding Ancillary Rural Earthworks</u>, from stopbanks to [...]</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only inappropriate land uses on areas defended by stopbanks should be controlled. Farming land uses will be appropriate and do not need to be controlled.</li> <li>• Only inappropriate buildings and earthworks should have a minimum setback from stopbanks.</li> <li>• Non-habitable farm building or structures will not pose a risk to human life. Rural Ancillary Earthworks may be required in these areas to support farming.</li> <li>• Plan should exempt low-risk activities from any minimum setback requirements.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.13
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.11
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.11 – New development that creates demand for new protection structures and works as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Generally supportive of this approach as low risk farming activities are unlikely to require new protection structures. Caution that this has no impact on the maintenance of minor addition to necessary flood defences in the work programme of the WDC, Waikato Regional Council or Crown.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.14
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.12
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.12 – Reduce potential for flood damage to buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains and flood ponding areas as follows:</p> <p>(a) Reduce the potential for flood damage to <u>habitable</u> buildings located on the Waikato and Waipa River floodplains and flood ponding areas by ensuring that the minimum floor level of <u>habitable</u> building development is above the design flood levels / ponding levels in a 1% AEP flood event, plus an allowance for freeboard, unless:</p> <p>(i) the building development is of a type that is not likely to <del>suffer material damage</del> <u>increase risk to human life</u> during a flood; or</p> <p>(ii) <del>the building is a small scale addition to an existing building</del> <u>any addition to an existing habitable building is of a small scale</u>; or</p> <p>(iii) The risk from flooding is otherwise avoided, remedied or mitigated</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Policy should distinguish between habitable buildings and non-habitable farm accessory buildings because farm buildings are of a resilient nature built for a working environment and therefore restriction is unnecessary. Provision (i) lacks the clarity needed to differentiate between habitable and non-habitable buildings.. Provision (ii) needs to provide more direction to the plan user. No need for further regulation because resilience to natural hazards is dealt with by the Building Consent process and Building Codes.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.15
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.13



<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.13 – Control filling of land within the 1% AEP floodplain and flood ponding areas as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Broadly supportive but concerned that the subsequent earthworks controls and conditions are unduly restrictive. Ancillary Rural Earthworks may be required in these areas to support farming, and low risk activities should be enabled.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.16
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.14
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Policy 15.2.1.14 – Hazardous substances located within floodplain and flood ponding areas, AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Stage 1 approach to manage and control hazardous substances was criticised for not providing evidence to justify why WDC controls were considered necessary over and above the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO) and Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (HSW).</li> <li>• The Hearing Panel supported a substantial rewrite of Chapter 10 (see Stage 1 Directions and Minutes).</li> <li>• The Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 which repealed the RMA section 30 and 31 functions. Stage 2 Section 32 report provides no evaluation on Policy 15.2.1.14 or rule.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.17
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.15 – Flood ponding areas and overland flow paths as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports intent of the policy. The creation of impermeable surfaces and managing increased stormwater runoff is largely an urban issue, more easily mitigated in a rural setting.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.18
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.16
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.16 – Development in the Coastal Sensitivity Areas as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Broadly supportive of an adaptive management approach to climate change effects. Urge a risk-based approach where an acceptable level of risk is enabled for low risk activities, including farming.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.19
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.17
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.17 – Setbacks from the coast as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Broadly supportive of an adaptive management approach to climate change effects. Supports provision for placement of buildings if this is a functional or operational need at or near the coast.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.20
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.18
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.18 – Residential development potentially subject to fire risk as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Support intent of the policy, but suggest it is best regulated under the Building Act 2004.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.21
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.19
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.19 – Development on land subject to instability or subsidence as follows:</p> <p>...does not increase the risk to people, property or infrastructure <u>beyond acceptable or tolerable levels.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Rules that cascade from this policy should make a distinction between habitable buildings and non-habitable farm accessory buildings because farm accessory buildings are more resilient and are built for a working environment. Normal farming activities have a threshold of acceptable risk higher than residential activities.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.22
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.20
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.20 – Development of land in the Mine Subsidence Risk Area as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports intent, because a robust assessment has identified the risk of surface subsidence resulting from historic coal mining.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.23
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.21
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.21 – Stormwater management in an area subject to risk of land instability or subsidence as notified.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports intent of the policy, but cautions that any consequential rules or conditions should not duplicate the Building Act 2004.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.24
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.22
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.22 – Liquefaction-prone land risk assessment as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports intent of the policy, but cautions that any consequential rules or conditions should not duplicate the Building Act 2004.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.25
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.23
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.1.23 – Control activities on land susceptible to damage from liquefaction as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Pleased to see a level of acceptable risk but cautions that any consequential rules or conditions should not duplicate the Building Act 2004.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.26
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Objective 15.2.2 – Awareness of natural hazard risks as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Broadly supportive of the objective but consider the consequent policy approach should aim to directly inform landowners subject to a natural hazard overlay.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.27
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.2.1 Natural hazard risk information as follows:</p> <p>(a) Enable people to be informed and have access to information on the natural hazards affecting their properties and surrounding area, including through:</p> <p>...</p> <p><del>(iii) education, provision of information and community engagement; and provide information directly to owners subject to the natural hazard overlays referred to in this district plan and shown on the accompanying planning maps;</del></p> <p><del>(iv) Ensure landowners are made aware of the impact the natural hazard overlays will have on existing and proposed activities;</del></p> <p>(iv) alignment with the work of other agencies including iwi and the Waikato Regional Council</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Significant areas of land are included in the natural hazard overlays, in many cases entire properties are classified. Given extra layer of land use controls that can apply, submitter requests that WDC engage in meaningful discussion with affected landowners and ground truth hazard areas to take site specific factors into account and landowners understand the impact that these areas will have on their farming practices.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.28
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.2.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.2.2 – Awareness of Community Response Plans as notified.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers WDC is in an appropriate position to collate and disseminate information regarding the community's response to natural hazard events. Supports Council raising awareness of community response plans.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.29
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Objective 15.2.3(b) – Climate Change  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the focus of the objective should be on the adverse effects arising from climate change rather than avoiding or remedying climate change itself.</li> <li>• Suggests 'how' WDC contributes toward or encourages lowering greenhouse gas emissions should be addressed outside the district plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.30
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.1 – Effects of climate change on new subdivision and development as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers policy is appropriate and meets WDC's requirements under s7(i) and NZCPS and WRPS.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.31
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.2 – Future land use planning and climate change as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports intent of the policy.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.32
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.3 – Precautionary approach for dealing with uncertainty as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports approach of the policy but cautions that decisions in relation to the effects of climate change over a 100-year time horizon must be based upon the best available evidence and modelling.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.33
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.3.4 – Provide sufficient setbacks for new development as follows:  (a) <del>Protect people, property and the environment from the projected adverse effects of climate change, including sea level rise, are managed</del> by providing sufficient setbacks from water bodies and the coast when assessing new <u>built</u> development.  (b) Ensure that, in establishing development setbacks, adequate consideration is given to:  (i) the <del>protection effects on</del> of natural ecosystems, including opportunities for the inland migration of coastal habitats...  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Broadly supports intent of the policy, however considers changes are required to better focus the policy direction.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.34
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.3.5
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Policy 15.2.3.5 – Assess the impact of climate change on the level of natural hazard risks as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Understands intent of the policy.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.35
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P1 as follows:  Construction of a new <u>habitable</u> building or an addition to an existing <u>habitable</u> building, unless specified in P2 – P5 in Rule 15.4.1.  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The rule should focus on habitable buildings to be consistent with WRPS direction. Important that the regulatory response to potential hazards is appropriate for responding to the risk to people, but simple farm structures should be exempt because farming structures have a different risk profile to habitable buildings and can tolerate a higher level of risk.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.36
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support



<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P2 as follows:</p> <p>Additions to an existing <u>habitable</u> building that does not increase the ground floor area of the building by more than 15m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>The regulatory response to potential hazards is appropriate for managing the risk of the activity to human communities, but should be focused on habitable buildings. This would be more consistent with the WRPS.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.37
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P3 as notified.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>The regulatory response to potential hazards is appropriate to manage the risk of the activity to human communities.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.38
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.4.1 P4 as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction of an accessory building <del>without a floor</del>;</li> <li>2. Construction of a farm building <del>without a floor</del>.</li> </ol> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Does not consider there is a need to make a distinction based on the flooring of an implement shed to the extent it becomes a non-complying activity in some areas.</p>

There is no extra risk to life or potential to exacerbate risk off-site due to the type of flooring in a shed.

**Point Number** 2173.39

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1 P5

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.4.1 P5 as notified.

**Decision Reasons:** Acknowledges that the regulatory response to potential hazards is appropriate to the risk of the activity on human wellbeing.

**Point Number** 2173.40

**Plan Chapter** 15.4.1 P6

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.4.1 P6 as follows:

(a)Earthworks associated with construction, replacement, repair, maintenance, minor upgrading or upgrading of utilities, including the formation and maintenance of access tracks.

(b)Ancillary Rural Earthworks.

OR

**Add** a new permitted activity Rule to 15.4.1 with no conditions, for ancillary rural earthworks

AND

Any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission point.

**Decision Reasons:** Acknowledges that the regulatory response to potential hazards is appropriate to the risk of the activity on human wellbeing. Considers the same approach should be taken for Ancillary Rural Earthworks, which are required for farming purposes and can be undertaken within acceptable levels of risk.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.41
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P7 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the intent of the permitted activity in so far as its activity-specific condition relates to habitable buildings rather than farm buildings.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.42
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.1 P8 and 15.4.1 P6
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.1 P8, conditional on the outcomes of the relief sought for Rule 15.4.1 P6 (submission point 2173.10).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned that the maximum filling volumes and maximum cumulative filling and excavation per site in the Rural Zone would be inadequate to enable to low risk earthworks associated with normal farming activities.</li> <li>• Thresholds may need to be increased to better reflect potential for minor effects compared to effects that may need a consent and assessment.</li> <li>• Submitter is unsure what activities beyond those already provided for under P1-P7 need to be controlled by the catch-all rule P8.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.43
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.2 RDI as notified.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Understands the purpose and considers the matters of discretion appropriate.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.44
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 DI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.3 DI, conditional on the outcome of the relief sought for Rule 15.4.1 P4 (submission point 2173.8).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Concerned that the leap from a permitted activity status with standards to a discretionary activity could be inappropriate for the construction of, or extension to a farm accessory building with a floor.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.45
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.4.3 D2 Flood as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	No reasons provided.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.46
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4.3 D3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Rule 15.4.3 D3A AND Any consequential amendments that may be required.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stage 1 approach to manage and control hazardous substances was criticised for not providing evidence to justify why WDC controls were considered necessary over and above the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO) and Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 (HSW). The Hearing Panel supported a substantial rewrite.</li> <li>• The term ‘hazardous facilities’ has been signalled for a significant change by the Hearing Panel in response to Stage 1.</li> <li>• Stage 2 Section 32 report provides no evaluation on The Resource Legislation Amendment Act 2017 which repealed the RMA section 30 and 31 functions.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.47
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 P1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.1 P1 as notified
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the permitted activity status. Considers that the regulatory response to potential hazards is appropriate for the risk of the activity to people, property and the environment.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.48
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.1 P2 as follows:</p> <p>(1) Construction of an accessory building <del>without a floor</del>;</p> <p>(2) Construction of a farm building <del>without a floor</del>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Does not consider there is a need to make a distinction based on the flooring of an implement shed to the extent it becomes a non-complying activity in some areas. There is no extra risk to life or potential to exacerbate risk off-site due to the type of flooring in a shed.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.49
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RDI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.5.2 RDI as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Understands purpose and considers the matters for discretion appropriate.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.50
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.2 RD2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.2 RD2 as follows:  One addition to a lawfully established <u>habitable</u> building existing at [ <i>the date this rule becomes operative</i> ], where the addition does not increase the ground floor area of the existing <u>habitable</u> building by more than 15m <sup>2</sup> , unless provided for in Rule 15.5.2 RD1.  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers the regulatory response to potential hazards should be appropriate to the risk of the hazard to human wellbeing. There should be a distinction made between existing habitable and non-habitable buildings. There is no need to impose extra conditions on an extension to a non-habitable implement shed where there is little risk to human life. Considers amendments are more consistent with WRPS.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.51
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.5.4 NCI
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.5.4 NCI as follows:</p> <p>Construction of a new <u>habitable</u> building or additions to an existing <u>habitable</u> building, not provided for in Rule 15.5.1 PI – P2 or Rule 15.5.2 RD1 and RD2.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Considers the regulatory response to potential hazards should be appropriate to the risk to human communities. A distinction should be made between existing habitable and non-habitable buildings. There is no need to impose extra conditions on an extension to a non-habitable implement shed where there is little risk to human life.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.52
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.1 Permitted Activities as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the purpose of the rule and agrees the default back to underlying relevant zone rules is appropriate.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.53
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.6.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the purpose of the rule and considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.54
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.6.3

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.6.3 Discretionary Activities as follows:</p> <p>(a) The activities listed below are discretionary activities within the Defended Area.</p> <p>D1 Construction of a new <u>habitable building</u> <del>or new accessory building</del>, located within 50m of the toe of a stop-bank where the stop-bank is under the responsibility of the Council, the Waikato Regional Council or the Crown.</p> <p>D2 Earthworks <u>that are not a permitted activity under Rule 15.4.1 P6 or P7 or ancillary rural earthworks</u>, located within 50m...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On D1 setbacks should only apply to habitable buildings, as it is inappropriate for other buildings to be subject to the same restrictions, which may disrupt normal farming activity. Such a restrictive approach should only apply where there is increased risk to human life beyond acceptable or tolerable levels or there is going to be an actual structural impact on the stopbank.</li> <li>• On D2, earthworks that form part of a normal farming activity or are necessary for the construction of a non-habitable building should be exempt unless activities are occurring at or abate the landward tow of the stopbank. There should be a level of acceptable risk for activities that do not endanger human life or exacerbate risk off-site beyond acceptable or tolerable levels.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.55
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1 P1(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.1 P1(a) as follows:</p> <p>The gross floor area of all additions to <del>the</del> <u>habitable building</u> from [date this rule becomes operative] do not exceed a total of 15m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	This rule should only apply to habitable buildings, and it is inappropriate for other buildings to be subject to the same restrictions. This rule could add significant cost and disruption without reducing risk to human life.



<b>Point Number</b>	2173.56
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.1 P2 as follows:</p> <p>(1) Construction of an accessory <del>building without a floor</del>;</p> <p>(2) Construction of a farm building <del>without a floor</del>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Unsure why there are extra conditions imposed on farm buildings and accessory buildings with a floor. Do not consider there is a need to make a distinction based on the flooring of an implement shed to the extent it becomes a non-complying activity in some areas. There is no extra risk to life or potential to exacerbate risk off-site due to the type of flooring in a shed.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.57
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.7.1 P3 as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers permitted activity status is appropriate.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.58
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.7.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the purpose of the rule and considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.59
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1 P1(a)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.1 P1(a) as follows:  The gross floor area of all additions to the <u>habitable</u> building from [ <i>date this rule becomes operative</i> ] do not exceed a total of 15m <sup>2</sup> .  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers this rule should only apply to habitable buildings, as it is inappropriate for other buildings to be subject to the same restrictions.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.60
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.1 P2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.1 P2 as follows:  (1) Construction of an accessory <del>building without a floor</del> ;  (2) Construction of a farm building <del>without a floor</del> .  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Unsure why there are extra conditions imposed on farm buildings and accessory buildings with a floor. There is no need to make a distinction based on the flooring of an implement shed to the extent it becomes a non-complying activity in some areas.

There is no extra risk to life or potential to exacerbate risk off-site due to the type of flooring in a shed.

**Point Number** 2173.61  
**Plan Chapter** 15.8.1 P4  
**Late:** NO  
**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support  
**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.8.1 P4 as notified.  
**Decision Reasons:** Supports the enabling, practical planning approach.

**Point Number** 2173.62  
**Plan Chapter** 15.8.2  
**Late:** NO  
**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support  
**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.8.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities as notified.  
**Decision Reasons:** Supports the purpose of the rule and considers the matters of discretion to be appropriate.

**Point Number** 2173.63  
**Plan Chapter** 15.9.1 P1  
**Late:** NO  
**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support  
**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.9.1 P1 as follows:  
(1) Construction of an accessory building ~~without a floor~~; and  
(2) Construction of a farm building ~~without a floor~~.

	<p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<p>Unsure why there are extra conditions imposed on farm buildings and accessory buildings with a floor. There is no need to make a distinction based on the flooring of an implement shed, to the extent it becomes a non-complying activity in some areas. There is no extra risk to life or potential to exacerbate risk off-site due to the type of flooring in a shed.</p>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.64
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.1 P3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.9.1 P3 High as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the enabling, practical planning approach.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.65
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.1 P4
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Rule 15.9.1 P4 as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks for</p> <p><u>(a)</u> an activity listed in Rule 15.9.1 P1 – P3, including the maintenance and repair of access tracks; <u>or</u></p> <p><u>(b)</u> <u>Ancillary Rural earthworks.</u></p>
	<p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that may be required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the enabling and practical intent of rules P1-P4, but considers that the condition thresholds are too low to enable the usual and anticipated earthworks associated with farming activities.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.66
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.2 D1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.9.2 D1 conditional on the outcome of relief sought at Rule 15.9.1 P4 (submission point 2173.78)
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Conditional support pending outcome of relief sought for P4 (submission point 2173.78).
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.67
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.2 D3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.9.2 D3(1) as follows:  Replacement of an existing <u>habitable</u> building within the same site where...  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Understands purpose of the planning response if applied and targeted to habitable buildings.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.68
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.1 P1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.1 P1 as follows:

(1) Construction of an accessory building ~~without a floor~~; and

(2) Construction of a farm building ~~without a floor~~.

AND

Any consequential amendments that may be required.

**Decision Reasons:**

Unsure why there are extra conditions imposed on farm buildings and accessory buildings with a floor. There is no need to make a distinction based on the flooring of an implement shed to the extent it becomes a non-complying activity in some areas. There is no extra risk to life or potential to exacerbate risk off-site due to the type of flooring in a shed.

**Point Number** 2173.69

**Plan Chapter** 15.10.1 P3

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Rule 15.10.1 P3 as notified.

**Decision Reasons:** Supports the enabling, practical planning approach.

**Point Number** 2173.70

**Plan Chapter** 15.10.1 P4

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Rule 15.10.1 P4 as follows:

Earthworks for

(a) an activity listed in Rule 15.10.1 P1 – P3, including the maintenance and repair of access tracks; or

(b) Ancillary Rural earthworks.

AND

Any consequential amendments that may be required.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the enabling, practical planning approach, but considers that the condition thresholds are too low to enable the usual and anticipated earthworks associated with farming activities.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.71
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.2 D1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.10.2 D1, subject to outcome of relief sought at Rule 15.10.1 P4 (submission point 2173.83).
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Conditional support pending outcome of relief sought for P4 (submission point 2173.83).
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.72
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.10.2 D2(1)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.10.2 D2(1) as follows:  Replacement and relocation of an existing <u>habitable</u> building within the same site where...  AND  Any consequential amendments that may be required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Understands purpose of the planning response if applied and targeted to habitable buildings.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.73
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) definition in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers the appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities, and to satisfy the obligations to control land use to manage risk posed by natural hazards under the higher order documents. Section 32 showed a robust, evidence-based process for identification of natural hazards. However, a site specific assessment is needed to ground truth the proposed overlays. Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays where they are shown to unreasonably impact members.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.74
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Defended Area in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities, and to satisfy the obligations to control land use to manage risk posed by natural hazards under the higher order documents. Section 32 showed a robust, evidence-based process for identification of natural hazards. However, a site specific assessment is needed to ground truth the proposed overlays, if requested. Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays where they are shown to unreasonably impact members.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.75
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Emergency service facility in Chapter 15.14 Definitions as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers it an appropriate definition.



<b>Point Number</b>	2173.76
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Farm building in Chapter 15.14 Definitions as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers it an appropriate definition.
<hr/>	
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.77
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Flood plain management area in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities. A site specific assessment is needed to ground truth the proposed overlays, if requested. Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays and seek appropriate amendment.
<hr/>	
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.78
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Flood ponding area in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities, and to satisfy the obligations to control land use to manage risk posed by natural hazards under the higher order documents. A site specific assessment is needed to ground truth the proposed overlays, if requested. Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays and seek appropriate amendment.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.79
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of High risk flood area in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities, and to satisfy the obligations to control land use to manage risk posed by natural hazards under the higher order documents. Submitter considers there is no substitute for a site-specific assessment, if requested. Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays and seek appropriate amendment.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.80
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities, and to satisfy the obligations to control land use to manage risk posed by natural hazards under the higher order documents. A site specific assessment is needed to ground truth the proposed overlays, if requested. Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays and seek appropriate amendment.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.81
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities, and to satisfy the obligations to control land use to manage risk posed by natural hazards under the higher order documents. A site specific assessment is needed to ground truth the proposed overlays, if requested.</li> <li>• Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays and seek appropriate amendment.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.82
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Mine Subsidence Risk Area in Chapter 15.14 Definitions, subject to appropriate refinement through the Schedule I process.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers appropriate identification and assessment of natural hazards crucial to WDC meeting its RMA responsibilities, and to satisfy the obligations to control land use to manage risk posed by natural hazards under the higher order documents. A site specific assessment is needed to ground truth the proposed overlays, if requested.</li> <li>• Reserves the right to challenge the accuracy of the proposed natural hazard overlays and seek appropriate amendment.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.83
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Minor upgrading in Chapter 15.14 Definitions as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Support to the extent that this definition is consistent with the NPSET and NESET.
<b>Point Number</b>	2173.84

<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Risk assessment in Chapter 15.14 Definitions as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers it an appropriate definition.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.85
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Standalone Garage in Chapter 15.14 Definitions as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers it an appropriate definition.

<b>Point Number</b>	2173.86
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.14 Definitions
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> the definition of Utility in Chapter 15.14 Definitions as notified.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Considers it an appropriate definition.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2174	<b>Submitter:</b>	Wayne Green
<b>Address:</b>	582 West Coast Road, Oratia, Waitakere, New Zealand,0604		

<b>Point Number</b>	2174.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 11.1 Port Waikato - High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area -Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> map 11.1 Port Waikato to accurately identify areas subject to the High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area, and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) at Port Waikato, including 9 Ocean View Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are inconsistencies in this map and no supporting scientific explanations.</li> <li>• Private property will be devalued.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2174.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.2 D2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> rule 15.9.2 D2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Give landowners the opportunity to maximise the use of their land, should erosion continue.
<b>Point Number</b>	2174.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.9.2 D3
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> rule 15.9.2 D3 to remove restriction on gross floor area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter supports replacement of an existing building within the same site. Landowners should be able to build any size relocatable structure that fits within WDC and NZ building regulations.

**Submitter Number:** 2175 **Submitter:** Darcel Rickard  
**On behalf of:** Te Kopua Trust & Te Kopua 2b3 Incorporation  
**Address:** 86 Riria Kereopa Memorial Drive, Whaingaroa, Raglan, New Zealand, 3297

---

**Point Number** 2175.1  
**Plan Chapter** 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast)  
**Late:** NO  
**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) to provide for intergenerational adaptive management plans

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) to enable development on Maori freehold land as a permitted activity or via a less tiresome planning process so long as development is in accordance with a site-specific adaptive management plan

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast) to enable tangata whenua to sustainably manage their land in the face of a changing climate

**Decision Reasons:**

- Maori freehold land is unique with its ability to mitigate and adapt to natural hazards and climate change.
- There is a long-term intergenerational relationship that tangata whenua have with whenua through whakapapa.
- Adaptive management planning is supported by WRC, NZCPS and MfE and WDC should enable adaptive management plans and the unique status of tangata whenua to sustainably manage Maori freehold land.

---

**Point Number** 2175.2  
**Plan Chapter** 15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation)  
**Late:** NO  
**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) to provide for intergenerational adaptive management plans

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) to enable development on Maori freehold land as a permitted activity or via a less tiresome planning process so long as development is in accordance with a site-specific adaptive management plan

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.8 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) to enable tangata whenua to sustainably manage their land in the face of a changing climate

**Decision Reasons:**

- Maori freehold land is unique with its ability to mitigate and adapt to natural hazards and climate change.
- There is a long-term intergenerational relationship that tangata whenua have with whenua through whakapapa.
- Adaptive management planning is supported by WRC, NZCPS and MfE and WDC should enable adaptive management plans and the unique status of tangata whenua to sustainably manage Maori freehold land.

---

**Point Number** 2175.3

**Plan Chapter** 15.9 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 15.9 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area to provide for intergenerational adaptive management plans.

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.9 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area to enable development on Maori freehold land as a permitted activity or via a less tiresome planning process so long as development is in accordance with a site-specific adaptive management plan.

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.9 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Erosion) Area to enable tangata whenua to sustainably manage their land in the face of a changing climate.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Maori freehold land is unique with its ability to mitigate and adapt to natural hazards and climate change.
- There is a long-term intergenerational relationship that tangata whenua have with whenua through whakapapa.
- Adaptive management planning is supported by WRC, NZCPS and MfE and WDC should enable adaptive management plans and the unique status of tangata whenua to sustainably manage Maori freehold land.

---

**Point Number** 2175.4

**Plan Chapter** 15.10 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 15.10 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area to provide for intergenerational adaptive management plans

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.10 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area to enable development on Maori freehold land as a permitted activity or via a less tiresome planning process so long as development is in accordance with a site-specific adaptive management plan

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.10 High Risk Coastal Hazard (Inundation) Area to enable tangata whenua to sustainably manage their land in the face of a changing climate

**Decision Reasons:**

- Maori freehold land is unique with its ability to mitigate and adapt to natural hazards and climate change.
- There is a long-term intergenerational relationship that tangata whenua have with whenua through whakapapa.
- Adaptive management planning is supported by WRC, NZCPS and MfE and WDC should enable adaptive management plans and the unique status of tangata whenua to sustainably manage Maori freehold land.

**Point Number** 2175.5

**Plan Chapter** 15.13

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Amend** Chapter 15.13 to provide for intergenerational adaptive management plans

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.13 to enable development on Maori freehold land as a permitted activity or via a less tiresome planning process so long as development is in accordance with a site-specific adaptive management plan

AND

**Amend** Chapter 15.13 to enable tangata whenua to sustainably manage their land in the face of a changing climate

**Decision Reasons:**

- Maori freehold land is unique with its ability to mitigate and adapt to natural hazards and climate change.
- There is a long-term intergenerational relationship that tangata whenua have with whenua through whakapapa.
- Adaptive management planning is supported by WRC, NZCPS and MfE and WDC should enable adaptive management plans and the unique status of tangata whenua to sustainably manage Maori freehold land.



---

**Point Number** 2175.6

**Plan Chapter** Map 23.2 Raglan Heads

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Provide** further site-specific investigation in Planning Map 23.2 Raglan Heads for Te Kopua on the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) mapped areas.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Based on these hazard maps the current plan imposes restrictions now for a 100-year planning horizon under high uncertainty.

---

**Point Number** 2175.7

**Plan Chapter** Map 23.3 Raglan West

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Provide** further site-specific investigation in Planning Map 23.3 Raglan West for Te Kopua on the Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) mapped areas

**Decision Reasons:**

- Based on these hazard maps the current plan imposes restrictions now for a 100-year planning horizon under high uncertainty

---

**Point Number** 2175.8

**Plan Chapter** 15.2.2.2

**Late:** NO

**Support/Oppose/Neutral:** Support

**Summary of Decision Requested:** **Retain** Policy 15.2.2.2 - Awareness of Community Response Plans

**Decision Reasons:** No reasons provided

---

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2176	<b>Submitter:</b>	Jane Bethell
<b>Address:</b>	36 Tuakau Bridge - Port Waikato Road, Port Waikato, Tuakau, New Zealand,2695		

---

<b>Point Number</b>	2176.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Planning Maps - Defended Area
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> the Defended Area hazard overlay to Planning Maps to include the property at 36 Tuakau Bridge to Port Waikato Road.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjacent properties have hard protection, making the property more vulnerable and increases the risk to the 36 Tuakau Bridge to Port Waikato Road.</li> <li>• Inclusion of the property in the Inundation zone without the ability to mitigate means the property will become a pathway for further erosion, endangering nearby properties and road.</li> <li>• Being included in the Defended Area would allow submitter to add hard protection.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2176.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.7
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.7 - Protection from risks of coastal hazards to allow for hard protection where there will be minimal or no effect or transferred risk to other property.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard protection on properties either side of 36 Tuakau Bridge to Port Waikato Road has made submitter's property more vulnerable.</li> <li>• Installing hard protection on property will not affect neighbours given they already have hard protection.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2176.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.8
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.8 – Limitations on hard protection works for coastal hazard mitigation to allow for hard protection where there will be minimal or no effect or transferred risk to other property.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hard protection on properties either side of 36 Tuakau Bridge to Port Waikato Road has made submitters property more vulnerable.</li> <li>• Installing hard protection on property will not affect neighbours given they already have hard protection.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2176.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Not specified
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	WDC to provide local reference levels at points such as boundary pegs.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At 36 Tuakau Bridge to Port Waikato Road, the house is included in the Inundation zone, but house is on piles.</li> <li>• Insufficient detail on affected properties provided.</li> <li>• This will have significant effects on both property values and the landowner's ability to continue insurance on the property.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2177	<b>Submitter:</b>	Dennis Warrick Young
<b>Address:</b>	27 Barbados Way, One Tree Point, New Zealand, 0118		
<b>Point Number</b>	2177.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.2 Huntly East- Mine Subsidence Risk		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 20.2 Huntly East the Mine Subsidence Risk Area on:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 44 Rosser Street, Huntly;</li> <li>• 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 Vincent Aspley Place; and</li> <li>• 5 Willoughby Place.</li> </ul>		

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter owns land at these addresses.
<b>Point Number</b>	2177.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.18
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.18 - Residential development potentially subject to fire risk.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter owns land at 44 Rosser Street, Huntly; 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 Vincent Aspley Place; and, 5 Willoughby Place.
<b>Point Number</b>	2177.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.19
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.19 - Development on land subject to instability or subsidence.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter owns land at 44 Rosser Street, Huntly; 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 Vincent Aspley Place; and, 5 Willoughby Place.
<b>Point Number</b>	2177.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.11 Mine Subsidence Risk Area.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Submitter owns land at 44 Rosser Street, Huntly; 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13 Vincent Aspley Place; and, 5 Willoughby Place.

--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2178	<b>Submitter:</b>	Graham & Di McBride
<b>Address:</b>	220 Collie Road, RD8, Hamilton, New Zealand, 3288		
<b>Point Number</b>	2178.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 and Variation 2		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	Delete Chapter 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change and Variation 2.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submitter raises a range of issues in relation to the proposed plan, including unclear and incorrect planning maps, lack of site-specific maps for fire and liquefaction, interface between regional and district councils' plans and functions, potential issues with insurance and the potential effects on property values. There is uncertainty around interpretation of rules e.g. what constitutes an "addition" to an existing building, what is the meaning of "use or development", what constitutes a "site".</li> <li>• In regard to flooding, the submitter questions the modelling accuracy, and the availability of supporting data. The submitter's house is included in the High Risk overlay but this has never flooded. The plan does not clearly distinguish between flood ponding, ponding and flooding. The plan does not recognise that council reserves and roads contribute to ponding on adjacent land or flooding created by the regional manipulation of water runoff during major rainfall events. The flood overlay shown at the intersection of Collie Road and Charles Barton Lane is incorrect, particularly given the elevation and topography.</li> </ul>		

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2180	<b>Submitter:</b>	Ambury Properties Limited
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand, 1640		
<b>Point Number</b>	2180.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.1(1)		

<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<p><b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.1(1) Introduction as follows:</p> <p>The Natural Hazards chapter manages land use in areas subject to the risk from natural hazards. It identifies areas where certain types of new development <del>will</del> <u>should be avoided, or mitigated</u> because of the natural hazards present, ...,</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further relief and/or amendments required.</p>
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	The terminology is unclear and inefficient. The Introduction does not acknowledge that mitigation of risk for new development is an appropriate resource management method or that not all land uses can be avoided where they are at risk of natural hazards.
<b>Point Number</b>	2180.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.9
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Add</b> definitions for the terms ‘natural ponding areas’ and ‘floodways’ in relation to proposed Policy 15.2.1.9 - Natural features and buffers providing natural hazard protection, AND Any further relief and/or amendments required.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Introduces terminology that is undefined and therefore could provide for ambiguous plan interpretation. It is not clear whether ‘natural ponding areas’ are only those located in historically undisturbed areas or not. It is not clear whether ‘floodways’ are intended to be defined as natural floodways.
<b>Point Number</b>	2180.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.2.1.15(a)(i)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Policy 15.2.1.15(a)(i) - Flood ponding areas and overland flow paths as follows:

maintain or appropriately manage the flood storage capacity of natural floodplains, wetlands and ponding areas; and,

AND

Any further relief and/or amendments required.

**Decision Reasons:**

- Considers word 'maintain' is too restrictive and should acknowledge appropriate management methods and opportunities that could avoid, mitigate or remedy any risk of stormwater hazards as a result of development infilling or otherwise affecting natural floodplains, wetlands and ponding areas.
- Submitter has worked with WRC to demonstrate effects of proposed infilling on site at corner of Lumsden Road and Tahuna Road, Ohinewai has negligible effects on flood storage capacity, appropriately managing capacity, so policy should not preclude this.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2181	<b>Submitter:</b>	Aaron West
<b>Address:</b>	New Zealand, 3240		

<b>Point Number</b>	2181.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Section 32 – Appendix 5(f) 7.7.3 Coastal Hazards Assessment, Wallis Street, Management Options and Recommendation, Option 1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Delete</b> Section 32 – Appendix 5(f) 7.7.3 Coastal Hazards Assessment, Wallis Street, Management Options and Recommendation, Option 1.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Strongly opposes option 1 in the RMA section 32 report, as the option reduced section sizes over time. Future development would be precluded Submitter supports Raglan Collective submission.

<b>Point Number</b>	2181.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Section 32 – Appendix 5(f) 7.7.3 Coastal Hazards Assessment, Wallis Street, Management Options and Recommendation, Option 2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Section 32 – Appendix 5(f) 7.7.3 Coastal Hazards Assessment, Wallis Street, Management Options and Recommendation, Option 2.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Supports the option of shoreline protection and upgrade over time. A seawall built on public land would provide long term protection. Submitters land currently has dual road frontage and a mean high water mark (MHWM) boundary. Proposals for any public footpath should link the ‘paper road’ of Wallis Street to the formed part of Wallis Streets, as opposed to across the MHWM boundary. Submitter supports Raglan Collective submission.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2182	<b>Submitter:</b>	Louise Davis
<b>Address:</b>	13 Ryan Road, Te Akau, Ngaruawahia, New Zealand,3793		

<b>Point Number</b>	2182.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West - Coastal sensitivity Area (Inundation)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 Raglan West of the vicinity of Horongarara Te Akau South, so Coastal Sensitivity Area (Inundation) boundaries along Horongarara Esplanade are further seaward and end on WDC esplanade.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Geography doesn’t match the map; some inundation boundaries extend too far inland. Submitter’s property is separated from a calm bay off Raglan Harbour by an esplanade.

<b>Point Number</b>	2182.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 23.3 Raglan West - Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion)
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Map 23.3 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) boundaries along Horongarara Esplanade to be further seaward.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) boundaries extend too far inland. Erosion in the calm bays off Raglan harbour should be far less than other parts.



<b>Point Number</b>	2182.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.7.2 Coastal Sensitivity Area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast), Restricted Discretionary Activities to permit ancillary dwelling up to 30m <sup>2</sup> .
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Rule too restrictive, usual building rules allow up to 30m <sup>2</sup> . Allowing ancillary dwelling follows the spirit of the restriction.

<b>Point Number</b>	2182.4
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.8.2
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Rule 15.8.2 to permit ancillary dwelling up to 30m <sup>2</sup> so long as ancillary building is on property but not in the inundation zone.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Rule too restrictive, usual building rules allow up to 30m <sup>2</sup> . Allowing ancillary dwelling follows the spirit of the restriction.

--	--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2183	<b>Submitter:</b>	Falesa & Leitu Fesolai Sila
<b>Address:</b>	71 James Henry Crescent, Huntly, New Zealand,3700		

<b>Point Number</b>	2183.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.1
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support

<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.1 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Permitted Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.

<b>Point Number</b>	2183.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.2 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.2 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.

<b>Point Number</b>	2183.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.3 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Discretionary Activities
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.3 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.

--	--

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2184	<b>Submitter:</b>	Charles Verstappen
<b>Address:</b>	138 Old Taupiri Road, RD2, Taupiri, New Zealand, 3792		

<b>Point Number</b>	2184.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Map 20.6 - Ngaruawahia

<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Flood Plain Management Area on 25A Old Taupiri Road, Taupiri.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Section at 25A Old Taupiri Road, Taupiri has never flooded.
<b>Point Number</b>	2184.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15.4 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas
<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15.4 Flood Plain Management Area and Flood Ponding Areas to enable development without punitive costs where hazards are identified and can be mitigated.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled without punitive costs where hazards are identified and can be mitigated.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2185	<b>Submitter:</b>	Falesa & Leitu Fesolai Sila
<b>Address:</b>	30 James Crescent, Huntly, New Zealand, 3700		
<b>Point Number</b>	2185.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.1 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Permitted Activities		
<b>Late:</b>	NO		
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support		
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.1 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Permitted Activities.		
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.		

<b>Point Number</b>	2185.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.2 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.2 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.

<b>Point Number</b>	2185.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.3 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Discretionary Activities
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.3 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2186	<b>Submitter:</b>	Falesa & Leitu Fesolai Sila
<b>Address:</b>	28 James Henry Crescent, Huntly, New Zealand, 3700		

<b>Point Number</b>	2186.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.1 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Permitted Activities
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.1 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Permitted Activities.

<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.</li> </ul>
<b>Point Number</b>	2186.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.2 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.2 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Restricted Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.
<b>Point Number</b>	2186.3
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11.3 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Discretionary Activities
<b>Late:</b>	NO
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Support
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Retain</b> Rule 15.11.3 Mine Subsidence Risk Area, Discretionary Activities.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	Development should be enabled where natural hazards and risks have been identified and can be appropriately managed.

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2187	<b>Submitter:</b>	Mark Mathers
<b>Address:</b>	PO Box 129, Raglan 3265, Raglan, New Zealand, 3265		
<b>Point Number</b>	2187.1		
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.7		
<b>Late:</b>	YES		

<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.7 Coastal Sensitivity area (Erosion) and Coastal Sensitivity Area (Open Coast).  Provide more in depth reasoning for the placement of this overlay and include evidential modelling which relates to the section 32 report.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	There is no substantial support contained in the s32 report that supports this overlay. This onerous activity status results in unduly penalisation for the identified property if the owner would like to add additional buildings. The other consequences which this overlay would produce are unclear. There needs to be an analysis of the overlay in connection to section 32 to ensure the stage 2 provisions generally meet the requirements of the Resource Management Act.

<b>Point Number</b>	2187.2
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	Chapter 15 and Variation 2
<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Chapter 15 in entirety.  Review the Proposed Waikato District Plan (stage 2) and Variation 2 in their entirety to ensure aspects required by the RMA are met.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The drafting of stage 2 provisions into the wider district plan needs to be reviewed in their entirety.</li> <li>• It is unclear how the provisions will work, and the association and effect of the other provisions of the district plan on Stage 2 (and Stage 1) provisions.</li> <li>• Ensure the inclusion of new provisions is consistent with good resource management practice.</li> </ul>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2188	<b>Submitter:</b>	David Whyte
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Huntly Community Board		
<b>Address:</b>	38 Ohinewai North Road, RDI, Huntly, New Zealand, 3771		

<b>Point Number</b>	2188.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.4

<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> Section 15.4 Floodplain Management Area and Flood Ponding Area Overlay.  Reconsider the 1:100 flood model overlay, as an overestimation for flood risk in some areas of Huntly.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The overlay includes areas which have not flooded since the 1950's which precipitated the installation of the stop bank system. These areas were unaffected by two high water flood events in approximately 1998, based on anecdotal evidence.</li> <li>• This overlay will unnecessarily result in higher insurance premiums, inability to obtain insurance and become a barrier for property sale, resulting in hardship. The negative social repercussions of the overlay demand a soundly accurate backing for the modelling used.</li> </ul> <p>Supports any submitter that argues that an area of the flood model over estimates the risk of flooding to property.</p>

<b>Submitter Number:</b>	2189	<b>Submitter:</b>	David Whyte
<b>On behalf of:</b>	Huntly Community Board		
<b>Address:</b>	38 Ohinewai North Road, RDI, Huntly, New Zealand, 3771		

<b>Point Number</b>	2189.1
<b>Plan Chapter</b>	15.11
<b>Late:</b>	YES
<b>Support/Oppose/Neutral:</b>	Oppose
<b>Summary of Decision Requested:</b>	<b>Amend</b> section 15.11 Mine Subsidence Risk Area Overlay.  Reduce overlay of subsidence risk modelling to align with the boundaries already identified by the Huntly Subsidence Zone.
<b>Decision Reasons:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no need to expand this zone as is proposed.</li> <li>• There is a better way to mitigate hazards produced by the now closed mine. The 2018 report used as the rationale for the change is not in line with other reports expert knowledge within the community. If the mine was still in operation, the risks for subsidence inside the zone would be the same as that outside the zone. This is backed up by expert reports. Local knowledge indicates that the mine was</li> </ul>

closer to the surface (less than 100m depth) compared to other mine workings and therefore probability of subsidence outside the zone is low. The mine system must almost be fully flooded.

- Trapped gas does not equate to subsidence risk. Entrapped gas is not cause to expand the subsidence area. Concrete data cannot be determined from probabilities and science carries a level of uncertainty. There are negative impacts of extending the zone, and the zone extension will have real world consequences for Huntly, lowering land values.