Proposed Waitaki District Plan

Section 42A Report: Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards

Report on submissions and further submissions

www.waitaki.govt.nz
t. 03 433 0300 e. service@waitaki.govt.nz
20 Thames Street, Private Bag 50058, Oamaru 9444

Waitaki District Council | TE KAUNIHERA Ā ROHE O WAITAKI

Authorisation and status			
Author	Briar Belgrave		
Position	Partner Barker & Associates		
Approved by	Mike Butler, Senior Planner - Policy		
Issue Date	22 September 2026	**Review Date**	18 September 2026
Document name	NH and CE - s42A - Final		

Contents

1 Submitters Addressed in Report 13
2 Introduction 17
2.1 Experience and Qualifications 17
2.2 Purpose and Scope of this Report 18
2.3 Submissions on Withdrawn PDP Provisions 19
3 Topic Overview 19
3.1 Summary of Relevant Provisions of the PDP 19
3.1.1 Strategic direction 19
3.1.2 Natural hazards 20
3.1.3 Coastal Environment: coastal hazards 20
3.1.4 Definitions 20
3.1.5 Planning Maps: Overlays 21
3.2 Background to Relevant Provisions 22
4 Overview of Submissions 25
5 Relevant Statutory Provisions 28
6 Statutory Instruments 28
6.1 National Planning Standards 29
6.2 National Policy Statements 29
6.2.1 Natural Hazards 2025 (NPS-NH) 29
6.2.2 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010, as amended 2025 (NZCPS) 30
6.2.3 National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025 30
6.3 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (operative) 32
6.4 Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (operative 9 July 2026) 32
6.5 Iwi Management Plans 33
6.6 Other strategies and guidance 34
6.6.1 The Waitaki District Coastal Hazards and Resilience Strategy 2026–2076 34
6.6.2 National climate adaptation direction 34
6.7 Other legislation 35
6.7.1 Building Act 2004 and Building Code 35
6.7.2 Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002 35
6.8 Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 35
7 Evaluation of Submissions 35
7.1 Approach to Evaluation 35

7.2 Provisions where No Change is Sought 36
7.3 DEFINITIONS & ABBREVIATIONS 37
7.3.1 Submissions 38
7.3.2 Analysis 40
7.3.3 Recommendations 45
7.3.4 Evaluation 46
7.4 STRATEGIC DIRECTION 47
7.4.1 Submissions 47
7.4.2 Analysis 48
7.4.3 Recommendations 49
7.4.4 Evaluation 50
7.5 NATURAL HAZARD & COASTAL HAZARD GENERAL MATTERS 50
7.5.1 Submissions 51
7.5.2 Analysis 52
7.5.3 Recommendations 55
7.5.4 Evaluation 55
NATURAL HAZARDS FRAMEWORK, RISK BASED APPROACH 57
7.6 Natural Hazards – NH-O1 Natural hazard risk 57
7.6.1 Submissions 58
7.6.2 Analysis 59
7.6.3 Recommendations 61
7.6.4 Evaluation 61
7.7 Natural Hazards – NH-P2 Risk Based Approach 62
7.7.1 Submissions 64
7.7.2 Analysis 65
7.7.3 Recommendations 67
7.7.4 Evaluation 67
7.8 Natural Hazards – NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation 69
7.8.1 Submissions 70
7.8.2 Analysis 71
7.8.3 Recommendations 72
7.8.4 Evaluation 72
NATURAL HAZARD AREAS, CHANGING EXPOSURE & CLIMATE CHANGE 74
7.9 Natural Hazards – NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas 74
7.9.1 Submissions 75
7.9.2 Analysis 76
7.9.3 Recommendations 77
7.9.4 Evaluation 77
7.10 Planning Maps & Overlays - General 78

7.10.1 Submissions 80
7.10.2 Analysis 82
7.10.3 Recommendations 85
7.10.4 Evaluation 85
NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: FLOODING 87
7.11 Natural Hazards – NHP6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay 87
7.11.1 Submissions 88
7.11.2 Analysis 88
7.11.3 Recommendations 92
7.11.4 Evaluation 92
7.12 Natural Hazards – NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay 93
7.12.1 Submissions 95
7.12.2 Analysis 95
7.12.3 Recommendations 98
7.12.4 Evaluation 99
7.13 Natural Hazards – NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay 100
7.13.1 Submissions 101
7.13.2 Analysis 102
7.13.3 Recommendations 105
7.13.4 Evaluation 106
7.14 Natural Hazards – NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay 108
7.14.1 Submissions 109
7.14.2 Analysis 110
7.14.3 Recommendations 111
7.14.4 Evaluation 113
7.15 Natural Hazards – NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay 113
7.15.1 Submissions 115
7.15.2 Analysis 115
7.15.3 Recommendations 117
7.15.4 Evaluation 118
7.16 Natural Hazards – NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Overlay (except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5) 119
7.16.1 Submissions 120
7.16.2 Analysis 121
7.16.3 Recommendations 122

7.16.4 Evaluation 123
7.17 Natural Hazards – NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays 124
7.17.1 Submissions 125
7.17.2 Analysis 126
7.17.3 Recommendations 127
7.17.4 Evaluation 128
7.18 Natural Hazards – NH-S1 Flood assessment certificate 129
7.18.1 Submissions 129
7.18.2 Analysis 130
7.18.3 Recommendations 131
7.18.4 Evaluation 131
NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: EARTHQUAKE & SURFACE FAULT .. 132
7.19 Natural Hazards – NH-P9 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Subdivision 132
7.19.1 Submissions 132
7.19.2 Analysis 133
7.19.3 Recommendations 134
7.19.4 Evaluation 134
7.20 Natural Hazards – NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay - Activities and Buildings 135
7.20.1 Submissions 136
7.20.2 Analysis 136
7.20.3 Recommendations 137
7.20.4 Evaluation 137
7.21 Natural Hazards – NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay 138
7.21.1 Submissions 139
7.21.2 Analysis 139
7.21.3 Recommendations 140
7.21.4 Evaluation 140
NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: LAND INSTABILITY 141
7.22 Natural Hazards – NH-P8 Moeraki Land Instability Overlay 141
7.22.1 Submissions 141
7.22.2 Analysis 141
7.22.3 Recommendations 142
7.22.4 Evaluation 143
7.23 Natural Hazards – NH-R11 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High-Risk Areas 144
7.23.1 Submissions 144
7.23.2 Analysis 144

7.23.3 Recommendations 146
7.23.4 Evaluation 146
7.24 Natural Hazards – NH-R7 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas 147
7.24.1 Submissions 148
7.24.2 Analysis 148
7.24.3 Recommendations 149
7.24.4 Evaluation 149
7.25 Natural Hazards – NH-R10 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High Risk Areas 150
7.25.1 Submissions 150
7.25.2 Analysis 150
7.25.3 Recommendations 152
7.25.4 Evaluation 152
7.26 Natural Hazards – NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas 153
7.26.1 Submissions 153
7.26.2 Analysis 154
7.26.3 Recommendations 155
7.26.4 Evaluation 156
7.27 Natural Hazards – NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Moderate Risk Area 157
7.27.1 Submissions 157
7.27.2 Analysis 157
7.27.3 Recommendations 159
7.27.4 Evaluation 160
7.28 NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: WILDFIRE 161
7.29 Natural Hazards – NH-P12 Wildfire — subdivision and land use 161
7.29.1 Submissions 162
7.29.2 Analysis 162
7.29.3 Recommendations 164
7.29.4 Evaluation 164
7.30 Natural Hazards – NH-R13 Wildfire — woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings 166
7.30.1 Submissions 167
7.30.2 Analysis 167
7.30.3 Recommendations 169
7.30.4 Evaluation 171
NATURAL HAZARDS GENERAL / OTHER HAZARDS 172
7.31 Natural Hazards – NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays 172

7.31.1 Submissions 173
7.31.2 Analysis 174
7.31.3 Recommendations 176
7.31.4 Evaluation 177
NATURAL HAZARDS ACTIVITY / DEVELOPMENT SPECIFIC POLICY & RULES 179
7.32 Natural Hazards – NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure 179
7.32.1 Submissions 180
7.32.2 Analysis 181
7.32.3 Recommendations 182
7.32.4 Evaluation 182
7.33 Natural Hazards – NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings 183
7.33.1 Submissions 184
7.33.2 Analysis 184
7.33.3 Recommendations 186
7.33.4 Evaluation 187
7.34 Natural Hazards – NH-P4 Natural protection features 187
7.34.1 Submissions 189
7.34.2 Analysis 189
7.34.3 Recommendations 191
7.34.4 Evaluation 191
7.35 Natural Hazards – NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays — maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrading 192
7.35.1 Submissions 192
7.35.2 Analysis 193
7.35.3 Recommendations 195
7.35.4 Evaluation 196
COASTAL HAZARDS AREAS AND CLIMATE CHANGE 197
7.36 Coastal Environment – General 197
7.36.1 Submissions 198
7.36.2 Analysis 199
7.36.3 Recommendations 201
7.36.4 Evaluation 202
7.37 Coastal Environment – CE-O5 Climate Change 202
7.37.1 Submissions 203
7.37.2 Analysis 204
7.37.3 Recommendations 205

7.37.4 Evaluation 205
7.38 Coastal Environment – CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards 206
7.38.1 Submissions 207
7.38.2 Analysis 207
7.38.3 Recommendations 208
7.38.4 Evaluation 209
COASTAL HAZARDS ACTIVITIES / DEVELOPMENT 209
7.39 Coastal Environment – CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development 209
7.39.1 Submissions 210
7.39.2 Analysis 211
7.39.3 Recommendations 213
7.39.4 Evaluation 213
7.40 Coastal Environment – CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development 214
7.40.1 Submissions 214
7.40.2 Analysis 215
7.40.3 Recommendations 217
7.40.4 Evaluation 217
7.41 Coastal Environment – CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development 217
7.41.1 Submissions 218
7.41.2 Analysis 218
7.41.3 Recommendations 220
7.41.4 Evaluation 221
7.42 Coastal Environment – CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development 222
7.42.1 Submissions 222
7.42.2 Analysis 223
7.42.3 Recommendations 225
7.42.4 Evaluation 225
7.43 Coastal Environment – CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment 226
7.43.1 Submissions 226
7.43.2 Analysis 227
7.43.3 Recommendations 228
7.43.4 Evaluation 228
7.44 Coastal Environment – CE-P3 Precautionary approach 228
7.44.1 Submissions 229
7.44.2 Analysis 229

7.44.3 Recommendations 230
7.44.4 Evaluation 230
7.45 Coastal Environment – CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay 230
7.45.1 Submissions 231
7.45.2 Analysis 232
7.45.3 Recommendations 233
7.45.4 Evaluation 234
7.46 Coastal Environment – CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay 234
7.46.1 Submissions 235
7.46.2 Analysis 235
7.46.3 Recommendations 236
7.46.4 Evaluation 236
7.47 Coastal Environment – CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natural hazard overlay 237
7.47.1 Submissions 237
7.47.2 Analysis 238
7.47.3 Recommendations 239
7.47.4 Evaluation 240
7.48 Coastal Environment – CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay 240
7.48.1 Submissions 241
7.48.2 Analysis 241
7.48.3 Recommendations 242
7.48.4 Evaluation 243
COASTAL HAZARD DEFENCES 243
7.49 Coastal Environment – CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards 243
7.49.1 Submissions 244
7.49.2 Analysis 244
7.49.3 Recommendations 246
7.49.4 Evaluation 246
7.50 Coastal Environment – CE-P18 Hard protection structures 246
7.50.1 Submissions 247
7.50.2 Analysis 248
7.50.3 Recommendations 250
7.50.4 Evaluation 251
7.51 Coastal Environment – CE-R8 Hard protection structures 252
7.51.1 Submissions 252

7.51.2 Analysis 253
7.51.3 Recommendations 255
7.51.4 Evaluation 255
8 Conclusion 256
8.1 Definitions & Abbreviations 256
8.2 Strategic Direction 257
8.3 Natural Hazard & Coastal Hazard General Matters 257
8.4 Natural Hazards Framework, Risk Based Approach 257
8.4.1 Natural Hazard Areas, Changing Exposure & Climate Change 257
8.4.2 Natural Hazard Specific Policy And Rules: Flooding 258
8.4.3 Natural Hazard Specific Policy And Rules: Earthquake & Surface Fault 258
8.4.4 Natural Hazard Specific Policy And Rules: Land Instability 258
8.4.5 Natural Hazard Specific Policy And Rules: Wildfire 259
8.4.6 Natural Hazards General / Other Hazards 259
8.4.7 Natural Hazards Activity / Development Specific Policy & Rules 259
8.5 Coastal Hazards Areas And Climate Change 259
8.5.1 Coastal Hazards Activities / Development 260
8.5.2 coastal hazard defences 260
8.6 Overall Recommendation 260

Appendices

Appendix 1 Recommended Changes to Provisions
Appendix 2 Recommended Responses to Submissions

Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Text
CDEM	Civil Defence Emergency Management
Council	Waitaki District Council
CRPS	Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013
HPL	Highly Productive Land
NES	National Environmental Standard
NES-CF	National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry 2023
NES-CS	National Environmental Standards for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011
NES-DMRU	National Environmental Standards for Detached Minor Residential Units 2025
NES-ETA	National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission and Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Activities 2026
NES-FW	National Environmental Standards for Freshwater 2020
NES-P	National Environmental Standards for Papakāinga 2026
NES-DW	National Environmental Standards for Sources of Drinking Water 2007
NES-TF	National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities 2016
NPS	National Policy Statement
NPS-EN	National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks 2008
NPS-FM	National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020
NPS-HPL	National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022
NPS-I	National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025
NPS-IB	National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023
NPS-NH	National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards 2025
NPS-UD	National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020
NPS-REG	National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011
NPStds	National Planning Standards 2019
NZCPS	New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010
ODP	Operative Waitaki District Plan
ORPS	Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021
PDP	Proposed Waitaki District Plan
pORPS	Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021
PLAN STOP	RM (Consenting and other Changes) Amendment Act 2025
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
SPA	Spatial Planning Act 2023

1 Submitters Addressed in Report

The tables below list the original and further submitters whose submission points are addressed in this report.

Table 1: Original Submitters Addressed in this Report

Sub	Submitter Name	on Behalf of	Abbreviation
10	Mark Kensington		M Kensington
16	Diane Rigby		D Rigby
22	Matt Menzies		M Menzies
23	Malcolm Cameron		M Cameron
25	Paul Bryant		P Bryant
30	Garry and Desiree Jones		G & D Jones
37	James White	St Kevins College	St Kevins
51	James White	Brian de Geest	B de Geest
54	Gavin Wills	Murray and Sharon Stuart, Nick and Kate Reekie, Justin and Gillian Wills, Bill and Penney Ellis, Neville and Michelle Kitchen	Wills Group
55	James Kerr		J Kerr
59	Mike and Christine Holland		M & C Holland
66	Janeen Benny		J Benny
68	Chris Bell	Elizabeth Bell, Lexie Bell, Diana Bell	Bell Group 1
69	Chris Bell	Elizabeth Bell	C & E Bell
71	Chris Bell	Lexie Bell, Diana Bell	Bell Group 2
81	Bryce and Rachel Kane		B & R Kane
83	Waitaki District Council		WDC
88	Colin Leith Begg & Linda Rose Begg		C & L Begg
93	Ian Carter		I Carter
99	Garry Mcleod		G Mcleod
102	Cameron Leckie		C Leckie 1
104	James White		J White 1
107	Cameron Leckie		C Leckie 2
112	Gavin Simpson		G Simpson 1
122	Kitty Culp		K Culp
126	Wendy Nash and Konrad Jankowitz		W & K Jankowitz
129	Sharne Adele Paton		S Paton
130	Noel and Jill Davie		N & J Davie
152	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi		NZTA

Sub	Submitter Name	on Behalf of	Abbreviation
153	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake		NHC
157	Conrad Anderson	Samuel James Marshall & Arlene Anna Marshall	S & A Marshall
163	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	FENZ 2
164	NPHS Te Waipounamu		NPHS
166	Horticulture New Zealand		HortNZ
169	Neville and Michelle Kitchen	Murray & Sharon Stuart, Gavin & Mandy Wills, Bill & Penny Ellis	Stuart Group
172	Bog Roy Station Limited		Bog Roy Station
178	Alastair & Sandra Gibson		A & S Gibson
184	Lake Ōhau Station Limited		Lake Ōhau Station
185	Resident's Association of Ōmarama	Residents Association of Ōmarama	RAO
188	Mackenzie District Council		MDC
189	New Zealand Defence Force		NZDF
190	Alliance Group Limited		Alliance
191	Hadleigh Bognuda and Magdalena Stanuch		H Bognuda & M Stanuch
192	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group		NZ Carbon Farming
193	Ōhau Company Trust (Shelton Downs Station)		Shelton Downs
194	Director-General of Conservation		DOC
195	New Zealand Pork Industry Board		NZ Pork
196	Mark and Jayne Strachan		M & J Strachan
203	Z Energy Limited		Z Energy
212	Glenbrook Station		Glenbrook
213	Leslie McAuley		L McAuley
216	Livingstone Creek Farming ltd		Livingstone Creek
232	Hampden Community Energy Society		HCES
233	KiwiRail Holdings Limited		KiwiRail
235	Cormorants on Waterfront Limited		COWL
238	Fuel Companies		Fuel Companies
240	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)		EDS
242	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga		MOED

Sub	Submitter Name	on Behalf of	Abbreviation
243	Whitestone Contracting Limited		WCL
244	Telecommunication Companies		Telcos
246	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated		FFNZ
251	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki		Kā Rūnaka
253	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated		Forest & Bird
254	Elizabeth Bell		E Bell
256	Fish and Game (Otago and Central South Island Fish and Game Councils)		Fish & Game
259	Otago Regional Council		ORC
265	Geoff and Katrina Taylor		G & K Taylor
266	The Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand (EPFNZ) and the Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (PIANZ)		EPFNZ & PIANZ
267	Kelvin and Debbie Weir		K & D Weir
269	Brenda & Ken McLeod		B & K McLeod
271	Canterbury Regional Council		CRC
281	Mainland Poultry Limited		Mainland Poultry
282	Dogterom Thomson Ltd		DTL
283	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd		DHL
284	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd		DDL
285	Barry and Anne Matthews		B & A Matthews
288	Network Waitaki Limited		Network Waitaki
290	Philip and Becky Wilson		P & B Wilson
291	Peter and Janine Stackhouse		P & J Stackhouse
292	Robert and Sylvia Borst		R & S Borst
293	Brock and Gemma Hamilton		B & G Hamilton
294	Meridian Energy Limited		Meridian
295	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited		OceanaGold
296	Gavin Simpson		G Simpson 2
297	Parkside Holdings Ltd		Parkside
298	Alastair and Carrie Gibson		A & C Gibson
299	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd		TT & Cayuga

Sub	Submitter Name	on Behalf of	Abbreviation
300	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others		A & F Verbakel
301	Carolyn Thelning		C Thelning
302	Peter and Sandra Mitchell		P & S Mitchell
303	Terry and Fiona Conlan		T & F Conlan
304	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan		K & N McLachlan
305	Erin Nivonne Schultz		E Schultz
306	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated		WPG 2
309	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Transpower
310	Graymont (NZ) Limited		Graymont
312	Springbank		Springbank
313	Geoff & Jan Keeling – Keeling Dairies Limited		Keeling Dairies

Table 2: Further Submitters Addressed in this Report

F Sub	Further Submitter Name	Abbreviation
152	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	NZTA
153	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	NHC
157	Samuel and Arlene Marshall	S & A Marshall
190	Alliance Group Limited	Alliance
194	Director-General of Conservation	DOC
195	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	NZ Pork
233	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	KiwiRail
238	Fuel Companies	Fuel Companies
246	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FFNZ
253	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	Forest & Bird
259	Otago Regional Council	ORC
265	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	G & K Taylor
271	Canterbury Regional Council	CRC
287	PKM Farms Limited	PKM Farms
294	Meridian Energy Limited	Meridian
295	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	OceanaGold
297	Parkside Holdings Ltd	Parkside
306	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	WPG 2
315	Awamoa Developments Ltd	Awamoa Developments
318	Omarama Lodge Holdings Limited	Omarama Lodge

2 Introduction

2.1 Experience and Qualifications

1. My full name is Briar Alayne Belgrave. I am a Partner at Barker & Associates, a planning and urban design consultancy. I am a qualified planner and hold a Master of Resource and Environmental Planning with Honours from Massey University. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.

2. I have over 15 years' experience in planning and resource management, working in central government, local government and private consultancy roles in New Zealand and Australia. My predominant experience is in strategic and policy planning, including district and regional planning matters, resource management reform and the preparation and review of national and local planning instruments. My experience includes preparing and processing resource consent applications, developing legislation and national direction, providing district plan and strategic policy advice to councils, drafting plan provisions, assessing submissions, and preparing section 32 evaluation reports, section 42A reports and planning evidence for hearings. I have worked on planning matters throughout New Zealand, including in Auckland, Whangārei, the Far North, Gisborne, Palmerston North, Waitaki and the West Coast, as well as in Australia.

3. I have extensive experience across all stages of the RMA plan-making process, from developing and drafting objectives, policies and rules and preparing section 32 evaluations, through to assessing submissions, preparing section 42A reports and evidence, and appearing at hearings. I have also prepared spatial plans, growth strategies and future development strategies for local authorities and have experience preparing legislation and national direction instruments for central government.

4. In relation to the Proposed Waitaki District Plan, I have been involved in the District Plan review and the preparation of section 42A reporting. My role includes consideration of the relationship between district-wide and topic-specific provisions and the wider statutory and policy framework. For this hearing, I have prepared the section 42A assessment and recommendations on the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions, including consideration of submissions and further submissions, the relevant higher-order planning framework, recommended amendments to the Proposed District Plan provisions, and further evaluation under section 32AA of the RMA.

5. Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I have complied with it when preparing this report. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person. Having reviewed the submitters and further submitters relevant to this topic I advise there are no real or perceived

conflicts of interest that would impede me from providing independent advice to the Hearings Panel.

2.2 Purpose and Scope of this Report

6. The purpose of this report is to provide the Hearing Panel with a summary and analysis of the submissions received on this topic, and to make recommendations in response to those submissions, to assist the Hearing Panel in evaluating and deciding on the submissions.

7. This report is prepared under s42A of the RMA in relation to Natural Hazards & Coastal Hazards in the PDP. It covers the following matters:

- Strategic direction
- Hazards & Risks – Natural Hazards
- Coastal environment: Coastal Hazards
- Natural Hazards Planning Map Layers / Overlays
    - Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay Subdivision
    - Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay Activities and Buildings
    - Liquefaction Assessment Overlay
    - Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay
    - Otago Flood Assessment Overlay
    - Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay
    - Moeraki Land Instability Overlay
    - Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay
    - Coastal Erosion Hazard Overlay
    - Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlay
    - Tsunami Hazard Area information layer only
- Definitions relating to the above provisions, including:
    - Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP)
    - Activity/development specific definitions
        - Critical facilities
        - Farm building
        - Woodlot
        - Hard protection structure
        - Natural hazard mitigation works
    - Coastal & hazard definitions:
        - Coastal hazard sensitive activity.
        - Coastal margin
        - Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay
    - New defined terms sought include; Coastal natural hazard, acceptable level of risk, appropriately mitigated, and significant coastal hazard risk.

8. This report considers the submissions and further submissions that were received in relation to Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards. It includes recommendations to either retain provisions without amendment, or to delete, add to, or amend provisions in response to submissions. All recommended amendments are shown by way of ~~strikeout~~ and underlining in **Appendix 1** to this Report, or, in relation to mapping, through recommended spatial amendments to the mapping. Footnoted

references to the relevant submitter(s) identify the scope for each recommended change. Recommended responses to each submission are given in **Appendix 2**.

9. The analysis and recommendations have been informed by publicly available technical reports as outlined in paragraph 32 below, as well as Section 32 evaluation reports that include the Coastal Environment and Natural Hazards supporting documents as are also outlined below at paragraph 33.
10. Where changes are recommended, an evaluation has been undertaken in accordance with Section 32AA of the RMA.
11. The conclusions reached and recommendations made in this report are not binding on the Hearing Panel. It should not be assumed that the Hearing Panel will reach the same conclusions having considered all the information in the submissions and the evidence to be brought before them by the submitters.

2.3 Submissions on Withdrawn PDP Provisions

12. On 15 January 2026, the Council withdrew aspects of the PDP that would no longer be progressed under the Plan Stop provisions in subpart 5B of the RMA. This included withdrawal of the Coastal Environment Chapter (excluding those provisions relating to coastal natural hazards plus mapping).
13. Submissions that were made on aspects of the PDP that have since been withdrawn (or that seek relief relating to topics that have since been withdrawn) are no longer relevant to proceedings. Such submissions related to the Coastal Environment identified by staff, are listed in **Appendix 3**, and are not considered further in this report. The Hearing Panel may direct that these submission points be struck out in accordance with s41D of the RMA as no longer relevant to the proposal. If the Hearing Panel determines that any submission point listed in **Appendix 3** should be considered, those points can be assessed in the reporting officer's right of reply.
14. It is possible that some submission points **not** identified in **Appendix 3** may still be wholly or partly outside the scope of the PDP. Any residual scope issues will be dealt with in the appropriate section of this report.

3 Topic Overview

3.1 Summary of Relevant Provisions of the PDP

15. This report relates to provisions associated with Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment - Coastal Hazards. This section of the report provides a brief summary of the provisions relevant to this topic.

3.1.1 Strategic direction

16. The Strategic Direction chapter establishes the overarching direction for natural hazard management across the Proposed District Plan. SD-RRNH-O1 – Natural

hazards seeks to improve the District's resilience to natural hazards and, where possible, avoid or, where avoidance is not possible, to mitigate the risks to people, communities, property and infrastructure. This strategic objective provides the overarching direction for the more detailed provisions in the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment chapters.

3.1.2 Natural hazards

17. The Natural Hazards chapter manages non-coastal natural hazards through a risk-based approach, recognising that the appropriate planning response varies according to the likelihood and consequences of the hazard and the vulnerability of the activity. NH-O1 seeks to ensure that natural hazard risks, including the effects of climate change, are recognised and understood, and are avoided or appropriately mitigated. This is implemented through policies addressing the identification and mapping of hazard areas, risk-based decision-making, critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, natural protection features, and site-specific risk assessment.

18. The chapter then establishes hazard-specific policy and rule frameworks for flooding, land instability, surface fault rupture, liquefaction and wildfire, as well as other identified natural hazard awareness areas. These provisions differentiate the planning response according to the nature and level of risk, including specific provisions for High Flood Hazard Areas, and use technical or site-specific assessment where necessary to determine risk and appropriate mitigation.

3.1.3 Coastal Environment: coastal hazards

19. Coastal natural hazards are addressed separately within the Coastal Environment chapter, while adopting the same general risk-based approach as the Natural Hazards chapter. The provisions address coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami, recognising that climate change is expected to influence the frequency and severity of coastal hazards and that the mapped coastal erosion and inundation areas incorporate climate-change predictions.

20. CE-O5 to CE-O7 establish the principal outcomes for coastal hazard management: recognising and providing for climate-change effects; ensuring new subdivision, use and development does not increase coastal hazard harm; and reducing risks to existing development. The supporting policies provide for identification and mapping of coastal hazards over a 100-year timeframe, site-specific risk assessment of new development, adaptive management and relocation of existing development, preference for natural defences, and restrictions on hard protection structures.

3.1.4 Definitions

21. The Definitions chapter provides the terminology required to interpret and apply the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions consistently. Relevant definitions establish the hazards and spatial areas to which provisions apply, the

activities and infrastructure considered particularly sensitive or critical, and the forms of hazard mitigation or protection addressed by the Plan.

22. Definitions particularly relevant to this report include Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP), Coastal hazard sensitive activity, Coastal margin, Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay, Critical facilities, Farm building, Hard protection structure, Natural hazard mitigation works, Natural Hazard Overlay, High Flood Hazard Area and Woodlot. Submissions also seek new or amended terminology concerning coastal natural hazards and how they are nested and identified in the plan and definitions which illuminate levels of acceptable or tolerable risk.

3.1.5 Planning Maps: Overlays

23. The Planning Maps identify areas where known or potential natural hazards warrant additional assessment or specific management through the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment chapters.

24. The overlays perform different functions depending on the nature and certainty of the hazard information whether this is identified as a hazard map or a susceptibility map, ranging from areas requiring site-specific assessment through to areas where particular activities are more directly controlled according to the potential level of risk. The following overlays are addressed:

    - Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay: Subdivision identifies areas potentially affected by active fault rupture and triggers more detailed investigation at subdivision stage, including identification of site-specific fault avoidance areas and appropriate setbacks.
    - Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay: Activities and Buildings identifies areas potentially affected by surface fault rupture where particular buildings, activities, critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure require consideration of fault-rupture risk.
    - Liquefaction Assessment Overlay: identifies areas where there is potential for liquefaction and where site-specific investigation is required to determine the nature and level of risk and appropriate mitigation.
    - Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay identifies land potentially subject to flooding within the Canterbury part of the District and provides the basis for site-specific flood assessment, including determining whether land constitutes a High Flood Hazard Area and establishing appropriate minimum floor levels.
    - Otago Flood Assessment Overlay identifies land potentially subject to flooding within the Otago part of the District and triggers assessment of flood risk and appropriate measures to avoid or mitigate effects on buildings and activities.
    - Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay identifies land potentially affected by flooding associated with the Waitaki River and provides for site-specific assessment of flood risk before specified development occurs.

- Moeraki Land Instability Overlay identifies areas of known land-instability susceptibility at Moeraki, differentiated according to the identified level of risk, with the planning response and requirements for geotechnical investigation increasing with the level of instability risk.
- Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay identifies areas potentially affected by alluvial fan hazards. It operates principally as an awareness layer to inform consideration and assessment of potential natural hazard risk rather than establishing the same hazard-specific regulatory framework as the flood or Moeraki overlays.
- Coastal Erosion Hazard Overlay identifies areas potentially affected by coastal erosion over the planning horizon, including the anticipated effects of climate change, and provides the spatial basis for applying the coastal hazard provisions to new and existing development.
- Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlay identifies low-lying coastal areas potentially subject to coastal inundation, including future climate-change effects, and provides the spatial basis for applying the coastal natural hazard provisions. The Coastal Environment chapter confirms that the mapped coastal erosion and inundation areas incorporate climate-change predictions.

25. Finally, the Tsunami Hazard Area is included as an information layer only, identifying areas potentially exposed to tsunami hazard but not operating as a regulatory overlay in the same manner as the Coastal Erosion and Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlays.

3.2 Background to Relevant Provisions

26. The Proposed District Plan (PDP) represents an updated approach to the management of natural hazards compared with the Operative District Plan (ODP), with greater use of risk-based provisions, mapped hazard and assessment overlays, and site-specific technical assessment.
27. The PDP addresses a broader range of natural hazards and differentiates the planning response according to the nature and level of risk and the vulnerability of subdivision, use and development. Coastal natural hazards are addressed through the Coastal Environment chapter, while other natural hazards are addressed through the Natural Hazards chapter. The notified approach is informed by updated technical information for flooding, liquefaction, surface fault rupture, land instability, alluvial fans and coastal hazards. As reflected in submissions, key issues arising from this approach include the accuracy and appropriate interpretation of hazard overlays, the relationship between regional-scale mapping and site-specific assessment, the appropriate level of regulation for different activities, and how risk should be managed where hazard information is uncertain or continues to evolve.
28. The natural hazard and coastal hazard provisions are also influenced by higher-order statutory direction. Section 6(h) of the RMA requires the management of significant risks from natural hazards to be recognised and provided for as a matter

of national importance, while section 7(i) requires particular regard to the effects of climate change.

29. The PDP must also give effect to the relevant operative regional policy statements for the two parts of the District; the CRPS and ORPS ; and, for coastal hazards, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS). These documents are discussed further section 6 below.

30. Since notification, the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards 2025 (NPS-NH) has introduced specific national direction requiring natural hazard risk associated with subdivision, use and development to be managed using a risk-based and proportionate approach. It applies to flooding, landslips, coastal erosion, coastal inundation, active faults, liquefaction and tsunami, although infrastructure and primary production are excluded from its application. Where the NPS-NH conflicts with the NZCPS, the NZCPS prevails.

31. There have been material changes to the national planning context since notification of the PDP. Most significantly, the NPS-NH came into force on 15 January 2026 and applies to decision-making from that date, although local authorities are not required to initiate a plan change within a specified timeframe solely to give effect to it. The wider resource management system is also undergoing significant reform. The Planning Bill and Natural Environment Bill 2025 are currently progressing through Parliament and are intended to replace the RMA with a new planning and environmental management system expected to be passed into law before the 2026 general election. The proposed system includes specific goals relating to adaptation to climate change and reducing risks from natural hazards, with further national direction anticipated under the new framework. The Ministry for the Environment describes the NPS-NH as a transitional measure, with its policy intent expected to be carried into and refined through national direction under the replacement system. These changes form an important part of the statutory and policy context for this report, with their specific implications for the submissions and recommendations addressed later in the s42A assessment.

32. The provisions have been informed by the following technical reports:

    - GNS Science Assessment of Liquefaction Hazards in the Queenstown Lakes, Central Otago, Clutha and Waitaki Districts of the Otago Region (2019) this informs the liquefaction susceptibility and basis for the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay.
    - Environment Canterbury Flood Hazard Report and Mapping (2023) which informs the flood hazard information underpinning the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay.

33. Environment Canterbury Review of the Waitaki District Plan Flood Hazard Mapping (2020) earlier Canterbury flood mapping and methodology, relevant to submissions challenging the current overlay.

- Otago Regional Council Waitaki District Floodplain Report (2025) which informs current flood hazard assessment relevant to the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay.

34. Environment Canterbury Updated Liquefaction Mapping for Waitaki (2023) which includes updated liquefaction susceptibility information for the Canterbury part of the District.

    - GNS Science General Distribution and Characteristics of Active Faults and Folds in the Waimate and Waitaki Districts. Which discusses active fault identification and characterisation underpinning the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlays.
    - Earthquake Fault Information in the Waitaki District Plan Review (2020) providing advice on translating active fault information into District Plan mapping and provisions.
    - Tonkin & Taylor Moeraki Hazard Report (2012) including detailed land-instability assessment and risk categorisation underpinning the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay.
    - GeoSolve Geotechnical Advice Relating to Land Instability, Moeraki (2020) supplementary geotechnical advice relevant to the Moeraki land-instability provisions and mapping.
    - Otago Alluvial Fans Regional Assessment Project Report (2009). Comprises a regional assessment underpinning identification of alluvial fan hazard areas.
    - Otago Alluvial Fans Project Supplementary Report (2009) supplementary technical information relevant to the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay.
    - FENZ/Beca Guidance on Fire Break and Setback Provisions (2020) which includes technical advice relevant to wildfire risk, including setbacks from woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry.
    - NIWA Waitaki District Coastal Hazards (2019) including an assessment of coastal erosion and coastal inundation, providing key technical information for the coastal hazard provisions and overlays.
    - ORC Community Vulnerability to Elevated Sea Level and Coastal Tsunami Events, Otago assessment of community exposure and vulnerability to coastal inundation and tsunami, relevant to the Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlay and Tsunami Hazard Area.
    - Coastal Environment Overview Report and Coastal Environment Technical Reports 1–3 supporting evidence on the extent, characteristics and values of the Coastal Environment, relevant where coastal hazard management interacts with natural character, natural defences and development.

35. Evaluation documents which are also relevant to the development of the provisions include the section 32 Evaluation Report – Natural Hazards – records the technical and policy basis for the notified natural hazard framework and the section 32

Evaluation Report – Coastal Environment – records the evaluation underpinning the Coastal Environment provisions, including coastal natural hazards.

4 Overview of Submissions

36. The full list of submission points addressed in this report is set out in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 826 original submission points and 278 further submission points are addressed.

37. The following table provides a brief summary of the key issues raised in submissions, which are discussed in more detail in the 'Evaluation of Submissions' section of this report.

Table 3: Summary of Key Issues Raised in Submissions

Issue Name	Summary of Issue	Position of Submitters
Overall natural hazard risk-based approach	Whether the notified framework appropriately applies a risk-based and proportionate approach to natural hazards, including consideration of likelihood, consequence, vulnerability, cumulative effects and the sensitivity of the activity. A key issue is the repeated use of "acceptable level" of risk, whether this requires a defined district-wide threshold or methodology, and whether avoidance and mitigation should instead be proportionate to the level of risk.	A substantial group supports the overall risk-based approach and/or notified provisions. NHC and others seek amendments to clarify or define acceptable risk and strengthen risk assessment. Infrastructure, industry and rural submitters seek a more proportionate approach, particularly where activities are less vulnerable or have functional or operational needs. Further submissions also seek alignment with the NPS-NH risk-based and proportionate approach.
Climate change and future hazard risk	Whether climate change is sufficiently integrated across the Natural Hazards framework, rather than principally through coastal hazards, including how changing frequency, magnitude and spatial extent of hazards should inform future risk. Also, whether assessment periods and information requirements appropriately reflect higher-order direction.	General support exists for recognising climate change, but a number of submitters seek stronger or clearer direction. Coastal submissions seek active identification and planning for changing coastal hazard risk and, in some cases, provision for natural adjustment of coastal processes, habitats and ecosystems.
Identification, mapping and information requirements	Whether hazard overlays appropriately identify areas potentially susceptible or exposed to hazards, as distinct from determining the level of risk at a property or activity-specific scale. Issues include the accuracy and extent of overlays; use of best available regional information; the role of site-specific assessment; whether awareness overlays should trigger controls or further investigation; and how mapping should be updated when better information becomes available.	A significant number of property-specific submissions challenge the accuracy or extent of individual overlays, particularly flood, liquefaction and alluvial fan mapping. Other submitters, including NHC, support using best available hazard information and overlays as a trigger for further site-specific investigation rather than treating inclusion within an overlay as a determination of site-specific risk.
Critical facilities and Regionally Significant Infrastructure	Whether the framework appropriately recognises the functional and operational needs of critical facilities and RSI, including infrastructure that must traverse or locate in	Many submitters support NH-P3 and its recognition of functional and operational need. Infrastructure providers and some industry submitters seek a less restrictive

Issue Name	Summary of Issue	Position of Submitters
	hazard-prone areas; the practicability of requiring infrastructure to be fully resilient; and the relationship between the Natural Hazards provisions and infrastructure-specific national direction.	or more practicable approach, particularly for linear networks and resilient infrastructure. Others support avoidance unless there is no feasible/practicable alternative and functional or operational need. CRC seeks resilience only "as far as practicable". NHC further supports maintaining functionality of critical infrastructure following hazard events.
Application of hazard provisions to primary production, low-vulnerability and existing activities	Whether the provisions unnecessarily constrain primary production, farm buildings, intensive indoor primary production, maintenance and repair, minor structures and other established activities where vulnerability or consequences may be comparatively low. This includes whether controls should respond to the nature and vulnerability of the activity, rather than activity labels alone.	Rural and primary-sector submitters seek greater enablement or exemptions for farm buildings, Intensive Indoor Primary Production (IIPP), stockyards, tracks, irrigation/solar infrastructure, maintenance and repair and other low-vulnerability activities. NZ Pork specifically considers hazard controls should reflect actual function and vulnerability rather than excluding IIPP from farm-building pathways.
Natural defences, natural hazard mitigation works and hard protection	The appropriate hierarchy between protection/restoration of natural defences, other natural hazard mitigation works and hard protection structures. Issues include whether natural approaches should be preferred where practicable and effective; the functional needs of council/regional council mitigation works; circumstances in which hard protection is appropriate; effects on natural processes and adjoining land; and the role of protection within longer-term adaptation.	Broad support exists for natural defences, but submitters differ on how strongly they should be preferred. ORC and CRC seek clearer provision for council natural hazard mitigation works. Other submitters seek greater enablement of hard protection, while Kā Rūnaka and Forest & Bird seek stronger alignment with higher-order limitations and effects management. NHC seeks clarification of risk terminology.
Flood hazards	Whether the Canterbury Flood Assessment, Otago Flood Assessment and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment frameworks appropriately distinguish hazard and risk; the treatment of High Flood Hazard Areas; appropriate flood events and floor levels; off-site displacement and exacerbation of flood risk; hazardous substances; and the relationship between regional mapping and site-specific flood assessment. Also, whether the three overlay/rule pathways are appropriately differentiated and internally consistent.	Submitters range from support for the notified graduated approach to requests for both greater and lesser stringency. NHC seeks stronger controls where High Flood Hazard is identified. Infrastructure, industry and rural submitters seek more risk-responsive pathways for resilient or low-vulnerability activities. Several submitters seek clarity on the design flood/event used for assessment, while numerous property owners challenge overlay accuracy.
Coastal hazards – identification, risk and climate change	Whether coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami hazards are appropriately identified over the required planning horizon; the distinction between identifying areas potentially affected by hazards and determining risk; and whether site-specific assessment adequately addresses exposure, vulnerability, consequences and changing hazard characteristics under climate change.	General support exists for identification and mapping, with NHC seeking an "at least 100 years" planning horizon. Kā Rūnaka and environmental submitters seek stronger alignment with higher-order coastal hazard and climate-change direction. Other submitters generally support the notified framework or seek more enabling treatment of development. CE-P14 currently identifies tsunami, coastal inundation and coastal erosion over 100 years.

Issue Name	Summary of Issue	Position of Submitters
Coastal adaptation and management of existing development	Whether the Coastal Environment provisions establish a sufficiently clear framework for resilience and adaptation, including monitoring and adjustment over time, natural defences, accommodation/protection responses, relocation and managed retreat. A related issue is whether hard protection can form part of a longer-term or transitional adaptation response without unnecessarily constraining future options.	Kā Rūnaka seeks a stronger adaptation framework, including communities being prepared and able to mitigate and adapt, protection/restoration of natural defences and development of a range of responses including relocation. ORC seeks recognition of ongoing mitigation works, while other submitters generally support CE-O7. The NZCPS requires assessment of a range of risk-reduction options and planning for transition mechanisms towards more sustainable approaches.
Earthquake – surface fault rupture and liquefaction	Whether mapped fault-awareness areas and liquefaction assessment areas appropriately function as triggers for site-specific investigation; the appropriate setbacks from identified fault deformation; treatment of subdivision, buildings and infrastructure; and whether the liquefaction overlay represents susceptibility rather than a determination that liquefaction risk exists at a particular site.	General support exists for site-specific investigation, but submitters differ upon the degree of prescription. NHC seeks defined fault setbacks and an acceptable-risk methodology; CRC seeks more flexible treatment of infrastructure that must cross fault zones; infrastructure/mining submitters seek exclusions or reliance on other provisions. The PDP itself describes the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay as identifying where damage is *possible* and further site-specific investigation is required.
Land instability – Moeraki	Whether the differentiated Very Low, Low, Moderate, High and Very High Risk framework is supported by the evidence and appropriately calibrates activity status to risk. Issues include the relationship with the ORPS risk framework, the meaning of acceptable/tolerable risk, notification, and whether different treatment is appropriate for Māori land and the Moeraki Native Reserve.	NHC generally supports the risk-based hierarchy but seeks an acceptable-risk metric. Kā Rūnaka questions aspects of the evidential basis and stringency and seeks recognition of Māori land/Native Reserve circumstances. EDS generally supports controls but seeks removal of notification preclusions. WDC seeks removal of the two-year deemed-compliance notes.
Wildfire	Whether the wildfire provisions appropriately manage the relationship between buildings and combustible vegetation, including setbacks from woodlots, shelterbelts and forestry; whether vegetation flammability should be recognised; treatment of existing versus new planting; and interaction with the NES for Commercial Forestry and highly productive land.	There is general support for managing wildfire risk, but substantial amendment is sought to NH-R13. A large group seeks recognition of low-flammability planting; FFNZ seeks application principally to new planting and changes relating to HPL; forestry interests raise consistency with the NES-CF; other primary-sector submitters support the notified setback approach.
Other natural hazards and awareness overlays	Whether hazards for which detailed risk information or specific regulatory controls are not available should be managed through awareness overlays and proportionate assessment rather than prescriptive rules. This includes alluvial fans and other lower-information hazards, and the relationship between land-use planning, Building Act and CDEM responses.	Some submitters support retaining awareness overlays and consideration of hazard risk, while others consider assessment should not automatically be required where an overlay does not establish that the particular use is at risk. Submitters also question the use of an undefined "acceptable level" test. The notified chapter itself recognises that some low-probability/high-consequence hazards are more appropriately

Issue Name	Summary of Issue	Position of Submitters
		addressed through CDEM and other statutory mechanisms.

5 Relevant Statutory Provisions

38. The assessment for the PDP includes the matters identified in sections 74-76 of the RMA. This includes whether:

- it is in accordance with the Council's functions (s74(1)(a));
- it is in accordance with Part 2 of the RMA (s74(1)(b));
- it will give effect to any national policy statement or operative regional policy statement (s75(3)(a) and (c));
- the objectives of the proposal are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA (s32(1)(a));
- the provisions within the plan change are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan (s32(1)(b)).

39. In addition, assessment of the PDP must also have regard to:

- any proposed regional policy statement, and management plans and strategies prepared under any other Acts (s74(2));
- the extent to which the plan is consistent with the plans of adjacent territorial authorities (s74 (2)(c)); and
- in terms of any proposed rules, the actual or potential effect on the environment of activities including, in particular, any adverse effect.

6 Statutory Instruments

40. The s32 reports for Natural Hazards and Coastal Hazards set out the statutory requirements and relevant planning context for this topic in more detail. The section below summarises the most relevant provisions from the most relevant planning instruments and highlights any pertinent changes to national direction that have occurred since the PDP was notified.

41. The statutory framework applying to the natural hazard provisions has changed since notification of the PDP, most notably through the introduction of the NPS-NH 2025 which is directive and has implications for managing natural hazard risks in district plans, amendments to the NZCPS and the Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 becoming operative.

42. The following sections summarise the higher-order instruments most relevant to the matters addressed in this report and their principal direction for natural hazard and coastal hazard management.

6.1 National Planning Standards

43. The NPStds establish nationally consistent requirements for the structure, format and terminology of district plans. For this report, they are particularly relevant to the location and organisation of provisions within the Natural Hazards, Coastal Environment and Infrastructure chapters, and to the application of nationally standardised definitions.

44. The Definitions Standard is relevant when considering submissions seeking amendments to hazard-related terminology and definitions, including where terms used by the PDP interact with nationally defined terms such as infrastructure and primary production. District plans are required to give effect to NPStds under section 75(3)(ba) of the RMA.

45. This is relevant to submissions seeking changes to definitions and to submissions concerning the interaction between natural hazard provisions and infrastructure, primary production, intensive indoor primary production and other defined activities. Where a term is mandated by the NPStds, the PDP cannot adopt an inconsistent local definition. Where the term is not prescribed, a local definition may be considered where this improves certainty and remains consistent with higher-order direction.

6.2 National Policy Statements

6.2.1 Natural Hazards 2025 (NPS-NH)

46. The National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards 2025 (NPS-NH) came into force on 15 January 2026, after notification of the PDP, and is therefore an important change in national direction relevant to this report.

47. Its purpose is to reduce the creation or increase of significant natural hazard risk and support communities to adapt to changing conditions. It establishes a nationally consistent risk-based and proportionate approach, including consideration of likelihood and consequence, use of the best available information notwithstanding uncertainty, and differentiation of the planning response according to the level of natural hazard risk.

48. It applies to flooding, landslips, coastal erosion, coastal inundation, active faults, liquefaction and tsunami.

49. The NPS-NH does not apply to infrastructure (as defined in the RMA) or primary production (as defined in the NPStds), although this does not prevent councils managing risks associated with these activities through their plans.

50. NPS-NH also applies within the coastal environment, but where it conflicts with the NZCPS, the NZCPS prevails.

6.2.1.1 NPS-NH Implementation Guide

51. MfE published the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards Implementation Guide in May 2026 to support implementation of the NPS-NH. While the Guide is not itself national direction, it provides relevant guidance on the intended operation of the NPS-NH. In particular, it explains that the risk-based proportionate approach requires consideration of the likelihood and potential consequences of a natural hazard, rather than simply the presence of a hazard, followed by a management response proportionate to the level of risk. This guidance is relevant to the assessment of submissions concerning hazard identification, risk assessment and the appropriate management response within this report.

6.2.2 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010, as amended 2025 (NZCPS)

52. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS), as amended in 2025, provides the principal national direction for managing natural hazards within the coastal environment.

53. Of relevance are the provisions relating to identification of coastal hazards, consideration of climate change over at least a 100-year timeframe, avoiding increases in coastal hazard risk, protecting and restoring natural defences, and managing the use of hard protection structures.

54. The NZCPS therefore provides important higher-order direction for the PDP's Coastal Erosion and Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlays and associated Coastal Environment objectives, policies and rules.

55. Amendments to the NZCPS came into force on 15 January 2026; these principally relate to infrastructure, development and primary-sector activities and form part of the updated national direction to be considered in this report.

6.2.3 National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025

56. The National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025 (NPS-I) came into force on 15 January 2026. It provides national direction for the development, operation, maintenance and upgrading of infrastructure and seeks to ensure that the national, regional and local benefits of infrastructure are provided for, infrastructure is resilient, and adverse effects from and on infrastructure are appropriately managed.

57. The NPS-I is particularly relevant to the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment chapters. Policy 2 requires decision-makers to recognise that infrastructure may have an operational or functional need to operate in, locate in, or traverse particular locations and environments. This expressly includes the need to locate where services are required, including in areas subject to natural hazards, and to manage risks from natural hazards. The NPS-I defines resilience as including the capacity of infrastructure to absorb and recover from disruption or adapt to changing conditions while retaining an appropriate level of service.

58. The NPS-I also expressly includes flood control and protection works carried out by or on behalf of a local authority within its definition of additional infrastructure. This is relevant to the Proposed District Plan definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure, which includes Otago Regional Council natural hazard mitigation works, including flood protection infrastructure and drainage schemes. The NPS-I therefore provides relevant national direction when considering the operational and functional needs, resilience and natural hazard management role of those works, including where they interact with the Coastal Environment provisions.

59. However, the NPS-I does not apply uniformly to all activities identified as Regionally Significant Infrastructure in the PDP. Its application must be determined by the particular type of infrastructure involved. In particular:

    - Renewable electricity generation activities and assets, including relevant generation components of the Waitaki Power Scheme, are managed under the NPS for Renewable Electricity Generation, rather than the NPS-I.
    - Electricity transmission and distribution networks are managed under the NPS for Electricity Networks 2008, as amended in 2025, rather than the NPS-I. That NPS expressly recognises the importance of safe, secure, reliable and resilient electricity networks.
    - Other qualifying infrastructure identified as RSI—including transport, telecommunications, water, wastewater, stormwater and qualifying local-authority flood protection infrastructure—may fall within the NPS-I, subject to its definitions and application provisions.

60. Accordingly, the District Plan's definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure should not be treated as equivalent to the scope of the NPS-I. The RSI definition is a District Plan classification encompassing infrastructure subject to several different national policy frameworks. The applicable national direction needs to be identified according to the infrastructure activity concerned.

61. This distinction is particularly relevant to NH-P3, CE-P18 and CE-R8. These provisions can appropriately recognise the functional and operational needs and resilience requirements of RSI, but their justification should not rely on the NPS-I alone. For infrastructure within the Coastal Environment, the applicable infrastructure-specific national direction must also be read alongside the NZCPS and other relevant higher-order direction. The NPS-I itself recognises this relationship: for new infrastructure and major upgrades affecting s6 environments and values, its enabling direction is to be read alongside other relevant national direction and regional and district planning provisions.

62. For CE-R8 specifically, this strengthens the distinction we made earlier. ORC's natural hazard mitigation works can fall within both the District Plan's RSI definition and the NPS-I's infrastructure framework, but not every activity defined as RSI is governed by the NPS-I. The rule should therefore continue to use the Plan-defined term Regionally Significant Infrastructure, while the s42A analysis identifies the relevant national direction according to the particular infrastructure involved.

6.3 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (operative)

63. The CRPS applies to the Canterbury portion of Waitaki District. Chapter 11 – Natural Hazards establishes a risk-based framework directed toward avoiding new subdivision, use and development where this would increase natural hazard risk, particularly within high-hazard areas, and otherwise mitigating natural hazard risk.

64. The chapter addresses flooding and inundation, geological hazards, critical infrastructure, natural features that provide hazard protection, physical hazard mitigation works and the effects of climate change. The CRPS is particularly relevant to the PDP's Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay and High Flood Hazard Area framework, as well as the surface fault rupture and liquefaction provisions. The PDP is required to give effect to the operative CRPS under section 75(3) of the RMA.

65. This direction is relevant to submissions concerning the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, High Flood Hazard Areas, Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlays, Liquefaction Assessment Overlay, critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure. It also provides an important higher-order basis for distinguishing between areas of higher hazard, where avoidance or strong constraint is appropriate, and areas where risk may instead be managed through site-specific assessment and mitigation.

66. Submissions seeking deletion or refinement of mapped overlays, changes to the High Flood Hazard Area framework, or a more proportionate response to different activities need to consider the CRPS requirement to appropriately identify and manage natural hazard risk.

67. The CRPS is also relevant to submissions concerning the role of natural hazard mitigation works and natural protection features. Its framework recognises both the value of natural systems in reducing hazard risk and the potential need for physical mitigation works. This is relevant to submissions seeking clearer provision for regional council flood and erosion protection activities, including amendments to the definition of natural hazard mitigation works and to rules enabling those activities.

68. There has not been a replacement CRPS since notification of the PDP. CRC/Environment Canterbury has confirmed that the operative CRPS remains in force and that preparation of a replacement RPS has been paused.

6.4 Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (operative 9 July 2026)

69. The Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (ORPS 2021) applies to the Otago portion of Waitaki District and became operative on 9 July 2026, replacing the pORPS 2021 and the ORPS 2019.

70. The natural hazard provisions in the HAZ – Hazards and Risks chapter establish a risk-based approach to identifying and managing natural hazard risk, including maintaining risk where it is acceptable and managing risk so that it does not exceed

a tolerable level. The ORPS also provides direction for adaptation to changing natural hazard risk, including risks exacerbated by climate change, and addresses development, natural hazard mitigation, natural systems and infrastructure.

71. The key natural hazard direction is contained in HAZ-NH Natural Hazards;

    - HAZ-NH-O1 seeks that activities do not exacerbate natural hazard risks and are managed to reduce significant natural hazard risk.
    - HAZ-NH-O2 seeks to ensure that people, communities and property are prepared for and able to adapt to the effects of natural hazards, including risks exacerbated by climate change.

The framework is supported by policies dealing with identification of hazard areas, risk assessment, development in hazard-prone areas, reduction of existing risk, natural hazard mitigation and adaptation.

72. The ORPS is particularly relevant to the submissions, as follow:

    - Seeking greater proportionality between the level of risk and the planning response, clearer consideration of acceptable and tolerable risk, and greater alignment of site-specific risk assessment with likelihood, consequence, vulnerability, cumulative effects, multiple or cascading hazards and climate change. Those matters are relevant to NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5, and with submissions seeking definitions or clarification of terms such as acceptable risk and appropriately mitigated.
    - The ORPS is also relevant to submissions on coastal natural hazards, including requests for a definition of coastal natural hazard, management of existing development, natural defences, hard protection structures and enabling natural hazard mitigation works where there is a functional need.

6.5 Iwi Management Plans

73. Under section 74(2A) of the RMA, relevant iwi planning documents must be taken into account when preparing or changing a district plan. Two iwi management plans are identified as relevant to the Waitaki PDP: the

    - Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005 (KTKO NRMP);
    - Waitaki Iwi Management Plan 2019 (IMP).

74. The KTKO NRMP promotes Ki Uta Ki Tai, integrated management of natural and physical resources, recognition of rakatirataka and kaitiakitaka, and effective participation of Kāi Tahu ki Otago in resource-management decision-making. The IMP records Kā Papatipu Rūnaka values and management direction for the Waitaki catchment, including matters relating to wai, mahika kai, wāhi tūpuna and the relationship of mana whenua with natural resources.

75. These documents are relevant particularly to submissions seeking stronger recognition of mana whenua values, environmental effects, climate change, natural systems and natural defences, and to decisions concerning hazard mitigation works

where those works may affect waterways, coastal environments, cultural values or wāhi tūpuna.

6.6 Other strategies and guidance

6.6.1 The Waitaki District Coastal Hazards and Resilience Strategy 2026–2076

76. The Waitaki District Coastal Hazards and Resilience Strategy 2026–2076 is being developed by Waitaki District Council to provide a long-term framework for responding to coastal erosion, inundation, sea-level rise and associated coastal hazard risks along approximately 70 km of the District's coastline.

77. It utilises a 2024 technical coastal hazards assessment, which identified 12 high-risk sites and potential management responses, including locations containing significant community, transport and public infrastructure assets. The Strategy is intended to guide proactive long-term decisions about the management, investment and eventual replacement or adaptation of assets, but does not itself commit Council to particular projects, expenditure or implementation timeframes. More detailed action plans for the identified high-risk sites are intended to follow its adoption.

78. The draft Strategy has recently completed formal public consultation, which will be followed by a hearings process which will in turn be followed by consideration of feedback and adoption of a final Strategy later in 2026. The Strategy remains a draft strategy and has not yet been adopted by Council.

6.6.2 National climate adaptation direction

79. Aotearoa New Zealand's first National Adaptation Plan 2022–2028 (NAP) establishes national objectives and actions for responding to climate change risk, including improving risk-informed decision-making, supporting climate-resilient development in appropriate locations, and considering adaptation options over time. Local authorities are required to have regard to the NAP when preparing or changing plans under the RMA. The NAP is therefore relevant to the consideration of climate change, resilience and adaptation within the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions.

80. The Government subsequently published the National Adaptation Framework in October 2025, which establishes a longer-term approach to improving New Zealand's resilience to natural hazard and climate risks and provides more recent national context for local adaptation planning.

6.7 Other legislation

6.7.1 Building Act 2004 and Building Code

81. The Building Act provides a separate but complementary mechanism for managing building work on land subject to natural hazards. Sections 71 to 74 address building consent decisions where land is subject to erosion, falling debris, subsidence, inundation or slippage, including circumstances where building work may proceed subject to a notice on the record of title.

82. The Building Act definition of natural hazard is narrower than the RMA definition. This is a relevant consideration in response to Submissions suggesting that building consent processes can adequately manage site-specific hazard risk.

6.7.2 Civil Defence Emergency Management Act 2002

83. Deals with the wider management of natural hazard risk and resilience, particularly the relationship between risk reduction, readiness, response and recovery. Emergency management measures often defer to land-use mechanisms as a risk-reduction function. This is relevant in relation to critical facilities, emergency services, lifeline infrastructure, evacuation/access and the consequences of locating vulnerable activities in hazard-prone areas.

6.8 Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996

84. The Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 (HSNO) provides the primary national framework for managing hazardous substances, including controls relating to their classification, use, storage and handling.

85. The District Plan has a separate but complementary role in managing the land-use and natural hazard consequences associated with hazardous facilities, including where a natural hazard event could result in the release of hazardous substances or increase risks to people, property or the environment.

7 Evaluation of Submissions

7.1 Approach to Evaluation

86. This section is organised by the key matters addressed through the submissions and is structured as follows: **Strategic Direction; Natural Hazards; Coastal Environment; Definitions; and Planning Maps**. Within each topic, the report summarises the submissions, assesses the issues raised, sets out recommended amendments to the PDP provisions, and provides further evaluation under s32AA where changes are recommended.

87. Evaluation follows the themes of:

    - Strategic direction

- Natural Hazards general matters
- Natural hazard framework, risk-based approach,
- Natural hazard areas, changing exposure & climate change
- Specific hazards
- Specific activities & assessment
- Coastal hazards

88. Clause 10(2)(b), Schedule 1 of the RMA provides for consequential changes arising from the submissions to be made where necessary, as well as any other matter relevant to the PDP arising from submissions. Consequential changes recommended under clause 10(2)(b) are footnoted as such.

89. Clause 16(2), Schedule 1 of the RMA allows a local authority to make an amendment to a proposed plan without using a Schedule 1 process, where such an alteration is of minor effect, or may correct any minor errors. Any changes recommended under clause 16(2) are footnoted as such.

90. Further submissions have been considered in the preparation of this report, but in general, they are not specifically mentioned because they are limited to the matters raised in original submissions and therefore the subject matter is canvassed in the analysis of the original submission. Further submissions may however be mentioned where they raise a valid matter not addressed in an original submission. Further submissions are not listed within Appendix 2. Instead, recommendations on the primary submissions indicate whether a further submission is accepted or rejected as follows:

    - Where a further submission supports a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be accepted, or where a further submission opposes a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be rejected, the further submission is recommended to be accepted.
    - Where a further submission supports a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be rejected, or where a further submission opposes a primary submission and the primary submission recommended to be accepted, the further submission is recommended to be rejected.
    - Where a further submission supports or opposes a primary submission and the primary submission is recommended to be accepted in part, then the further submission is recommended to be accepted in part.

7.2 Provisions where No Change is Sought

91. The following provisions within the Natural Hazards and relevant Coastal Environment provisions were either not subject to submissions seeking amendment, or submissions received sought their retention. No substantive

amendment to these provisions is recommended and, accordingly, they are not assessed further in this report:

- CE-R3 – Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment.

92. The remaining provisions of the Coastal Environment Chapter that do not relate to the management of coastal natural hazard risk are outside the scope of this report and are therefore not addressed further.

7.3 DEFINITIONS & ABBREVIATIONS

93. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 48 original submission points and 29 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
DOC	194.7, 194.4, 194.11
CRC	271.1, 271.65, 271.7, 271.13, 271.16, 271.23, 271.39, 271.40, 271.64, 271.268
MOED	242.3
FFNZ	246.12, 246.16
NHC	153.41, 153.1
FENZ 2	163.3
Telcos	244.4
NZ Pork	195.3
G & K Taylor	265.4
EPFNZ & PIANZ	266.1
K & D Weir	267.4
B & K McLeod	269.4
DTL	282.4
DHL	283.4
DDL	284.4
B & A Matthews	285.4
P & B Wilson	290.4
P & J Stackhouse	291.4
R & S Borst	292.4
B & G Hamilton	293.4
G Simpson 2	296.4
Parkside	297.4

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
A & C Gibson	298.4
TT & Cayuga	299.4
A & F Verbakel	300.4
C Thelning	301.4
P & S Mitchell	302.4
T & F Conlan	303.4
K & N McLachlan	304.4
E Schultz	305.4
WPG 2	306.4
Springbank	312.12
Keeling Dairies	313.9
EDS	240.10
NZ Carbon Farming	192.9

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Number
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	FS195
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS253

7.3.1 Submissions

94. DOC [194.7] opposes the absence of a *Coastal natural hazard* definition and seeks a new definition. DOC [194.11] seeks consequential amendment to the definition of Hard protection structure. This is to ensure consistency with the Otago Regional Policy Statement.

95. DOC [194.4] opposes in part the definition of *Coastal margin*, as the drafting is unclear where the 20m margin extends beyond the mapped *Coastal Environment* and seeks amendments to clarify the area.

96. Telcos [244.4] and CRC [271.7] support the definition of *Critical facilities* and seek the definition to be retained as notified.

97. CRC [271.1, 271.65] opposes the use of *Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP)* and seeks to replace the definition and abbreviation with *Average Recurrence Interval (ARI)*, while noting ORC uses the AEP term, so would accept its use if that is the recommendation.

98. CRC [271.13, 271.16, 271.23, 271.40, 271.64] support the definitions of *Farm building*, *Hard protection structure, High flood hazard area, Natural hazard overlay and Woodlot* and seek that these be retained.

99. CRC [271.39] supports the definition of *Natural hazard mitigation works* but seeks amendments so it clearly captures flood and erosion protection works.

100. MOED [242.3] supports the definition of *Coastal hazard sensitive activity*, as it recognises educational facilities as sensitive to coastal hazards. MOED seeks the definition be retained as notified.

101. FFNZ [246.12] supports the definition of *Coastal hazard sensitive activity* but seeks amendments so only relevant intensive primary production activities and hazardous facilities are included.

102. NHC [153.41] seeks amendments to the definition of *Coastal natural hazard overlay*, so it includes the *Tsunami hazard area overlay*.

103. NHC [153.1] Supports avoiding or mitigating the risks from natural hazards and recommends including a definition for what is considered "appropriately mitigated" to avoid confusion and ensure the consistent application of rules and policies. They seek the following definition from Mackenzie District Council is adopted as follows:

> *Appropriately Mitigated means*
>
> *a) The effectiveness of any proposed natural hazard mitigation works and the alternative design options considered, including low impact design.*
>
> *b) Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed mitigation measures.*
>
> *c) The extent to which the mitigation works transfer, or create, unacceptable hazard risk to other people, property or infrastructure.*
>
> *d) The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site.*
>
> *e) Whether or not the work would be carried out under the supervision of either a Chartered Professional Engineer with experience in geotechnical engineering or a Professional Engineering Geologist (IPENZ registered).*

104. FENZ 2 [163.3] oppose the definition of *Critical facilities* and seeks the definition to refer more consistently to emergency service facilities. FENZ 2 supports the inclusion of *fire stations* and *emergency coordination facilities* in the definition.

105. NZ Pork [195.3], FFNZ [246.16] and EPFNZ & PIANZ [266.1] oppose or support in part the definition of *Farm building* as it excludes buildings used for intensive indoor primary production. They seek amendments to include indoor primary production within the definition.

106. G & K Taylor [265.4], K & D Weir [267.4], B & K McLeod [269.4], DTL [282.4], DHL [283.4], DDL [284.4], B & A Matthews [285.4], P & B Wilson [290.4], P & J Stackhouse [291.4], R & S Borst [292.4], B & G Hamilton [293.4], G Simpson 2 [296.4], Parkside [297.4], A & C Gibson [298.4], TT & Cayuga [299.4], A & F Verbakel [300.4], C Thelning [301.4], P & S Mitchell [302.4], T & F Conlan [303.4], K & N McLachlan [304.4], E Schultz [305.4], WPG 2 [306.4], Springbank [312.12] and Keeling Dairies [313.9] oppose or support in part the definition of *Farm building* and seek that *farming activities* be replaced with *primary production activities* for consistency across the proposed district plan.

107. EDS [240.10] supports the definition of *Natural defences* and seeks for the definition to be retained as notified.

108. NZ Carbon Farming [192.9] supports the in part the definition of *Woodlot* but seeks that *carbon sink* be removed.

7.3.2 Analysis

109. A number of the definition submissions overlap directly with matters considered elsewhere in this report. In particular, the analysis of NH-O1–NH-P5, the flood provisions, NH-P8–P13 and CE-O5–CE-P18 has identified recurring concerns regarding the meaning of acceptable level, the role of overlays, the distinction between hazard and risk, and the relationship between natural defences, natural hazard mitigation works and hard protection structures.

110. I consider the definitions should support, but not duplicate, the substantive policy and rule framework. Definitions should therefore describe what an activity, hazard or mapped area is, while questions of acceptable or tolerable risk, effects management and the appropriateness of particular mitigation should remain within the relevant objectives, policies, rules and site-specific assessments.

7.3.2.1 Coastal natural hazard and Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay

111. DOC [194.7] seeks a new definition of Coastal natural hazard to clarify the relationship between the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment chapters. This concern is also raised in DOC [194.39], which seeks a clearer distinction between natural hazards generally and coastal hazards.

112. I agree that a definition would improve plan usability. However, I do not recommend adopting DOC's proposed definition in full. It extends to matters such as groundwater rise, salinisation and associated liquefaction, which would blur the distinction between the Coastal Environment and Natural Hazards chapters. The Coastal Environment provisions specifically manage coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami, and CE-P14 identifies those three hazards.

113. I therefore recommend a concise definition limited to hazards arising from coastal processes and expressly including those three hazards. Sea-level rise and climate change are appropriately treated as drivers that may alter the likelihood, extent or severity of those hazards rather than as separate mapped hazards.

114. NHC [153.41] seeks to add the Tsunami Hazard Area to the definition of Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay. I do not recommend this amendment. The tsunami mapping is an information layer and, unlike the Coastal Erosion and Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlays, is not intended to trigger the full suite of Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay rules. Including it in the definition would materially expand the regulatory application of CE-P15–P18 and CE-R5–R11 without a corresponding assessment of those consequences. Tsunami should therefore be included within the definition of Coastal natural hazard, but not within the regulatory definition of Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay.

7.3.2.2 Coastal margin

115. DOC [194.4] identifies a genuine drafting ambiguity where the 20 m coastal margin extends beyond the mapped Coastal Environment. I recommend clarifying that the Coastal Margin does not extend beyond the mapped Coastal Environment. This does not change the spatial extent intended by the chapter but makes the relationship between the mapped Coastal Environment and the 20 m margin explicit.

7.3.2.3 Risk terminology – "acceptable", "intolerable" and "appropriately mitigated"

116. NHC [153.1] seeks a definition of appropriately mitigated. CRC's further submission opposes this, considering the meaning is established through the rule framework.

117. The same underlying issue arises through NHC submissions on NH-P8, NH-P9, NH-P11, NH-P12, CE-P15 and CE-P18 seeking definitions or metrics for acceptable or intolerable risk. For example, NHC seeks an acceptable-risk metric for the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay and the fault provisions, while CE-P15 relief seeks an intolerable risk threshold.

118. Consistent with the analysis of those provisions, I do not recommend district-wide definitions of acceptable level, intolerable risk or appropriately mitigated. Risk depends on the hazard, likelihood, exposure, vulnerability, consequences and nature of the activity. A single definition risks creating a universal threshold where the framework instead requires a proportionate and hazard-specific assessment.

119. Where these expressions created uncertainty in individual provisions, I have recommended clearer substantive wording — for example, requiring risk to be adequately managed or specifying the relevant effects to be avoided or mitigated. This is preferable to introducing a generic risk-tolerance definition into the Definitions chapter.

7.3.2.4 AEP and ARI

120. CRC [271.1, 271.65] seeks replacement of Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) with Average Recurrence Interval (ARI), principally on usability grounds, while acknowledging that ORC uses AEP.

121. I recommend retaining AEP as the operative terminology. It is already embedded in the notified flood provisions and provides a direct expression of the probability of an event occurring in any year. Replacing it with ARI would create inconsistency with the Otago flood framework and require consequential changes across the chapter. To address CRC's usability concern, I recommend a minor explanatory addition to the AEP definition using a simple probability example, rather than introducing dual terminology throughout the Plan.

7.3.2.5 Critical facilities

122. Telcos [244.4] and CRC [271.7] support the notified definition. FENZ [163.3] supports inclusion of fire stations and emergency coordination facilities but seeks use of the defined term Emergency service facilities.

123. I agree that the FENZ amendment improves consistency with terminology used elsewhere in the Plan without materially changing the intended scope. The definition should continue to distinguish Critical facilities from Regionally Significant Infrastructure. As discussed under NH-P3 and CE-R8, those terms perform different functions and should not be merged.

7.3.2.6 Farm building

124. A large group of rural submitters seeks replacement of farming activities with primary production activities for consistency across the Plan. I agree with that drafting change.

125. NZ Pork [195.3], FFNZ [246.16] and EPFNZ/PIANZ [266.1] also seek removal of the exclusion for intensive indoor primary production. Their concern is that hazard management should reflect the function and vulnerability of the particular building rather than the farming system with which it is associated. Further submissions support that relief.

126. I acknowledge the merit of the functional-risk argument, but do not recommend removing the exclusion. As discussed in relation to NH-R1–R3, the permitted flood pathways for farm buildings are intentionally directed toward comparatively low-vulnerability buildings and structures. Including intensive indoor primary production within the definition would extend those permitted pathways to buildings that may contain animals, workers, equipment and services with materially different vulnerability and consequences. The appropriate distinction is therefore retained at the definition level, while the terminology is updated to primary production activities for consistency.

7.3.2.7 Coastal hazard sensitive activity

127. MOE [242.3] supports the definition and the inclusion of educational facilities. FFNZ [246.12] seeks a narrower treatment of intensive primary production and replacement of generic hazardous-substance wording with the defined terms hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities. NHC's further submission supports use of those defined hazardous-facility terms because they are less open to interpretation.

128. I recommend retaining the overall definition, including educational facilities, but amending the hazardous-substance component to use the defined terms hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities. This is consistent with the approach recommended for NH-R12 and avoids capturing incidental or domestic-scale storage. I do not recommend broader deletion of intensive primary production from the definition without evidence that all such activities have a comparable vulnerability profile.

7.3.2.8 Hard protection structure, Natural defences and Natural hazard mitigation works

129. These three definitions should be read together.

130. CRC [271.16] supports the notified Hard protection structure definition, while DOC [194.11] seeks the addition of rip rap to the non-coastal component. I agree. Within the Coastal Environment, the definition should continue to adopt the NZCPS meaning. Outside the Coastal Environment, adding rip rap improves alignment with the regional framework and recognises a commonly used engineered protection form.

131. EDS [240.10] supports the notified definition of Natural defences. I recommend retaining it. As discussed under CE-P17 and CE-P18, natural defences are conceptually distinct from engineered hard protection and should remain separately defined.

132. CRC [271.39] seeks to broaden Natural hazard mitigation works to expressly include flood and erosion protection works, earthworks, planting and vegetation clearance and both soft- and hard-engineering responses. NHC supports the inclusion of council flood and erosion protection works.

133. I agree in part. The definition should be broad enough to capture the range of works that may form part of a mitigation scheme, but the definition itself should not determine activity status. As discussed under NH-R5, CE-R4, CE-P17 and CE-P18, the fact that an activity is a natural hazard mitigation work does not mean it should automatically be permitted or enabled. The applicable policy and rule must determine whether natural, soft-engineered or hard-engineered works are appropriate.

7.3.2.9 High Flood Hazard Area and Natural Hazard Overlay

134. CRC [271.23] and [271.40] support these definitions and seek their retention. I recommend retaining them.

135. This is consistent with the wider analysis in the report: an overlay identifies an area where a hazard may be present and further investigation may be required; it does not itself establish the level of risk at a particular site. Further submissions expressly support clearer explanation of this distinction because hazard overlays can otherwise be misunderstood as predictions that a hazard will occur. Site-specific assessment remains the mechanism for determining hazard characteristics and risk where required.

7.3.2.10 Woodlot

136. NZ Carbon Farming [192.9] seeks deletion of carbon sink from the definition of Woodlot because it is undefined and may overlap with the NES-CF, while CRC [271.64] supports the notified definition.

137. I agree in part with NZ Carbon Farming. Given NH-R13 separately addresses woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry, retaining the undefined phrase carbon sink risks unnecessary overlap with commercial forestry terminology. I recommend removing carbon sink while retaining the exclusion for commercial plantation forestry.

7.3.2.11 Regionally Significant Infrastructure

138. CRC [271.268] seeks an amendment to the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure (RSI), together with clarification under NH-R12 that natural hazard mitigation works are managed through NH-R5. As identified under NH-R12, the latter matter is addressed through the recommended note to that rule, while the requested change to the RSI definition is appropriately considered here because the definition applies more broadly across the Plan.

139. The notified RSI definition already includes Otago Regional Council natural hazard mitigation works, including flood protection infrastructure and drainage schemes. This is relevant to the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions because those works may have functional or operational requirements to locate within areas affected by natural hazards and may themselves perform an important risk-reduction function.

140. I consider that this inclusion should be retained. However, the fact that a natural hazard mitigation work is RSI does not determine its activity status nor establish an entitlement to locate within a hazard area or the Coastal Environment. The relevant objectives, policies and rules continue to determine the appropriate management response. This distinction is particularly important for NH-P3, NH-R12, CE-P18 and CE-R8.

141. The national direction applying to RSI also varies according to the infrastructure concerned. The NPS-I applies to qualifying infrastructure, including local-authority flood control and protection works, but the District Plan definition of RSI is broader. Renewable electricity generation and electricity networks, for example, are subject to their respective national policy statements. The Plan-defined term should therefore not be treated as synonymous with infrastructure subject to the NPS-I.

142. This distinction is also relevant to the relief considered under CE-R8. A hard protection structure does not warrant a more enabling pathway merely because the structure itself is RSI. Where a structure is a Hard protection structure, its activity status should continue to be determined through CE-P18 and CE-R8, including whether it is the only practical means of protecting RSI. Other natural hazard mitigation works are not necessarily hard protection structures and should be managed according to their nature and the applicable provisions.

143. Overall, I consider the RSI definition should continue to identify infrastructure of regional significance, including the specified natural hazard mitigation works. Any clarification sought by CRC should be limited to ensuring that the relevant regional council natural hazard mitigation infrastructure is clearly captured and should not alter the substantive management of RSI under the Natural Hazards or Coastal Environment provisions.

7.3.3 Recommendations

144. Amend the following definitions as follows:

- Add Coastal natural hazard definition as follows;

Coastal natural hazard *means a natural hazard arising from coastal processes, including coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami*

- Amend the definition of Coastal margin as follows;

Coastal margin *means all landward property within 20 metres of mean high-water springs and within the mapped Coastal Environment. Where the 20 metre distance extends beyond the mapped Coastal Environment, that land is not part of the Coastal Margin.*

- Retain the definition of Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay
- Amend the definition of Annual Exceedance Probability

Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) *means the probability that a flood event of a specified magnitude will be equalled or exceeded in any one year. For example, a 0.2% AEP event has a 1 in 500 chance of being equalled or exceeded in any year*

- Amend the definition of Critical facilities

Amend the relevant component of the definition to:

~~*fire stations, police stations, ambulance stations and emergency coordination facilities*~~
Emergency service facilities, including fire stations, police stations, ambulance stations and emergency coordination facilities.

- Amend the definition of Farm building, as follows;

Farm building *means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:*

- *buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and*
- *visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with ~~farming~~ primary production activities or a rural farmstay experience.*

- Amend the definition of Coastal hazard sensitive activity to retain the definition generally, but amend the hazardous-substance component from:

~~...storage of hazardous substances~~ *to: ...hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities*

- For the definition of 'Hard protection structure' Retain the NZCPS definition within the Coastal Environment and amend the non-coastal component to include (as set out in Appendix 1):

"...any dam, weir, stop bank, carriageway, groyne, rip rap, reservoir..."

- Amend the definition of Natural hazard mitigation works as follows;

Natural hazard mitigation works *means structures and associated ~~engineering works~~ earthworks, engineering works, planting and vegetation clearance undertaken to prevent, reduce or control the effects of natural hazards, and includes soft-engineering and hard-engineering natural hazard mitigation works*

- Amend the definition of Woodlot

Woodlot *means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, the creation of other wood products, ~~a carbon sink,~~ erosion control, pest or wilding tree management purposes, but excludes commercial plantation forestry.*

- Retain the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure.
- No new definitions are recommended for acceptable level, intolerable risk, appropriately mitigated or suitably qualified and experienced professional/expert.

7.3.4 Evaluation

145. The recommended definition amendments require a proportionate further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the evaluations for the substantive Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions.

146. The amendments principally improve clarity, internal consistency and implementation. Defining Coastal natural hazard clarifies the division between the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment chapters, while retaining a narrower Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay definition avoids unintentionally applying the full coastal hazard rule framework to the information-only tsunami layer.

147. The amendments to Farm building, Critical facilities, Coastal hazard sensitive activity, Hard protection structure, Natural hazard mitigation works and Woodlot improve readability and consistency with terminology used elsewhere in the Plan and with the substantive recommendations in this report. Importantly, broadening the description of Natural hazard mitigation works does not itself enable those works; their activity status remains controlled through the relevant rules.

148. Retaining AEP, the High Flood Hazard Area definition and Natural Hazard Overlay definition maintains consistency with the notified flood framework, while the explanatory amendment to AEP improves usability.

149. Not introducing generic definitions of acceptable or intolerable risk avoids imposing a single risk threshold across materially different hazards and activities.

The revised policy and rule framework instead provides the relevant risk-management tests at the point where they are required.

150. Overall, the amendments are considered more effective and efficient than either retaining the identified ambiguities or introducing broad universal risk definitions and are the most appropriate approach for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.4 STRATEGIC DIRECTION

151. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, nine original submission points and five identified further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
FENZ 2	163.9
Alliance	190.15
HCES	232.11
WCL	243.5
Kā Rūnaka	251.45
Fish & Game	256.20
ORC	259.16
Meridian	294.18
OceanaGold	295.81

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306

7.4.1 Submissions

152. FENZ 2 [163.9], Alliance [190.15], WCL [243.5], ORC [259.16] and OceanaGold [295.81] support SD-RRNH-O1 and seek that the objective be retained as notified.

153. HCES [232.11], Kā Rūnaka [251.45] and Fish & Game [256.20] seek amendments to SD-RRNH-O1.

154. Meridian [294.18] opposes SD-RRNH-O1 and seeks amendments. It considers *avoid where possible* is unnecessarily restrictive and amendments should focus on managing significant risks.

7.4.2 Analysis

155. SD-RRNH-O1 provides the overarching strategic direction for natural hazards, seeking to improve the District's resilience and avoid or mitigate risks to people, communities, property and infrastructure. The objective received broad support, although submissions seek refinement in relation to climate change, the approach to avoidance and mitigation, and the range of consequences addressed.

156. I agree that an overarching strategic objective addressing resilience and natural hazard risk remains appropriate. However, the statutory framework has changed since notification, most notably through the NPS-NH, which establishes a risk-based and proportionate approach to managing natural hazard risk. This provides a basis for refining the notified wording so that the strategic direction does not imply that avoidance is the preferred response irrespective of the level or nature of risk.

7.4.2.1 Climate change and resilience

157. HCES [232.11] seeks to replace "improve" with "continually strengthen", reflecting the ongoing nature of resilience as natural hazard risk changes over time. Kā Rūnaka [251.45] also seeks explicit recognition of climate change.

158. I agree with the underlying concern. Natural hazard risk is not static, and climate change may alter hazard likelihood, extent and consequences over time. This is also consistent with the wider Natural Hazards provisions and the strategic direction relating to adaptation to climate change.

159. I do not consider it necessary to replace "improve" with "continually strengthen". "Improve the District's resilience" is sufficiently enduring for a strategic objective. I do, however, recommend expressly recognising the effects of climate change so that the strategic direction clearly encompasses changing natural hazard risk over time.

7.4.2.2 Avoidance and proportionate management of risk

160. Meridian [294.18] seeks to move away from the notified "avoid where possible" approach and instead focus on managing significant risks. Further submissions take differing positions, including support for retaining avoidance and support for greater alignment with a proportionate risk-based approach.

161. I agree in part with Meridian. The notified formulation may be read as establishing a general preference for avoidance whenever it is practicable, irrespective of the level of risk. This does not clearly reflect the differentiated, risk-based approach now established through the higher-order framework.

162. I do not, however, recommend limiting the objective to "significant natural hazard risk". That terminology has a particular application under the NPS-NH, whereas SD-RRNH-O1 is a district-wide strategic objective and also applies to

activities and hazards outside the scope of that NPS, including infrastructure, primary production and wildfire.

163. I therefore recommend retaining the broader concept of natural hazard risk, while directing that it be avoided or mitigated in a manner proportionate to the level of risk. This provides a clearer strategic link to the more detailed risk-based framework in NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5.

7.4.2.3 People, communities, property and the environment

164. Fish & Game [256.20] seeks inclusion of "natural resources", while Kā Rūnaka also seeks recognition of environmental consequences.

165. I agree that the notified objective is unnecessarily narrow. The subordinate Natural Hazards provisions already recognise potential consequences for the environment alongside effects on people and property. I therefore recommend adding "the environment" rather than "natural resources". This terminology is broader and maintains consistency with the remainder of the chapter.

7.4.2.4 Coastal natural hazards

166. Kā Rūnaka seeks express reference to both "natural hazards" and "coastal natural hazards". I do not consider this necessary. Coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami are natural hazards notwithstanding that the detailed provisions addressing them are principally contained in the Coastal Environment chapter. Separating the terms within a district-wide strategic objective could imply that coastal natural hazards sit outside the broader concept of natural hazards.

167. Overall, I recommend retaining the fundamental intent of SD-RRNH-O1 but amending it to expressly recognise climate change, environmental consequences and proportionate management of natural hazard risk. in response to submission points;

- I recommend accepting HCES [232.11], Kā Rūnaka [251.45], Fish & Game [256.20] and Meridian [294.18] in part, to the extent that their submissions support refinement of SD-RRNH-O1.
- I recommend accepting the submissions seeking retention of the objective in part, insofar as its overall resilience and natural hazard risk-management function is retained.

7.4.3 Recommendations

168. I recommend SD-RRNH-O1 be amended as follows:

SD-RRNH-O1 – Natural hazards

Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards <u>including the effects of climate change, by avoiding or mitigating natural hazard</u> ~~and where possible, avoid or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigate the~~ risks to people, communities, property, and infrastructure <u>and the environment in a manner proportionate to the level of risk</u>.

7.4.4 Evaluation

169. The recommended amendments to SD-RRNH-O1 require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation.

170. The amendments retain the notified objective's overall focus on improving resilience to natural hazards but provide clearer and more contemporary direction by expressly recognising the effects of climate change, environmental consequences and the need for natural hazard risk to be avoided or mitigated in a manner proportionate to the level of risk. This improves alignment with the risk-based approach now reflected through the Natural Hazards framework and avoids implying that avoidance is the preferred response irrespective of the level or nature of risk.

171. The amendments are effective and efficient because they improve consistency between the strategic direction and the more detailed Natural Hazards provisions, particularly NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5, without introducing new regulatory processes or assessment requirements. The principal benefit is greater clarity and certainty for plan users, while any additional implementation costs are expected to be limited because the detailed assessment of risk remains within the subordinate provisions.

172. Retaining the objective as notified would provide less clear alignment with the proportionate risk-based framework, while limiting the objective to "significant" natural hazard risk could unintentionally narrow its application to hazards and activities outside the scope of that terminology. Overall, the recommended amendments are considered a more appropriate and effective way of achieving the strategic resilience outcome for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.5 NATURAL HAZARD & COASTAL HAZARD GENERAL MATTERS

173. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 27 original submission points and 15 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Kā Rūnaka	251.130, 251.129, 251.133, 251.131
B de Geest	51.39, 51.38, 51.40
C Leckie 2	107.4, 107.2
ORC	259.32
NPHS	164.18
NZDF	189.25
Alliance	190.29

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
DOC	194.38, 194.39
Livingstone Creek	216.6, 216.7
FFNZ	246.92
CRC	271.263, 271.249, 271.247, 271.250, 271.248, 271.246
W & K Jankowitz	126.3
Telcos	244.82
Transpower	309.89

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
Otago Regional Council	FS259
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Director-General of Conservation	FS194

7.5.1 Submissions

174. Kā Rūnaka [251.130, 251.129, 251.133] seeks amendments to emphasise activities must not exacerbate natural hazard risk. They also seek amendments to better align with the PORPS

175. Kā Rūnaka [251.131] seek amendments to the Natural hazards user notes to refer to the SASM chapter.

176. Telcos [244.82] and Transpower [309.89] seeks amendments to the Natural hazard user notes to clarify how the chapter applies to infrastructure. They consider infrastructure provisions should primarily sit within the Infrastructure and Energy chapters.

177. B de Geest [51.39, 51.40] and C Leckie 2 [107.4, 107.2] oppose the *Alluvial fan awareness overlay* and seek the removal of the overlay. Both submitters oppose the *Waitaki River flood assessment overlay* in select areas

178. B de Geest [51.38] seeks clarification on information requirements for properties affected by the *Liquefaction assessment overlay*.

179. ORC [259.32] and DOC [194.39] seek clearer distinction between coastal and non-coastal hazards. ORC opposes the approach to natural hazards, whereas DOC supports the approach to natural hazards, however both submitters seek amendments.

180. NPHS [164.18], Alliance [190.29], DOC [194.38] and FFNZ [246.92] generally support the Natural hazards chapter and seek that it be retained as notified, subject to changes. Submitters support the flexible risk-based approach.

181. NZDF [189.25] oppose in part the Natural hazards chapter and seek amendments to permit Temporary Military Training Activities (TMTA), including associated temporary buildings/structures and earthworks.

182. Livingstone Creek [216.6, 216.7] oppose the *Liquification assessment overlay* and the *Flood assessment overlay* as the submitter considers they are inaccurately mapped and seeks a complete halt until Council engages with landowners and experts.

183. CRC [271.263] seeks a new policy is needed to support *Natural hazard mitigation works* undertaken by a local authority.

184. CRC [271.248, 271.246, 271.249, 271.247, 271.250] supports parts of the Natural hazards chapter but seeks amendments to clarify that surface fault rupture, liquefaction and land instability overlays identify areas where hazard potential may exist and where further site-specific investigations may be required.

185. W & K Jankowitz [126.3] oppose the extent of the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay on submitters property and seek the overlay be reduced to 10m.

7.5.2 Analysis

186. I support retaining the overall structure and risk-based approach of the Natural Hazards chapter. The notified chapter recognises that the appropriate planning response varies according to the likelihood and consequences of a natural hazard and the vulnerability of the activity exposed to that hazard. This approach has received general support from a number of submitters.

187. The statutory context has changed since notification of the PDP. In particular, the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards 2025 (NPS-NH) came into force, and its objective requires natural hazard risk to people and property associated with subdivision, use and development to be managed using a risk-based proportionate approach. It requires risk assessment using a prescribed risk matrix, proportionate management according to the level of risk, avoidance of very high natural hazard risk, and avoidance or proportionate mitigation where development creates or increases significant natural hazard risk on other sites.

188. The NPS-NH also requires decision-makers to use the best information available, notwithstanding uncertainty or incompleteness, and to consider the potential impacts of climate change at least 100 years into the future. I consider that these requirements generally reinforce rather than displace the fundamental risk-based approach of the notified Natural Hazards chapter.

189. The NPS-NH does not, however, apply to infrastructure or primary production and does not prevent decision-makers (in a resource consent context) from managing natural hazard risks beyond its scope. Care is therefore required not to

simply transpose NPS-NH terminology throughout the PDP where provisions have a wider application.

190. The regional policy context has also changed since submissions were lodged. The Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 became operative on 9 July 2026 replacing the pORPS following the appeals process, and the Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 ceased to be operative from that date. The submissions seeking alignment with the ORPS must therefore now be considered and now appropriately weighted.

191. In relation to the Kā Rūnaka submissions concerning the exacerbation of natural hazard risk, I agree with the underlying intent. A risk-based framework needs to consider not only the risk experienced by the proposed activity itself but whether development or associated mitigation transfers or increases risk elsewhere. This is particularly important for hazards such as flooding and land instability where changes to landform, flow paths or mitigation measures may affect surrounding land.

192. This approach is now expressly reinforced by Policy 4 of the NPS-NH, which requires significant natural hazard risk created or increased on other sites by subdivision, use or development, including associated mitigation measures, to be avoided or mitigated proportionately. I therefore recommend accepting Kā Rūnaka [251.129, 251.130 and 251.133] in part, with the substantive amendments addressed through the relevant objectives and policies, particularly NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5, rather than duplicating equivalent wording throughout the chapter.

193. I also agree with CRC that the purpose of the assessment and awareness overlays should be more clearly explained. Inclusion of land within an assessment overlay does not necessarily establish the presence, severity or level of natural hazard risk at a particular site. Rather, the overlay identifies land where available information indicates that a hazard may be present and where further site-specific assessment may therefore be required when subdivision, use or development is proposed. This distinction is particularly evident for liquefaction, where CRC explains that the mapped geology, soils and groundwater indicate that liquefiable soils may be present and require further investigation. Consideration of consent mechanisms and associated assessment is undertaken in response to those provisions below.

194. I consider this clarification appropriate and consistent with the NPS-NH requirement to use the best available information and to continue making risk assessments where that information is uncertain or incomplete. It also responds in part to landowner concerns about the regulatory implications of being located within an assessment or awareness overlay. I therefore recommend accepting CRC [271.246–271.250] in part, with the detailed amendments addressed in relation to the relevant hazard descriptions and NH-P13.

195. I do not consider that the general concerns regarding the accuracy of individual overlays provide a basis for abandoning the use of hazard mapping or delaying the Natural Hazards framework as a whole. The submissions of B de Geest, C Leckie 2,

Livingstone Creek and W & K Jankowitz raise site- and hazard-specific questions about the technical basis and spatial extent of individual overlays. Those matters should be assessed against the relevant technical evidence in the hazard-specific and Planning Maps sections of this report. The relief sought in those submissions is therefore not determined through this General Matters section.

196. In relation to the distinction between coastal and non-coastal hazards, I agree with ORC [259.32] and DOC [194.39] that the notified introduction could provide greater clarity. DOC notes that the current drafting leaves uncertainty as to whether the two chapters overlap, while ORC observes that some hazards do not fall neatly within a geographic coastal/non-coastal distinction.

197. In my view, the more useful distinction is which PDP chapter contains the provisions managing each hazard, rather than suggesting that all hazards occurring within the coastal environment are managed through the Coastal Environment chapter. Coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami are addressed through the Coastal Environment chapter, while other hazards are principally managed through the Natural Hazards chapter. I recommend accepting these submissions in part and clarifying the introduction and/or User Notes accordingly.

198. This approach is also consistent with the NPS-NH, which applies to flooding, landslips, coastal erosion, coastal inundation, active faults, liquefaction and tsunami across all environments, including coastal environments, while providing that the NZCPS prevails where there is a conflict.

199. I support the intent of Kā Rūnaka [251.131] submission seeking an additional cross-reference to the SASM chapter. Natural hazard mitigation works may overlap wāhi tūpuna and other identified sites and areas, and a cross-reference will improve plan usability without changing the substantive requirements applying to those activities. I note however that this chapter has been withdrawn, as such, cross reference is not able to be achieved. I therefore recommend addition to the user notes to reflect this consideration.

200. I similarly agree that the relationship between the Natural Hazards chapter and the Infrastructure and Energy chapters should be clear. The notified User Notes already recognise that additional provisions applying to infrastructure within natural hazard overlays are contained within those chapters. Transpower seeks greater certainty that only the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter apply to infrastructure and that applicable infrastructure rules are located in the Infrastructure chapter. I address the substantive application of the Natural Hazards provisions to infrastructure under the Critical Facilities and Infrastructure section. Any consequential clarification to the User Notes should be coordinated with the recommendations in that section.

201. NZDF [189.25] raises a separate issue concerning Temporary Military Training Activities. I agree that the temporary duration and vulnerability of an activity are relevant to the level of natural hazard risk. However, temporary activities are not necessarily without risk, particularly where they involve occupation by people, temporary structures or earthworks capable of altering natural hazard processes. I

therefore consider a permitted pathway may be appropriate where appropriate standards ensure the activity does not materially increase exposure or exacerbate natural hazard risk. The detailed relief should be addressed through the relevant rules rather than through amendments to the general chapter framework.

202. CRC [271.263] seeks a policy enabling natural hazard mitigation works undertaken by local authorities. I agree there is merit in ensuring the policy framework recognises the role of such works. However, mitigation works may themselves have social, cultural, environmental and natural hazard effects, including displacement of floodwater or transfer of risk upstream or downstream. The merits and appropriate drafting of such a policy are therefore addressed under the Natural Protection Features and Natural Hazard Mitigation Works section rather than determined here.

7.5.3 Recommendations

203. I recommend the following changes to the Natural Hazards User Notes as follows:

> ***User notes***
>
> *For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one chapter in the District Plan. Plan users are encouraged to check all District-Wide Matters chapters, as well as the relevant zone chapter.*
>
> *For example, where activities, including natural hazard mitigation works, may affect a Site or Area of Significance to Māori, the provisions of the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) chapter also apply.*
>
> *This chapter includes objectives, policies and rules for land use and development occurring within the natural hazard overlays. Subdivision within the natural hazard overlays is addressed in the Subdivision Chapter.*
>
> *The Coastal Environment Chapter contains provisions relating to coastal natural hazards. While this chapter address non-coastal hazards which may also be located in a coastal environment.*
>
> *Additional objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within areas subject to a natural hazard overlay, are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter. While the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter may also be applicable to infrastructure the rules are located infrastructure rules are in the Infrastructure chapter*

7.5.4 Evaluation

204. The recommended amendments are principally targeted clarifications to the notified risk-based framework rather than a change to its fundamental approach. The alternatives are to retain the chapter entirely as notified, make the targeted amendments recommended above, or substantially restructure the chapter and hazard overlays in response to the submissions.

205. Retaining the provisions entirely as notified would have the benefit of maintaining the existing structure and avoiding additional drafting complexity. However, it would not respond to identified uncertainty about the function of assessment and awareness overlays, the relationship between the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment chapters, or relevant cross-references to other PDP chapters. It would also miss the opportunity to better reflect the higher-order natural hazard framework that has changed since notification.

206. Conversely, substantially restructuring or removing the Natural Hazards framework and associated overlays would reduce regulatory requirements for some affected landowners but would reduce the ability of the PDP to identify where further investigation of potential natural hazards is warranted. I do not consider that approach appropriate where the individual submissions primarily challenge the accuracy or application of particular overlays, rather than demonstrating that the overall use of risk-based hazard mapping is inappropriate.

207. The recommended approach is more effective because it retains the existing risk-based framework while making clearer that mapped assessment and awareness areas are a screening mechanism rather than necessarily a site-specific determination of risk. Site-specific information can therefore refine the understanding of hazard and risk at the point when an activity is proposed. This is consistent with the NPS-NH direction to use the best available information and to assess and manage natural hazard risk proportionately.

208. The recommended approach is also more efficient because it avoids unnecessarily duplicating provisions across the Natural Hazards, Coastal Environment, Infrastructure and Energy chapters. Clear User Notes and cross-references provide a more proportionate means of explaining how those chapters interact while retaining the substantive provisions in those chapters most directly responsible for managing the relevant effects.

209. Strengthening consideration of whether activities create or exacerbate natural hazard risk on other sites provides an additional benefit by recognising that hazard mitigation or development on one property can alter risk elsewhere. This is consistent with Policy 4 of the NPS-NH and provides greater certainty that off-site consequences form part of the risk assessment.

210. There will be some costs associated with site-specific investigations where land is identified within an assessment overlay. However, requiring investigation where available information indicates potential hazard is preferable to either assuming that all mapped land has the same level of risk or removing the overlay in the absence of better information. The recommended clarification should also reduce unnecessary costs by making clear that the mapped overlay itself does not establish the final level of risk.

211. There remains uncertainty regarding the precise extent and severity of hazards at some individual locations. I do not consider that uncertainty warrants delaying the overall Natural Hazards framework. The NPS-NH expressly requires decision-makers to use the best available information and not delay decisions solely

because available information is uncertain or incomplete. Property-specific mapping amendments should instead be determined on the technical evidence addressed in the relevant hazard-specific sections.

212. Overall, I consider the recommended amendments provide a more effective and efficient means of achieving the PDP's natural hazard objectives than either retaining the provisions entirely as notified or substantially restructuring the framework. They retain the supported risk-based approach, improve plan interpretation and integration, and better align the PDP with the higher-order statutory framework now applying to natural hazard risk.

NATURAL HAZARDS FRAMEWORK, RISK BASED APPROACH

7.6 Natural Hazards – NH-O1 Natural hazard risk

213. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 29 original submission points and 3 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.1
FENZ 2	163.36
HortNZ	166.26
NZ Carbon Farming	192.13
Fuel Companies	238.40
Kā Rūnaka	251.132
G & K Taylor	265.22
K & D Weir	267.22
B & K McLeod	269.22
CRC	271.251
DTL	282.22
DHL	283.22
DDL	284.22
B & A Matthews	285.22
P & B Wilson	290.22
P & J Stackhouse	291.22
R & S Borst	292.22
B & G Hamilton	293.22

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
OceanaGold	295.131
G Simpson 2	296.22
A & C Gibson	298.22
TT & Cayuga	299.22
A & F Verbakel	300.22
C Thelning	301.22
P & S Mitchell	302.22
T & F Conlan	303.22
K & N McLachlan	304.22
Springbank	312.285
Keeling Dairies	313.26

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Alliance Group Limited	FS190
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295

7.6.1 Submissions

214. The submissions on NH-O1 generally support the objective and its risk-based approachbut seek amendments concerning the proportionality of the response to natural hazard risk, exacerbation of risk, and interpretation of the objective.

215. FENZ 2 [163.36], CRC [271.251] and OceanaGold [295.131] generally support NH-O1. FENZ considers that recognising, understanding and reducing natural hazard risk is important for protecting people, property and the environment, while CRC supports the intent of the objective and seeks its retention as notified. OceanaGold supports the objective, including because it does not require complete avoidance of activities within hazard areas.

216. HortNZ [166.26], NZ Carbon Farming [192.13], Fuel Companies [238.40], G & K Taylor [265.22], K & D Weir [267.22], B & K McLeod [269.22], DTL [282.22], DHL [283.22], DDL [284.22], B & A Matthews [285.22], P & B Wilson [290.22], P & J Stackhouse [291.22], R & S Borst [292.22], B & G Hamilton [293.22], G Simpson 2 [296.22], A & C Gibson [298.22], TT & Cayuga [299.22], A & F Verbakel [300.22], C Thelning [301.22], P & S Mitchell [302.22], T & F Conlan [303.22], K & N McLachlan [304.22], Springbank [312.285] and Keeling Dairies [313.26] seek amendments to provide a more explicitly proportionate response to natural hazard risk, generally seeking that avoidance or mitigation is relative or proportionate to the level of risk.

217. Springbank [312.285] also considers the requirement for natural hazard risks to be "understood" to be subjective and seeks revised wording focused on recognising natural hazard impacts and ensuring avoidance and mitigation are proportionate to the level of risk.

218. Kā Rūnaka [251.132] seeks amendment to NH-O1 to better align with the regional natural hazard framework by ensuring activities are managed so that natural hazard risks are not exacerbated, or alternatively seeks that this outcome is provided for through amendments to the policies.

219. NHC [153.1] supports the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazard risk but seeks a definition of "appropriately mitigated" to provide greater certainty and consistency in implementation. CRC opposes this relief through further submission, considering that the meaning of "appropriately mitigated" is adequately established through the rule framework.

7.6.2 Analysis

220. NH-O1 establishes the overarching outcome for the Natural Hazards chapter. It seeks recognition and understanding of natural hazard risk, including the effects of climate change, and the avoidance or appropriate mitigation of impacts on people, property and the environment. This objective supports the flexible risk-based approach described in the chapter introduction and implemented through the subsequent policies.

221. There is broad support for the intent of NH-O1. FENZ 2 [163.36] considers that recognising, understanding and reducing natural hazard risk is important to protecting people, property and the environment, while CRC [271.251] seeks retention of the objective as notified. OceanaGold [295.131] also supports the objective, including because it does not require the complete avoidance of activities within natural hazard areas.

222. The principal issue raised by submissions is whether NH-O1 should more clearly express that the planning response is proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk. Twenty-four submitters seek substantially similar amendments to this effect. Their proposed wording would recognise the impacts of natural hazards and climate change and require those impacts to be avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.

223. I agree with the intent of these submissions. The notified objective refers to risks being "avoided or appropriately mitigated", which provides some scope for a response that reflects the nature and severity of the risk. However, it does not expressly establish the relationship between the level of risk and the appropriate management response. In my view, expressly incorporating proportionality would better articulate the risk-based approach intended by the chapter.

224. This conclusion is reinforced by the NPS-NH, which came into force on 15 January 2026 after the PDP was notified. Its objective requires natural hazard risk to people and property associated with subdivision, use and development to be

managed using a "risk-based proportionate approach". Policy 2 similarly requires management proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk. Very high risk must be avoided, while high and medium risk may be avoided or mitigated proportionate to the level of risk.

225. I acknowledge that the NPS-NH does not apply to infrastructure or primary production and applies only to the natural hazards specified in clause 1.3. It does not, however, preclude decision-makers from managing other natural hazards or activities beyond its application. I therefore do not consider it appropriate to reproduce the NPS-NH terminology or risk matrix wholesale in NH-O1. Rather, the broader concept of management proportionate to the level of risk is appropriate for the district-wide objective and is consistent with the underlying approach already adopted by the PDP.

226. Springbank [312.285] additionally considers that requiring natural hazard risks to be "understood" is subjective and seeks its removal. I do not agree that the concept should be removed. Understanding natural hazard risk is fundamental to determining an appropriate risk response and is supported by NH-P1 and NH-P5, which provide for identification, mapping and site-specific assessment. I therefore recommend rejecting this aspect of the submission.

227. NHC [153.1] supports the avoidance or mitigation of natural hazard risk but seeks a definition of "appropriately mitigated" to improve certainty and consistency. CRC opposes that relief on the basis that the meaning of appropriate mitigation is established through the rule framework.

228. I do not consider a separate definition necessary. The appropriateness of mitigation depends on the nature and level of risk, the vulnerability of the activity and the relevant hazard-specific provisions. A generic definition could therefore constrain the risk-based assessment intended by the chapter. Further, the amendment I recommend below replaces "appropriately mitigated" with clearer direction that avoidance or mitigation is to be proportionate to the level of risk. I therefore recommend rejecting NHC [153.1]. Any associated submission seeking a definition of "appropriately mitigated" is more appropriately addressed in the Definitions section.

229. Kā Rūnaka [251.132] seeks amendments to better align NH-O1 with the regional natural hazard framework, particularly by ensuring activities do not exacerbate natural hazard risk, or alternatively seeks that this outcome be addressed through the policies. I agree with the intent of this submission. NH-P5 already requires consideration of "any exacerbation of an existing natural hazard risk", but I consider this direction should be strengthened through the policy framework.

230. This approach is also consistent with the NPS-NH, which requires the creation or increase of significant natural hazard risk on other sites to be avoided or mitigated proportionate to the level of risk. The Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 has also become operative since notification of the PDP, on 9 July 2026, and now provides the relevant regional policy framework for the Otago part of the District.

231. I do not, however, consider that specific direction concerning exacerbation needs to be added to NH-O1. NH-O1 should remain a concise statement of the overall outcome, while the circumstances and effects that must be considered in achieving that outcome are more appropriately expressed through NH-P2 and NH-P5. I therefore recommend accepting Kā Rūnaka [251.132] in part, with amendments addressed through the relevant policies.

232. Overall, I recommend retaining the intent and structure of NH-O1 but amending it to expressly recognise that avoidance or mitigation should be proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk. This responds to the substantial number of submissions seeking a more explicitly proportionate approach and better aligns the objective with the NPS-NH, while retaining its broader application to people, property and the environment.

7.6.3 Recommendations

233. I recommend the following changes to the provision, amend NH-O1 Natural hazard risk as follows:

NH-O1 Natural hazard risk

The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate change, and their impact on people, property and the environment ~~is~~ are recognised and understood, and avoided or ~~appropriately~~ mitigated in a manner proportionate to the level of risk.

7.6.4 Evaluation

234. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendment to NH-O1. As NH-O1 is an objective, the relevant test under s32(1)(a) is whether the amended objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the limited scale and significance of the recommended change.

235. The amended objective is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, particularly s5, the requirement under s6(h) to recognise and provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards, and s7(i) to have particular regard to the effects of climate change. Retaining reference to people, property and the environment also reflects the broader sustainable management purpose of the RMA.

236. The NPS-NH 2025 provides particularly relevant higher-order direction. Its objective and policies establish a risk-based proportionate approach, including management proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk, avoidance of very high risk, and avoidance or proportionate mitigation where development creates or increases significant natural hazard risk on other sites. The recommended amendment better gives effect to this direction by expressly linking the management response to the level of risk. The more detailed policies and rules will continue to determine when avoidance or mitigation is required.

237. I acknowledge that the NPS-NH does not apply to all hazards or activities addressed by the PDP, including infrastructure and primary production, and that the

NZCPS prevails where there is a conflict within the coastal environment. The recommended wording is nevertheless appropriate as an overarching district-wide objective because it expresses proportionality without importing the NPS-NH risk framework into areas outside its scope.

238. The amendment is also consistent with the applicable regional policy direction. For the Otago part of the District, the ORPS, including HAZ-NH-O1, HAZ-NH-O2 and its associated risk-assessment framework, directs management of natural hazard risk and adaptation. For the Canterbury part of the District, Chapter 11 of the CRPS directs avoidance of new subdivision, use and development in areas of high hazard risk and management of risk elsewhere. The recommended wording accommodates these differing responses by requiring management proportionate to risk rather than assuming mitigation is appropriate in all circumstances.

239. The amendment is also consistent with the PDP's Strategic Direction, particularly SD-RRNH-O1 and SD-RRNH-O2 concerning resilience to natural hazards and adaptation to climate change. NH-O1 provides the more specific chapter-level outcome, while the policies and rules establish how different hazards and levels of risk are to be managed.

240. I have considered retaining NH-O1 as notified and adopting the alternative wording sought by submitters. Retaining the objective would leave proportionality implicit within the term “appropriately mitigated”. Conversely, replacing the objective entirely would unnecessarily remove the requirement that risks are recognised and understood. The recommended amendment is more effective and efficient because it retains the notified structure while providing clearer direction that the management response is proportionate to the level of risk.

241. The amendment is not expected to result in significant additional environmental, economic, social or cultural costs, as it clarifies rather than fundamentally changes the notified risk-based framework. Benefits include improved certainty, greater consistency with higher-order direction and a clearer basis for ensuring that assessment and mitigation requirements reflect the level of risk. Uncertainty regarding risk at individual sites can continue to be addressed through the best available information and the site-specific assessment framework.

242. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-O1 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. It gives effect to relevant national and regional policy direction, supports the PDP Strategic Direction, and provides a clearer, effective and more efficient objective for implementing the risk-based approach through the subsequent Natural Hazards policies and rules.

7.7 Natural Hazards – NH-P2 Risk Based Approach

243. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision

requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 36 original submission points and 10 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.3
FENZ 2	163.38
HortNZ	166.27
NZ Pork	195.15
COWL	235.7
Fuel Companies	238.41
EDS	240.51
MOED	242.16
WCL	243.40
FFNZ	246.93
Kā Rūnaka	251.135
G & K Taylor	265.24
K & D Weir	267.24
B & K McLeod	269.24
CRC	271.253
DTL	282.24
DHL	283.24
DDL	284.24
B & A Matthews	285.24
P & B Wilson	290.24
P & J Stackhouse	291.24
R & S Borst	292.24
B & G Hamilton	293.24
OceanaGold	295.133
G Simpson 2	296.24
A & C Gibson	298.24
TT & Cayuga	299.24
A & F Verbakel	300.24
C Thelning	301.24
P & S Mitchell	302.24
T & F Conlan	303.24
K & N McLachlan	304.24
Transpower	309.90

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Graymont	310.36
Springbank	312.287
Keeling Dairies	313.28

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Alliance Group Limited	FS190
Fuel Companies	FS238
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295
Parkside Holdings Ltd	FS297

7.7.1 Submissions

244. FENZ 2 [163.38], HortNZ [166.27], NZ Pork [195.15], Fuel Companies [238.41], FFNZ [246.93], G & K Taylor [265.24], K & D Weir [267.24], B & K McLeod [269.24], DTL [282.24], DHL [283.24], DDL [284.24], B & A Matthews [285.24], P & B Wilson [290.24], P & J Stackhouse [291.24], R & S Borst [292.24], B & G Hamilton [293.24], OceanaGold [295.133], G Simpson 2 [296.24], A & C Gibson [298.24], TT & Cayuga [299.24], A & F Verbakel [300.24], C Thelning [301.24], P & S Mitchell [302.24], T & F Conlan [303.24], K & N McLachlan [304.24], Springbank [312.287] and Keeling Dairies [313.28] support NH-P2 and seek that the policy be retained as notified. Submitters generally support a risk-based approach to natural hazards management.

245. NHC [153.3] supports NH-P2 in part but seeks a definition or metric for what constitutes an acceptable level of risk to improve clarity and consistent application.

246. COWL [235.7] opposes NH-P2 in part, considering that the direction to avoid development where natural hazards may occur it too strong and may conflict with existing provisions. The submitter seeks that avoid be replaced with manage.

247. EDS [240.51] supports NH-P2 in part but seeks an amendment to the reference in clause (5) which considers it should refer to NH-P3.

248. MOED [242.16] supports NH-P2 but seeks recognition that some activities may have an operational need to locate in natural hazard areas.

249. WCL [243.40] opposes NH-P2 as it is unclear whether use includes maintenance or repairs and seeks that amendments clarify this.

250. Kā Rūnaka [251.135] seeks amendments to make NH-P2 more consistent with the PORPS risk-based framework, including consideration of the characteristics proposed and whether they exacerbate natural hazard risk.

251. CRC [271.253] generally supports NH-P2 but seeks more consistent terminology with other policies and prefers wording such as areas subject to natural hazards or areas with identified natural hazard risks.

252. Transpower [309.90] supports the intent of NH-P2 but seeks amendments to avoid strict avoidance requirements for regionally significant infrastructure, recognising operational needs and the role of NH-P3.

253. Graymont [310.36] seeks amendments to clarify that NH-P2 applies to new subdivision, use and development, to recognise the functional need for mineral extraction and quarrying to locate in areas with natural hazard risk where effects can be assessed and mitigated.

7.7.2 Analysis

254. There is broad support for NH-P2 and for the use of a risk-based approach to natural hazard management. The notified policy requires avoidance of subdivision, use and development in areas where natural hazards may occur unless risk can be mitigated to an acceptable level, having regard to likelihood, hazard characteristics, consequences, cumulative effects and climate change.

255. Since notification, the NPS-NH 2025 has come into force and provides more specific national direction on the application of a risk-based approach. It requires risk to be assessed using the prescribed risk matrix and managed proportionately: very high risk is to be avoided, while high and medium risk may be avoided or mitigated proportionate to the level of risk. It also requires consideration of effects on other sites, best available information and climate change over at least 100 years.

256. I therefore agree in part with COWL [235.7] and Kā Rūnaka [251.135] that the opening direction in NH-P2 is too broadly expressed. The notified wording starts from avoidance wherever natural hazards “may occur”, irrespective of the level of risk. In my view, this does not sufficiently distinguish between different levels of risk and is less consistent with the proportionate approach now required by the NPS-NH. Kā Rūnaka’s relief is also supported by further submissions from FFNZ and the Fuel Companies.

257. I consider that NH-P2 should instead direct subdivision, use and development to be managed using a risk-based approach proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk. This provides a clearer overarching policy framework, while allowing the hazard-specific policies to impose avoidance where required. This approach also aligns with the recommended amendment to NH-O1.

258. NHC [153.3] seeks a definition or metric for an "acceptable level" of risk. Further submitters take differing positions, with CRC considering that acceptable risk is established through the rule framework, while FFNZ and Waitaki Property Guardians support greater clarity. Given that the NPS-NH now provides a prescribed risk matrix for activities and hazards within its scope, I consider it preferable to remove reliance on the generic concept of an "acceptable level" from NH-P2 rather than introduce a separate district-wide definition that may conflict with the national framework or the differing Canterbury and Otago regional approaches.

259. I agree with Kā Rūnaka [251.135] that the characteristics and vulnerability of the proposed activity, and whether it exacerbates risk on the site or other sites, are relevant to determining the appropriate response. These matters are already reflected to some extent in NH-P5, which considers activity vulnerability and exacerbation of existing risk. However, given their importance to the overarching risk-based approach, I consider they should also be recognised in NH-P2. This also assists in giving effect to NPS-NH Policy 4 concerning the creation or increase of significant natural hazard risk on other sites.

260. I agree with CRC [271.253] that terminology should be internally consistent. However, I do not favour replacing "areas where natural hazards may occur" with "areas with identified natural hazard risks", as this could imply that NH-P2 only applies once risk has already been established through site-specific assessment. The policy needs to operate where hazard information identifies the potential for risk, with the subsequent assessment determining its level. I therefore recommend rejecting this aspect of the submission.

261. MOED [242.16], Transpower [309.90] and Graymont [310.36] seek greater recognition of operational or functional need. I agree that these considerations can be relevant, particularly for activities that cannot practicably avoid hazard areas. Graymont's relief is supported by OceanaGold and Parkside Holdings. However, infrastructure is specifically addressed through NH-P3 and is excluded from the application of the NPS-NH, while the functional needs of particular activities are more appropriately addressed through the relevant activity-specific provisions. I therefore do not recommend adding a general operational or functional need test to NH-P2.

262. Similarly, I do not consider it necessary to amend NH-P2 to state that it applies only to "new" subdivision, use and development as sought by Graymont. Existing use rights are governed by the RMA, and the NPS-NH expressly does not override existing use rights under s10. WCL [243.40] raises a related concern regarding maintenance and repair. I do not consider a general statement that "use" excludes maintenance or repair to be appropriate, as whether particular maintenance or repair activities are regulated depends on the applicable rules and existing use rights.

263. EDS [240.51] correctly identifies that clause (5) should refer to NH-P3, rather than NH-P4, as NH-P3 addresses critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure. I recommend accepting this submission. Given the recommended

restructuring of NH-P2 below, however, I consider the clearer approach is to expressly state that critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure are managed in accordance with NH-P3.

7.7.3 Recommendations

22. I recommend the following changes to the proposal.

23. Amend **NH-P2** to clarify the proportionate risk-based approach, recognise the characteristics and vulnerability of the activity and effects on other sites, and clarify the relationship with NH-P3, as follows:

NH-P2 Risk based approach

Manage ~~Avoid~~ subdivision, use and development in areas where natural hazards may occur, ~~unless it can be demonstrated that the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and the environment can be mitigated to an acceptable level~~, using a risk-based approach that is proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk, taking into consideration:

1. likelihood of the natural hazard event; and

2. type and characteristics of the natural hazard; and

3. potential consequence of the natural hazard event, including cumulative effects; and

4. effects of climate change; and

4A the type and characteristics of the subdivision, use or development, including its vulnerability to the natural hazard; and

4B. whether the subdivision, use or development, including any mitigation measures, will create or increase natural hazard risk on the site or other sites; and

5. in relation to critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, those matters in NH-P~~4~~3

7.7.4 Evaluation

264. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to NH-P2. As NH-P2 is a policy, the relevant assessment under s32(1)(b) is whether the amended policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives, having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting where information is uncertain. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the scale and significance of the recommended changes.

265. The amended policy is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, particularly s5, the requirement under s6(h) to recognise and provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards, and s7(i) to have particular regard to the effects of climate change. It also more effectively implements NH-O1 by linking the management response to the level of natural hazard risk.

266. The NPS-NH 2025 provides particularly relevant higher-order direction through its risk-based proportionate approach. The recommended amendments better give effect to this direction by expressly linking the management response to the level of

risk and recognising the characteristics and vulnerability of the proposed activity and the potential to create or increase risk on other sites. The more specific policies and rules will continue to determine where avoidance or mitigation is required.

267. I acknowledge that the NPS-NH does not apply to all hazards or activities addressed by the PDP, including infrastructure and primary production, and that the NZCPS prevails where there is a conflict within the coastal environment. The recommended wording therefore establishes an overarching risk-based approach without applying the NPS-NH risk framework beyond its statutory scope. Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure continue to be addressed specifically through NH-P3.

268. The amendments are also consistent with the applicable regional policy direction. For the Otago part of the District, the ORPS provides a risk-based framework for managing natural hazards and adaptation. For the Canterbury part of the District, Chapter 11 of the CRPS directs avoidance of development in high hazard areas and management of natural hazard risk elsewhere. The recommended wording enables these more specific regional requirements to operate within a coherent district-wide risk-based framework.

269. The amendments are also consistent with the PDP's Strategic Direction, particularly SD-RRNH-O1 and SD-RRNH-O2, and with NH-O1. NH-P2 provides the overarching policy for implementing those objectives, while the subsequent policies and rules establish the more specific responses for individual hazards, activities and levels of risk.

270. Retaining NH-P2 as notified would retain a broad avoidance starting point wherever natural hazards "may occur", which does not clearly distinguish between levels of risk. Conversely, replacing "avoid" with "manage" without further qualification would provide insufficient direction. The recommended amendments are more effective and efficient because they expressly establish proportionality while retaining the relevant assessment considerations and relationship with the more specific provisions.

271. The amendments are not expected to result in significant additional environmental, economic, social or cultural costs, as they clarify rather than fundamentally alter the notified risk-based framework. Benefits include improved certainty, greater consistency with higher-order direction, and a clearer basis for ensuring that the level of assessment and management response is proportionate to risk. Uncertainty regarding individual sites can continue to be addressed through the best available information and site-specific assessment framework.

272. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-P2 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives. It gives effect to relevant national and regional policy direction, supports the PDP Strategic Direction and NH-O1, and provides a clearer and more effective framework for the subsequent natural hazard policies and rules.

7.8 Natural Hazards – NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation

273. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 32 original submission points and 7 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.6
FENZ 2	163.40
NZ Pork	195.16
COWL	235.8
Fuel Companies	238.43
EDS	240.54
WCL	243.41
FFNZ	246.95
Kā Rūnaka	251.138
ORC	259.35
G & K Taylor	265.32
K & D Weir	267.32
B & K McLeod	269.32
CRC	271.256
DTL	282.32
DHL	283.32
DDL	284.32
B & A Matthews	285.32
P & B Wilson	290.32
P & J Stackhouse	291.32
R & S Borst	292.32
B & G Hamilton	293.32
G Simpson 2	296.32
A & C Gibson	298.32
TT & Cayuga	299.32
A & F Verbakel	300.32
C Thelning	301.32
P & S Mitchell	302.32
T & F Conlan	303.32

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
K & N McLachlan	304.32
Springbank	312.290
Keeling Dairies	313.31

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Alliance Group Limited	FS190
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.8.1 Submissions

274. NHC [153.6], FENZ 2 [163.40], NZ Pork [195.16], Fuel Companies [238.43], FFNZ [246.95], G & K Taylor [265.32], K & D Weir [267.32], B & K McLeod [269.32], DTL [282.32], DHL [283.32], DDL [284.32], B & A Matthews [285.32], P & B Wilson [290.32], P & J Stackhouse [291.32], R & S Borst [292.32], B & G Hamilton [293.32], G Simpson 2 [296.32], A & C Gibson [298.32], TT & Cayuga [299.32], A & F Verbakel [300.32], C Thelning [301.32], P & S Mitchell [302.32], T & F Conlan [303.32], K & N McLachlan [304.32], Springbank [312.290] and Keeling Dairies [313.31] support NH-P5 and seek that the policy be retained as notified. Submitter generally support site-specific assessment and investigation of natural hazard risk.

275. COWL [235.8] supports the intent of NH-P5 but seeks amendments so risk assessments focus on new subdivision, use and development.

276. EDS [240.54] supports NH-P5 but seeks amendments so potential effects on the environment are considered.

277. WCL [243.41] opposes NH-P5 as it is unclear whether use includes maintenance or repairs and seeks that amendments clarify this.

278. Kā Rūnaka [251.138] seeks amendments to NH-P5 so risk assessments are proportionate to the level of risk, consistent with the PORPS.

279. ORC [259.35] supports NH-P5 but seeks amendments to better align with the PORPS APP6 methodology, including consideration of cumulative effects, climate change, vulnerability and resilience.

280. CRC [271.256] seeks amendments to NH-P5 to improve technical accuracy and consistency with other natural hazard policies, including referring to a site-specific hazard assessment for areas potentially susceptible to natural hazards.

7.8.2 Analysis

281. NH-P5 is an important component of the PDP's risk-based approach, establishing the matters to be considered through site-specific natural hazard assessment. There is broad support for the policy, including from NHC, FENZ, NZ Pork, Fuel Companies and FFNZ, together with a substantial number of individual and corporate submitters.

282. Since notification, the NPS-NH 2025 has introduced more specific national direction for natural hazard risk assessment. It requires applicable natural hazard risk to be assessed using likelihood and consequence, requires the scale and detail of information to have regard to the anticipated level of risk, and requires consideration of existing and proposed mitigation, residual risk, best available information and the potential impacts of climate change over at least 100 years.

283. I therefore agree with Kā Rūnaka [251.138] that the assessment required by NH-P5 should be proportionate to the anticipated level of risk. CRC supports this approach in part, noting that proportionality should also reflect the type and scale of the proposed activity, while FFNZ supports the relief as improving efficient plan implementation. I recommend amending the introductory wording accordingly.

284. ORC [259.35] seeks closer alignment with the Otago regional risk assessment methodology, including cumulative and cascading hazards, climate change, vulnerability and resilience. The notified policy already addresses the type, frequency and scale of the hazard, activity vulnerability, consequences, wellbeing, exacerbation, mitigation and adaptive management. I nevertheless agree that explicit consideration of multiple and cascading hazards, climate change and residual risk would improve the completeness of the assessment framework and its alignment with current higher-order direction.

285. I also agree in part with EDS [240.54] that the assessment should consider effects on the environment. The notified policy expressly addresses public health and safety, other property, and social, cultural and economic wellbeing, but does not expressly refer to environmental effects. Given the broader scope of NH-O1, I consider this should be included.

286. CRC [271.256] seeks the terminology “site-specific hazard assessment” and application to areas “potentially susceptible to natural hazards”. I agree that greater consistency between NH-P2 and NH-P5 is desirable. However, the purpose of NH-P5 is to assess risk, rather than simply establish the presence of a hazard. I therefore recommend retaining “risk assessment” but aligning the trigger with NH-P2 by referring to areas where natural hazards may occur.

287. I do not agree with COWL [235.8] that the policy should be limited to “new” subdivision, use and development. Whether an assessment is necessary should instead depend on the nature of the proposal and anticipated risk. The recommended proportionality amendment provides greater flexibility for lower-risk proposals, including alterations or adaptive reuse of existing development, without

excluding activities that could materially alter natural hazard exposure or vulnerability.

288. For similar reasons, I do not recommend WCL's [243.41] relief to state that "use" excludes maintenance and repair. Whether maintenance or repair requires assessment will depend on the applicable rule framework, existing use rights and the extent to which the activity affects natural hazard risk.

289. Overall, I recommend retaining the structure of NH-P5 while amending it to ensure that assessment is proportionate to anticipated risk, better reflects current national and regional assessment direction, and remains integrated with NH-P2.

7.8.3 Recommendations

290. I recommend the following changes to NH-P5:

Site specific assessment/investigation:

NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation

A risk assessment, of a scale and level of detail proportionate to the anticipated level of risk, will be required for subdivision, use and development in areas ~~subject to risk from~~ where natural hazards may occur that takes into account all of the following:

1.the type, frequency and scale of the natural hazard and whether the effects will likely be temporary or permanent including cumulative effects and multiple or cascading hazards, where relevant; and

2.the type of activity being undertaken and its vulnerability and resilience to natural hazard events; and

3.the consequence of a natural hazard event in relation to the proposed activity; and

4.the suitability of any proposed new allotment and intended future use; and

5.the potential effects, including positive effects on public health and safety the environment and other property; and

5A. the potential effects, on natural defenses or hazard mitigation systems or infrastructure; and

6.the potential effects, including positive effects on social, cultural and economic well-being; and

7.any exacerbation of an existing natural hazard risk; and

8.any risk reduction or hazard mitigation measures proposed, including relocation and recovery and residual risk; and

8A. the potential effect of climate change

9.any opportunities to take an adaptive management approach to addressing the risk.

7.8.4 Evaluation

291. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to NH-P5. As NH-P5 is a policy, the relevant assessment under s32(1)(b) is whether the amended policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives, having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency,

benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting where information is uncertain. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the scale and significance of the recommended changes.

292. The amended policy is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, particularly s5, s6(h) concerning the management of significant risks from natural hazards, and s7(i) concerning the effects of climate change. It also more effectively implements NH-O1 and NH-P2 by providing the site-specific assessment necessary to identify the level of risk and determine a proportionate management response.

293. The NPS-NH 2025 provides particularly relevant higher-order direction. It requires risk assessment using likelihood and consequence, the scale and detail of information to reflect anticipated risk, consideration of mitigation and residual risk, use of the best available information, and consideration of climate change over at least 100 years. The recommended amendments better give effect to these requirements while retaining a broader assessment framework for hazards and activities outside the scope of the NPS-NH.

294. I acknowledge that the NPS-NH does not apply to all hazards or activities addressed by the PDP, including infrastructure and primary production, and that the NZCPS prevails where there is a conflict within the coastal environment. NH-P5 therefore appropriately remains a broader district-wide assessment policy, with the specific national and hazard-specific requirements applying where relevant.

295. The amendments are also consistent with the applicable regional policy direction. For the Otago part of the District, the ORPS is now operative and provides the applicable regional framework for natural hazard risk assessment and management. For the Canterbury part of the District, Chapter 11 of the operative CRPS provides the regional framework for managing natural hazard risk, including avoidance and mitigation according to the nature and significance of risk. The recommended amendments provide a common district-wide assessment framework while allowing these regional requirements to apply where relevant.

296. The amendments are also consistent with the PDP's remaining Strategic Direction, particularly SD-RRNH-O1 and SD-RRNH-O2, and with NH-O1 and NH-P2. NH-P5 provides the assessment mechanism necessary to understand the nature and level of risk before determining the appropriate management response.

297. Retaining NH-P5 as notified would provide a comprehensive assessment framework but would not expressly provide for proportionality, residual risk or some aspects of current higher-order direction. Conversely, prescribing the full NPS-NH or regional risk methodologies within NH-P5 would add unnecessary complexity and could inappropriately extend those frameworks beyond their respective scope. The recommended amendments are therefore more effective and efficient because they strengthen the core assessment requirements while retaining flexibility.

298. The amendments may result in some additional assessment where multiple or cascading hazards, residual risk or climate change are relevant. These costs are proportionate to the benefit of more robust identification and management of

natural hazard risk. Expressly requiring the scale and detail of assessment to be proportionate to anticipated risk should also avoid unnecessary assessment costs for lower-risk proposals. Where information is uncertain, the policy enables assessment using the best available information rather than delaying decision-making.

299. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-P5 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives. It gives effect to relevant national and regional policy direction, supports NH-O1 and NH-P2, and provides a clearer, proportionate and more complete framework for site-specific natural hazard risk assessment.

NATURAL HAZARD AREAS, CHANGING EXPOSURE & CLIMATE CHANGE

7.9 Natural Hazards – NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas

300. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 27 original submission points and 25 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.2
FENZ 2	163.37
NPHS	164.17
EDS	240.50
Kā Rūnaka	251.134
G & K Taylor	265.23
K & D Weir	267.23
B & K McLeod	269.23
CRC	271.252
DTL	282.23
DHL	283.23
DDL	284.23
B & A Matthews	285.23
P & B Wilson	290.23
P & J Stackhouse	291.23
R & S Borst	292.23
B & G Hamilton	293.23

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
G Simpson 2	296.23
A & C Gibson	298.23
TT & Cayuga	299.23
A & F Verbakel	300.23
C Thelning	301.23
P & S Mitchell	302.23
T & F Conlan	303.23
K & N McLachlan	304.23
Springbank	312.286
Keeling Dairies	313.27

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.9.1 Submissions

301. NHC [153.2], FENZ 2 [163.37] and NPHS [164.17] support NH-P1 and seek that is be retained as notified.

302. EDS [240.50] and Kā Rūnaka [251.134] support NH-P1 in part but seek stronger wording around information gathering. EDS considers Council should source information to identify and map hazard areas.

303. G & K Taylor [265.23] and Springbank [312.286] oppose in part NH-P1 and seeks amendments are made to better focus the policy.

304. K & D Weir [267.23], B & K McLeod [269.23], DTL [282.23], DHL [283.23], DDL [284.23], B & A Matthews [285.23], P & B Wilson [290.23], P & J Stackhouse [291.23], R & S Borst [292.23], B & G Hamilton [293.23], G Simpson 2 [296.23], A & C Gibson [298.23], TT & Cayuga [299.23], A & F Verbakel [300.23], C Thelning [301.23], P & S Mitchell [302.23], T & F Conlan [303.23], K & N McLachlan [304.23] and Keeling Dairies [313.27] support in part NH-P1 and seek that the policy be narrowed to refer to land that *is known to* be subject to natural hazards, rather than land that *may* be subject to natural hazards. Submitters consider this would better focus the policy given the stringent provisions applying within natural hazard overlays.

305. CRC [271.252] opposes NH-P1 and seeks that it be deleted, on the basis that land that may be subject to natural hazards has already been identified, mapped and included in the PDP.

7.9.2 Analysis

306. NH-P1 provides the foundation for the PDP's natural hazard framework by directing the identification and mapping of land that may be subject to natural hazards as information becomes available, including taking account of climate change. I consider this ongoing identification function important because natural hazard information and exposure are not static.

307. Since notification, the NPS-NH 2025 has introduced relevant national direction. In particular, Policy 5 requires natural hazard risk assessment and decisions to be based on the best available information, including where that information is uncertain or incomplete, and Policy 6 requires consideration of the potential impacts of climate change to at least 100 years into the future. This supports retaining NH-P1 as an ongoing policy rather than treating the hazard mapping included at notification as complete.

308. I therefore agree with Kā Rūnaka [251.134] that the policy should expressly refer to the best available information. Their requested amendment would replace "as information becomes available" with "using best available information". I consider this provides clearer direction and better aligns NH-P1 with the NPS-NH. It also substantially addresses the intent of EDS [240.50] that Council should actively source information rather than rely only on information being provided to it.

309. I do not agree with the submissions seeking to limit identification and mapping to land "known to be subject to natural hazards". Hazard overlays commonly identify areas potentially susceptible to hazard effects and provide a basis for further site-specific investigation; they are not necessarily predictions that a hazard will occur at every location within an overlay. NHC makes this point in its further submissions, noting that restricting mapping to known hazard areas would be inconsistent with the purpose of hazard mapping and would not adequately recognise uncertainty.

310. This distinction is also important when considering the relationship between NH-P1 and the recommended amendments to NH-P5. NH-P1 identifies areas where natural hazards may occur, while site-specific assessment determines the nature and level of risk where required. This approach avoids treating regional or district-scale hazard overlays as property-specific determinations of risk and provides an appropriate response to uncertainty in the underlying information.

311. I also do not agree with CRC [271.252] that NH-P1 should be deleted because natural hazard areas have already been mapped in the PDP. The hazard environment will continue to change, including through climate change, new technical information and changes to mitigation or exposure. Waitaki Property Guardians similarly opposes deletion on the basis that new information may change the current understanding or extent of natural hazard areas.

312. The express reference to climate change should also be retained. NPHS [164.17] supports the notified wording, noting that some hazard information remains incomplete and that changes in extreme rainfall are still being quantified.

This is consistent with the NPS-NH requirement to consider potential climate change impacts over at least 100 years and with the Canterbury RPS direction to consider climate change projections when managing natural hazards.

313. Overall, I recommend retaining NH-P1 with a targeted amendment requiring identification and mapping to be based on the best available information. This maintains an appropriately precautionary and forward-looking identification function while leaving determination of actual site-specific risk to the subsequent assessment framework.

7.9.3 Recommendations

314. Amend NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas, as follows;

NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas

~~*As information becomes available,*~~ *Using the best available information, identify and map land that may be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change*

7.9.4 Evaluation

315. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendment to NH-P1. As NH-P1 is a policy, the relevant assessment under s32(1)(b) is whether the amended policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives, having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting where information is uncertain. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the limited scale and significance of the recommended change.

316. The amended policy is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, particularly s5, s6(h) concerning the management of significant risks from natural hazards, and s7(i) concerning the effects of climate change. It more effectively implements NH-O1 by ensuring that natural hazard risk can continue to be recognised and understood as information and hazard conditions change.

317. The NPS-NH 2025 provides particularly relevant higher-order direction. Policy 5 requires natural hazard risk assessment and decisions to use the best available information and to proceed where information is uncertain or incomplete, while Policy 6 requires consideration of potential climate change impacts to at least 100 years into the future. The recommended amendment directly reflects this direction while retaining the broader role of NH-P1 in identifying areas potentially subject to natural hazards.

318. I acknowledge that the NPS-NH does not apply to all hazards or activities addressed by the PDP, including infrastructure and primary production, and that the NZCPS prevails where there is a conflict within the coastal environment. NH-P1 appropriately remains a broader district-wide identification policy, with the specific national and hazard-specific requirements applying where relevant.

319. The amendment is also consistent with the applicable regional policy direction. For the Otago part of the District, the Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 provides the regional framework for identifying, assessing and managing natural hazard risk. For the Canterbury part of the District, Chapter 11 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement provides the regional natural hazards framework and includes consideration of climate change in the management of natural hazard risk.

320. The amendment is also consistent with the PDP's Strategic Direction, particularly SD-RRNH-O1 and SD-RRNH-O2, and supports NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5. NH-P1 provides for identification of potentially affected areas, while the subsequent policies provide for site-specific assessment and a management response proportionate to the identified risk.

321. Retaining NH-P1 as notified would broadly achieve the intended outcome but would not expressly require the best available information to be used. Limiting mapping to land “known to” be subject to natural hazards would be less effective because it could exclude areas of potential hazard where uncertainty remains and undermine the screening function of the overlays. Deleting NH-P1 would also remove the policy basis for responding to changing hazard information over the life of the Plan.

322. The amendment is not expected to result in significant additional environmental, economic, social or cultural costs, as it clarifies rather than materially expands the notified identification function. The principal benefits are improved alignment with higher-order direction and a clearer basis for incorporating improved hazard and climate change information. The approach also appropriately addresses uncertainty by allowing potential hazard areas to be identified while leaving determination of actual risk to site-specific assessment where required.

323. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-P1 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives. It gives effect to relevant national and regional policy direction and provides a clear, forward-looking basis for identifying natural hazard areas as hazard exposure and information change over time.

7.10 Planning Maps & Overlays - General

324. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 66 original submission points and 3 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
M Kensington	10.1
D Rigby	16.1
M Menzies	22.1, 22.2, 22.3

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
M Cameron	23.1
P Bryant	25.1
G & D Jones	30.1
St Kevins	37.2
Wills Group	54.1
J Kerr	55.1
J Benny	66.4, 66.5, 66.6, 66.7, 66.9
Bell Group 1	68.1
C & E Bell	69.1
Bell Group 2	71.1
B & R Kane	81.2
WDC	83.9
C & L Begg	88.1
I Carter	93.4
G Mcleod	99.1
C Leckie 1	102.1
J White 1	104.1
G Simpson 1	112.1 (part), 112.4 (part)
K Culp	122.2
S Paton	129.15
N & J Davie	130.1
S & A Marshall	157.3
Stuart Group	169.1
A & S Gibson	178.6, 178.7, 178.8
Lake Ōhau Station	184.51
RAO	185.1
MDC	188.24
H Bognuda & M Stanuch	191.2
Shelton Downs	193.21
M & J Strachan	196.7, 196.8, 196.9
Z Energy	203.2, 203.3, 203.9, 203.12, 203.13
L McAuley	213.1
COWL	235.17
E Bell	254.1
ORC	259.92

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
CRC	271.271
Mainland Poultry	281.24
OceanaGold	295.135, 295.137, 295.234
G Simpson 2	296.331
A & C Gibson	298.310
TT & Cayuga	299.310, 299.331
A & F Verbakel	300.310
Keeling Dairies	313.25

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Omarama Lodge Holdings Limited	FS318
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
Samuel and Arlene Marshall	FS157

7.10.1 Submissions

325. A number of submitters oppose or seek amendments to natural hazard overlays on the Planning Maps because they consider the mapping is inaccurate, too broad, not site-specific, or unsupported by local topography, elevation data or historic flood evidence. Relief sought includes deleting or reducing overlays, reassessing mapping using more accurate or updated information, ground-truthing affected areas and consulting affected landowners. These submitters include M Kensington [10.1], D Rigby [16.1], M Menzies [22.1, 22.2, 22.3], M Cameron [23.1], P Bryant [25.1], St Kevins [37.2], Wills Group [54.1], J Kerr [55.1], Bell Group 1 [68.1], C & E Bell [69.1], Bell Group 2 [71.1], WDC [83.9], C & L Begg [88.1], G Mcleod [99.1], C Leckie 1 [102.1], J White 1 [104.1], G Simpson 1 [112.1 (part), 112.4 (part)], K Culp [122.2], S Paton [129.15], N & J Davie [130.1], S & A Marshall [157.3], Stuart Group [169.1], A & S Gibson [178.6, 178.7, 178.8], Lake Ōhau Station [184.51], RAO [185.1], H Bognuda & M Stanuch [191.2], Shelton Downs [193.21], M & J Strachan [196.7, 196.8, 196.9], L McAuley [213.1], E Bell [254.1], ORC [259.92], Mainland Poultry [281.24], OceanaGold [295.135, 295.137, 295.234], G Simpson 2 [296.331], A & C Gibson [298.310], TT & Cayuga [299.310, 299.331], A & F Verbakel [300.310] and Keeling Dairies [313.25].

326. Several submitters oppose the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, particularly around Ōmārama, Ahuriri Heights, Cirrus Place, Lake Ōhau, Shelton Downs, Maerewhenua and other elevated or low-catchment areas. The submitters seek removal, correction or review of the overlay, requesting that updated Environment Canterbury flood mapping information be used instead. The

submitters include M Menzies [22.1, 22.3], Wills Group [54.1], J Kerr [55.1], Bell Group 1 [68.1], Bell Group 2 [71.1], C Leckie 1 [102.1], G Simpson 1 [112.1 (part), 112.4 (part)], Stuart Group [169.1], A & S Gibson [178.6], Lake Ōhau Station [184.51], RAO [185.1], H Bognuda & M Stanuch [191.2], Shelton Downs [193.21], G Simpson 2 [296.331], A & C Gibson [298.310], A & F Verbakel [300.310] and Keeling Dairies [313.25].

327. CRC [271.271] generally supports the Planning Maps but seeks deletion of the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay from the Canterbury part of the District, as it overlaps with the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay and creates unnecessary duplication and more onerous rules. A number of submitters also raise concerns with the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay, seeking a single or alternative flood overlay, reassessment or deletion of associated rules where mapping is considered too broad or inaccurate. These submitters are J Benny [66.5], S Paton [129.15], A & S Gibson [178.7], M & J Strachan [196.8] and TT & Cayuga [299.331].

328. A number of submitters address the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay. The majority of these submitters seek deletion or reassessment where they consider the overlay inaccurate or unsupported by site-specific evidence. These submitters are M Cameron [23.1], P Bryant [25.1], C & E Bell [69.1], A & S Gibson [178.8], M & J Strachan [196.7] and Z Energy [203.9, 203.12]

329. A number of submitters address the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay. The majority of these submitters seek deletion, reassessment or clarification of the overlay where it is considered inaccurate, low risk or unsupported by evidence. These submitters are M Kensington [10.1], D Rigby [16.1], P Bryant [25.1], C & L Begg [88.1], K Culp [122.2], S & A Marshall [157.3], Z Energy [203.2, 203.13] and Mainland Poultry [281.24].

330. A number of submitters seek amendments to non-flood coastal, natural character, SASM, ONF, SNF or related overlays where they consider mapping is over-extended, insufficiently justified or affects farming and property rights. Relief includes reducing or deleting overlays, limiting SASM013 to the limestone escarpment, retaining ONF27 only over the escarpment, refining coastal overlays to actual coastal features, and consulting landowners. These submitters are G & D Jones [30.1], J Benny [66.4, 66.5, 66.6], B & R Kane [81.2], I Carter [93.4] and J White 1 [104.1]

331. J Benny [66.7, 66.9] supports retaining Map 17 for specified Maerewhenua land as notified, accepting the flood overlays and approach because the land is now largely part of the Waitaki River riverbed through historic flooding.

332. MDC [188.24] supports the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Overlays but seeks consistent mapping colours with the Mackenzie ePlan for the cross-boundary Ostler Fault Hazard Overlay.

333. COWL [235.17] seeks removal of the Tsunami Hazard Area information layer from the Planning Maps as it has no corresponding rules.

334. OceanaGold [295.135, 295.137 & 295.234] seeks amendments or removal of natural hazard overlays within the Macraes Mining Zone/SPZMM, particularly the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay.

7.10.2 Analysis

335. The submissions raise a common issue concerning the appropriate role, accuracy and level of precision of the natural hazard overlays in the PDP. While a number of submitters identify specific locations where they consider the mapping to be incorrect, there is also a broader concern that district or regional-scale hazard mapping has been treated as if it establishes the presence and level of natural hazard risk at an individual property.

336. I acknowledge these concerns. Natural hazard overlays are an important planning tool, but their purpose and limitations need to be clearly understood. They identify land that may be susceptible to a natural hazard and provide a basis for determining where further assessment may be required. They do not necessarily establish that every part of a mapped property will be affected by a hazard, or determine the level of risk associated with a particular subdivision, use or development.

337. This distinction is consistent with my recommendations on NH-P1 and NH-P5. NH-P1 provides for the identification and mapping of land that may be subject to natural hazards using the best available information, while NH-P5 provides the mechanism for more detailed assessment where this is warranted. The notified Natural Hazards chapter similarly adopts a flexible risk-based approach and recognises site-specific assessment as part of determining actual risk.

338. The NPS-NH 2025 reinforces this approach. Policy 5 requires natural hazard risk assessments and decisions to use the best available information, including where information is uncertain or incomplete. Clause 3.3 also requires the scale and detail of information needed to assess risk to have regard to the anticipated level of risk. The NPS-NH therefore does not require perfect property-scale information before a potential hazard can be recognised; rather, uncertainty is addressed through the subsequent risk assessment and decision-making process.

339. I therefore do not consider that an overlay should be removed solely because it is based on district or regional-scale modelling, because a hazard has not previously been observed at a particular property, or because site-specific investigation has not been undertaken. For example, some submissions rely on the historical absence of flooding or individual property characteristics as evidence that land should not be mapped. Those matters may be relevant evidence, but they do not in themselves establish that the broader hazard susceptibility mapping is incorrect. A potential hazard may not be static in nature. The same principle applies to liquefaction and alluvial fan susceptibility mapping.

340. Equally, however, the planning maps should represent the best available information. Where updated regional council information, LiDAR, corrected topographic information or other sufficiently robust technical evidence

demonstrates that the notified mapping is inaccurate, I consider that the overlay should be amended. ORC [259.92], for example, supports inclusion of the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay but identifies that subsequent work may demonstrate inaccuracies and seeks reconsideration using updated information. This is consistent with the approach I recommend for NH-P1.

341. This is particularly relevant to the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay. A substantial number of submissions identify apparent inconsistencies around Ōmārama and other locations and seek use of more recent or detailed Environment Canterbury/CRC information. For example, submissions identify elevated land and differences between the notified overlay and Environment Canterbury's more detailed flood assessments. The Residents' Association of Ōmārama [185.1] similarly seeks alignment with Environment Canterbury's detailed flood hazard assessments.

342. I consider that updated information from the relevant regional council should be preferred where it represents more recent, appropriately scaled and technically robust information than that used to prepare the notified overlay. This does not mean that individual landowner observations should automatically displace regional hazard modelling, but rather that identified discrepancies should be tested against the best available technical information.

343. Similar considerations apply to the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay. I support retaining the overlay as an appropriate mechanism for identifying potential flood susceptibility, subject to incorporating any mapping corrections supported by the updated ORC information. This approach is also consistent with the operative Otago RPS, which directs identification of areas where natural hazards may adversely affect people, communities and property using, amongst other matters, likelihood, climate change and the best available information.

344. In relation to the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay, I agree with CRC [271.271] and the related submissions that unnecessary duplication between flood overlays should be avoided where the same hazard is already adequately represented through the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay. The submissions identify that overlapping overlays can result in different rule pathways applying to the same land. J Benny [66.5], for example, seeks a single flood overlay or, alternatively, consistency between the applicable rules.

345. I therefore consider there is merit in removing the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay from the Canterbury part of the District where it duplicates the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, provided the Canterbury overlay adequately identifies the relevant flood susceptibility. This would simplify implementation without removing the underlying identification or management of flood risk.

346. In relation to the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay, I do not agree with submissions seeking its general removal because it is not supported by property-specific geotechnical investigation. The purpose of susceptibility mapping is to identify where further investigation may be appropriate; requiring property-specific investigation before land can be identified as potentially susceptible would invert

that process. However, where site-specific or updated regional information demonstrates that the mapped susceptibility is incorrect, this should be reflected in the final mapping. This approach also responds to submissions seeking reassessment rather than wholesale deletion.

347. I take the same general approach to the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay. The fact that an alluvial fan has not recently experienced flooding or debris deposition does not necessarily demonstrate an absence of susceptibility. I therefore do not support general deletion of the overlay on this basis. However, individual mapping corrections should be made where supported by the technical evidence available to Council.

348. I note that Z Energy [203.2, 203.3, 203.9, 203.12 and 203.13] supports retention of the relevant flood, liquefaction and alluvial fan overlays applying to its identified sites. These submissions demonstrate that the issue is not the use of overlays as a planning method itself, but whether the particular mapping represents an appropriate identification of potential hazard susceptibility.

349. I also do not consider that inclusion of a property within an overlay should depend on agreement from the affected landowner. Consultation and local knowledge can provide useful evidence and assist in identifying anomalies, but hazard mapping ultimately needs to be determined from the best available technical information and the statutory requirements applying to the Council.

350. In relation to the Tsunami Hazard Area information layer, I do not agree with COWL [235.17] that the absence of corresponding rules is, by itself, sufficient reason to remove the layer. The RMA permits a district plan to contain information required for the territorial authority's functions, powers and duties, and an information layer can serve a different function from a regulatory overlay. COWL's concern that the layer may nevertheless be interpreted as imposing a regulatory consequence is relevant, and I consider its status as an information layer rather than a regulatory overlay should be clearly identified.

351. MDC [188.24] seeks consistent symbology for the cross-boundary Ostler Fault Hazard Overlay. The submission does not challenge the underlying hazard mapping and I consider greater consistency between adjoining district ePlans would assist plan users where practicable.

352. OceanaGold's submissions concerning the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay within the SPZMM raise both mapping accuracy and the regulatory consequences of the overlay. OceanaGold questions the accuracy of the overlay and seeks its removal from the SPZMM on the basis that hazard risks are already managed within the operational mining environment. I consider the accuracy of the mapped fault should be determined on the best available technical evidence, while whether and how the Natural Hazards provisions apply to mining activities within the SPZMM is more appropriately addressed through the relevant SPZMM and natural hazard provisions. The presence of an existing operational risk-management regime does not, by itself, establish that the underlying hazard should be removed from the planning maps.

353. Several of the submissions grouped in this section also relate to SASM, ONF, coastal environment, coastal protection and other non-natural-hazard overlays. For example, J Benny seeks refinement of SASM013 and ONF27 around the Maerewhenua limestone escarpment, while other submissions challenge coastal and natural character overlays. I recommend that the merits of those mapping requests are addressed under the relevant topic sections, as scope allows, rather than determined through the natural hazards assessment.

354. Overall, I consider the appropriate approach is to retain the use of natural hazard overlays as screening and identification tools, while making mapping amendments where these are supported by updated or more robust technical information. This approach recognises both the limitations inherent in district-scale hazard mapping and the importance of identifying areas of potential susceptibility before subdivision, use or development occurs.

7.10.3 Recommendations

355. I recommend retaining the natural hazard overlays as the primary spatial method for identifying land potentially subject to natural hazards.

356. I recommend removing the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay from the Canterbury part of the District where it duplicates the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, provided the Canterbury overlay adequately identifies the relevant flood susceptibility. This would simplify implementation without removing the underlying identification or management of flood risk.

357. I recommend amending the 'Surface Fault Rupture Hazard overlays' natural hazard overlays, to achieve the relief sought in sub 188.24 by MDC. I recommended amending the geospatial shapefiles, for the purpose of improved plan useability. This is compatible with NPStds Specific controls whereby a specific control spatially identifies where a site or area has provisions that are different from other spatial layers or district-wide provisions that apply to that site or area (NPStds 12).

7.10.4 Evaluation

358. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to the Planning Maps. The evaluation is proportionate to the scale and significance of the amendments and focuses on whether the amended mapping methods are the most appropriate means of achieving the PDP's natural hazard objectives.

359. The use of spatial overlays is an effective means of implementing the PDP's risk-based natural hazard framework because it identifies where potential hazard susceptibility exists and where the policies, rules or assessment requirements may apply. This assists implementation of NH-O1 and NH-P1 and the wider Strategic Direction concerning resilience and climate change.

360. The approach also gives effect to relevant higher-order direction. Section 75(3) of the RMA requires the District Plan to give effect to national policy statements, the

NZCPS, national planning standards and the applicable regional policy statements. The NPS-NH now requires natural hazard decisions to use the best available information, notwithstanding uncertainty or incompleteness, and requires the scale and detail of information used in risk assessment to reflect the anticipated level of risk.

361. For the Otago part of the District, the Otago RPS 2021, operative from 9 July 2026, provides relevant direction through HAZ-NH, including identifying areas potentially affected by natural hazards having regard to hazard characteristics, multiple and cascading hazards, cumulative effects, climate change, likelihood and the best available information. The Canterbury RPS similarly provides the regional natural hazard framework for the Canterbury part of the District.

362. The recommended approach is more effective than either removing broad areas from the overlays because property-specific risk has not been demonstrated, or retaining mapping known to have been superseded by more robust information. The former would risk failing to identify areas potentially exposed to natural hazards; the latter would impose unnecessary assessment and regulatory costs on land where the available evidence no longer supports the mapped extent.

363. Updating the overlays where supported by improved regional council information, LiDAR or other robust technical evidence therefore has environmental and social benefits through improved identification of hazard exposure, while reducing unnecessary economic and administrative costs associated with inaccurate mapping. Retaining site-specific assessment as the mechanism for determining actual risk also avoids the potentially significant cost of requiring district-wide mapping to achieve property-scale precision.

364. Removing unnecessary duplication between the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay and Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, where the latter adequately identifies the hazard, would improve efficiency and plan usability without reducing the management of natural hazard risk. Similarly, distinguishing information-only layers from regulatory overlays improves transparency and reduces the potential for plan users to attribute regulatory consequences to information that is provided principally for awareness.

365. There remains inherent uncertainty in natural hazard mapping. The NPS-NH expressly anticipates this and requires decisions to continue using the best information available rather than being delayed solely because information is uncertain or incomplete. The recommended approach appropriately manages that uncertainty by using overlays to identify potential exposure, while relying on more detailed assessment to establish the actual level of risk where required.

366. Overall, I consider the recommended approach to the Planning Maps to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives. It provides an efficient and transparent spatial basis for the natural hazard framework, incorporates improved information where available, avoids unnecessary duplication, and maintains an appropriate distinction between hazard identification, site-specific risk assessment and the subsequent management response.

NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: FLOODING

7.11 Natural Hazards – NHP6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay

367. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 28 original submission points and 2 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.7
Bog Roy Station	172.2
Fuel Companies	238.44
FFNZ	246.96
Kā Rūnaka	251.139
G & K Taylor	265.33
K & D Weir	267.33
B & K McLeod	269.33
CRC	271.257
DTL	282.33
DHL	283.33
DDL	284.33
B & A Matthews	285.33
P & B Wilson	290.33
P & J Stackhouse	291.33
R & S Borst	292.33
B & G Hamilton	293.33
G Simpson 2	296.33
A & C Gibson	298.33
TT & Cayuga	299.33
A & F Verbakel	300.33
C Thelning	301.33
P & S Mitchell	302.33
T & F Conlan	303.33
K & N McLachlan	304.33
Transpower	309.92

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Springbank	312.291
Keeling Dairies	313.32

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.11.1 Submissions

368. CRC [271.257], G & K Taylor [265.33], K & D Weir [267.33], B & K McLeod [269.33], DTL [282.33], DHL [283.33], DDL [284.33], B & A Matthews [285.33], P & B Wilson [290.33], P & J Stackhouse [291.33], R & S Borst [292.33], B & G Hamilton [293.33], G Simpson 2 [296.33], A & C Gibson [298.33], TT & Cayuga [299.33], A & F Verbakel [300.33], C Thelning [301.33], P & S Mitchell [302.33], T & F Conlan [303.33], K & N McLachlan [304.33], Springbank [312.291] and Keeling Dairies [313.32] support NH-P6 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

369. NHC [153.7] supports NH-P6 in part but seeks a definition for *significant adverse effects* to improve clarity and consistent application.

370. Bog Roy Station [172.2] opposes the Canterbury flood assessment overlay and seeks the removal of the overlay relating to specified sites. The submitter considers the land is not susceptible to flooding.

371. Fuel Companies [238.44] oppose NH-P6 in part, considering it is not risk-based to avoid inundation of spaces storing hazardous substances. The submitter seeks amendments to remove or refine this requirement.

372. FFNZ [246.96] supports NH-P6 in part but seeks that the policy applies only to new subdivision, use and development. The submitter seeks amendments to refer to *spaces storing hazardous substances* be refined to hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities regulated under the Hazardous substance chapter.

373. Kā Rūnaka [251.139] seeks amendments to clarify *material damage*, avoid exacerbating natural hazard effects or risks on surrounding site including Māori land and Native Reserves, and include effects on the wider environment and natural hazard mitigation measures.

374. Transpower [309.92] supports the exception for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure but seeks clarification to avoid these activities being inadvertently captured.

7.11.2 Analysis

375. **Overall policy approach**

376. I support the overall structure and intent of NH-P6. The policy establishes a differentiated approach to flood hazard within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay. Where site-specific assessment identifies a High Flood Hazard Area, subdivision, use and development are subject to a more restrictive policy response. Outside a High Flood Hazard Area, development is enabled subject to specified outcomes relating to effects on people and property, material damage, floor levels and hazardous substances. This is broadly consistent with the PDP's wider risk-based approach.

377. The majority of submissions support retention of NH-P6, including CRC [271.257] and a number of landowners. I agree that the principal structure should be retained. The combination of an overlay identifying potential flood susceptibility, site-specific assessment and a management response reflecting the resulting hazard and risk provides an appropriate framework.

378. Since notification of the PDP, the NPS-NH 2025 has introduced national direction requiring natural hazard risk to people and property to be assessed and managed using a risk-based proportionate approach. Very high natural hazard risk must be avoided, while high and medium risk must be avoided or mitigated proportionately. Decisions must also use the best available information. NH-P6 is generally consistent with this direction, although some amendments are appropriate to improve its alignment and clarity.

379. I note that the Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area framework and the NPS-NH risk categories perform related but different functions. A High Flood Hazard Area should not automatically be assumed to equate to a 'high natural hazard risk' under the NPS-NH, which is determined through the national likelihood and consequence matrix. I therefore recommend retaining the Canterbury-specific terminology while ensuring that, where the NPS-NH applies, risk assessment and management also meet its requirements.

380. **Significant adverse effects and material damage**

381. NHC [153.7] seeks a definition of *significant adverse effects*. I do not support this amendment. The significance of an adverse effect is context dependent and can appropriately be assessed having regard to the nature, scale and consequences of the particular activity and flood hazard. A generic definition could introduce an artificial threshold that does not operate appropriately across different circumstances.

382. For similar reasons, I do not consider that *material damage*, as raised by Kā Rūnaka [251.139], requires a separate definition. The relevant consideration is whether the anticipated flood consequences are material in the context of the particular development and its vulnerability. These matters can appropriately be determined through the assessment required by the policy and associated rules.

383. **Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay**

384. Bog Roy Station [172.2] challenges application of the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay to specified properties on the basis of topography, absence of

significant flow paths and observed flood history. I consider this primarily a mapping issue rather than a reason to amend NH-P6. The overlay identifies land where potential flood hazard warrants further consideration; it does not establish that every part of mapped land is subject to the same level of flood risk.

385. Whether the overlay should be amended for particular properties should therefore be determined through the Planning Maps assessment using the best available technical flood information. This is also consistent with Policy 5 and clause 3.4 of the NPS-NH, which require decisions to use the best available information even where that information is uncertain or incomplete. I therefore address the specific mapping relief under the Planning Maps section rather than through amendment to NH-P6.

386. **Existing activities**

387. FFNZ [246.96] seeks to limit NH-P6 to *new* subdivision, use and development. I do not consider this amendment necessary. Lawfully established activities may be protected by existing use rights under s10 of the RMA, and the NPS-NH expressly does not override those rights.

388. Conversely, redevelopment, extensions and changes in land use can alter exposure, vulnerability or flood consequences and may appropriately require assessment where the relevant rules are triggered. Restricting the policy to activities described as 'new' could create uncertainty about its application to such development. I therefore recommend retaining the broader terminology.

389. **Effects on other sites**

390. Kā Rūnaka [251.139] seeks clearer direction that development does not exacerbate natural hazard effects or risks on surrounding sites, including Māori land and Native Reserves. I agree with the underlying concern. NH-P6 currently addresses exacerbation expressly for High Flood Hazard Areas, but the equivalent direction is less explicit for development outside those areas.

391. This is particularly relevant to flooding because buildings, filling and other development can alter flow paths or displace floodwater onto adjoining land. The NPS-NH now expressly requires natural hazard risk created or increased on other sites by subdivision, use or development, including associated mitigation measures, to be avoided or mitigated proportionately.

392. I therefore recommend accepting this aspect of Kā Rūnaka [251.139] in part and amending NH-P6 so that development does not create or exacerbate flood risk on other sites. I prefer a generally applicable reference to other sites rather than identifying particular forms of land tenure. Effects on Māori land, Native Reserves and cultural values remain relevant where applicable under the wider PDP framework.

393. **Natural hazard mitigation works**

394. I also agree in principle with Kā Rūnaka that development should not compromise the operation, maintenance or effectiveness of natural hazard

mitigation works. Flood protection and drainage infrastructure can be important to managing risk across a wider area, and development that compromises those systems can transfer or increase risk.

395. However, this is not an issue unique to the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay. I consider it more efficient to address this matter through the overarching natural hazard policy framework, including NH-P5, rather than duplicating equivalent direction within individual flood policies. I therefore recommend accepting this aspect of the submission in principle but addressing it through the broader provisions.

396. **Hazardous substances**

397. Fuel Companies [238.44] and FFNZ [246.96] raise concerns with the requirement that *spaces that store hazardous substances* are not inundated. Fuel Companies identify that some facilities, including appropriately designed underground fuel storage, can withstand inundation, while FFNZ considers the notified wording could capture relatively minor storage.

398. I agree that the notified wording is broader than necessary. The relevant planning concern is whether inundation of hazardous substances could result in a material risk to people, property or the environment, rather than whether any hazardous substance is present within an inundated area.

399. I therefore recommend accepting these submissions in part and aligning the provision with the PDP's existing terminology for hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities. This provides greater certainty and better focuses the policy on activities where inundation has the potential to result in material consequences.

400. This is also consistent with a proportionate approach to natural hazard management. I note, however, that the NPS-NH does not apply to infrastructure or primary production. The application of NH-P6 to those activities must therefore continue to be justified through the wider RMA, Canterbury RPS and PDP framework rather than through the NPS-NH itself.

401. **Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure**

402. Transpower [309.92] supports the exception for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure but seeks clarification that these activities are not inadvertently recaptured by the second part of NH-P6. I agree.

403. The words *Except as provided for in NH-P3* currently precede the High Flood Hazard Area component of NH-P6, creating potential uncertainty as to whether the exception also applies to the subsequent *in all other cases* component. I recommend restructuring the policy so that the NH-P3 qualification clearly applies to NH-P6 as a whole. This is a drafting clarification rather than a change to the substantive policy approach.

404. Overall, I recommend retaining the risk-based structure of NH-P6, with targeted amendments to address risk created or exacerbated on other sites, refine the hazardous substances provision and clarify the relationship with NH-P3. The

Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay and site-specific High Flood Hazard Area assessment should remain the basis of the Canterbury-specific framework, while the NPS-NH risk assessment and proportionate management requirements apply in addition where that national direction applies.

7.11.3 Recommendations

405. I recommend the following amendments to NH- P6 as follows;

NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay

Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdivision, use and development in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay where a site-specific assessment identifies the site as a High Flood Hazard Area, unless it can be demonstrated that the risks can be mitigated so that:

1. *it is not likely to result in loss of life or serious injuries in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and*
3. *there is not likely to be significant damage or loss in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and*
4. *it is not likely to require new or upgraded hazard mitigation works to mitigate or avoid the natural hazard; and*
5. *it is not likely to exacerbate the effects of the natural hazard or create or increase flood risk on other sites.*

In all other cases, except as provided for in NH-P3, where the site is not in a High Flood Hazard Area, provide for subdivision, use and development where:

1. *significant adverse effects on people and property are avoided; and*
2. *the use or development is not likely to suffer material damage in a flood event; and*
3. *new buildings have a floor level that will avoid inundation in a 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood event or are otherwise designed to mitigate damage to property from a flood event; and*
4. *spaces that are designed to store quantities of hazardous substances, hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities will not be inundated.*

7.11.4 Evaluation

406. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to NH-P6. As NH-P6 is a provision implementing the PDP objectives, the relevant s32 assessment is whether the amended policy is the most appropriate way to achieve those objectives, having regard to reasonably practicable alternatives and the effectiveness and efficiency, benefits, costs and risks of the amendments. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the relatively limited nature of the recommended changes.

407. The amendments support NH-O1 and the PDP Strategic Direction by maintaining the existing Canterbury flood-risk framework while improving how risk to people, property and other sites is managed. They are also consistent with the Canterbury RPS Chapter 11 framework, which directs avoidance of development in high-hazard circumstances and management of natural hazard risk elsewhere.

408. The NPS-NH 2025 is particularly relevant to the amendments where it applies. Its objective requires a risk-based proportionate approach; Policy 2 requires management proportionate to the level of risk; Policy 3 requires very high natural hazard risk to be avoided; Policy 4 addresses significant risk created or increased on

other sites; and Policy 5 requires use of the best available information. The recommended addition addressing off-site flood risk improves alignment with that direction without incorrectly treating the Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area classification as equivalent to a NPS-NH risk category.

409. I have considered retaining NH-P6 as notified. While this would retain a workable flood-management framework, it would leave less explicit direction concerning risk transferred to other sites, retain an unnecessarily broad hazardous-substances requirement and maintain ambiguity about whether the NH-P3 exception applies throughout the policy. The recommended amendments are therefore more effective in providing clear and proportionate direction.

410. The principal benefits are improved protection from transferred flood risk, greater consistency with the NPS-NH and improved certainty for plan users. Refining the hazardous-substances provision should also reduce unnecessary regulatory costs where minor or appropriately designed storage does not present a material flood-related risk. Clarifying the NH-P3 exception improves efficiency without changing the substantive treatment of critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure.

411. The amendments are not expected to result in significant additional environmental, economic, social or cultural costs. There may be additional assessment or mitigation costs where development has the potential to increase flood risk on other sites; however, those costs are proportionate to avoiding or managing the corresponding consequences for affected land and communities. Conversely, narrowing the hazardous-substances provision should reduce unnecessary assessment and compliance costs.

412. There remains uncertainty inherent in determining flood hazard and risk at individual sites. Retaining the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay together with site-specific assessment provides an appropriate means of managing that uncertainty. This is consistent with the NPS-NH direction to use the best available information and continue decision-making where information is uncertain or incomplete.

413. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-P6 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives. It retains the established Canterbury flood hazard framework while providing clearer, more proportionate and more effective direction for managing on-site and off-site flood risk.

7.12 Natural Hazards – NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay

414. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision

requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 28 original submission points and 2 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.42
Alliance	190.30
Fuel Companies	238.45
FFNZ	246.97
Kā Rūnaka	251.140
ORC	259.36
G & K Taylor	265.34
K & D Weir	267.34
B & K McLeod	269.34
DTL	282.34
DHL	283.34
DDL	284.34
B & A Matthews	285.34
P & B Wilson	290.34
P & J Stackhouse	291.34
R & S Borst	292.34
B & G Hamilton	293.34
G Simpson 2	296.34
A & C Gibson	298.34
TT & Cayuga	299.34
A & F Verbakel	300.34
C Thelning	301.34
P & S Mitchell	302.34
T & F Conlan	303.34
K & N McLachlan	304.34
Transpower	309.93
Springbank	312.292
Keeling Dairies	313.33

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.12.1 Submissions

415. ORC [259.36], G & K Taylor [265.34], K & D Weir [267.34], B & K McLeod [269.34], DTL [282.34], DHL [283.34], DDL [284.34], B & A Matthews [285.34], P & B Wilson [290.34], P & J Stackhouse [291.34], R & S Borst [292.34], B & G Hamilton [293.34], G Simpson 2 [296.34], A & C Gibson [298.34], TT & Cayuga [299.34], A & F Verbakel [300.34], C Thelning [301.34], P & S Mitchell [302.34], T & F Conlan [303.34], K & N McLachlan [304.34], Transpower [309.93], Springbank [312.292] and Keeling Dairies [313.33] support NH-P7 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

416. NHC [153.42], seeks amendments to require site-specific assessment within the *Otago Flood Assessment Overlay* and *Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay* to identify High Flood Hazard Areas. NHC seeks a definition for *significant adverse effects*.

417. Alliance [190.30] opposes NH-P7 because it is unclear what flood level is to be managed for in subclauses 3 and 4. The submitter seeks clarification of the relevant flood level, or deletion of the provision.

418. Fuel Companies [238.45] oppose NH-P7 in part, considering that avoiding inundation of spaces storing hazardous substances is not risk-based. Amendments are sought to remove or refine this requirement.

419. FFNZ [246.97] supports NH-P7 but seeks that condition 4 align with the Hazardous Substances chapter by referring to *hazardous facilities* and *major hazard facilities*, rather than all *spaces that store hazardous substances*.

420. Kā Rūnaka [251.140] seeks amendments to clarify *material damage*, avoid exacerbating natural hazard effects or risks on surrounding site including Māori land and Native Reserves, and include effects on the wider environment and natural hazard mitigation measures.

7.12.2 Analysis

421. I support the overall intent of NH-P7. The policy provides for subdivision, use and development within the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay where specified flood-risk outcomes are achieved. The majority of submissions support retention of the policy, including ORC [259.36], which considers that the policy appropriately recognises the potentially significant effects of flood hazards on development.

422. Since notification, two changes to the higher-order planning framework are particularly relevant. The NPS-NH 2025 now requires applicable natural hazard risk to be assessed using its likelihood and consequence matrix and managed proportionately to the resulting level of risk. The Otago Regional Policy Statement also became operative and now provides confirmation of the relevant regional policy framework for the Otago part of the District.

High Flood Hazard Areas

423. NHC [153.42] seeks to replicate the Canterbury approach by requiring site-specific assessment within the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay to determine whether land is a High Flood Hazard Area, with avoidance applying where that classification is identified.

424. I do not recommend this amendment. The Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area concept reflects the Canterbury regional framework and does not form part of the notified NH-P7 approach. Extending it into the Otago part of the District would introduce a Canterbury-specific hazard classification into an area now subject to the operative Otago RPS framework.

425. The commencement of the NPS-NH further reduces the justification for introducing an additional High Flood Hazard Area classification. Where the NPS-NH applies, natural hazard risk must now be assessed as low, medium, high or very high using its prescribed risk matrix. Very high risk must be avoided, while high and medium risk must be avoided or mitigated proportionately. It would add unnecessary complexity to overlay that framework with a separate Canterbury-derived classification.

426. I therefore recommend retaining the distinct approaches in NH-P6 and NH-P7. The overlays identify areas where flood hazard requires consideration, while NH-P5 and the applicable rules and standards provide for more detailed assessment. Where the NPS-NH applies, its risk assessment and proportionate management requirements must also be applied.

Significant adverse effects and material damage

427. NHC [153.42] also seeks a definition of significant adverse effects. For the same reasons addressed in relation to NH-P6, I do not consider a separate definition necessary. The significance of an effect depends on its nature, scale, duration and consequences in the circumstances of the particular proposal.

428. Kā Rūnaka [251.140] similarly seeks clarification of material damage. I do not recommend defining this term. Whether anticipated damage is material can appropriately be determined having regard to the nature and vulnerability of the proposed activity and the anticipated flood consequences.

Flood level and design event

429. Alliance [190.30] raises a more substantive implementation issue, seeking clarification of the flood level to be managed under clauses 3 and 4 of NH-P7. The notified policy requires new buildings to have a floor level that will avoid inundation but, unlike NH-P6, does not identify a particular design event. The notified wording confirms that NH-P7 does not specify an AEP or other design event.

430. I agree with Alliance that the applicable flood event needs to be sufficiently clear to allow consistent implementation. However, I do not consider that prescribing a single flood event within NH-P7 is necessarily the appropriate response. The relevant flood level may depend on the applicable hazard

information, activity vulnerability, regional methodology and the requirements of the corresponding rules and standards.

431. This is particularly relevant following commencement of the NPS-NH. Where it applies, the NPS-NH requires risk to be determined using likelihood and consequence rather than relying solely on a single design flood event. It also requires potential climate change impacts to at least 100 years into the future to be considered.

432. I therefore recommend accepting Alliance [190.30] in part, with the flood event or assessment basis clarified through the relevant flood assessment standard and rules rather than inserting a single universal flood event into NH-P7. This will provide the necessary implementation certainty while retaining a risk-based approach.

Effects on other sites and the wider environment

433. Kā Rūnaka [251.140] seeks amendments requiring development not to exacerbate natural hazard risk on surrounding sites, including Māori land and Native Reserves, and seeks recognition of effects on the wider environment and natural hazard mitigation measures. I agree with the underlying concern regarding off-site risk.

434. Floodplain development can alter flow paths, displace floodwater or otherwise transfer risk beyond the development site. The NPS-NH now expressly requires significant natural hazard risk created or increased on other sites by subdivision, use or development, including associated mitigation measures, to be avoided or mitigated proportionately.

435. I therefore recommend expressly requiring development under NH-P7 not to create or increase flood risk on other sites. As with NH-P6, I prefer a generally applicable reference to other sites rather than identifying particular forms of land tenure. Māori land, Native Reserves and cultural values remain relevant through the wider PDP framework.

436. Kā Rūnaka also seeks to add the environment to clause 1. I support this amendment. NH-O1 expressly addresses risk to people, property and the environment, and inclusion in NH-P7 would improve consistency between the objective and its implementing policy.

Natural hazard mitigation measures

437. I agree in principle that development should not compromise the operation or effectiveness of natural hazard mitigation measures. However, as discussed for NH-P6, this issue is not unique to either flood overlay. I consider it more efficient to address this through NH-P5 or another overarching provision rather than repeat equivalent direction in each hazard-specific policy.

Hazardous substances

438. Fuel Companies [238.45] and FFNZ [246.97] seek amendment of clause 4. The notified wording captures all “spaces that store hazardous substances”, while FFNZ seeks alignment with the defined terms hazardous facilities and major hazard

facilities. NHC supports the FFNZ amendment through its further submission, considering the defined terminology clearer and appropriately focused on the structures and activities that should be restricted within the overlays.

439. I agree. The relevant issue is the consequence of inundation rather than the mere presence of any hazardous substance. The notified wording could capture minor household, commercial or farm storage that presents limited flood-related risk. I recommend replacing it with the existing PDP terminology for hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities.

440. I note that the NPS-NH does not apply to infrastructure or primary production. The PDP may continue to manage flood risk associated with these activities, but the basis for doing so derives from the wider RMA, operative Otago RPS and PDP framework rather than directly from the NPS-NH.

Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure

441. Transpower [309.93] supports the exception for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure and seeks NH-P7 to be retained. I agree. The opening qualification referring to NH-P3 provides a clear alternative policy pathway for these activities and should be retained.

442. Overall, I recommend retaining the structure of NH-P7 but making targeted amendments to address effects on the environment and off-site flood risk and to refine the hazardous-substances provision. I do not recommend importing the Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area framework into NH-P7.

7.12.3 Recommendations

443. I recommend amending the provisions of NH-P7 as follows;

NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay

Except as provided for in NH-P3, provide for subdivision, use and development in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay where:

1. significant adverse effects on people and property and the environment are avoided; and

2. the use or development is not likely to suffer material damage in a flood event; and

3. new buildings have a floor level that will avoid inundation in accordance with the applicable flood assessment requirements ; and

4. spaces that are designed to store quantities of hazardous substances, hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities will not be inundated.

5. the subdivision, use or development will not create or increase flood risk on other sites

7.12.4 Evaluation

444. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to NH-P7. As NH-P7 is a policy, the relevant assessment under s32(1)(b) is whether the amended policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives, having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting where information is uncertain. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the relatively limited scale and significance of the recommended changes.

445. The amended policy is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, particularly s5, s6(h) concerning the management of significant risks from natural hazards, and s7(i) concerning the effects of climate change. It more effectively implements NH-O1 and the wider Strategic Direction by maintaining a risk-based approach to flood hazard while expressly addressing effects on the environment and risk transferred to other sites.

446. The NPS-NH 2025 provides particularly relevant higher-order direction where it applies. It requires natural hazard risk to be assessed using likelihood and consequence and managed proportionately to the resulting risk level. It also requires significant natural hazard risk created or increased on other sites to be avoided or mitigated proportionately, use of the best available information, and consideration of climate change to at least 100 years into the future. The recommended amendments improve alignment with this direction without unnecessarily introducing a separate Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area classification into NH-P7.

447. I acknowledge that the NPS-NH does not apply to all activities addressed by NH-P7, including infrastructure and primary production. The policy therefore appropriately remains a broader district plan provision, with the NPS-NH requirements applying where relevant and the wider RMA and regional policy framework continuing to apply to activities outside its scope.

448. The amendments are also consistent with the Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021, which became operative on 9 July 2026 and now provides the applicable regional policy framework for managing natural hazard risk within the Otago part of the District. Retaining a distinct Otago flood policy rather than importing the Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area framework provides a clearer relationship with that regional framework.

449. I have considered retaining NH-P7 as notified. While this would retain a workable flood-management framework, it would leave less explicit direction concerning environmental effects and flood risk transferred to other sites and retain an unnecessarily broad requirement relating to all spaces storing hazardous substances. Conversely, importing the full Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area framework would add complexity and potentially duplicate the risk assessment now required by the NPS-NH where it applies.

450. The recommended amendments are therefore more effective and efficient. They provide clearer direction concerning off-site flood risk and environmental effects, while aligning hazardous-substance controls with existing PDP terminology. Clarifying the applicable flood assessment basis through the relevant rules and standards also provides greater implementation certainty without embedding a single flood event in the policy where different circumstances may warrant different assessment.

451. The amendments are not expected to result in significant additional environmental, economic, social or cultural costs. There may be additional assessment or mitigation costs where development could transfer flood risk to other sites, but these costs are proportionate to the benefits of avoiding increased risk to neighbouring land and communities. Refining the hazardous-substances provision should reduce unnecessary regulatory costs for activities presenting limited flood-related consequences.

452. There remains inherent uncertainty in flood hazard assessment, including the magnitude and consequences of future events and the effects of climate change. Retaining the overlays together with site-specific assessment and the best available information provides an appropriate mechanism for managing that uncertainty. The recommended approach also avoids introducing an additional hazard classification where the operative regional and national frameworks already provide mechanisms for assessing and managing risk.

453. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-P7 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives. It retains the established Otago flood hazard framework while providing clearer and more proportionate direction for managing environmental effects, off-site flood risk and activities involving hazardous substances.

7.13 Natural Hazards – NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay

454. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 28 original submission points and five (5) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.13
NZ Pork	195.17
Fuel Companies	238.46
EDS	240.55
FFNZ	246.99

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Kā Rūnaka	251.143
G & K Taylor	265.28
K & D Weir	267.28
B & K McLeod	269.28
DTL	282.28
DHL	283.28
DDL	284.28
B & A Matthews	285.28
P & B Wilson	290.28
P & J Stackhouse	291.28
R & S Borst	292.28
B & G Hamilton	293.28
G Simpson 2	296.28
A & C Gibson	298.28
TT & Cayuga	299.28
A & F Verbakel	300.28
C Thelning	301.28
P & S Mitchell	302.28
T & F Conlan	303.28
K & N McLachlan	304.28
E Schultz	305.42
WPG 2	306.42
Springbank	312.296

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.13.1 Submissions

455. NHC [153.13] supports NH-R1 in part but seeks that buildings are only permitted where they are outside a Flood Hazard Area, to reduce flood risk to people and property and improve consistency with NH-R2.

456. NZ Pork [195.17] opposes NH-R1, specifically the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production buildings from the permitted pathway. The submitter seeks to delete the exclusion of *Intensive Indoor Primary Production* from the definition of *Farm Buildings*. FFNZ [246.99] supports NH-R1 but seeks amendments consistent with those of NZ Pork.

457. Fuel Companies [238.46] opposes NH-R1 in part, considering it is unclear why the permitted pathway only applies to enclosed buildings without a floor. They seek amendments so unenclosed buildings without floors, and small-scale buildings are provided for.

458. EDS [240.55] supports NH-R1 in part but considered non-notification of hazard related activities inappropriate due to their public importance.

459. Kā Rūnaka [251.143] seek amendments to the matters of discretion to include effects on natural hazard mitigation measures and whether the activity causes or exacerbates natural hazard risk to surrounding sites and properties.

460. G & K Taylor [265.28], K & D Weir [267.28], B & K McLeod [269.28], DTL [282.28], DHL [283.28], DDL [284.28], B & A Matthews [285.28], P & B Wilson [290.28], P & J Stackhouse [291.28], R & S Borst [292.28], B & G Hamilton [293.28], G Simpson 2 [296.28], A & C Gibson [298.28], TT & Cayuga [299.28], A & F Verbakel [300.28], C Thelning [301.28], P & S Mitchell [302.28], T & F Conlan [303.28], K & N McLachlan [304.28] and Springbank [312.296] oppose NH-R1 in part. The submitters seek that additional rural structures be included in the permitted pathway, and that unclosed buildings with concrete floors also be provided for. Clarification is sought regarding the term *suitably qualified and experienced professional*.

461. E Schultz [305.42] and WPG 2 [306.42] oppose NH-R1, considering the distinction between Canterbury and Otago Flood Assessment Overlay rules is confusing. The submitters seek that the rules be combined or clarified, and consider farm buildings with pervious floors are low risk and should not be unnecessarily restricted.

7.13.2 Analysis

462. NH-R1 provides a permitted pathway for specified low-risk buildings, structures and fences within the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay, with a restricted discretionary pathway where the permitted standards are not met. I consider this structure appropriate because it enables activities with relatively low flood vulnerability while providing for site-specific assessment where the scale, form or consequences of development warrant closer consideration.

463. NHC [153.13] seeks to require buildings to be outside a High Flood Hazard Area before qualifying for permitted status, to align NH-R1 with NH-R2. I do not support this amendment. As discussed in relation to NH-P7, the High Flood Hazard Area concept is specific to the Canterbury flood framework. Extending that classification to the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay would introduce a Canterbury-specific

methodology into an area now subject to the operative Otago RPS framework and, where applicable, the NPS-NH risk matrix.

464. Since notification, the NPS-NH 2025 requires applicable flood risk to be assessed through likelihood and consequence and managed proportionately to the resulting level of risk. Very high risk must be avoided, while high and medium risk may be avoided or mitigated proportionately. It does not require the use of a High Flood Hazard Area classification. I therefore recommend rejecting NHC [153.13] insofar as it seeks to import that classification into NH-R1.

Low-risk buildings and structures

465. Fuel Companies [238.46] seeks to broaden PER-1 so that unenclosed buildings without floors and small-scale structures are expressly enabled. The submitter identifies structures such as forecourt canopies, cabinets and signage that may have limited flood vulnerability. I agree in principle. The flood consequences of an open structure without a floor are likely to be comparable to, or lower than, those of the structures already contemplated by PER-1.

466. A substantial group of rural submitters similarly seeks permitted provision for poles, irrigation and stockwater infrastructure, together with broader provision for farm buildings and structures. The common submission position is that these activities are not necessarily more vulnerable to flooding or more likely to exacerbate flood effects than structures already listed in PER-1.

467. I agree that poles and irrigation or stockwater infrastructure are generally low-vulnerability structures and should be expressly included in PER-1, subject to the wider requirement that development does not materially divert or displace floodwaters onto other sites. Their inclusion would better reflect the risk-based approach and avoid unnecessary consenting requirements for routine rural infrastructure.

468. FFNZ also seeks clarification that permitted rural fencing includes post-and-rail fencing and other functionally similar fencing and farm-style gates. I support this amendment in principle. The relevant flood consideration is whether the fence materially impedes flood flows, rather than its particular agricultural design. I recommend broadening the wording accordingly.

Concrete floors and farm buildings

469. The rural submitters also seek to permit unenclosed buildings and farm buildings with concrete floors, noting that concrete floors may be required for practical and hygienic farm operations. Further submissions from FFNZ support this relief.

470. I agree that a concrete floor should not automatically result in resource consent simply because it is impermeable. However, unlike a pole, open fence or floorless structure, a building and associated floor area can displace floodwater, alter flow paths and increase exposure to material damage. Whether those effects are material depends on the scale, location and flood conditions.

471. I therefore recommend accepting this relief in part. Small or open structures with concrete floors could appropriately be enabled where they fall within a defined low-risk threshold and do not divert or displace floodwaters onto other sites. I do not recommend a general permitted pathway for all farm buildings with concrete floors irrespective of scale or location.

Intensive indoor primary production

472. NZ Pork [195.17] and FFNZ [246.99] seek removal of the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from the definition of farm building, arguing that flood controls should reflect actual vulnerability rather than the type of primary production activity.

473. I agree that flood risk should primarily be assessed according to the characteristics and vulnerability of the building and activity. However, the requested amendment is principally a definition issue with consequences beyond NH-R1. I therefore recommend that the merits of removing the intensive indoor primary production exclusion be addressed in the Definitions section. For NH-R1, any resulting definition should then apply consistently.

Effects on other sites and mitigation measures

474. Kā Rūnaka [251.143] seeks additional matters of discretion addressing effects on natural hazard mitigation measures and whether development causes or exacerbates natural hazard risk on surrounding sites and properties. NHC supports this relief, while CRC considers these effects could instead be addressed more efficiently through a consolidated flood-effects provision.

475. I agree with the underlying concern. Flood development can alter flow paths or displace floodwater, and activities should not compromise existing flood mitigation systems. This is reinforced by Policy 4 of the NPS-NH, which requires significant natural hazard risk created or increased on other sites by development or associated mitigation to be avoided or mitigated proportionately.

476. I consider the most efficient approach is to ensure that off-site displacement and effects on mitigation works are clearly addressed once through the overarching flood-rule framework, rather than unnecessarily repeating identical matters across NH-R1, NH-R2 and NH-R3. If that consolidated amendment is not adopted, these matters should be added to the NH-R1 matters of discretion.

Suitably qualified and experienced professional

477. A number of submitters seek clarification of *suitably qualified and experienced professional*. I do not recommend replacing this with the broader term *suitably qualified person*. Both qualifications and relevant experience are important for natural hazard assessment. The appropriate expertise may also differ depending on whether the assessment concerns flood modelling, geotechnical matters or building design. I therefore consider that the notified terminology should be retained, with guidance provided administratively if required.

Relationship between the Canterbury and Otago rules

478. E Schultz [305.42] and WPG 2 [306.42] seek consolidation of NH-R1 and NH-R2 on the basis that separate Canterbury and Otago rules are confusing. They also consider the existing treatment of farm buildings unnecessarily restrictive.

479. I agree that the rules should be as consistent as possible in relation to activities presenting comparable levels of risk. Common permitted activities such as open structures, poles and rural infrastructure should therefore be aligned where the underlying hazard effects are equivalent.

480. However, I do not recommend fully combining NH-R1 and NH-R2. The Canterbury rule implements a regional framework that includes the High Flood Hazard Area and NH-S1 assessment methodology, whereas the Otago rule operates within a different regional policy and technical context. Maintaining separate rules makes those differences clearer, provided their common components are drafted consistently.

Notification

481. EDS [240.55] seeks removal of the preclusion on public notification because of the wider public importance of natural hazard risk. FFNZ opposes that relief through further submission, considering flood effects primarily technical and capable of specialist assessment.

482. I do not consider the public significance of natural hazard management means all restricted discretionary applications under NH-R1 should be publicly notified. The matters addressed by the rule are principally site-specific, including flood effects, floor levels, safe access, displacement and mitigation. I therefore recommend retaining the public-notification preclusion. This does not remove the wider statutory requirements relating to affected persons where those requirements apply.

483. Overall, I recommend retaining NH-R1 with targeted amendments to broaden permitted provision for genuinely low-risk structures, improve consistency in rural fencing and infrastructure, and ensure off-site flood risk is appropriately addressed.

7.13.3 Recommendations

484. I recommend the following changes to the proposal.

485. Amend NH-R1as follows:

NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The building or structure is:

1.a below ground swimming pool; or

2.a deck; or

3.an unenclosed building without a floor; or

4.a post and wire or post and rail or other open or permeable rural fence including farm-style gates; or

5.a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed or pervious floor;

6.a pole associated with irrigation or stockwater infrastructure.

PER-2

The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building and does not increase the building footprint; or

PER-3

Any building is not greater than 10m^2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m^2 over a 10-year period.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.mitigation of flooding effects; and

2.floor levels; and

3.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and

4.risk to people, property and the environment during a flood event; and

5.flooding effects/displacement of flood waters on and/or off site including the extent to which the activity, including any mitigation measures, creates or increases flood risk on other sites; and

6.effects of any proposed mitigation; and

7.the intended use of the building or structure; and

8.any storage of hazardous substances.

9.effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on natural hazard mitigation measures.

Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified.

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

7.13.4 Evaluation

486. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to NH-R1. As NH-R1 is a rule, the relevant assessment under s32(1)(b) is whether the amended rule is the most appropriate

way to achieve the relevant objectives, having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting where information is uncertain. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the limited scale and significance of the recommended changes.

487. The amendments are consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, particularly s5, s6(h) concerning management of significant risks from natural hazards, and s7(i) concerning the effects of climate change. They more effectively implement NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P5 and NH-P7 by enabling activities that present comparatively low flood risk while retaining assessment for activities with greater potential consequences.

488. The NPS-NH 2025 provides relevant higher-order direction where it applies. It requires a risk-based proportionate approach, including consideration of activity vulnerability and off-site risk, and requires significant natural hazard risk created or increased on other sites to be avoided or mitigated proportionately. The recommended amendments better reflect this direction by distinguishing low-vulnerability structures from development requiring further assessment and by addressing potential transfer of flood risk.

489. I acknowledge that the NPS-NH does not apply to primary production or infrastructure. The amendments applying to farm structures and rural infrastructure therefore rely on the wider RMA and regional policy framework rather than directly on the NPS-NH. The Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021, operative since 9 July 2026, provides the applicable regional framework for identifying and managing natural hazard risk in the Otago part of the District.

490. The amendments are also consistent with the PDP Strategic Direction and the recommended changes to NH-P7. They retain a differentiated, risk-based pathway: activities with limited vulnerability and limited potential to alter flood behaviour may proceed as permitted activities, while activities presenting greater risk remain subject to restricted discretionary assessment.

491. Retaining NH-R1 as notified would avoid additional drafting but would continue to require resource consent for some structures, such as poles and irrigation infrastructure, that have limited vulnerability or potential to exacerbate flooding. Conversely, permitting all farm buildings with concrete floors would not adequately account for differences in scale, flood displacement and material-damage exposure. The recommended approach provides a more proportionate middle ground.

492. The principal benefits are reduced consenting costs for low-risk rural and ancillary structures, improved consistency between the flood rules and clearer assessment of off-site effects. Potential environmental and social costs are limited because development capable of materially altering flood flows or increasing risk remains subject to assessment. Any additional assessment of effects on neighbouring sites or mitigation works is proportionate to the consequences being managed.

493. There remains uncertainty as to the actual flood risk at individual locations within the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay. Retaining the restricted discretionary pathway and site-specific assessment framework provides an appropriate mechanism for addressing that uncertainty using the best available information rather than requiring the permitted rule itself to resolve property-scale risk.

494. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-R1 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives. It provides a more efficient and proportionate permitted pathway for low-risk structures while maintaining appropriate controls on development capable of increasing flood risk to people, property, the environment or other sites.

7.14 Natural Hazards – NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay

495. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 33 original submission points and 29 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
J Benny	66.1, 66.2
NHC	153.14
NZ Pork	195.18
Glenbrook	212.33
Fuel Companies	238.47
EDS	240.125
FFNZ	246.100
Kā Rūnaka	251.144
G & K Taylor	265.29
K & D Weir	267.29
B & K McLeod	269.29
CRC	271.264
DTL	282.29
DHL	283.29
DDL	284.29
B & A Matthews	285.29
P & B Wilson	290.29
P & J Stackhouse	291.29
R & S Borst	292.29
B & G Hamilton	293.29

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
G Simpson 2	296.29
A & C Gibson	298.29
TT & Cayuga	299.29
A & F Verbakel	300.29
C Thelning	301.29
P & S Mitchell	302.29
T & F Conlan	303.29
K & N McLachlan	304.29
E Schultz	305.43
WPG 2	306.43
Springbank	312.297
Keeling Dairies	313.37

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	FS152

7.14.1 Submissions

496. J Benny [66.1, 66.2] seeks amendments to address the duplication between the Canterbury and Waitaki River flood overlays. The submitter seeks that only one flood overlay applies, or the rules are made consistent if both overlays are retained and that stockyards are provided for as a permitted activity.

497. NHC [153.14] supports NH-R2 and seeks that the rule be retained as notified.

498. NZ Pork [195.18] and FFNZ [246.100] oppose the exclusion of *intensive indoor primary production* from *farm buildings* definition. FFNZ seeks clarification that a post-and-wire fence includes a range of fencing types.

499. Glenbrook [212.33] seeks amendments to NH-R2 so solar and irrigation structures are exempt.

500. Fuel Companies [238.47] oppose nH-R2 in part and seek amendments so unenclosed buildings without floors, and small-scale buildings or structures are provided for.

501. EDS [240.125] supports NH-R2 in part but seeks amendments so that activities in hazard risk areas are subject to normal notification processes.

502. Kā Rūnaka [251.144]

503. G & K Taylor [265.29], K & D Weir [267.29], B & K McLeod [269.29], , DTL [282.29], DHL [283.29], DDL [284.29], B & A Matthews [285.29], P & B Wilson [290.29], P & J Stackhouse [291.29], R & S Borst [292.29], B & G Hamilton [293.29], G Simpson 2 [296.29], A & C Gibson [298.29], TT & Cayuga [299.29], A & F Verbakel [300.29], C Thelning [301.29], P & S Mitchell [302.29], T & F Conlan [303.29], K & N McLachlan [304.29], Springbank [312.297] and Keeling Dairies [313.37] oppose NH-R2 and seek that the rule provide for additional farm structures and floor types.

504. CRC [271.264] seeks amendments to NH-R2 to refer to buildings, structures and fences, and to broaden the permitted activity list.

505. E Schultz [305.43] and WPG 2 [306.43] oppose NH-R2, considering the distinction between the Canterbury and Otago flood assessment overlay rules is confusing. The submitters seek amendments so that the rules are combined or clarified.

7.14.2 Analysis

506. I support retaining the overall structure of NH-R2. As addressed in relation to NH-P6, the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay appropriately uses a graduated approach, with low-risk activities enabled and buildings requiring further assessment subject to NH-S1 and the High Flood Hazard Area framework.

507. J Benny [66.1, 66.2] raises duplication between the Canterbury and Waitaki River flood overlays. I have addressed the spatial overlap under the Planning Maps section. I agree that, where both overlays remain, the rules should operate consistently. I also agree that open or permeable stockyards are generally comparable to the rural fencing already enabled and should be expressly provided for.

508. Glenbrook [212.33], Fuel Companies [238.47] and the group of rural submitters seek broader permitted provision for low-vulnerability structures, including unenclosed buildings without floors, poles, irrigation and stockwater infrastructure and some solar structures. Consistent with my assessment of NH-R1, I agree in part. These structures generally have limited vulnerability and displacement effects and can appropriately be enabled where they do not materially obstruct or redirect flood flows.

509. I also agree that the presence of a concrete floor does not, of itself, establish unacceptable flood risk. However, as discussed for NH-R1, I do not support an unrestricted permitted pathway for all concrete-floored farm buildings. Scale,

location, displacement and exposure to damage remain relevant. Larger buildings can continue to rely on the NH-S1 assessment pathway.

510. The submissions of NZ Pork [195.18] and FFNZ [246.100] concerning the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from farm building are addressed under the Definitions section, as the relief has implications beyond NH-R2.

511. Kā Rūnaka [251.144] seeks greater consideration of effects on adjoining land and natural hazard mitigation measures. I agree with the outcome sought. As addressed above for NH-R1 and NH-P6, I prefer these effects to be managed through a common effects-based flood provision, rather than repeated across each flood rule. CRC similarly considers a consolidated approach more efficient, particularly for displacement or diversion of floodwaters.

512. I do not recommend combining NH-R1 and NH-R2 as sought by E Schultz [305.43] and WPG 2 [306.43]. While common permitted activities should be aligned, NH-R2 has a distinct function because it implements the Canterbury-specific NH-S1 and High Flood Hazard Area framework.

513. I also recommend retaining the notification provisions. As addressed for NH-R1, the relevant flood matters are predominantly technical and site-specific, and I do not consider all applications that fail the permitted standards warrant public notification.

514. Overall, I recommend retaining NH-R2 with targeted amendments to enable additional low-risk structures, improve consistency with NH-R1 and NH-R3, and retain the Canterbury-specific flood assessment pathway.

7.14.3 Recommendations

515. I recommend the following changes to NH-R2;

NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The building or structure is:

1.a below ground swimming pool; or

2.a deck; or

3.an unenclosed building without a floor; or

4.a post and wire, or post and rail <u>or other open or permeable rural fence, farm-style gate or stockyard</u> ~~fence~~; or

5.a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed or pervious floor

6. <u>Pole, irrigation or stockwater infrastructure; or</u>

7.a small-scale open-frame solar structure that does not materially impede or divert flood flows.;

or

PER-2

The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint; ***or***

PER-3

1.any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and

2. is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2; and

RDIS-2

Compliance is not achieved with PER-3 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.mitigation of flooding effects; and

2.floor levels; and

3.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and

4.risk to people, property and the environment during a flood event; and

5.flooding effects/displacement of flood waters on and/or off site; and

6.effects of any proposed mitigation; and

7.the intended use of the building or structure; and

8.any storage of hazardous substances.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

Where:

NC-1

Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2

Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.

7.14.4 Evaluation

516. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to NH-R2. As a rule, the relevant assessment is whether the amended provision is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives, having regard to effectiveness and efficiency, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting. The level of evaluation is proportionate to the limited scale of the amendments.

517. As set out in the evaluations for NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P5 and NH-P6, the PDP is required to implement a risk-based and proportionate approach consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, the NPS-NH where applicable, and the Canterbury regional natural hazard framework. NH-R2 implements that direction by retaining a more stringent assessment pathway where High Flood Hazard is identified, while enabling activities with comparatively low vulnerability.

518. Retaining NH-R2 as notified would continue to unnecessarily capture some minor rural and ancillary structures. Conversely, broadly permitting all farm buildings or concrete-floored structures would not adequately account for differences in displacement, exposure and flood consequences. The recommended amendments provide a more proportionate response by expanding the permitted pathway only for activities with comparatively low flood vulnerability or effects.

519. The amendments are expected to reduce consenting costs for low-risk activities and improve consistency between NH-R1, NH-R2 and NH-R3. Retaining NH-S1, the High Flood Hazard Area pathway and controls on off-site flood effects maintains the environmental and social benefits of managing more significant flood risk.

520. Any remaining uncertainty regarding site-specific flood depth, velocity or consequences can continue to be addressed through NH-S1 and the wider site-specific assessment framework, as discussed above for NH-P5 and NH-P6.

521. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-R2 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives, providing a clearer and more efficient permitted pathway while retaining the Canterbury-specific safeguards for higher flood hazard.

7.15 Natural Hazards – NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay

522. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 31 original submission points and five (5) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
J Benny	66.8
NHC	153.15
Alliance	190.32
NZ Pork	195.19
Fuel Companies	238.48
EDS	240.126
FFNZ	246.101
Kā Rūnaka	251.145
G & K Taylor	265.37
K & D Weir	267.37
B & K McLeod	269.37
DTL	282.37
DHL	283.37
DDL	284.37
B & A Matthews	285.37
P & B Wilson	290.37
P & J Stackhouse	291.37
R & S Borst	292.37
B & G Hamilton	293.37
G Simpson 2	296.37
A & C Gibson	298.37
TT & Cayuga	299.37
A & F Verbakel	300.37
C Thelning	301.37
P & S Mitchell	302.37
T & F Conlan	303.37
K & N McLachlan	304.37
E Schultz	305.44
WPG 2	306.44
Springbank	312.298
Keeling Dairies	313.335

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246

OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271

7.15.1 Submissions

523. J Benny [66.8] seeks amendments to address duplication between the Canterbury and Waitaki River flood overlays and considers the land should be subject to one flood overlay but seeks consistency if both overlays are retained.

524. NHC [153.15] supports NH-R3 in part but seeks a condition requiring buildings to be outside a High flood hazard area to meet minimum floor levels identified through a flood assessment.

525. Alliance [190.32] supports providing for buildings, structures and fences as permitted activities in the Waitaki River flood plain assessment overlay. The submitter seeks clarity on the flood level to be managed in the matters of discretion or delete the provision.

526. NZ Pork [195.19] and FFNZ [246.101] oppose the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from farm buildings definition. FFNZ seeks clarification that a post-and-wire fence includes a range of fencing types.

527. Fuel Companies [238.48] oppose NH-R3 in part and seek amendments so unenclosed buildings without floors and small-scale buildings or structures are provided for.

528. EDS [240.126] supports NH-R3 in part but seeks amendments so that activities in hazard risk areas are subject to normal notification processes.

529. Kā Rūnaka [251.145] seek amendments to the matters of discretion to include effects on natural hazard mitigation measures.

530. G & K Taylor [265.37], K & D Weir [267.37], B & K McLeod [269.37], DTL [282.37], DHL [283.37], DDL [284.37], B & A Matthews [285.37], P & B Wilson [290.37], P & J Stackhouse [291.37], R & S Borst [292.37], B & G Hamilton [293.37], G Simpson 2 [296.37], A & C Gibson [298.37], TT & Cayuga [299.37], A & F Verbakel [300.37], C Thelning [301.37], P & S Mitchell [302.37], T & F Conlan [303.37], K & N McLachlan [304.37], Springbank [312.298] and Keeling Dairies [313.335] oppose NH-R3 in part and seek that the rule provide for additional farm structures and floor types.

531. E Schultz [305.44] and WPG 2 [306.44] oppose NH-R3, considering the distinction between the Canterbury and Otago flood assessment overlay rules is confusing. The submitters seek amendments so that the rules are combined or clarified.

7.15.2 Analysis

532. I support retaining a rule framework for buildings, structures and fences within the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay. Consistent with my conclusions

for NH-R1 and NH-R2, the rule should provide a proportionate pathway for low-risk activities while retaining assessment where buildings or structures may materially increase exposure to, or the consequences of, flooding.

533. J Benny [66.8] raises duplication between the Canterbury and Waitaki River flood overlays. As addressed under the Planning Maps and NH-R2, I consider this primarily a mapping issue. Where both overlays remain, their provisions should operate coherently, but this does not justify deleting NH-R3 or applying the Canterbury framework throughout the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay.

534. NHC [153.15] seeks application of the Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area and minimum-floor-level approach. For the reasons addressed under NH-P7, I do not support importing the Canterbury-specific High Flood Hazard Area methodology into NH-R3 without an equivalent technical and policy basis. Site-specific flood risk can instead be addressed through the flood assessment required by NH-R3.

535. Alliance [190.32] seeks clarification of the flood event against which development is assessed. I agree that the assessment basis should be clear, but do not recommend prescribing a particular AEP or design event without supporting technical evidence. This should instead be addressed through the applicable flood assessment requirements, having regard to the best available hazard information and climate change.

536. The submissions of Fuel Companies [238.48], FFNZ [246.101] and the rural submitters seek broader permitted provision for low-risk structures and different floor types. Consistent with NH-R1 and NH-R2, I agree in part. Poles, open or permeable fencing and gates, irrigation and stockwater infrastructure, unenclosed buildings without floors and appropriately defined small-scale structures can reasonably be enabled where they do not materially obstruct or displace floodwaters. I do not support an unrestricted permitted pathway for buildings with impermeable floors, as their effects depend on scale, location and flood characteristics.

537. The exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from farm building, raised by NZ Pork [195.19] and FFNZ [246.101], is more appropriately determined through the Definitions section because the amendment would have effects beyond NH-R3.

538. Kā Rūnaka [251.145] seeks consideration of effects on natural hazard mitigation measures. I agree with the outcome sought. The notified matters already address displacement of floodwaters and mitigation effects. Consistent with my conclusions for NH-R1 and NH-R2, I recommend expressly addressing effects on legally established natural hazard mitigation works, preferably through a common flood-effects provision to avoid unnecessary duplication.

539. EDS [240.126] seeks removal of the public-notification preclusion. Unlike NH-R1 and NH-R2, the matters under NH-R3 expressly include off-site displacement and mitigation effects, which may extend beyond the subject site. I therefore

recommend accepting this submission and removing the blanket preclusion on public notification, allowing the normal statutory notification tests to apply.

540. Finally, E Schultz [305.44] and WPG 2 [306.44] seek consolidation of the flood rules. As discussed under NH-R1 and NH-R2, I support aligning common permitted activities and terminology but do not recommend consolidation where this would obscure the different regional and technical bases for the Canterbury, Otago and Waitaki River flood provisions.

7.15.3 Recommendations

541. I recommend the following changes to NH-R3:

NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The building or structure is:

1.a below ground swimming pool; or

2.a deck; or

3.an unenclosed building without a floor; or

4.a post and wire or post and rail fence or other open or permeable rural fence or farm-style gate; or

5.a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed or pervious floor;

6.a pole; irrigation or stockwater infrastructure; or

7.a small-scale building or structure of no more than 10m^2 in gross floor area, provided it does not materially obstruct, divert or displace floodwaters

or

PER-2

The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building and does not increase the building footprint.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.mitigation of flooding effects; and

2.floor levels; and

3.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and

4.risk to people, property and the environment during a flood event; and

~~5.flooding effects/displacement of flood waters on and/or off site~~ the extent to which the activity obstructs, diverts or displaces floodwaters, including whether it creates or increases flood risk on other sites; and

6.effects of any proposed mitigation including whether mitigation creates or increases flood risk on other sites; and

7.the intended use of the building or structure; and

8.any storage of hazardous substances, and

9.effects on legally established natural hazard mitigation works

***~~Notification~~**: ~~Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified.~~*

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

7.15.4 Evaluation

542. In accordance with s32AA of the RMA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments to NH-R3. As a rule, the relevant consideration under s32(1)(b) is whether the amended provision is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives, having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting. The scale of this evaluation is proportionate to the relatively limited amendments recommended.

543. As evaluated above for NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P5 and NH-P7, the relevant higher-order framework supports a risk-based and proportionate approach to natural hazard management. The NPS-NH requires that approach where it applies, including use of the best available information and management of significant risk created or increased on other sites. It does not apply to infrastructure or primary production but does not prevent the PDP managing those activities through its wider RMA and regional policy framework.

544. The recommended amendments are more effective and efficient than retaining NH-R3 unchanged. They reduce unnecessary consenting requirements for structures with comparatively low flood vulnerability, while retaining assessment for development capable of materially increasing flood exposure, displacement or consequences. They also improve consistency with NH-R1 and NH-R2 without importing the Canterbury-specific High Flood Hazard Area methodology into the Waitaki River overlay.

545. The principal benefits are reduced consenting costs for low-risk activities, clearer and more consistent plan administration, and continued management of off-site flood effects and natural hazard mitigation works. Removing the blanket public-notification preclusion also enables the normal notification tests to apply where effects extend beyond the subject site.

546. Uncertainty concerning site-specific flood depth, velocity and future flood behaviour can continue to be addressed through the required flood assessment and best available information. This is consistent with the NPS-NH approach to decision-making where hazard information is uncertain or incomplete.

547. Overall, having undertaken the further evaluation required by s32AA, I consider the amended NH-R3 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives, while maintaining a proportionate and technically appropriate approach to flood risk.

7.16 Natural Hazards – NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Overlay (except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5)

548. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 31 original submission points and three (3) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
WDC	83.10
NHC	153.18
HortNZ	166.29
NZ Pork	195.21
Glenbrook	212.30, 212.34
Fuel Companies	238.50
FFNZ	246.104
Kā Rūnaka	251.148
G & K Taylor	265.31
K & D Weir	267.31
B & K McLeod	269.31
CRC	271.267
DTL	282.31
DHL	283.31
DDL	284.31
B & A Matthews	285.31
P & B Wilson	290.31
P & J Stackhouse	291.31

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
R & S Borst	292.31
B & G Hamilton	293.31
G Simpson 2	296.31
A & C Gibson	298.31
TT & Cayuga	299.31
A & F Verbakel	300.31
C Thelning	301.31
P & S Mitchell	302.31
T & F Conlan	303.31
K & N McLachlan	304.31
Springbank	312.300
Keeling Dairies	313.39

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Geoff and Katrina Taylor	FS265

7.16.1 Submissions

549. WDC [83.10] seeks minor amendments to NH-R6 to improve grammar and clarity.

550. NHC [153.18], HortNZ [166.29] and FFNZ [246.104] support NH-R6 and seek that it be retained as notified.

551. NZ Pork [195.21] supports the permitted activity status for primary production but seeks amendments to include a permitted activity pathway for farm buildings associated with intensive indoor primary production.

552. Glenbrook [212.30, 212.34] opposes and seeks amendments to NH-R6 so airstrips, helicopter take-off and landing areas, and solar farms are not sensitive to flooding and should be provided for as permitted activities or exempt from the rule.

553. Fuel Companies [238.50] oppose NH-R6 in part and seek clarification that land disturbance is a permitted activity in all flood overlays, otherwise all land disturbance could be interpreted as restricted discretionary under NH-R6.

554. Kā Rūnaka [251.148] seek amendments to exclude intensive indoor and outdoor primary production from the permitted primary production pathway.

555. CRC [271.267] opposes NH-R6 and seeks its deletion, considering the listed activities would otherwise be permitted by default without conditions.

556. G & K Taylor [265.31], K & D Weir [267.31], B & K McLeod [269.31], , DTL [282.31], DHL [283.31], DDL [284.31], B & A Matthews [285.31], P & B Wilson [290.31], P & J Stackhouse [291.31], R & S Borst [292.31], B & G Hamilton [293.31], G Simpson 2 [296.31], A & C Gibson [298.31], TT & Cayuga [299.31], A & F Verbakel [300.31], C Thelning [301.31], P & S Mitchell [302.31], T & F Conlan [303.31], K & N McLachlan [304.31], Springbank [312.300] and Keeling Dairies [313.39] support NH-R6 in part but seek amendments to add aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas as permitted activities, considering these uses are compatible with the Natural Hazards chapter and often support primary production.

7.16.2 Analysis

557. I support retaining NH-R6 as the residual rule for land use activities within the flood assessment overlays. Unlike NH-R1–R5, NH-R6 is not principally concerned with buildings, structures or earthworks, but with whether the use of land itself has a vulnerability to flooding that warrants resource consent. The notified rule accordingly permits primary production, recreation and leisure activities, temporary events, and parking and loading activities.

558. WDC [83.10] seeks minor drafting corrections to RDIS-1. I agree these improve clarity without changing the operation of the rule.

559. NZ Pork [195.21] seeks a permitted pathway for farm buildings associated with intensive indoor primary production. I do not recommend this amendment to NH-R6. While primary production as a land use is permitted by NH-R6, associated buildings and structures are development and are appropriately managed through NH-R1–R3. Whether intensive indoor primary production falls within the definition of farm building should be determined separately under the Definitions section.

560. Glenbrook [212.30] and the rural submitters seek permitted provision for aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas. I agree. As land use activities, these have relatively low vulnerability to flooding and can appropriately be added to PER-1. Any associated buildings, structures or earthworks would remain subject to the applicable NH-R1–R5 provisions.

561. I do not recommend adding a general exemption for solar farms as sought by Glenbrook [212.34]. While operation of a solar farm is a land use, its flood risk is materially associated with its physical development, including panels, supporting structures, electrical infrastructure and earthworks. Those components should continue to be assessed under the relevant building, structure and earthworks rules rather than being exempted through NH-R6.

562. Similarly, I do not recommend adding land disturbance to PER-1 as sought by Fuel Companies [238.50]. Land disturbance is a physical alteration of land rather

than the type of land use activity that NH-R6 is intended to regulate. Its relationship with earthworks should instead be clarified through NH-R4 and the relevant definitions, avoiding overlap between the land use and development rules.

563. Kā Rūnaka [251.148] seeks to exclude intensive indoor and outdoor primary production from the permitted primary production pathway. I do not recommend the amendment. The relevant question under NH-R6 is the vulnerability and consequences associated with the land use activity, rather than the buildings or other development supporting that use, which are separately regulated. As discussed above, a blanket restriction on primary production across the extensive flood overlays would not provide a proportionate response to the natural hazard risk. Further submissions similarly identify the potential for primary production activities to manage flood exposure through operational practices.

564. I do not support CRC [271.267] seeking deletion of NH-R6. Retaining the rule provides clarity about which land use activities are expressly enabled and establishes an assessment pathway for other land uses with potentially greater vulnerability to flooding. This complements, rather than duplicates, the separate controls on buildings, structures, earthworks and mitigation works.

565. Overall, I recommend retaining NH-R6 as a land use activity rule, with the minor drafting amendments sought by WDC and the addition of aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas. I do not recommend extending NH-R6 to regulate or exempt buildings, structures, earthworks or land disturbance, which are more appropriately addressed through the specific development rules above.

7.16.3 Recommendations

566. I recommend amendments to NH-R6 as follows;

NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Overlay (except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5)

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The activity is one of the following:

1.primary production;

2.recreation or leisure activity including sports fields;

3.temporary events;

4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above

5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas

Activity status: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, and if the activity is located within the Canterbury region of the District, it is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.mitigation of flooding effects; and

2.floor levels, including alternative means of complying with any floor level specified in a flood assessment; and

3.methods to manage the activity and people during a flood event; and

4.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and

5.the nature of the activity and the risk and vulnerability to flood events.

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

Where:

NC-1

Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1

7.16.4 Evaluation

567. In accordance with s32AA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments. This should be read alongside the evaluations for NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P5, NH-P6 and NH-P7, including the assessment of the risk-based and proportionate approach.

568. The recommended amendments improve the effectiveness and efficiency of NH-R6 by maintaining a clear distinction between land use activities and the buildings, structures and physical works associated with those activities. Low-vulnerability land uses are enabled through NH-R6, while their physical development remains subject to NH-R1–R5 where relevant.

569. Adding aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas is consistent with this approach because the land use itself has comparatively low vulnerability to flooding. Conversely, permitting farm buildings, solar infrastructure or land disturbance through NH-R6 could bypass the more specific provisions managing the flood effects of physical development.

570. The amendments therefore improve plan clarity and reduce unnecessary consenting requirements for low-vulnerability land uses without reducing the management of flood risk associated with development. For the reasons evaluated above, I consider the amended NH-R6 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives.

7.17 Natural Hazards – NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays

571. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 35 original submission points and five (5) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.16
HortNZ	166.28
Alliance	190.33
NZ Pork	195.20
Glenbrook	212.28, 212.35
Fuel Companies	238.49
EDS	240.127
WCL	243.43
FFNZ	246.102
Kā Rūnaka	251.146
G & K Taylor	265.30
K & D Weir	267.30
B & K McLeod	269.30
CRC	271.265
DTL	282.30
DHL	283.30
DDL	284.30
B & A Matthews	285.30
P & B Wilson	290.30
P & J Stackhouse	291.30
R & S Borst	292.30
B & G Hamilton	293.30
G Simpson 2	296.30
A & C Gibson	298.30
TT & Cayuga	299.30
A & F Verbakel	300.30
C Thelning	301.30
P & S Mitchell	302.30

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
T & F Conlan	303.30
K & N McLachlan	304.30
E Schultz	305.45
WPG 2	306.45
Springbank	312.299
Keeling Dairies	313.38

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Geoff and Katrina Taylor	FS265
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
Fuel Companies	FS238

7.17.1 Submissions

572. NHC [153.16] supports NH-R4 and seek that the rule be retained as notified.

573. HortNZ [166.28] and NZ Pork [195.20] oppose NH-R4 because it does not provide for erosion and sediment controls required to support primary production activities. The submitters seek a permitted activity pathway for ancillary rural earthworks or earthworks associated with erosion and sediment controls.

574. Alliance [190.33] seeks amendments to NH-R4 to provide for more realistic earthworks height and volume limits within overlays.

575. Glenbrook [212.28, 212.35] opposes NH-R4 and seeks exemptions for earthworks associated with buildings that have building consent, for certain earthworks on properties over 40ha, and earthworks associated with solar farms.

576. Fuel Companies [238.49] oppose NH-R4 and seeks amendments to enable a permitted pathway for earthworks undertaken in accordance with the NESCS.

577. EDS [240.127] supports NH-R4 in part but seeks amendments so that activities in hazard risk areas are subject to normal notification processes.

578. WCL [243.43] opposes NH-R4 in part and seeks a new permitted activity clause for earthworks relating to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of roads.

579. FFNZ [246.102] supports NH-R4 in part but considers the earthworks provisions should be located in the Earthworks (EW) chapter. FFNZ seeks broader permitted pathways for repair and maintenance of existing rural infrastructure and activities.

580. Kā Rūnaka [251.146] seek amendments to nH-R4 to align with the relief on NH-R5 and ensure consistency with related policy relief for hazard mitigation works.

581. G & K Taylor [265.30], K & D Weir [267.30], B & K McLeod [269.30], DTL [282.30], DHL [283.30], DDL [284.30], B & A Matthews [285.30], P & B Wilson [290.30], P & J Stackhouse [291.30], R & S Borst [292.30], B & G Hamilton [293.30], G Simpson 2 [296.30], A & C Gibson [298.30], TT & Cayuga [299.30], A & F Verbakel [300.30], C Thelning [301.30], P & S Mitchell [302.30], T & F Conlan [303.30], K & N McLachlan [304.30], Springbank [312.299] and Keeling Dairies [313.38] support NH-R4 in part but seek amendments to permit earthworks for the construction of farm tracks.

582. CRC [271.265] seeks amendments to NH-R4, so the rule better manages actual off-site flood effects. CRC seeks that the rule address earthworks, buildings and structures.

583. E Schultz [305.45] and WPG 2 [306.45] oppose NH-R4, considering earthworks associated with permitted buildings or structures should be permitted. Submitters consider the current thresholds would constrain primary production activities across large hazard-mapped areas.

7.17.2 Analysis

584. I support retaining NH-R4 as a specific rule for earthworks within the Flood Assessment Overlays. This is distinct from NH-R1–R3, which manage buildings and structures, and NH-R6, which manages land use activities. Maintaining these distinctions provides a clearer and more practicable rule framework.

585. NHC [153.16] supports the notified rule, while Alliance [190.33], FFNZ [246.102], E Schultz [305.45] and WPG 2 [306.45] raise concerns regarding the scale of the permitted earthworks thresholds and their application across extensive rural areas. E Schultz and WPG 2, for example, seek an increase from the notified 10m^3 annual threshold to 20m^3 and provision for earthworks associated with permitted buildings and structures. I agree that there is merit in ensuring the permitted thresholds are proportionate to the potential flood effects of earthworks.

586. CRC [271.265] raises a valid concern that earthworks below a prescribed threshold may still displace floodwater, while earthworks exceeding it may not necessarily result in off-site effects. CRC therefore seeks an effects-based standard based on whether flooding is worsened on another property through diversion or displacement of floodwaters. This approach is supported by NHC and Fuel Companies in further submissions.

587. While I agree with the outcome sought by CRC, I do not recommend replacing the measurable permitted activity standards with that approach. A requirement to establish whether earthworks will worsen flooding on another property would require a site-specific effects assessment to determine compliance. In my view, this would reduce certainty for plan users and is not a sufficiently measurable or readily ascertainable permitted activity standard.

588. I also do not support extending NH-R4 to buildings and structures as sought by CRC. As discussed under NH-R1–R3, those activities have their own rule pathways which address their vulnerability and potential effects within the respective flood overlays. NH-R4 should remain focused on the effects arising from modification of ground levels through earthworks.

589. I nevertheless consider CRC's submission identifies an important issue that should inform the design of NH-R4. The permitted standards should provide clear and measurable limits on the scale and change in ground level associated with earthworks, while activities exceeding those limits are subject to restricted discretionary assessment, including consideration of diversion and displacement of floodwaters and off-site effects. This retains certainty at the permitted activity level while allowing effects-based assessment where the scale of earthworks warrants consent.

590. HortNZ [166.28], NZ Pork [195.20], FFNZ [246.102] and the rural submitters seek broader provision for earthworks associated with primary production, including erosion and sediment controls, rural infrastructure and farm tracks. The rural submitters expressly seek a permitted pathway for farm tracks. I consider there is merit in providing for routine rural earthworks, but this should remain subject to measurable parameters rather than an unrestricted activity-specific exemption.

591. Similarly, I agree in part with WCL [243.43] that routine road maintenance should not be unnecessarily constrained. However, road maintenance can involve deposition or changes to ground levels that affect flood behaviour. Any permitted pathway should therefore be subject to the same measurable limits or appropriate activity-specific standards.

592. I do not support exemptions based solely on a building consent, property size, solar-farm use or compliance with the NESCS. These matters do not establish that the earthworks will have acceptable flood effects. In particular, the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2012 (NESCS) addresses contaminated soil and human health rather than flood risk.

593. I therefore recommend retaining the fundamental structure of NH-R4, including quantitative volume, fill and cut standards, while providing targeted additional permitted pathways for routine rural earthworks where appropriate. The matters of discretion should expressly address diversion and the displacement of floodwater and off-site flood risk, responding to the substantive concern raised by CRC and Kā Rūnaka. The normal test for notification should apply.

7.17.3 Recommendations

594. I recommend amendment to NH-R4 as follows;

NH-R4 Earthworks ~~excluding land disturbance~~ in all Flood Assessment Overlays

All zones
Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

1.the earthworks do not exceed 10m^3 per year and 20m^3 cumulatively in any 10 year period; and

2.the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 200mm above natural ground level; and

3.the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or

PER-2

The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5

Or

The earthworks are for the construction, maintenance or repair of a farm track and the works;

1.do not result in the widening of track footprint;

2.are not located within an overland flow path.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.location, nature and scale of the earthworks; and

2.mitigation of flooding and drainage effects; and

3.effects on land stability, flooding, waterways, ground levels and ~~dispersed effects on and off site.~~

4. The diversion or displacement of floodwaters, including whether the earthworks will create or increase flood risk on other sites, and

5. effects on natural hazard mitigation works.

~~Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified.~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

Note: A consent from the regional council may also be required for earthworks within a flood assessment overlay.

7.17.4 Evaluation

595. In accordance with s32AA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments. This should be read alongside the evaluations of NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P5, NH-P6 and NH-P7 and the preceding flood rules.

596. The principal alternative raised by CRC is replacing the quantitative earthworks thresholds with a permitted activity standard based on whether flooding is worsened on another property. While this more directly describes the effect to be managed, determining compliance could require site-specific hydraulic or technical assessment. The notified measurable thresholds provide greater certainty and practicability for a permitted activity rule.

597. Retaining measurable volume, cut and fill standards, while strengthening the restricted discretionary assessment of floodwater diversion, displacement and off-site effects, provides a more appropriate balance. It enables small-scale earthworks without technical assessment while ensuring larger or potentially consequential works are assessed for their actual flood effects.

598. Retaining buildings and structures within NH-R1–R3 also avoids unnecessary overlap between rules and maintains a clear distinction between earthworks, buildings and structures, and land use activities within the Natural Hazards chapter.

599. Overall, retaining the measurable framework, with targeted amendments to improve proportionality and the assessment of off-site effects, is an effective and efficient approach and is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives.

7.18 Natural Hazards – NH-S1 Flood assessment certificate

600. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, two original submission points and two (2) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.19
CRC	271.270

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.18.1 Submissions

601. NHC [153.19] supports requiring a flood assessment certificate for activities in the Canterbury flood assessment overlay but seeks that NH-S1 also apply to the Otago flood assessment overlay and Waitaki River floodplain assessment overlay.

602. CRC [271.270] seeks amendments to NH-S1 to improve certainty and align with the approach preferred by WDC and Mackenzie District Council. CRC considers the standard should refer to a 500-year ARI flood event, at a minimum, a 200-year ARI standard required by the CRPS.

7.18.2 Analysis

603. NHC [153.19] supports the use of a flood assessment certificate within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay but seeks to extend NH-S1 to the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay, including identification of High Flood Hazard Areas and minimum floor levels.

604. I agree with NHC that development within all three flood overlays requires an appropriate understanding of flood hazard and, where relevant, appropriate floor levels. However, I do not agree that this requires the same flood assessment certificate mechanism across the three overlays. As discussed under NH-P6, NH-P7 and NH-R1–R3, the Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area framework is specific to the Canterbury regional planning and flood information framework. Federated Farmers makes the same point in its further submission opposing NHC's relief.

605. Extending NH-S1 would also effectively introduce the Canterbury High Flood Hazard Area classification into the Otago and Waitaki River overlays. I do not consider that appropriate without an equivalent regional methodology and supporting technical framework. Development in those overlays should instead continue to be assessed under NH-P7 and NH-R1/NH-R3, using the applicable Otago and Waitaki River flood information and site-specific assessment where required. This maintains consistency in the risk-based approach, without requiring identical assessment mechanisms across areas supported by different regional flood frameworks.

606. CRC [271.270] seeks greater certainty regarding the flood event used by NH-S1. In particular, CRC considers the notified reference to the “assessed flood level” insufficiently certain and proposes a minimum finished floor level 300mm above the assessed 500-year ARI flood level, while noting that a 200-year ARI standard could alternatively be used.

607. I agree with CRC that NH-S1 should identify a clear and measurable flood event. This is consistent with the approach taken above for NH-R4: where compliance with a permitted activity standard depends upon a technical threshold, the standard should enable the plan user and decision-maker to determine objectively whether it has been met. A generic reference to the “assessed flood level” provides less certainty as to the event against which the floor level is to be established.

608. I therefore support CRC's relief in principle. However, the choice between the 500-year ARI and 200-year ARI flood event should be based on the technical evidence supporting the Canterbury flood framework, rather than selected solely as a drafting preference. CRC itself identifies 200-year ARI as the minimum CRPS standard while proposing 500-year ARI as the preferred WDC/Mackenzie approach.

609. I also support CRC's proposed clarification that the flood assessment should use the most up-to-date Council and CRC modelling, relevant field information and any site-specific assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional. This is consistent with the approach recommended under NH-P1 and NH-P5 of using the best available information while allowing more detailed site-specific information to inform assessment.

7.18.3 Recommendations

610. I recommend amending NH-S1 as follows;

NH-S1Flood assessment certificate

Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay;

A flood assessment ~~certificate shall be provided~~ that is valid for three years from the date of issue shall be provided by Canterbury Regional Council, which specifies:

1.whether or not the building or activity is located on land that is within a High Flood Hazard Area; and

2.the minimum finished floor level for any new building or structure that is 300mm above the assessed flood (being the 500-year/200-year ARI flood level).

The flood assessment will be completed with reference to:

1.the most up to date models and maps held by

2.Waitaki District Council or Canterbury Regional Council; and

3.any relevant field information; and

4.any site-specific flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experience professional.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

7.18.4 Evaluation

611. In accordance with s32AA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments. This should be read alongside the evaluations for NH-P6, NH-P7 and NH-R1–R3, which address the different flood-management frameworks applying across the Canterbury, Otago and Waitaki River overlays.

612. Extending NH-S1 to all three overlays would provide procedural consistency but would also import the Canterbury-specific High Flood Hazard Area assessment mechanism into areas supported by different regional flood information and policy frameworks. Retaining NH-S1 specifically for the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay is therefore more effective and appropriately aligned with the structure of the PDP.

613. Within the Canterbury framework, specifying the flood event used to establish minimum floor levels provides greater certainty and measurability than an undefined “assessed flood level”. The appropriate ARI should, however, be supported by the technical evidence and applicable higher-order direction.

614. The recommended approach therefore maintains consistency in the overall risk-based approach without requiring identical technical assessment methods across different flood overlays. It provides a clear assessment standard for Canterbury while retaining the separate Otago and Waitaki River assessment pathways established elsewhere in the chapter.

615. I consider amended NH-S1 to be the most appropriate way to implement the relevant objectives and policies.

NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: EARTHQUAKE & SURFACE FAULT

7.19 Natural Hazards – NH-P9 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Subdivision

616. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, three original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.43
CRC	271.258
OceanaGold	295.134

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271

7.19.1 Submissions

617. NHC [153.43] supports NH-P9 in part, including requiring a site-specific fault avoidance zone and ensuring subdivision avoids this area to reduce risk to people and property from earthquake events. NHC seeks amendments to future allotments, buildings and infrastructure be set back at least 20m from any fault avoidance zone.

618. CRC [271.258] considers points 2 and 3 are too restrictive. CRC seeks amendments to refer to the zone of fault deformation and to allow subdivision where fault rupture risk is avoided or mitigated, rather than requiring avoidance in all cases.

619. OceanaGold [295.134] opposes NH-P9, questioning the relevance of the policy to subdivision in the SPZMN. The submitter seeks that the SPZMN operates as a

standalone chapter and that subdivision for mining activities is addressed through that chapter.

7.19.2 Analysis

620. I support retaining NH-P9 as a specific policy for subdivision within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay. The notified policy appropriately requires site-specific investigation at subdivision stage, but its use of the term “fault avoidance zone” creates some uncertainty as to the area of fault deformation itself and the setback to be applied from it.

621. NHC [153.43] supports the policy but seeks a requirement for future allotments, buildings and infrastructure to be set back at least 20m from any fault avoidance zone. I agree with the underlying intent of ensuring that subdivision provides sufficient separation between future development and surface fault rupture. However, I do not recommend the amendment as drafted.

622. CRC [271.258] identifies an important distinction between the mapped zone of fault deformation and the setback or buffer applied to that area. CRC explains that a fault avoidance zone, as used in the MfE guidance, comprises the mapped zone of fault deformation together with a buffer of at least 20m. Consequently, applying a further 20m setback from the fault avoidance zone, as sought by NHC, could result in an additional buffer beyond that intended.

623. I therefore prefer CRC's terminology of “mapped zone of fault deformation”. The policy should establish a clear sequence whereby subdivision first identifies the zone of fault deformation at a site-specific scale, then identifies the required setback from that zone, and subsequently locates future allotments and building sites outside both. This more clearly identifies the physical hazard area and distinguishes it from the planning response applied to that hazard.

624. I also agree in part with CRC that the policy should distinguish future allotments and building sites from infrastructure associated with subdivision. CRC identifies that linear infrastructure, including roads and water and electricity infrastructure, may need to cross a zone of fault deformation even where future buildings can readily be located away from it. Applying an absolute avoidance requirement to all infrastructure would therefore be unnecessarily restrictive.

625. Consistent with the risk-based approach established through NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P3 and NH-P5, I consider avoidance should remain the primary response where subdivision is creating future building opportunities within an identified fault deformation area. A different approach is appropriate for infrastructure where there is a functional or operational need to cross that area, provided the resulting fault rupture risk is appropriately managed.

626. I also recommend removing the notified reference to mitigating fault rupture risk to an “acceptable level”. As discussed earlier in relation to NH-O1 and NH-P2, the clearer approach is for the policy itself to establish the intended outcome. In this case, that outcome is achieved by identifying the fault deformation area,

establishing the required setback and locating future building opportunities outside those areas.

627. OceanaGold [295.134] seeks exclusion of subdivision associated with mining activities within the SPZMM. I do not consider the underlying zoning or purpose of subdivision removes the relevance of surface fault rupture risk. The relationship between the SPZMM and subdivision provisions should be addressed through those chapters rather than through an exemption from NH-P9.

7.19.3 Recommendations

628. I recommend amendment to NH-P9 as follows;

NH-P9 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Subdivision

1.Require applications for subdivision of sites that are identified within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Subdivision to identify and map a ~~fault avoidance zone~~ the zone of fault deformation at a site-specific scale and identify the required setback from the mapped zone of fault deformation ~~at a site-specific scale~~; and

2.provide for subdivision in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay - Subdivision, where future allotments or building sites cannot be located outside the mapped zone of fault deformation and the required setback ~~any future allotments, buildings and infrastructure can be set back from any fault avoidance zone to mitigate the potential effects of fault rupture to an acceptable level~~; and

3.avoid subdivision where future allotments or building sites cannot be located outside the mapped zone of fault deformation and the required setback except where infrastructure has a functional or operational need to cross the mapped zone of fault deformation and the risk from fault rupture is appropriately managed ~~in instances where future allotments, buildings and infrastructure cannot set back from any fault avoidance zone~~.

7.19.4 Evaluation

629. In accordance with s32AA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments. This evaluation should be read alongside those for NH-O1, NH-P2, NH-P3 and NH-P5, particularly the assessment of the risk-based and proportionate approach to natural hazard management.

630. The recommended amendments improve the effectiveness and clarity of NH-P9 by distinguishing between the mapped zone of fault deformation and the required setback from that zone. This provides a clearer sequence for subdivision assessment and reduces the potential for the setback to be duplicated through use of the term fault avoidance zone. CRC's further submission specifically identifies that the latter terminology already incorporates a buffer under the MfE approach.

631. The amendments are also more efficient because they establish different responses for different components of subdivision. Future allotments and building sites can generally be located through subdivision design to avoid the identified fault deformation area and required setback. In contrast, linear infrastructure may have a functional or operational need to cross that area. Providing a risk-management pathway for such infrastructure avoids an unnecessarily absolute restriction while retaining management of fault rupture risk.

632. The reasonably practicable alternatives include retaining the notified wording, adopting NHC's additional 20m setback from a fault avoidance zone, or more clearly separating the mapped fault deformation area from the setback applied to it. The recommended approach is preferred because it provides greater certainty without potentially duplicating the setback and better differentiates between building opportunities and infrastructure created through subdivision.

633. The amendments are not expected to materially increase consenting or technical assessment costs because site-specific identification of the fault hazard is already required by the notified policy. Rather, the amendments provide greater certainty about what is to be mapped, where the setback is measured from, and how that information is to inform subdivision design.

634. Overall, the amendments provide a clearer and more proportionate framework for managing surface fault rupture risk at subdivision stage and are considered the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives.

7.20 Natural Hazards – NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay - Activities and Buildings

635. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, seven original submission points and four (4) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.9
Alliance	190.31
MOED	242.17
CRC	271.259
OceanaGold	295.136
Transpower	309.94
Graymont	310.38

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Awamoa Developments Ltd	FS315
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295

7.20.1 Submissions

636. NHC [153.9] supports the intent of NH-P10 but seeks amendments requiring a site-specific fault avoidance zone to be mapped for critical facilities, regionally significant infrastructure and other specified sensitive activities, and seeks removal of the option to mitigate potential fault rupture effects. NHC also seeks a 20m setback from the fault.

637. Alliance [190.31], MOED [242.17] and CRC [271.259] support NH-P10 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

638. OceanaGold [295.136] opposes NH-P10 as it relates to mining activities and seeks that mining activities within the SPZMM are addressed through the Special Purpose Zone provisions rather than NH-P10.

639. Transpower [309.94] supports the intent of NH-P10 but seeks removal of references to critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, relying instead on NH-P3.

640. Graymont [310.38] supports the intent of NH-P10 but seeks its extension to regionally significant industry, including recognition that mineral extraction activities may have a functional need to locate within natural hazard areas.

7.20.2 Analysis

641. NH-P10 applies specifically to higher-vulnerability activities and important infrastructure within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay and requires potential effects of fault rupture to be avoided or mitigated as far as practicable. I support retaining this specific policy, subject to amendments to improve its relationship with NH-P9 and NH-P3.

642. As discussed in relation to NH-P9, I agree with NHC that site-specific identification of the fault is important but prefer the clearer distinction between the mapped zone of fault deformation and the required setback from that zone. I therefore consider that the same terminology should be used consistently in NH-P10.

643. I do not, however, support NHC's requested absolute avoidance approach for all activities captured by NH-P10. Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure may have functional or operational requirements that constrain their location. NHC itself recognises in its further submission that such infrastructure may need to locate within the hazard area where there are no feasible or practicable alternatives and there is an operational or functional need. This is consistent with the approach previously recommended for NH-P3.

644. I therefore consider NH-P10 should distinguish between identifying the fault deformation area and required setback, which provides the preferred location for development, and circumstances where avoidance is not practicable. Where an

activity has a functional or operational need to locate within or cross that area, the policy should require the risk from fault rupture to be mitigated as far as practicable.

645. Transpower's request to remove critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure would reduce duplication with NH-P3. However, NH-P10 serves a different purpose by providing hazard-specific direction for surface fault rupture. I therefore recommend retaining these activities in NH-P10 while ensuring the policy operates consistently with the functional and operational need pathway established through NH-P3.

646. I do not recommend extending NH-P10 generally to regionally significant industry, as sought by Graymont. The policy is directed toward activities where fault rupture has particular consequences because of their vulnerability, importance to community resilience or hazardous substances. Regionally significant industry is not necessarily comparable in vulnerability or consequence. Where mineral extraction has a functional need to locate within a particular area, that issue is more appropriately addressed through the applicable activity-specific and natural hazard provisions.

647. For the same reason, I do not recommend excluding the SPZMM as sought by OceanaGold. The underlying zoning does not remove exposure to surface fault rupture. Any relationship between the SPZMM and other district-wide provisions should be addressed through the relevant chapter relationship provisions rather than by removing the natural hazard policy.

7.20.3 Recommendations

648. Amend NH-P10 as follows:

NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings

Require applications for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement villages and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings to identify the mapped zone of fault deformation and required setback at a site-specific scale and demonstrate that any potential effects of fault rupture are avoided, where avoidance is not practicable because of a functional or operational need ~~or~~ mitigated as far as practicable.

7.20.4 Evaluation

649. In accordance with s32AA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendments. This should be read alongside the evaluations for NH-P3, NH-P5 and NH-P9.

650. The amendments improve effectiveness and plan coherence by using the same approach established through NH-P9: identify the mapped zone of fault deformation, identify the required setback, and then determine whether the relevant activity can avoid that area. This provides greater clarity than relying generally on avoidance or mitigation of fault rupture effects.

651. The amendments also provide a proportionate response for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure. Avoidance remains the preferred response, while recognising that infrastructure may have a functional or operational need that makes complete avoidance impracticable. In those circumstances, mitigation as far as practicable remains necessary.

652. Retaining a specific surface fault rupture policy for these activities is more effective than relying solely on NH-P3 because NH-P10 provides hazard-specific direction. Conversely, extending the policy to all regionally significant industry would capture activities with differing vulnerabilities and consequences and is not necessary to achieve the natural hazard objectives.

653. Overall, the amended policy improves clarity, consistency with NH-P9 and integration with NH-P3 and is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives.

7.21 Natural Hazards – NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay

654. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 24 original submission points and two (2) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
C Leckie 2	107.5
NHC	153.10
G & K Taylor	265.35
K & D Weir	267.35
B & K McLeod	269.35
CRC	271.260
DTL	282.35
DHL	283.35
DDL	284.35
B & A Matthews	285.35
P & B Wilson	290.35
P & J Stackhouse	291.35
R & S Borst	292.35
B & G Hamilton	293.35
G Simpson 2	296.35
A & C Gibson	298.35

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
TT & Cayuga	299.35
A & F Verbakel	300.35
C Thelning	301.35
P & S Mitchell	302.35
T & F Conlan	303.35
K & N McLachlan	304.35
Springbank	312.293
Keeling Dairies	313.34

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271

7.21.1 Submissions

655. G & K Taylor [265.35], K & D Weir [267.35], B & K McLeod [269.35], CRC [271.260], DTL [282.35], DHL [283.35], DDL [284.35], B & A Matthews [285.35], P & B Wilson [290.35], P & J Stackhouse [291.35], R & S Borst [292.35], B & G Hamilton [293.35], G Simpson 2 [296.35], A & C Gibson [298.35], TT & Cayuga [299.35], A & F Verbakel [300.35], C Thelning [301.35], P & S Mitchell [302.35], T & F Conlan [303.35], K & N McLachlan [304.35], Springbank [312.293] and Keeling Dairies [313.34] support NH-P11 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

656. C Leckie 2 [107.5] opposes the Liquefaction assessment overlay on the basis that the lack of clear rules creates uncertainty and seeks clearer guidance on how to avoid, remedy or mitigate liquefaction hazards.

657. NHC [153.10] supports reducing liquefaction risk but seeks NH-P11 include a definition or metric for what constitutes an acceptable level of risk.

7.21.2 Analysis

658. NH-P11 provides for subdivision within the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay where the potential risk of liquefaction can be mitigated to an acceptable level. I support retaining the policy and its risk-based intent.

659. In response to C Leckie 2 [107.5], I acknowledge that the Natural Hazards chapter does not itself contain the detailed rules implementing NH-P11. However, CRC confirms in its further submission that the relevant rules are located within the Subdivision chapter. This is principally a matter of plan navigation rather than an absence of an implementation framework. I agree with CRC that a cross-reference in the Natural Hazards chapter would assist plan users, but this does not require amendment to NH-P11 itself.

660. NHC seeks a definition or metric for an "acceptable level" of liquefaction risk. As discussed previously in relation to the general natural hazard provisions, I do not consider it appropriate to establish a separate generic definition of acceptable risk within NH-P11. The level of risk that can appropriately be accommodated depends on the nature and vulnerability of the proposed development, the hazard characteristics and the mitigation available.

661. CRC similarly opposes NHC's requested definition on the basis that the rule framework establishes the acceptable planning outcome by managing activities that would result in unacceptable risk. I agree with that approach. However, consistent with the amendments recommended to NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5, I consider the policy can be made clearer by expressly linking the response to the level of natural hazard risk, rather than relying solely on an undefined concept of an "acceptable level".

7.21.3 Recommendations

662. Amend NH-P11 as follows:

NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay

Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay where it can be demonstrated that the potential risk of liquefaction is avoided or mitigated in a manner proportionate to the level of risk ~~mitigated to an acceptable level~~.

7.21.4 Evaluation

663. In accordance with s32AA, I have undertaken a further evaluation of the recommended amendment. This should be read alongside the evaluations for NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5.

664. Retaining NH-P11 provides clear policy direction for subdivision within the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay. The detailed implementation of that policy through the Subdivision chapter avoids unnecessary duplication of rules within the Natural Hazards chapter, while an appropriate cross-reference can improve plan navigation. CRC confirms that the relevant liquefaction rules are located in the Subdivision chapter.

665. Replacing the undefined reference to an "acceptable level" with a requirement to avoid or mitigate liquefaction risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk improves consistency with the broader natural hazard framework recommended for NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5. It also avoids establishing a single numerical risk threshold that may not appropriately reflect differences in hazard characteristics, development vulnerability and available mitigation.

666. The amendment retains the intended risk-based outcome while improving consistency and certainty across the Natural Hazards chapter. I therefore consider amended NH-P11 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives.

NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: LAND INSTABILITY

7.22 Natural Hazards – NH-P8 Moeraki Land Instability Overlay

667. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, three original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.8
WCL	243.42
Kā Rūnaka	251.141

7.22.1 Submissions

668. NHC [153.8] supports NH-P8 but seek that a definition or metric for an *acceptable level* of risk is included.

669. WCL [243.42] opposes NH-P8 as it is unclear whether *use* includes maintenance or repairs and seeks amendments to clarify this.

670. Kā Rūnaka [251.141] opposes NH-P8 and considers land instability in Moeraki has not been sufficiently explained. They seek amendments to give effect to the pORPS by identifying tolerable risk levels and the effects management approach for any areas that may be identified as moderate hazard risk in the future.

7.22.2 Analysis

671. NH-P8 establishes a differentiated approach to land instability at Moeraki. As notified, subdivision, use and development within the Very High Risk and High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas is avoided unless a geotechnical assessment demonstrates that risk can be mitigated to an acceptable level, while activities within the Low Risk and Very Low Risk areas are managed through geotechnical assessment. I support retaining a specific policy for the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay but consider amendments are necessary to better align the policy with the higher-order risk-management framework.

672. NHC [153.8] supports the differentiated approach but seeks a definition or metric for an “acceptable level” of risk. I agree that the notified terminology lacks clarity. However, I do not recommend establishing a separate district-level definition of acceptable risk. The NPS-NH and operative ORPS now provide the relevant higher-order frameworks for assessing and managing natural hazard risk.

673. Kā Rūnaka [251.141] raises a broader concern regarding the evidential basis for the Moeraki land-instability approach and the absence of a pathway for areas where risk may be tolerable or moderate. I agree in part. The ORPS distinguishes between significant, tolerable and acceptable natural hazard risk and establishes corresponding management responses. This provides an important regional context for NH-P8 and supports retaining a pathway for activities where risk can appropriately be managed rather than relying solely on the mapped hazard classification.

674. The Kā Rūnaka submission should also be considered in the context of the ORPS direction relating to Kāi Tahu rakatirataka and natural hazard decision-making. This is particularly relevant where natural hazard constraints affect Māori land, native reserves or wāhi tūpuna. The policy framework should therefore allow appropriate consideration of culturally significant land and activities, including the range of risk-management responses available, while still achieving the applicable natural hazard risk outcomes.

675. The NPS-NH provides additional national direction. Where it applies, very high natural hazard risk must be avoided, while high and medium risk is avoided or mitigated proportionately to the level of risk. The terminology used by the NPS-NH and ORPS is not identical, and I do not consider the existing Moeraki Very High, High, Low and Very Low overlay classifications should automatically be equated with either higher-order risk classification without evidence demonstrating that equivalence.

676. Accordingly, the mapped Moeraki Land Instability Overlay should identify the hazard context, while the natural hazard risk associated with a particular proposal is determined through the applicable assessment framework. This is consistent with the approach recommended for NH-P1 and NH-P5, including use of the best available information and assessment proportionate to anticipated risk.

677. WCL [243.42] seeks clarification that "use" does not include maintenance or repairs. I do not recommend a broad policy-level exclusion. The nature and scale of maintenance and repair activities varies and their regulatory treatment is more appropriately addressed through the applicable rules and existing-use framework.

7.22.3 Recommendations

678. Amend NH-P8 as follows;

NH-P8 Moeraki Land Instability Overlay

1.In the Very High Risk and High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas, require subdivision, use and development to be informed by a geotechnical assessment, proportionate to the anticipated level of risk, which:

a. assesses the natural hazard risk associated with the proposal; and

b. demonstrates that the natural hazard risk will be avoided or mitigated in accordance with the applicable natural hazard risk management framework; and

~~*Avoid subdivision, use and development in the Very High Risk and High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas, unless a geotechnical assessment can demonstrate that the risk can be mitigated to an acceptable level;*~~ *and*

2. manage subdivision, use and development in the Low Risk and Very Low Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas *where the natural hazard risk is assessed and managed in a manner proportionate to the anticipated level of risk* ~~*a geotechnical assessment can demonstrate that the risk can be mitigated to an acceptable level*~~*.*

3. recognise and provide for Kāi Tahu rakatirataka in managing natural hazard risk affecting native reserves and Māori land, including by enabling mana whenua and owners of Māori land to lead the identification and evaluation of appropriate risk-management responses, and include Kāi Tahu in decision-making where natural hazard risk affects the values of wāhi tūpuna

7.22.4 Evaluation

679. The recommended amendments should be read alongside the evaluations for NH-O1, NH-P1, NH-P2 and NH-P5, particularly the assessment of the risk-based and proportionate approach to natural hazard management.

680. The amendments improve the effectiveness of NH-P8 by distinguishing the mapped Moeraki land-instability hazard classifications from the natural hazard risk associated with a particular proposal. This avoids assuming that the mapped hazard category itself necessarily determines the risk associated with every subdivision, use or development.

681. Removing the undefined requirement to mitigate risk to an "acceptable level" also improves integration with the higher-order framework. Rather than establishing a separate district-level threshold, the amended policy enables the NPS-NH and ORPS risk-management frameworks to perform their intended functions.

682. The amendments respond more directly to Kā Rūnaka [251.141] by retaining a pathway for site-specific assessment and management of risk. Recognition of Kāi Tahu rakatirataka also ensures that culturally significant land and activities can inform consideration of appropriate risk-management responses without establishing a different standard of life-safety risk.

683. Requiring assessment to be proportionate to anticipated risk is more efficient than applying the same level of geotechnical investigation in all circumstances. It enables more detailed investigation where anticipated risk warrants it while avoiding unnecessary assessment where risk is lower.

684. The reasonably practicable alternatives include retaining NH-P8 as notified, establishing a separate definition or metric for acceptable risk, or relying solely on the general natural hazard policies. The recommended approach provides greater clarity and integration without duplicating the NPS-NH or ORPS risk frameworks.

685. Overall, the amendments retain a specific response to the established Moeraki land-instability hazard while providing a clearer and more adaptable pathway for managing risk. They better integrate NH-P8 with the NPS-NH, the ORPS risk-management framework and the ORPS direction relating to Kāi Tahu rakatirataka,

and are considered the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant PDP objectives.

7.23 Natural Hazards – NH-R11 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High-Risk Areas

686. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, three original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.22
EDS	240.132
Kā Rūnaka	251.153

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295

7.23.1 Submissions

687. NHC [153.22] supports NH-R11 and seeks that the rule be retained as notified.

688. EDS [240.132] supports NH-R11 in part but oppose the non-notification clause. EDS seeks amendments so activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.

689. Kā Rūnaka [251.153] seek clarification on the reasons for the stringency of the approach taken and seek amendments to reduce stringency upon building activities which are minor additions and alterations, improvements or non-residential activities.

7.23.2 Analysis

690. NH-R11 applies a non-complying activity status to building activity within the High Risk and Very High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas. Applications must be accompanied by a geotechnical report demonstrating the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development, and the notified rule precludes public notification.

691. NHC [153.22] supports retention of NH-R11 as notified. I agree that a stringent consent pathway remains appropriate for building activity within these mapped

areas, reflecting the potentially significant consequences associated with land instability.

692. Kā Rūnaka [251.153] seeks clarification of the justification for the stringency of the rule and amendments to reduce the stringency applying to minor additions and alterations, improvements and non-residential activities. This concern should be considered alongside Kā Rūnaka's related submissions on the Moeraki provisions, including the specific concern regarding use of the Moeraki Native Reserve by Kāi Tahu.

693. As discussed in relation to NH-P8, the higher-order ORPS framework is relevant to this concern. In particular, it provides specific direction concerning Kāi Tahu rakatirataka and the management of natural hazard risk affecting native reserves, Māori land and wāhi tūpuna. This supports ensuring that the District Plan provides appropriate opportunities for cultural considerations and Kāi Tahu involvement to inform natural hazard decision-making.

694. However, I do not consider this requires a separate activity pathway within NH-R11. The relief sought by Kā Rūnaka identifies particular types of building activity for which reduced stringency is sought but does not provide a sufficiently developed alternative rule framework or measurable thresholds for determining when such activities would warrant a different activity status. Introducing a new pathway could therefore extend beyond what is necessary to respond to the submission and would introduce additional complexity into the rule.

695. This approach also maintains consistency with recommendations elsewhere in this report where site-, zone- or activity-specific exemptions have not been supported simply because an activity has a particular locational or operational context. The distinction for Kā Rūnaka is appropriately recognised through the policy hierarchy, including the recommended amendments to NH-P8, rather than through an exemption from NH-R11.

696. The non-complying activity status does not prohibit building activity. It provides a stringent consent pathway through which the site-specific geotechnical risk, nature and vulnerability of the proposed activity, mitigation available and relevant policy considerations can be assessed. Importantly, this includes the relevant Kāi Tahu and cultural considerations identified through NH-P8 and the higher-order ORPS framework.

697. This retains the ability to consider minor additions, alterations, improvements and non-residential activities on their individual merits without predetermining that those activities necessarily warrant a lower activity status. It also avoids establishing a different natural hazard safety threshold for culturally significant activities. Rather, cultural considerations inform the assessment and management response within the applicable natural hazard framework.

698. EDS [240.132] opposes the preclusion of public notification and seeks application of the normal notification provisions. OceanaGold opposes that relief in its further submission. Given the potentially significant and site-specific

consequences associated with land instability, I agree with EDS that the blanket preclusion is unnecessary. The normal notification tests provide an appropriate mechanism to determine whether notification is warranted based on the circumstances of an individual application.

699. Overall, I recommend retaining the non-complying activity status in NH-R11. Kā Rūnaka's concerns are more appropriately addressed through the amended policy framework, particularly NH-P8, which ensures that the relevant cultural considerations and higher-order direction inform assessment of applications without creating a new or potentially over-broad rule pathway.

700. I recommend NHC [153.22] be accepted in part, EDS [240.132] be accepted, and Kā Rūnaka [251.153] be accepted in part insofar as the concerns raised are addressed through the amendments recommended to NH-P8, but that no additional activity pathway be introduced into NH-R11

7.23.3 Recommendations

701. I recommend amendment to NH-R11 as follows;

NH-R11 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High-Risk Areas

All zones

Activity status: Non-Complying

~~*Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.*~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by a geotechnical report that demonstrates the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

7.23.4 Evaluation

702. The recommended amendment should be read alongside the evaluation of NH-P8 and the earlier evaluations of NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5.

703. The principal issue raised by Kā Rūnaka is whether the non-complying activity status is unnecessarily stringent for minor additions and alterations, improvements and non-residential activities. A more enabling activity pathway for these activities has been considered. Such a pathway could provide greater proportionality where an activity does not materially increase exposure or vulnerability to land instability.

704. However, creating a separate pathway would require additional criteria to determine which activities qualify and the level of risk at which the alternative activity status should apply. The submissions do not provide a sufficiently developed framework for those distinctions, and introducing one through the

hearing process could extend beyond what is necessary to respond to the relief sought.

705. Retaining non-complying activity status is also consistent with the approach taken elsewhere in the Natural Hazards chapter to requests for site-, zone- or activity-specific relief. It avoids creating an exemption based solely on the location, ownership or purpose of an activity while retaining the ability for the merits of individual proposals to be considered through resource consent.

706. The concerns raised by Kā Rūnaka are instead more appropriately addressed through the policy framework. The recommended amendments to NH-P8 recognise the relationship between site-specific risk assessment and the higher-order natural hazard framework and provide for the relevant Kāi Tahu cultural considerations to inform natural hazard management. This means those considerations can be applied when assessing an application under NH-R11 without establishing a separate activity pathway or a different natural hazard safety standard.

707. Non-complying status remains effective because it provides the Council with the ability to undertake a comprehensive assessment of building activity within areas mapped as High and Very High Risk, including the geotechnical evidence, nature and vulnerability of the activity, available mitigation and relevant policy direction. It does not amount to an absolute prohibition on development.

708. Removing the blanket public-notification preclusion provides an additional improvement. The circumstances and potential consequences of development within the High and Very High Risk areas will vary between applications. Applying the normal notification provisions enables those circumstances to determine whether affected persons or wider interests should be involved.

709. Overall, retaining the notified activity status while relying on the amended NH-P8 policy framework provides the most appropriate and proportionate response. It recognises the concerns raised by Kā Rūnaka and the specific cultural direction within the higher-order framework without creating additional site- or activity-specific relief, while maintaining an appropriately stringent consent pathway for building activity within the High and Very High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay.

7.24 Natural Hazards – NH-R7 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas

710. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, two original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
EDS	240.128
Kā Rūnaka	251.149

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295

7.24.1 Submissions

711. EDS [240.128] supports NH-R7 in part but seeks amendments so that activities in hazard risk areas are subject to normal notification processes.

712. Kā Rūnaka [251.149] supports NH-R7 and seeks that the rule be retained as notified.

7.24.2 Analysis

713. NH-R7 manages earthworks within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas. The notified rule provides for earthworks as a permitted activity where the specified permitted activity standards are met, with restricted discretionary activity status where compliance is not achieved.

714. Kā Rūnaka [251.149] supports NH-R7 and seeks that it be retained as notified. I agree that the graduated approach is appropriate. In particular, the permitted activity pathway recognises the comparatively lower level of land-instability risk identified by these mapped areas, while the restricted discretionary pathway provides for assessment where the scale or nature of the earthworks exceeds the permitted standards.

715. This approach is consistent with the risk-based framework recommended for NH-P8. As discussed in relation to that policy, the Very Low Risk and Low Risk terminology reflects the mapped Moeraki land-instability classification and should not be assumed to correspond directly with the risk classifications under the NPS-NH. The rule nevertheless provides an appropriately proportionate regulatory response to the hazard information represented by the overlay.

716. I do not consider any change to the activity status or substantive permitted activity standards is necessary in response to the submissions. Both submissions support the rule in substance, and there is no submission evidence before me demonstrating that the notified thresholds are inappropriate for earthworks within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk areas.

717. EDS [240.128] supports NH-R7 in part but seeks removal of the preclusion on public notification so that the normal notification provisions apply. This issue is consistent with EDS's submissions on the other Moeraki land-instability rules.

718. For NH-R7, however, I consider it important to distinguish the nature of the consent pathway from the higher-risk rules. Resource consent is only required where earthworks fail to comply with the permitted activity standards, at which point the activity is restricted discretionary. The effects being considered are therefore principally the site-specific land-instability effects associated with the scale and nature of the earthworks.

719. I do not consider that the significance of natural hazard management generally is, by itself, sufficient reason to remove the public-notification preclusion from every restricted discretionary application under NH-R7. In the Very Low Risk and Low Risk mapped areas, the notified approach appropriately recognises that these matters are predominantly technical and can ordinarily be assessed through geotechnical information and the specified matters of discretion.

720. This differs from the approach recommended for NH-R11, which applies to building activity within the High Risk and Very High Risk areas and involves a materially different hazard context and consent threshold. It is therefore appropriate for the notification provisions to differ between the rules where the nature and potential significance of the effects differ.

721. I recommend EDS [240.128] be rejected and Kā Rūnaka [251.149] be accepted.

722. I recommend retaining NH-R7 as notified.

7.24.3 Recommendations

723. I recommend no changes to NH-R7.

7.24.4 Evaluation

724. As no amendments are recommended to NH-R7, no further evaluation under section 32AA is required.

725. For completeness, I consider the notified rule remains an appropriate method for implementing NH-P8 and the wider natural hazard objectives and policies. It provides a proportionate regulatory response by enabling earthworks within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk mapped areas where the permitted activity standards are met, while providing a restricted discretionary consent pathway where those standards are exceeded.

726. The alternative sought by EDS would remove the preclusion on public notification. While that would provide greater flexibility to notify individual applications, it would also introduce the potential for additional process, cost and delay for activities occurring within the lower mapped land-instability categories. The effects requiring consideration under this rule are principally technical and site-specific, and there is insufficient evidence from the submissions to demonstrate that the notified notification approach would prevent those effects from being appropriately assessed.

727. Retaining the rule is therefore efficient and effective in providing a graduated response to land-instability hazards and is consistent with the risk-based and

proportionate approach established through the recommended Natural Hazards policy framework.

7.25 Natural Hazards – NH-R10 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High Risk Areas

728. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, two original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
EDS	240.131
Kā Rūnaka	251.152

7.25.1 Submissions

729. EDS [240.131] supports NH-R10 in part but opposes the non-notification clauses. EDS seeks amendments because natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and that activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.

730. Kā Rūnaka [251.152] seek clarification on the reasons for the stringency of the approach taken and seek amendments to reduce stringency upon building activities which are minor additions and alterations, improvements or non-residential activities.

7.25.2 Analysis

731. NH-R10 applies to earthworks within the High Risk and Very High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas and provides for those earthworks as a discretionary activity. Any application must be accompanied by a geotechnical report demonstrating the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development. The notified rule also precludes public notification.

732. The discretionary activity status reflects the greater potential for earthworks within these mapped areas to initiate, accelerate or otherwise affect land instability. Unlike NH-R7, which provides a permitted pathway for earthworks within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk areas, NH-R10 enables the location, scale and nature of the earthworks and the site-specific geotechnical conditions to be considered through resource consent.

733. As discussed in relation to NH-P8, the mapped High Risk and Very High Risk classifications reflect the underlying Moeraki land-instability assessment and should not be assumed to correspond directly with the risk classifications under the NPS-NH. The overlay nevertheless identifies areas where the underlying land-

instability conditions warrant greater scrutiny. A discretionary activity status is appropriate because it enables the actual risk associated with the proposed earthworks to be established through site-specific geotechnical assessment rather than predetermining the outcome solely from the mapped classification.

734. Kā Rūnaka [251.152] questions the stringency of the notified approach. I acknowledge the broader concerns raised by Kā Rūnaka regarding the application of the Moeraki natural hazard provisions, particularly in relation to the Moeraki Native Reserve and the higher-order direction concerning Kāi Tahu rakatirataka. Those matters have been addressed through the recommended amendments to NH-P8. Kā Rūnaka's related submission on NH-R8 expressly identifies enabling use of the Moeraki Native Reserve by Kāi Tahu.

735. I do not consider those considerations justify a separate permitted or restricted discretionary pathway under NH-R10. Earthworks can alter slope geometry, loading and drainage conditions and therefore potentially affect the land-instability hazard itself. The potential effects depend on the scale, location and geotechnical circumstances of the works and are not necessarily related to the vulnerability of the activity that the earthworks support.

736. Consistent with the approach recommended for NH-R11, I also do not recommend introducing site-, landowner- or activity-specific exemptions. Relevant cultural considerations and the specific higher-order direction applying to Māori land, native reserves and wāhi tūpuna can inform assessment under the amended NH-P8 policy framework without removing the requirement to assess the geotechnical consequences of the earthworks.

737. The discretionary activity status is important in this respect. It does not require earthworks to be avoided. Rather, it enables the Council to consider the full effects of the proposal and determine, on the basis of the required geotechnical assessment, whether and how the earthworks can proceed consistently with the applicable natural hazard policy framework. I therefore recommend retaining the discretionary activity status.

738. EDS [240.131] seeks removal of the blanket preclusion on public notification. I consider there is greater justification for that relief under NH-R10 than under NH-R7. NH-R10 applies to earthworks within the two highest mapped land-instability categories, and the potential consequences of earthworks may extend beyond the immediate works area, including through changes to slope stability or drainage. It is therefore appropriate that the normal notification tests determine whether an application should be notified in the circumstances of a particular proposal.

739. I therefore recommend retaining the substantive rule and discretionary activity status but removing the blanket preclusion on public notification.

740. I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.152] be rejected insofar as a less stringent activity status is sought, noting that the broader cultural and policy matters raised by Kā Rūnaka are addressed through the recommended amendments to NH-P8. I recommend EDS [240.131] be accepted.

7.25.3 Recommendations

741. I recommend the following amendment to NH-R10

NH-R10 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High Risk Areas

Activity status: Discretionary

~~*Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.*~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by a geotechnical report that demonstrates the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

7.25.4 Evaluation

742. The recommended amendment should be read alongside the evaluation of NH-P8 and the wider amendments recommended to the Natural Hazards policy framework.

743. The principal issue is whether a less stringent activity status should apply to some earthworks within the High Risk and Very High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas. Permitted and restricted discretionary alternatives have been considered. While these could reduce consenting costs for smaller-scale works, the submissions do not provide sufficiently robust or measurable standards for identifying earthworks that can occur within these mapped areas without site-specific consideration of the potential effects on land instability.

744. This is particularly relevant for earthworks because the regulatory concern is not limited to the vulnerability of the activity being established. Earthworks can alter the physical conditions contributing to land instability, and their consequences depend on factors including their scale, location, slope conditions, loading and drainage. Discretionary activity status therefore provides an effective means of assessing the full geotechnical implications of a proposal.

745. The approach is also proportionate when considered alongside the wider Moeraki rule framework. Earthworks within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk areas are provided for through the permitted and restricted discretionary framework in NH-R7, while NH-R10 applies a more precautionary consent pathway in the two highest mapped categories. The distinction reflects the underlying hazard information while allowing the actual risk associated with individual proposals to be established through site-specific assessment.

746. No separate exemption is recommended for Māori land, native reserves nor particular activities. The relevant cultural considerations are more appropriately recognised through NH-P8 and the higher-order policy framework and can therefore inform the assessment of a discretionary activity without establishing a different

geotechnical or life-safety standard. This maintains consistency with the approach elsewhere in the chapter to requests for site- and activity-specific relief.

747. Removing the blanket public-notification preclusion is appropriate given that earthworks within the High Risk and Very High Risk mapped areas may have effects extending beyond the immediate works area. Applying the normal notification provisions enables the nature, scale and potential consequences of a particular proposal to determine whether notification is warranted.

748. Overall, retaining discretionary activity status while removing the notification preclusion provides an effective and proportionate response. It maintains appropriate scrutiny of earthworks within the higher mapped land-instability categories while allowing site-specific geotechnical evidence, the amended NH-P8 policy framework and relevant cultural considerations to inform the determination of individual applications.

7.26 Natural Hazards – NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas

749. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, four original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
WDC	83.7
NHC	153.20
EDS	240.129
Kā Rūnaka	251.150

7.26.1 Submissions

750. WDC [83.7] seeks amendments to NH-R8 as they consider the note about compliance where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with geotechnical conditions of a recent resource consent is unnecessary.

751. NHC [153.20] supports NH-R8 and seeks that the rule be retained as notified.

752. EDS [240.129] support NH-R8 in part but seeks amendments so that activities in hazard risk areas are subject to normal notification processes.

753. Kā Rūnaka [251.150] oppose NH-R8 and seeks amendments to enable building activities for the very low and low risk areas in relation to Kāi Tahu use of the Moeraki Native Reserve.

7.26.2 Analysis

754. NH-R8 applies to building activity within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas. As notified, all building activity is restricted discretionary where an engineering assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced engineer confirms that there are no indicators of slope instability. Where that requirement is not met, the activity is non-complying. Matters of discretion address risk to people, property and the environment, including off-site risk, mitigation and infrastructure resilience.

755. WDC [83.7] seeks deletion of the note providing that the rule can be considered complied with where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with geotechnical conditions of a resource consent approved within the preceding two years. I agree. The note introduces uncertainty as to whether a subsequent proposal is actually exempt from the rule and whether the earlier geotechnical assessment remains applicable to the particular building activity. The rule itself should determine activity status, while relevant existing resource consents and geotechnical information can form part of the assessment of a subsequent proposal.

756. NHC [153.20] supports the rule as notified. I agree with the underlying intent that building activity within areas identified as susceptible to land instability should respond appropriately to that hazard. However, this needs to be considered in light of the risk-based and proportionate approach recommended for NH-P8.

757. Kā Rūnaka [251.150] considers restricted discretionary status for all building activity within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk areas to be overly stringent and insufficiently justified by the evidence base. The submission specifically seeks greater provision for building activity associated with Kāi Tahu use of the Moeraki Native Reserve.

758. I agree in part with the underlying concern regarding proportionality. The notified approach requires resource consent for every building activity within areas that the underlying Moeraki assessment itself identifies as Very Low or Low Risk. The regulatory response should reflect both the mapped hazard information and the vulnerability and consequences associated with the particular development.

759. However, I do not recommend creating a separate permitted or more enabling pathway specifically for the Moeraki Native Reserve or Kāi Tahu activities. As discussed for NH-P8 and NH-R11, the relevant higher-order cultural direction should inform the policy framework and assessment of proposals, rather than establishing a different natural hazard safety standard or a site-specific exemption.

760. I also do not consider there is sufficient evidence before me to establish new permitted activity standards for particular categories of buildings. Doing so would require a clear evidential basis for determining which building types, scales or alterations can proceed without site-specific consideration of land instability. The submissions do not provide those measurable thresholds.

761. Accordingly, while I acknowledge Kā Rūnaka's concern regarding proportionality, I recommend retaining the restricted discretionary activity status. This provides a relatively enabling consent pathway while ensuring that the site-specific implications of land instability are considered. Importantly, the matters of discretion are confined to natural hazard effects and mitigation rather than reopening the full merits of the underlying land use.

762. The requirement in RDIS-1 is also important. The rule does not require the engineering assessment to demonstrate an absence of natural hazard risk; it requires confirmation that there are no indicators of slope instability. Where that can be demonstrated, the proposal remains restricted discretionary. Where it cannot, the non-complying pathway appropriately provides greater scrutiny.

763. EDS [240.129] seeks removal of the blanket preclusion on public notification. I do not recommend that amendment for NH-R8. The rule applies only within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk mapped areas and requires an engineering assessment before the restricted discretionary pathway is available. The matters of discretion are predominantly technical and site-specific. The significance of natural hazard management generally does not, in my view, justify opening every application under this lower-risk rule to public notification. This differs from NH-R10 and NH-R11, where the rules apply within the High Risk and Very High Risk mapped areas and the potential consequences justify application of the normal notification tests.

7.26.3 Recommendations

764. I recommend the following changes to NH-R8

NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas

All zones

Activity status: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

An engineering assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced engineer is provided to WDC to confirm that there are no indicators of slope instability.

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.potential risk to people, property and the environment, including potential risk off-site; and

2.any mitigation measures proposed; and

3.effects of any mitigation measures; and

4.suitability of any infrastructure to withstand slope movement.

~~*Note: Where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with any geotechnical conditions of a resource consent that has already been approved within the last two years from 1 March 2025, then this rule can be considered to be complied with.*~~

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

Where:

NC-1

Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1

Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.

7.26.4 Evaluation

765. The recommended amendment is limited to deletion of the note and should be read alongside the evaluation of NH-P8 and the wider Moeraki land-instability provisions.

766. The principal alternative raised through submissions is a more enabling activity status for building activity within the Very Low Risk and Low Risk areas. Such an approach could reduce consenting costs and better recognise that these are the two lowest mapped land-instability categories. However, no sufficiently robust or measurable standards have been provided through submissions to distinguish building activities that could proceed without site-specific consideration of slope instability.

767. Retaining restricted discretionary status therefore provides an appropriate intermediate response. It is more enabling than the discretionary and non-complying approaches applying within the higher mapped categories, while retaining the ability to assess whether indicators of slope instability are present and whether the proposed building would expose people, property, the environment or infrastructure to additional risk.

768. The alternative of establishing a separate pathway for building activity associated with the Moeraki Native Reserve has also been considered. I do not consider that necessary or appropriate. The relevant Kāi Tahu cultural considerations can be recognised through NH-P8 and the higher-order policy framework without establishing a site- or landowner-specific exemption from the building rule. This maintains consistency across the natural hazard provisions while enabling those considerations to inform individual resource consent decisions.

769. Deletion of the note improves certainty and plan administration. Whether an earlier geotechnical assessment or resource consent remains relevant will depend on the nature and location of the subsequent proposal and the information supporting the earlier consent. Removing the deemed-compliance mechanism avoids treating earlier approval as automatically establishing compliance with NH-R8.

770. Retaining the public-notification preclusion is efficient and proportionate given the lower mapped land-instability categories, the requirement for engineering assessment and the technical and site-specific matters to which discretion is restricted. This differs appropriately from the recommended approach for NH-R10 and NH-R11 within the High and Very High Risk mapped areas.

771. Overall, the amended rule remains an effective and proportionate method of implementing NH-P8: Very Low and Low does not mean no hazard, but nor does it warrant the same regulatory response as the Moderate, High and Very High mapped areas. The restricted discretionary pathway appropriately reflects that distinction.

7.27 Natural Hazards – NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Moderate Risk Area

772. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, four original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
WDC	83.8
NHC	153.21
EDS	240.130
Kā Rūnaka	251.151

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295

7.27.1 Submissions

773. WDC [83.8] seeks deletion of the note in NH-R9.

774. NHC [153.21] supports NH-R9 and seeks that the rule be retained as notified.

775. EDS [240.130] supports NH-R9 in part but seeks amendments so that activities in hazard risk areas are subject to normal notification processes.

776. Kā Rūnaka [251.151] seek clarification on the reason for the restricted discretionary activity status in moderate risk areas, considering the justification for this approach and risk categorisation is unclear.

7.27.2 Analysis

777. NH-R9 applies to earthworks and building activity within the Moderate Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay and provides for these activities as restricted discretionary. The matters of discretion address potential risk to people, property and the environment, including off-site risk, mitigation and the suitability of infrastructure to withstand slope movement. The rule also contains a note relating

to buildings or structures constructed in accordance with geotechnical conditions of a recently approved resource consent.

778. WDC [83.8] seeks deletion of this note on the basis that it is unnecessary. I agree for the same reasons discussed in relation to NH-R8. Whether an earlier resource consent and associated geotechnical assessment remain applicable will depend on the nature, location and circumstances of the subsequent proposal. The note is therefore unnecessary and may create uncertainty as to whether a subsequent activity is required to comply with NH-R9.

779. NHC [153.21] supports NH-R9 as notified. I agree with the substantive restricted discretionary framework. The Moderate Risk Area sits between the Very Low and Low Risk areas managed through NH-R7 and NH-R8 and the High and Very High Risk areas managed through NH-R10 and NH-R11. A restricted discretionary pathway provides an intermediate regulatory response that enables site-specific consideration of land-instability effects without applying the more stringent discretionary or non-complying activity status used in the higher mapped categories.

780. Kā Rūnaka [251.151] questions the justification for restricted discretionary activity status and the basis for the Moderate Risk categorisation. Appendix 2 records that the relief sought is clarification of the reasoning for the stringency of the approach, rather than a specified alternative activity status.

781. As discussed in relation to NH-P8, the mapped Moeraki classifications reflect the underlying land-instability assessment and should not be assumed to correspond directly with the natural hazard risk classifications established under the NPS-NH. The Moderate Risk Overlay nevertheless identifies an increased level of land-instability concern relative to the Very Low and Low Risk areas and provides a basis for requiring greater scrutiny of development.

782. I consider restricted discretionary status to be proportionate in this context. Unlike NH-R8, NH-R9 does not require an engineering assessment demonstrating that there are no indicators of slope instability as a gateway to restricted discretionary status. Instead, resource consent enables the actual implications of the proposed earthworks or building activity to be assessed against specified natural hazard matters. This provides an appropriate mechanism for determining the significance of the site-specific risk and the adequacy of any mitigation.

783. I therefore do not recommend changing the activity status in response to Kā Rūnaka's submission. The clarification sought is appropriately provided through the explanation of the relationship between the mapped classification and the regulatory framework, together with the amendments recommended to NH-P8. No separate pathway for the Moeraki Native Reserve nor Kāi Tahu activities is necessary or sought through this submission.

784. EDS [240.130] seeks removal of the preclusion on public notification. OceanaGold opposes that relief in further submission, considering non-notification appropriate where natural hazards can be suitably managed.

785. I consider NH-R9 warrants a different approach from NH-R7 and NH-R8. It applies within the Moderate Risk Area and manages both earthworks and building activity. Depending on the nature of the proposal and site conditions, effects associated with land instability may extend beyond the site, as expressly recognised by the matters of discretion. I therefore consider that the normal notification tests should apply rather than precluding public notification in all circumstances.

- Overall, I recommend retaining the restricted discretionary activity status and matters of discretion, deleting the note identified by WDC and removing the blanket preclusion on public notification. I recommend WDC [83.8] be accepted. I recommend NHC [153.21] be accepted in part, insofar as the restricted discretionary framework is retained. I recommend EDS [240.130] be accepted. And I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.151] be accepted in part, insofar as the reasons for the Moderate Risk regulatory approach are clarified through this report and the recommended amendments to NH-P8, but no change to the activity status is recommended.

7.27.3 Recommendations

786. I recommend the following amendments to NH-R9:

NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Moderate Risk Area

All zones

Activity status: Restricted Discretionary

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.potential risk to people, property and the environment, including potential risk off-site; and

2.any mitigation measures proposed; and

3.effects of any mitigation measures; and

4.suitability of any infrastructure to withstand slope movement.

~~*Note: Where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with any geotechnical conditions of a resource consent that has already been approved within the last two years from 1 March 2025, then this rule can be considered to be complied with, with respect to proposals for buildings and structures (including additions and alterations).*~~

~~*Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.*~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by a geotechnical report that demonstrates the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

7.27.4 Evaluation

787. The recommended amendments are limited to deletion of the existing resource consent note and removal of the public-notification preclusion. The restricted discretionary activity status and substantive matters of discretion are retained.

788. A more enabling activity status has been considered in response to the concerns raised by Kā Rūnaka. While this could reduce consenting requirements, the Moderate Risk Overlay represents an intermediate land-instability classification where the effects of earthworks and building activity warrant site-specific consideration. No alternative standards or thresholds have been identified through submissions that would provide a sufficiently robust basis for determining when those activities could proceed without resource consent.

789. Conversely, applying discretionary or non-complying status to all activities would provide greater regulatory control but would not reflect the distinction between the Moderate Risk Area and the High and Very High Risk areas. Restricted discretionary status therefore provides a proportionate intermediate response.

790. This produces a coherent graduated framework across the Moeraki overlays: Very Low/Low areas have the more enabling pathways in NH-R7 and NH-R8; Moderate is subject to restricted discretionary assessment under NH-R9; and High/Very High areas are subject to the more stringent NH-R10 and NH-R11 pathways. The mapped classifications establish the regulatory starting point, while site-specific assessment determines the implications of each particular proposal.

791. Deletion of the existing consent note improves certainty and avoids treating an earlier resource consent or geotechnical assessment as automatically establishing compliance for subsequent development.

792. Removing the blanket public-notification preclusion provides greater flexibility where the potential effects of land instability may extend beyond the site. It does not mean that applications will necessarily be publicly notified; rather, the applicable notification tests will determine that question based on the circumstances and effects of the proposal. This is appropriate for the Moderate Risk Area and distinguishes NH-R9 from the lower mapped risk areas managed through NH-R7 and NH-R8.

793. Overall, the recommended approach is an effective and proportionate means of implementing NH-P8. It retains the substantive restricted discretionary framework while improving clarity and ensuring that the consent process can respond appropriately to the site-specific nature and potential consequences of land-instability risk.

7.28 NATURAL HAZARD SPECIFIC POLICY AND RULES: WILDFIRE

7.29 Natural Hazards – NH-P12 Wildfire — subdivision and land use

794. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 26 original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.11
FENZ 2	163.41
NZ Carbon Farming	192.15
FFNZ	246.98
G & K Taylor	265.36
K & D Weir	267.36
B & K McLeod	269.36
CRC	271.261
DTL	282.36
DHL	283.36
DDL	284.36
B & A Matthews	285.36
P & B Wilson	290.36
P & J Stackhouse	291.36
R & S Borst	292.36
B & G Hamilton	293.36
G Simpson 2	296.36
A & C Gibson	298.36
TT & Cayuga	299.36
A & F Verbakel	300.36
C Thelning	301.36
P & S Mitchell	302.36
T & F Conlan	303.36
K & N McLachlan	304.36
Springbank	312.294
Keeling Dairies	313.35

7.29.1 Submissions

795. FENZ 2 [163.41], G & K Taylor [265.36], K & D Weir [267.36], B & K McLeod [269.36], CRC [271.261], DTL [282.36], DHL [283.36], DDL [284.36], B & A Matthews [285.36], P & B Wilson [290.36], P & J Stackhouse [291.36], R & S Borst [292.36], B & G Hamilton [293.36], G Simpson 2 [296.36], A & C Gibson [298.36], TT & Cayuga [299.36], A & F Verbakel [300.36], C Thelning [301.36], P & S Mitchell [302.36], T & F Conlan [303.36], K & N McLachlan [304.36], Springbank [312.294], Keeling Dairies [313.35] support NH-P12 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

796. NHC [153.11] supports NH-P12 in principle but seeks definitions for *appropriate setbacks* and *acceptable level* to improve clarity and ensure consistent application.

797. NZ Carbon Farming [192.15] supports NH-P12 in part but seeks amendments so wildfire risk is managed consistently across all forestry types, including plantation forestry.

798. FFNZ [246.98] supports NH-P12 in part but is concerned about unclear setback requirements for shelterbelts and seeks amendments to recognise the role of shelterbelts in primary production, including protecting stock, soils and property.

7.29.2 Analysis

799. NH-P12 provides specific policy direction for managing wildfire risk associated with subdivision and land use. The policy requires appropriate setbacks and mitigation of wildfire risk and seeks to minimise the risk to existing buildings arising from new woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry.

800. I consider specific policy direction for wildfire to remain appropriate. Unlike several other hazards addressed by the Natural Hazards chapter, there is no mapped wildfire hazard or risk overlay in the PDP . Wildfire risk is spatially and temporally dynamic and can change as a consequence of vegetation, land use, development patterns, climatic conditions and the relationship between buildings and surrounding fuels. The absence of a mapped overlay does not therefore indicate an absence of wildfire hazard or remove the need for the District Plan to manage the land-use factors that can create or increase exposure to it.

801. Wildfire also presents a different planning challenge from hazards that can be more readily represented by a defined hazard extent. Risk can arise from the interaction between the location and vulnerability of development, vegetation type and continuity, topography, access, available water and the capacity for fire to spread between properties. Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) identifies rural and urban-rural interface properties as being particularly exposed to these interactions and notes that management of wildfire risk requires consideration across property boundaries.

802. The hazard is also evolving. FENZ identifies climate change as increasing wildfire risk and advises that some parts of New Zealand could experience more

than 40 extreme fire-weather days annually by 2090. Its wildfire risk-reduction work consequently includes improving wildfire risk-assessment tools, fire-breaking policy and understanding of fire behaviour. In my view, this reinforces the importance of retaining a policy framework capable of responding to actual and potential wildfire risk without relying upon a fixed mapped hazard extent.

803. I note that wildfire is not one of the seven hazards to which the NPS-NH directly applies. However, the NPS-NH expressly provides that it does not preclude decision-makers from managing risks from other natural hazards. I therefore consider the specific wildfire provisions complementary to, rather than inconsistent with, the broader risk-based approach recommended for the Natural Hazards chapter.

804. A substantial majority of submitters, including FENZ 2 [163.41] and CRC [271.261], support NH-P12 as notified. CRC specifically identifies the role of natural features and firebreaks in reducing susceptibility to wildfire. I agree with those submissions that specific policy direction should be retained.

805. NHC [153.11] supports the policy in principle but seeks definitions of appropriate setbacks and acceptable level. NHC identifies its Risk Tolerance Methodology and guidance relating to homes at the rural-urban interface as potential mechanisms for improving certainty.

806. I agree with NHC that the policy should provide sufficient direction to be consistently administered. However, I do not consider that defining a single appropriate setback at policy level would improve the management of wildfire risk. An appropriate separation distance depends upon the particular combination of vegetation, topography, development, vulnerability and other mitigation measures. A fixed policy definition could therefore imply a level of precision that is not appropriate across all circumstances. The measurable setbacks applying to particular activities are more appropriately established through NH-R13.

807. I reach a similar conclusion in relation to defining an acceptable level specifically for NH-P12. As recommended elsewhere in this report, the Natural Hazards chapter should use a risk-based and proportionate approach rather than relying on an undefined concept of acceptable risk. I therefore consider that NH-P12 should be amended consistently with NH-O1 and NH-P2 to refer to management of wildfire risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk. This provides consistent policy direction while retaining sufficient flexibility to respond to the characteristics of wildfire at a particular location.

808. NZ Carbon Farming [192.15] seeks to ensure that wildfire risk is managed consistently across forestry types. I agree with the principle that the planning response should focus on the wildfire risk created by vegetation rather than unnecessarily distinguish between forestry activities where they present comparable risk. The notified policy already refers collectively to woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry. I therefore do not consider a further amendment necessary unless consequential changes to NH-R13 alter the activities to which the policy applies.

809. FFNZ [246.98] supports the policy but seeks recognition of the productive functions of shelterbelts, including protection of stock, soils and property. I acknowledge those functions. However, I do not consider it necessary to incorporate them expressly into a natural hazards policy. NH-P12 does not seek to prevent shelterbelts; it directs management of the wildfire risk arising from their relationship with buildings and other land uses. The appropriate balance between enabling shelterbelts and managing wildfire risk is more appropriately addressed through the standards and consent pathway in NH-R13.

810. Overall, I consider NH-P12 should be retained with a limited amendment replacing the reference to mitigating wildfire risk to an "acceptable level" with terminology consistent with the risk-based and proportionate approach recommended elsewhere in the chapter. I recommend the submissions seeking retention of NH-P12, including FENZ 2 [163.41], CRC [271.261] and the other submissions identified above, be accepted in part, subject to the amendment below.

811. I recommend NHC [153.11] be accepted in part, insofar as greater clarity is provided through replacement of the reference to an "acceptable level" but reject the request to define a universal "appropriate setback".

812. I recommend NZ Carbon Farming [192.15] be accepted in part, insofar as the policy continues to apply across woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry, but no additional amendment is required.

813. I recommend FFNZ [246.98] be rejected insofar as it seeks specific recognition of the productive functions of shelterbelts within NH-P12.

7.29.3 Recommendations

814. I recommend the following amendment to NH-P12:

NH-P12 Wildfire — subdivision and land use

Ensure that subdivision and land use in areas where there is actual or potential risk to people and property from wildfire achieve appropriate setbacks and ~~mitigate the risk to an acceptable level~~ avoid or mitigate wildfire risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk and the wildfire risk to existing buildings from the establishment of new woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry is minimised.

7.29.4 Evaluation

815. As I recommend an amendment to NH-P12, a further evaluation is required under section 32AA of the RMA. This evaluation should be read alongside the section 32 evaluation for the Proposed District Plan and the further evaluations undertaken for NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5.

816. In accordance with section 32(1)(b), I have considered whether the amended policy is the most appropriate way to achieve the Natural Hazards objectives, having regard to its efficiency and effectiveness, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting where information is uncertain or insufficient.

817. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain NH-P12 as notified; define fixed setbacks or an acceptable-risk threshold at policy level; rely solely on the general natural hazard policies; or amend NH-P12 to apply the risk-based and proportionate approach recommended elsewhere in the chapter.

818. Retaining a specific wildfire policy is considered more effective than relying solely on the general natural hazard provisions. Unlike the mapped flood, land-instability and fault hazards addressed elsewhere in the chapter, wildfire is not spatially mapped in the PDP. Its occurrence and consequences are dynamic and influenced by changing vegetation, development, climatic conditions, topography and the relationship between buildings and surrounding fuels. The absence of a mapped hazard area therefore increases the importance of a policy capable of responding to actual and potential wildfire risk as circumstances and information evolve.

819. Defining a universal setback or acceptable-risk threshold would provide greater certainty but would be less effective in responding to the complexity and variability of wildfire risk. The appropriate response may depend on the nature and vulnerability of the development, vegetation and fuel characteristics, topography, access and other mitigation measures. Specific measurable requirements are more appropriately addressed through NH-R13 rather than through a universal policy-level definition.

820. Replacing "acceptable level" with a requirement to avoid or mitigate wildfire risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk improves consistency with NH-O1 and NH-P2 and provides clearer direction for circumstances where comprehensive spatial hazard information is unavailable. It also enables new or improved information about wildfire risk to be incorporated into decision-making without requiring the hazard to first be comprehensively mapped.

821. The recommended amendment has limited additional regulatory cost because it does not introduce a new activity or consent requirement. Its principal benefit is improved clarity, consistency and flexibility in the application of the wildfire provisions. It also retains recognition that woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry can contribute to wildfire risk while allowing the detailed balance between wildfire management and the productive functions of vegetation to be addressed through NH-R13.

822. There remains uncertainty associated with the location and changing nature of future wildfire risk. In terms of section 32(2), I consider the risks of not acting are greater than retaining a flexible policy response, particularly because the hazard is not comprehensively mapped and may change over the life of the Plan. The recommended wording provides for proportionate management as information improves rather than relying on a static representation of wildfire hazard.

823. Overall, I consider the amended NH-P12 to be a more appropriate, effective and efficient means of achieving the Natural Hazards objectives than the reasonably practicable alternatives. It provides specific direction for an evolving and complex

hazard, while remaining consistent with the wider risk-based approach recommended for the Natural Hazards chapter.

7.30 Natural Hazards – NH-R13 Wildfire — woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings

824. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 27 original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.24
HortNZ	166.30
NZ Carbon Farming	192.16
NZ Pork	195.22
FFNZ	246.106
G & K Taylor	265.38
K & D Weir	267.38
B & K McLeod	269.38
CRC	271.269
DTL	282.38
DHL	283.38
DDL	284.38
B & A Matthews	285.38
P & B Wilson	290.38
P & J Stackhouse	291.38
R & S Borst	292.38
B & G Hamilton	293.38
G Simpson 2	296.38
A & C Gibson	298.38
TT & Cayuga	299.38
A & F Verbakel	300.38
C Thelning	301.38
P & S Mitchell	302.38
T & F Conlan	303.38
K & N McLachlan	304.38
Springbank	312.301

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Keeling Dairies	313.40

7.30.1 Submissions

825. HortNZ [166.30] and NZ Pork [195.22] support NH-R13 and seek that the rule be retained as notified.

826. NHC [153.24] supports NH-R13 in part but seeks amendments to clarify that setbacks are measured *from the outside extent of the mature tree canopy*.

827. NZ Carbon Farming [192.16] opposes NH-R13 in part and seek amendments so the rule applies to commercial forestry, and includes a note clarifying the relationship with the NES-CF.

828. FFNZ [246.106] supports NH-R13 in part but seeks amendments so the rule applies only to new plantings and excludes HPL. FFNZ seeks an additional matter of discretion recognising the need for shelterbelts to support primary production and protect stock, soil and property.

829. G & K Taylor [265.38], K & D Weir [267.38], B & K McLeod [269.38], , DTL [282.38], DHL [283.38], DDL [284.38], B & A Matthews [285.38], P & B Wilson [290.38], P & J Stackhouse [291.38], R & S Borst [292.38], B & G Hamilton [293.38], G Simpson 2 [296.38], A & C Gibson [298.38], TT & Cayuga [299.38], A & F Verbakel [300.38], C Thelning [301.38], P & S Mitchell [302.38], T & F Conlan [303.38], K & N McLachlan [304.38], Springbank [312.301] and Keeling Dairies [313.40] support NH-R13 in part but seek amendments to encourage low-flammability planting. Submitters seek a new permitted activity standard requiring woodlots, shelterbelts or plantation forestry to use species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.

830. CRC [271.269] generally supports NH-R13 but seeks amendments to the rule heading to clarify that the rule manages wildfire associates risks rather than implying wildfire itself is a permitted activity.

7.30.2 Analysis

831. NH-R13 establishes permitted activity standards for woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and residential units or other principal buildings. As notified, PER-1 and PER-2 require vegetation setbacks from adjoining buildings, non-rural zones and accessways, while PER-3 requires residential units and other principal buildings to be setback 30m from the canopy of a woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry. Where these standards are not met, the activity is restricted discretionary.

832. As discussed in relation to NH-P12, wildfire differs from a number of the other natural hazards managed by this chapter because there is no mapped wildfire hazard or risk overlay in the Proposed District Plan. Wildfire risk is dynamic and can change with vegetation, land use, development, climatic conditions and the relationship between buildings and surrounding fuels. NH-R13 therefore performs an important risk-management function by establishing minimum spatial

separation between potentially combustible vegetation and vulnerable development, while providing a restricted discretionary pathway where those standards cannot be achieved.

833. I nevertheless consider that the rule should be understood as establishing minimum permitted activity standards rather than defining the extent of wildfire hazard or establishing that compliance represents an absence of wildfire risk. Wildfire is a complex hazard and the effectiveness of a particular setback can vary depending on vegetation characteristics, topography, exposure, building design, access and other mitigation measures. This supports retaining a restricted discretionary pathway where the prescribed setbacks are not achieved so that the actual risk and available mitigation can be considered.

834. NHC [153.24] seeks clarification that setbacks are measured from the outside extent of the mature tree canopy. I agree. While the notified rule already refers to the outside extent of the canopy, it does not expressly address whether this means the canopy at planting or once established. Measurement from the anticipated outside extent of the mature canopy provides a more durable and precautionary basis for administering the setback and avoids compliance changing as vegetation grows. I recommend corresponding amendments to PER-1, PER-2 and PER-3.

835. HortNZ [166.30] and NZ Pork [195.22] support the rule as notified. I agree with these submitters that a permitted activity framework based on clear measurable setbacks is appropriate. However, I recommend limited refinements in response to the other submissions and to improve alignment with the amended NH-P12.

836. NZ Carbon Farming [192.16] seeks that the rule apply consistently to commercial forestry and that its relationship with the NES-CF be clarified. The NES-CF now applies to both plantation forestry and exotic continuous-cover forests deliberately established for commercial purposes. It also contains national setback requirements for afforestation, including setbacks from adjoining properties, dwellings and urban or papakāinga-zoned land.

837. I agree that the relationship between NH-R13 and the NES-CF should be clear. However, I do not recommend simply extending the district rule to all commercial forestry without considering the extent to which the national standard applies and the statutory basis for any more stringent district plan requirement. A note identifying the application of the NES-CF is appropriate and assists plan users without unnecessarily duplicating national regulation. NZ Carbon Farming's submission is therefore accepted in part.

838. FFNZ [246.106] seeks that the rule applies only to new planting, excludes highly productive land and recognises the productive functions of shelterbelts. I agree in part that the rule should principally regulate the establishment of vegetation and new buildings rather than retrospectively render existing lawfully established vegetation non-compliant. The notified standards are most appropriately understood as applying when a new woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is established, or when a new residential unit or principal building is established in proximity to existing vegetation.

839. I do not, however, support an exemption for highly productive land. The presence of highly productive land does not remove wildfire risk, and a blanket exemption would be inconsistent with the risk-based approach recommended for NH-P12. The productive function of shelterbelts, including protection of stock, soil and property, is nevertheless a relevant consideration where compliance with the permitted setback cannot be achieved. I therefore recommend adding this consideration to the matters of discretion rather than exempting shelterbelts from the rule.

840. A large group of submitters seeks a new PER-4 requiring woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry to comprise species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory. I agree with the intent of encouraging lower-flammability vegetation, but do not recommend the proposed mandatory permitted activity standard.

841. Requiring all vegetation regulated by NH-R13 to comprise species contained in a particular external directory would significantly extend the scope of the rule beyond the notified setback approach. More importantly, vegetation flammability is only one component of wildfire risk. A species-based requirement would not account for vegetation arrangement, continuity, maintenance, topography, climatic conditions or the relationship between fuels and development. It could therefore create an overly simplified distinction between compliant and non-compliant wildfire risk.

842. I nevertheless consider vegetation flammability to be relevant to the site-specific assessment enabled by the restricted discretionary pathway. I recommend adding the nature and flammability of vegetation to the matters of discretion. This gives effect to the intent of these submissions while allowing vegetation characteristics to be considered alongside setbacks and other mitigation measures rather than operating as an absolute permitted activity requirement.

843. CRC [271.269] seeks amendment of the rule heading because the notified title could be read as describing wildfire itself as a permitted activity. I agree that the heading should more clearly describe the activities being regulated and their relationship to wildfire risk. I recommend removing “Wildfire -” and referring instead to woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings in relation to wildfire risk.

844. Taken together, these amendments retain clear and measurable permitted activity standards while recognising the limitations of using setbacks alone to manage a complex and evolving hazard. The 30m and 5m standards establish an administratively certain permitted baseline. Where those standards cannot be achieved, restricted discretionary assessment enables consideration of the actual wildfire risk, vegetation characteristics, productive function of shelterbelts and available mitigation.

7.30.3 Recommendations

845. I recommend the following changes to NH-R13;

NH-R13 ~~Wildfire —~~ woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings – wildfire risk

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The new woodlot or shelterbelt is no wider than 30m and is setback (as measured from the anticipated outside extent of the mature canopy):

1. *30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property; and*
2. *30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and*
3. *5m from any adjoining lawfully established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building.*

PER-2

The plantation forestry is setback (as measured from the anticipated outside extent of the mature canopy):

1. *30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property; and*
2. *30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and*
3. *5m from any adjoining lawfully established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building.*

PER-3

1. *The residential unit or principal building is setback 30m from the anticipated outside extent of the mature canopy of any woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry.*

Note: Commercial forestry activities may also be subject to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry) Regulations 2017

Note: Discussion with Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) should be undertaken to determine specific steps to manage fire risk and maintain an effective fire break or setback. For further guidance on ways to improve how a house performs when it is affected by wildfire please also refer to the FENZ publication Wildfire Safer

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 and/or PER-3

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. *potential risk to people, property and the environment; and*
2. *the extent to which any vegetation required for visual screening of a principal building affects the wildfire risk to any residential unit or other principal building; and*
3. *any mitigation measures proposed; and*
4. *the nature, arrangement and flammability of vegetation, including the use of lower-flammability species; and*
5. *where relevant, the operational need for a shelterbelt to support primary production, including protection of stock, soil and property.*

7.30.4 Evaluation

846. As amendments are recommended to NH-R13, a further evaluation is required under section 32AA of the RMA. This evaluation should be read alongside the section 32 evaluation for the PDP and the further evaluation of NH-P12.

847. In accordance with section 32(1)(b), I have considered whether the amended rule is the most appropriate way to achieve the Natural Hazards objectives and amended NH-P12, having regard to its effectiveness and efficiency, benefits and costs, and the risks of acting or not acting where information is uncertain or insufficient.

848. The reasonably practicable alternatives include retaining NH-R13 as notified; relying on a more comprehensive mapped wildfire hazard area; imposing more prescriptive vegetation requirements, including mandatory low-flammability species; providing broader exemptions for primary production or highly productive land; or retaining the measurable setback framework with the refinements recommended above.

849. A mapped wildfire hazard framework could provide greater spatial differentiation of regulatory requirements. However, no comprehensive wildfire hazard or risk mapping forms part of the PDP. Wildfire risk is also dynamic and can change over the life of the Plan as vegetation, development and climatic conditions change. In the absence of a sufficiently robust mapped basis, I do not consider it appropriate to introduce spatially differentiated activity status through this hearing process.

850. Conversely, removing or substantially weakening NH-R13 because the hazard is not mapped would reduce the Plan's ability to manage the relationship between vegetation and development. The setback standards therefore provide an important minimum risk-management mechanism where a mapped hazard extent is unavailable.

851. The notified 30m and 5m setbacks provide clear and readily ascertainable standards and are therefore efficient to administer. However, they should not be interpreted as defining the extent of wildfire hazard or demonstrating that wildfire risk is necessarily acceptable whenever those distances are achieved. Clarifying that measurement occurs from the anticipated mature canopy improves the effectiveness and durability of those standards.

852. The restricted discretionary pathway is particularly important given the complexity of wildfire risk. It enables departures from the prescribed setbacks to be assessed against the actual characteristics of the site and proposal rather than treating the setback as an absolute measure of risk. Adding vegetation characteristics and flammability to the matters of discretion strengthens that assessment.

853. A mandatory requirement to use species from the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory would potentially reduce vegetation flammability but would impose additional restrictions on productive planting and would address only one

component of wildfire risk. Considering flammability as part of restricted discretionary assessment is therefore a more proportionate means of recognising this risk-reduction measure.

854. Similarly, a blanket exemption for highly productive land would reduce costs for primary producers but could leave materially similar wildfire risks unmanaged solely because of the underlying land classification. Recognising the operational and productive function of shelterbelts through the matters of discretion provides greater flexibility without removing consideration of wildfire risk.

855. Clarifying the relationship with the NES-CF also reduces duplication and regulatory uncertainty. The NES-CF applies nationally to commercial forestry and contains its own setback requirements, including a 40m setback for afforestation from dwellings in specified circumstances and 30m from land zoned as an urban area or papakāinga. The recommended note alerts plan users to that separate regulatory framework without purporting to duplicate it.

856. There remains uncertainty associated with the spatial distribution and future evolution of wildfire risk. For the purposes of section 32(2), the risk of not acting is material because the absence of comprehensive mapping does not mean the hazard is absent, and future changes in vegetation, development and climatic conditions may alter wildfire exposure. Conversely, overly prescriptive regulation could impose unnecessary costs where site-specific conditions allow risk to be effectively mitigated.

857. Overall, the recommended amendments provide a more effective and efficient approach than the reasonably practicable alternatives. They retain clear minimum standards, improve their administration, recognise the productive role of shelterbelts, provide for consideration of vegetation flammability, and retain a site-specific pathway where the prescribed setbacks cannot be achieved. This appropriately implements the refined NH-P12 approach to a complex, evolving and presently unmapped natural hazard.

NATURAL HAZARDS GENERAL / OTHER HAZARDS

7.31 Natural Hazards – NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays

858. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 25 original submission points and 40 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.12
FENZ 2	163.42

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Kā Rūnaka	251.142
G & K Taylor	265.27
K & D Weir	267.27
B & K McLeod	269.27
CRC	271.262
DTL	282.27
DHL	283.27
DDL	284.27
B & A Matthews	285.27
P & B Wilson	290.27
P & J Stackhouse	291.27
R & S Borst	292.27
B & G Hamilton	293.27
G Simpson 2	296.27
A & C Gibson	298.27
TT & Cayuga	299.27
A & F Verbakel	300.27
C Thelning	301.27
P & S Mitchell	302.27
T & F Conlan	303.27
K & N McLachlan	304.27
Springbank	312.295
Keeling Dairies	313.36

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Awamoa Developments Ltd	FS315
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	FS152
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.31.1 Submissions

859. FENZ 2 [163.42] and CRC [271.262] support NH-P13 and seek the policy be retained as notified.

860. NHC [153.12] supports NH-P13 in part but seeks that natural hazard risk assessment and risk reduction or mitigation methods be required for all subdivision, use and development proposals in natural hazard awareness overlays, rather than encouraged. NHC seeks a definition for what constitutes an *acceptable level* of risk.

861. Kā Rūnaka [251.142] seeks amendments to NH-P13 to clarify expected risk levels, ensure risks are not exacerbated, and better align the policy with a risk-based approach.

862. G & K Taylor [265.27] oppose NH-P13 and considers an assessment should not be required in all cases. The submitter seeks amendments that ensure subdivision, use and development in natural hazard areas consider natural hazard risks and incorporate measures to reduce those risks.

863. K & D Weir [267.27], B & K McLeod [269.27], DTL [282.27], DHL [283.27], DDL [284.27], B & A Matthews [285.27], P & B Wilson [290.27], P & J Stackhouse [291.27], R & S Borst [292.27], B & G Hamilton [293.27], G Simpson 2 [296.27], A & C Gibson [298.27], TT & Cayuga [299.27], A & F Verbakel [300.27], C Thelning [301.27], P & S Mitchell [302.27], T & F Conlan [303.27], K & N McLachlan [304.27], Springbank [312.295] and Keeling Dairies [313.36] support NH-P13 in part but seek amendments so assessments are not required in all cases, particularly where there is no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Submitters seek clarification of what constitutes an *acceptable level* of risk. Where *use* remains in the policy, submitters seek more proportionate working requiring proposals to consider the effects of natural hazard risk rather than undertake a full assessment in every case.

7.31.2 Analysis

864. NH-P13 applies to subdivision, use and development within the District's other natural hazard awareness overlays. As notified, the policy encourages proposals to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate that risk to an "acceptable level".

865. There is broad support for the intent of the policy. FENZ and CRC support the provision as notified. NHC seeks a stronger requirement for natural hazard risk assessment and mitigation, together with a definition or metric for "acceptable level". Kā Rūnaka similarly seeks greater clarity regarding expected risk levels and an explicit requirement that risk is not exacerbated. Conversely, a substantial group of submitters considers that requiring an assessment in every circumstance would be disproportionate, particularly where there is little evidence that the particular activity would be materially affected by the identified hazard.

866. I agree with NHC, Kā Rūnaka and the other submitters that the notified reference to an "acceptable level" does not provide a sufficiently clear or consistent planning test. This issue also arises elsewhere in the Natural Hazards chapter, including NH-P8, NH-P9, NH-P11 and NH-P12. As discussed in relation to NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5, I consider it preferable to establish a consistent risk-based and

proportionate framework across the chapter rather than introduce a separate definition or district-wide metric for an “acceptable level” of risk.

867. This approach has become particularly important following the commencement of the NPS-NH. For the hazards and activities within its scope, the NPS-NH requires natural hazard risk to be assessed using its risk matrix and managed using an approach proportionate to the assessed level of risk. Very high natural hazard risk must be avoided; high and medium risk must be avoided or mitigated proportionately; and the creation or increase of significant natural hazard risk on other sites must also be avoided or mitigated proportionately. The scale and detail of information required to assess risk is itself to have regard to the anticipated level of risk.

868. I therefore do not recommend introducing the separate definition or metric for “acceptable level” sought by NHC. While I agree with the underlying concern regarding clarity, a separate Waitaki-specific acceptable-risk threshold could create an additional test alongside the NPS-NH framework and imply that a single threshold applies irrespective of the hazard, likelihood, consequences and vulnerability associated with a proposal. I consider that concern is more appropriately addressed by removing the phrase and expressly linking NH-P13 to a risk-based and proportionate response.

869. I also agree, however, with the submitters who consider that a full natural hazard risk assessment should not necessarily be required merely because land is located within a natural hazard awareness overlay. The function of an awareness overlay is to identify that a potential hazard may warrant consideration; it does not, by itself, establish the level of risk associated with every subdivision, use or development within that area. The nature and vulnerability of the activity, its exposure to the hazard, the quality of available hazard information and the potential consequences are also relevant.

870. This is consistent with the NPS-NH requirement that the scale and detail of information necessary to assess risk have regard to the anticipated level of risk. It also responds to CRC's further submissions, which acknowledge that an assessment may not be necessary in every circumstance and consider that the need for assessment should depend upon the type of activity proposed and the associated rule framework.

871. I therefore consider that NH-P13 should require proposals within an awareness overlay to consider the natural hazard risk, with a natural hazard risk assessment undertaken where warranted by the nature of the hazard, the proposed activity and the anticipated level of risk. This is preferable to either the notified direction to simply “encourage” assessment or NHC's requested requirement for a full assessment in all cases.

872. I also agree with Kā Rūnaka that the policy should address the potential for a proposal to exacerbate risk. The concept is consistent with the broader approach recommended for NH-P2, NH-P5 and the hazard-specific provisions. For hazards and activities within the scope of the NPS-NH, Policy 4 specifically addresses

significant natural hazard risk created or increased on other sites. I recommend expressing this more generally in NH-P13 as avoiding or mitigating the creation or increase of natural hazard risk, proportionate to the level of risk.

873. The recommended amendment consequently provides a clearer progression: identify and consider the hazard; assess risk where warranted; and manage the identified risk proportionately. It avoids treating an awareness overlay as establishing a predetermined level of risk, while ensuring that relevant natural hazard risk is not overlooked.

874. For hazards or activities that fall outside the application of the NPS-NH, I consider the same general risk-based and proportionate approach remains appropriate as a District Plan framework. The NPS-NH expressly does not prevent decision-makers from managing other natural hazards or activities outside its scope. This does not extend the statutory application of the NPS-NH but provides a coherent approach across the Natural Hazards chapter.

875. Accordingly, I recommend accepting in part NHC [153.12] and Kā Rūnaka [251.142]. I recommend accepting in part the submissions seeking a more proportionate approach to assessment, insofar as a full assessment is not required in every circumstance. I recommend accepting FENZ 2 [163.42] and CRC [271.262] insofar as the fundamental intent of NH-P13 is retained, but with amendments to improve its clarity and consistency with the wider Natural Hazards framework.

876. I recommend the following changes to the proposal.

- NHC [153.12] accept in part, insofar as the policy is strengthened and the uncertainty associated with "acceptable level" is addressed but reject the requested separate definition or metric and a requirement for a full assessment in every case.
- FENZ 2 [163.42] and CRC [271.262] accept in part, insofar as the intent of the policy is retained.
- Kā Rūnaka [251.142] accept in part, through clearer risk-based and proportionate direction and express recognition of risk created or increased on other sites.
- G & K Taylor [265.27] and the submitters seeking a proportionate assessment requirement accept in part, insofar as an assessment is required only where warranted, but reject relief that would reduce the policy to merely considering hazard effects without an assessment where the anticipated risk warrants one.

7.31.3 Recommendations

877. Amend NH-P13 as follows:

NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays

Require ~~Encourage proposals for~~ subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to consider the natural hazard risk identified by the overlay and, reflective of the likelihood of the hazard, the proposed activity and the anticipated level of

risk, undertake a natural hazard risk assessment and avoid or mitigate the identified risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk, including avoiding or mitigating the creation or increase of natural hazard risk on other sites ~~*undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk to an acceptable level.*~~

7.31.4 Evaluation

878. A further evaluation is required under s32AA because amendments are recommended to NH-P13 following notification. Section 32AA requires the further evaluation to be undertaken in accordance with s32 and at a level of detail corresponding to the scale and significance of the changes. Section 32 requires consideration of reasonably practicable alternatives and the efficiency and effectiveness, benefits and costs of the provisions in achieving the relevant objectives.

879. The evaluation should be read alongside the evaluations for NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5, which establish the recommended chapter-wide risk-based and proportionate approach. The amendment does not alter the fundamental purpose of NH-P13. Rather, it provides clearer direction as to when assessment is required and how identified risk is to be managed.

880. The principal reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain NH-P13 as notified; require a natural hazard risk assessment for every subdivision, use and development within an awareness overlay as sought by NHC; define a district-wide "acceptable level" of natural hazard risk; or adopt the recommended proportionate approach.

881. Retaining the notified provision would have the benefit of simplicity but would retain two material uncertainties. First, "encourage" provides limited direction as to when an assessment is actually necessary. Second, "acceptable level" does not identify the basis upon which acceptability is to be determined. These uncertainties may result in inconsistent application and are increasingly difficult to justify given the risk-based framework now established by the NPS-NH.

882. Requiring a full natural hazard risk assessment for every proposal would provide greater certainty that hazard risk is considered. However, it would impose assessment costs irrespective of the vulnerability of the proposed activity, quality of existing information or anticipated level of risk. This could be inefficient and disproportionate for activities where the identified hazard has little material bearing on the proposal. It would also sit uneasily with the NPS-NH direction that the scale and detail of information required to assess risk should have regard to the anticipated level of risk.

883. Establishing a separate definition or metric for an "acceptable level" would provide greater certainty than the notified wording but would introduce an additional district-specific threshold alongside the national risk framework. A single acceptable-risk threshold would also be difficult to apply consistently across materially different hazards, activities and consequences. I therefore consider that

the benefits of defining the term are outweighed by the greater consistency and clarity achieved by removing it.

884. The recommended approach is more effective because it requires natural hazard risk identified through an awareness overlay to be considered, while making the need and scale of further assessment proportionate to the hazard, activity and anticipated level of risk. Where assessment identifies risk, the policy provides clear direction that it is to be avoided or mitigated proportionately and that risk should not simply be transferred or increased elsewhere.

885. The approach is also more efficient. It directs technical assessment toward circumstances where it is warranted, reducing unnecessary assessment costs for low-risk or materially unaffected proposals while retaining the ability to require appropriately detailed assessment where consequences may be significant. This is particularly relevant to awareness overlays, which identify the potential presence of a hazard but do not necessarily establish proposal-specific risk.

886. The amendment has environmental and social benefits through clearer identification and management of natural hazard risk and by reducing the potential for development to increase risk to people, property or other sites. Economic costs may arise where additional technical assessment or mitigation is required, but these costs are proportionate to the anticipated risk and are offset by avoiding unnecessary assessment where the circumstances do not warrant it. Cultural effects are expected to be neutral to positive through a clearer and more consistent risk-management framework and should be considered alongside the Kāi Tahu provisions and other relevant policies of the Plan.

887. There remains uncertainty in the location, likelihood and consequences of some natural hazards represented by the awareness overlays. The recommended approach responds appropriately to that uncertainty by not treating mapped awareness as a definitive determination of risk, while ensuring that uncertainty does not result in relevant risk being disregarded. This is consistent with the NPS-NH direction to use the best available information and continue to make risk assessments and decisions where information is uncertain or incomplete.

888. Overall, I consider the amended NH-P13 to be a more effective and efficient means of achieving NH-O1 and the wider Natural Hazards objectives than the notified wording or the alternatives sought by submitters. It resolves the uncertainty associated with “acceptable level”, provides a proportionate trigger for assessment, and establishes a clearer relationship between hazard awareness, risk assessment and risk management.

NATURAL HAZARDS ACTIVITY / DEVELOPMENT SPECIFIC POLICY & RULES

7.32 Natural Hazards – NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure

889. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 33 original submission points and six (6) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NZTA	152.49
NHC	153.4
FENZ 2	163.39
KiwiRail	233.67
Fuel Companies	238.42
EDS	240.52
Kā Rūnaka	251.136
ORC	259.33
G & K Taylor	265.25
K & D Weir	267.25
B & K McLeod	269.25
CRC	271.254
DTL	282.25
DHL	283.25
DDL	284.25
B & A Matthews	285.25
Network Waitaki	288.64
P & B Wilson	290.25
P & J Stackhouse	291.25
R & S Borst	292.25
B & G Hamilton	293.25
G Simpson 2	296.25
A & C Gibson	298.25
TT & Cayuga	299.25
A & F Verbakel	300.25
C Thelning	301.25

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
P & S Mitchell	302.25
T & F Conlan	303.25
K & N McLachlan	304.25
Transpower	309.91
Graymont	310.37
Springbank	312.288
Keeling Dairies	313.29

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS233
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	FS152
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295

7.32.1 Submissions

890. NZTA [152.49], NHC [153.4], FENZ 2 [163.39], KiwiRail [233.67], ORC [259.33], G & K Taylor [265.25], K & D Weir [267.25], B & K McLeod [269.25], , DTL [282.25], DHL [283.25], DDL [284.25], B & A Matthews [285.25], , P & B Wilson [290.25], P & J Stackhouse [291.25], R & S Borst [292.25], B & G Hamilton [293.25], G Simpson 2 [296.25], A & C Gibson [298.25], TT & Cayuga [299.25], A & F Verbakel [300.25], C Thelning [301.25], P & S Mitchell [302.25], T & F Conlan [303.25], K & N McLachlan [304.25], Springbank [312.288], Keeling Dairies [313.29] support NH-P3 and seek that the policy be retained as notified. Submitters generally support recognising that critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure may need to locate in hazard areas where there are additional operational or functional constraints.

891. Fuel Companies [238.42] oppose NH-P3 in part and seeks that amendments are made to enable a more risk-based approach.

892. EDS [240.52] and Kā Rūnaka [251.136] support NH-P3 in part but seek amendments requiring development to demonstrate that is will not increase or exacerbate natural hazard risk.

893. CRC [271.254] generally supports NH-P3 but seeks more consistent terminology with other natural hazard policies and seeks amendments so that resilience to natural hazard risk be required as far as practicable.

894. Network Waitaki [288.64] supports NH-P3 in part but considers the requirement for infrastructure design and function be resilient to natural hazard risk may be too

high for electricity distribution networks. It seeks wording that requires consideration of, and responsiveness to, natural hazard risk instead.

895. Transpower [309.91] supports NH-P3 in part but considers strict avoidance is inappropriate for infrastructure with operational or functional needs. Transpower seeks amendments to allow

896. Graymont [310.37] supports NH-P3 in part but seeks that the policy should also apply to regionally significant industry.

897. Transpower [309.90], addressed under NH-P2, seeks an express exception from the general risk-based policy for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure. Graymont [310.36] similarly seeks recognition under NH-P2 of the functional requirements of mineral extraction and quarrying. These submissions raise the same issue concerning activities that cannot necessarily avoid hazard-prone locations.

898. Transpower [309.92], addressed under NH-P6, supports the NH-P3 exception for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure but seeks clarification that the exception applies throughout NH-P6 rather than only to part of that policy.

899. Transpower [309.94], addressed under NH-P10, seeks removal of critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure from that policy on the basis that NH-P3 should provide the relevant policy direction. Graymont [310.38] conversely seeks extension of NH-P10 to regionally significant industry.

900. The submissions on NH-R12 also raise the relationship between NH-P3 and the specific regulation of critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay. In particular, Transpower [309.95] seeks a less restrictive pathway for regionally significant infrastructure, while NHC's further submission emphasises the consequences of fault rupture and the importance of maintaining infrastructure functionality following an event.

7.32.2 Analysis

901. NH-P3 provides a specific pathway for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure where functional or operational needs may constrain their ability to avoid areas subject to natural hazard risk. I consider this remains appropriate and complements the general risk-based approach recommended for NH-P2.

902. I agree in part with Fuel Companies [238.42] and Transpower [309.91] that the notified avoidance wording is unnecessarily absolute. However, I do not support deleting NH-P3 or limiting it to the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay. The policy has a broader role across the Natural Hazards chapter.

903. I also agree with CRC [271.254] and Network Waitaki [288.64] that requiring infrastructure to be fully “resilient” may not always be practicable, particularly for extensive linear networks. CRC's proposed qualification of “as far as practicable” provides an appropriate response while retaining resilience as the intended

outcome. Network Waitaki's alternative of requiring only "consideration of, and responsiveness to" risk would provide less certainty as to the outcome sought.

904. I agree in part with EDS [240.52] and Kā Rūnaka [251.136] that NH-P3 should also address risk created or increased beyond the infrastructure itself. This is consistent with the approach recommended under NH-P2, NH-P5, NH-P6 and NH-P7. I recommend using the same terminology adopted elsewhere in the chapter: create or increase natural hazard risk on other sites.

905. This approach also responds to the related Transpower submissions under NH-P2, NH-P6, NH-P10 and NH-R12. NH-P3 should provide the general policy pathway for infrastructure, while the hazard-specific provisions continue to determine how that pathway applies to particular hazards. For example, as discussed under NH-P10, functional or operational need may justify infrastructure crossing a fault hazard area, but does not remove the requirement to appropriately manage the resulting risk.

906. I do not support Graymont [310.37] extending NH-P3 to regionally significant industry. Functional or operational requirements may be relevant to such activities under other provisions, but this does not justify applying the specific critical-facilities and infrastructure pathway to industry generally.

907. Overall, I recommend retaining NH-P3 with amendments to provide a clearer risk-management approach, recognise functional and operational need, qualify the resilience requirement by practicability, and address risk created or increased on other sites.

7.32.3 Recommendations

908. I recommend NH-P3 be amended as follows:

NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure

Manage the location of ~~Avoid locating~~ critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in areas ~~with identified natural hazard risks~~ subject to natural hazard risk, ~~unless~~ taking into account whether it can be demonstrated that:

1.there are no other feasible or practicable alternatives to locating inside the area; and

2.there are operational needs or functional needs for the location; and

3.the design and function are resilient to natural hazard risk as far as practicable; and

4.the location, design and any associated mitigation measures avoid or mitigate the creation or increase of natural hazard risk on other sites in a manner proportionate to the level of risk.

7.32.4 Evaluation

909. The amendments require further evaluation under s32AA. This evaluation should be read alongside the evaluations of NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5.

910. The principal alternatives are retaining the notified avoidance-based policy, adopting a less directive infrastructure pathway, or adopting the recommended risk-based approach.

911. The recommended amendments are more effective in recognising the functional and operational requirements of critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure while maintaining clear natural hazard risk-management outcomes. Qualifying resilience by "as far as practicable" also avoids imposing an absolute requirement that may not be achievable for some infrastructure networks.

912. The amendments are more efficient because they allow the response to reflect the infrastructure, hazard and level of risk rather than requiring avoidance or complete resilience in all circumstances. There may be costs associated with assessing alternatives and providing resilience or mitigation measures, but these are proportionate to the benefits of reducing infrastructure disruption, damage and risk to other sites.

913. The amendments also reduce the risk of acting or not acting under uncertainty by retaining a precautionary risk-management framework while allowing the response to be proportionate and practicable.

914. Overall, I consider the amended NH-P3 is the most appropriate way to achieve the Natural Hazards objectives because it provides clearer and more proportionate direction for infrastructure while maintaining appropriate management of natural hazard risk.

7.33 Natural Hazards – NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings

915. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, nine original submission points and six (6) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.23
Alliance	190.34
EDS	240.133
FFNZ	246.105
CRC	271.268
E Schultz	305.46
WPG 2	306.46

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Transpower	309.95
Graymont	310.39

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	FS295
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Parkside Holdings Ltd	FS297
Canterbury Regional Council	FS271

7.33.1 Submissions

916. NHC [153.23] supports NH-R12 in part but seeks that the rule only applies as a discretionary activity where the activity is at least 20m from the fault, consistent with the MfE guidance for land use planning around active faults.

917. Alliance [190.34] seeks amendments to clarify that NH-R12 applies to new buildings containing hazardous substances, and extensions or upgrades to existing hazardous facilities, rather than all existing activities or facilities.

918. EDS [240.133] supports NH-R12 in part but opposes the non-notification clause. EDS seeks amendments so activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.

919. E Schultz [305.46] and WPG 2 [306.46] oppose NH-R12 and seek amendments for the rule refers to *hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities* to align with the Hazardous Substances chapter. FFNZ [246.105] supports NH-R12 but seeks amendments consistent with E Schultz and WPG 2.

920. CRC [271.268] supports NH-R12 but seeks amendments to the definition of *Regionally Significant Infrastructure* and a note clarifying that the rule does not apply to *Natural hazard mitigation works* managed under NH-R5.

921. Transpower [309.95] and Graymont [310.39] seeks amendments to delete *regionally significant infrastructure* from the rule.

7.33.2 Analysis

922. NH-R12 provides the regulatory pathway for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure (RSI), education facilities, retirement villages and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay. As notified, these activities are Discretionary.

923. As discussed under NH-P3, critical facilities and RSI may have functional or operational needs that constrain their ability to avoid areas subject to natural hazard risk. The recommended amendments to NH-P3 recognise those constraints while requiring resilience as far as practicable and management of risk created or increased on other sites. NH-R12 should provide the corresponding consenting pathway rather than exclude RSI from the fault-hazard framework.

924. Similarly, as discussed under NH-P10, the mapped fault hazard should not be treated as equivalent to a universal setback. The preferred approach is to identify the zone of fault deformation and the appropriate setback at a site-specific scale, while recognising that some infrastructure may have a functional or operational need to cross that area.

925. I therefore do not support NHC [153.23] insofar as it seeks a fixed 20m threshold, with activities within that distance becoming Non-Complying. A fixed setback may provide certainty, but it does not respond to variation in fault location, deformation width, activity vulnerability or the functional and operational requirements recognised through NH-P3. The appropriate setback should instead be informed by the site-specific assessment required by the rule.

926. I also do not support Transpower [309.95] deleting RSI from NH-R12. Fault rupture can have significant consequences for infrastructure, including service continuity. The further submissions illustrate the competing considerations: CRC accepts that some infrastructure may appropriately locate in fault-risk areas, while NHC emphasises the importance of infrastructure continuing to function following an earthquake. Retaining a Discretionary pathway allows both matters to be considered under NH-P3 and NH-P10.

927. For the same reasons identified under NH-P3 and NH-P10, I do not support Graymont [310.39] extending the rule to regionally significant industry or creating a general functional-need pathway for such activities.

928. Alliance [190.34] seeks a Restricted Discretionary pathway and clarification that the hazardous-substance component applies to new buildings and relevant extensions or upgrades. I agree that the notified reference to “buildings containing hazardous substances” is overly broad. As FFNZ [246.105], E Schultz [305.46] and WPG 2 [306.46] identify, it could capture ordinary buildings containing small quantities of hazardous substances. The defined terms hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities provide a clearer relationship with the Hazardous Substances chapter. This position is also supported by NHC and CRC in further submissions.

929. I do not, however, recommend changing the overall activity status to Restricted Discretionary. The activities captured by NH-R12 are potentially highly vulnerable or important to post-event functioning, while surface fault rupture effects and appropriate responses may be strongly site- and activity-specific. Discretionary status provides appropriate scope to consider fault-rupture risk, alternative locations, functional or operational need, resilience and mitigation consistently with NH-P3 and NH-P10.

930. CRC [271.268] seeks a note confirming that natural hazard mitigation works are addressed through NH-R5. I agree this would improve plan navigation and avoid uncertainty about the relationship between the rules. The requested amendment to the RSI definition is addressed separately in the Definitions section.

931. I recommend accepting EDS [240.133] and deleting the blanket preclusion on public notification. Given the nature and potential consequences of activities regulated by NH-R12, I do not consider there is a sufficient basis to predetermine that public notification will never be appropriate. Normal RMA notification tests should apply. This is consistent with the approach recommended for the higher-risk provisions elsewhere in the chapter.

932. Overall, I recommend retaining the Discretionary framework, while improving its relationship with NH-P3 and NH-P10, clarifying the hazardous-facilities terminology and allowing normal notification tests to apply. As follows;

- I recommend NHC [153.23] be rejected insofar as it seeks a fixed 20m threshold and Non-Complying status within that setback.
- I recommend Alliance [190.34] be accepted in part, insofar as clarification of the hazardous-facility activities is appropriate but reject Restricted Discretionary status.
- I recommend EDS [240.133] be accepted and the public-notification preclusion deleted.
- I recommend FFNZ [246.105], E Schultz [305.46] and WPG 2 [306.46] be accepted insofar as the rule is amended to refer to hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities.
- I recommend CRC [271.268] be accepted in part, including the requested NH-R5 note, with its RSI definition relief addressed in the Definitions section.
- I recommend Transpower [309.95] and Graymont [310.39] be rejected.

7.33.3 Recommendations

933. I recommend the following amendments to NH-R12

NH-R12Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement villages~~ and buildings containing hazardous substances~~ hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings

All zones

Activity status: Discretionary

~~*Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.*~~

Note: This rule does not apply to natural hazard mitigation works managed under NH-R5.

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by an assessment of the surface fault rupture risk (likelihood and potential consequences) posed by the fault, undertaken by a suitably qualified professional, including any recommendations for locating or designing the facility to avoid or mitigate the potential adverse effects of surface fault rupture. The investigation report must also be supplied to Canterbury Regional Council.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

7.33.4 Evaluation

934. The amendments require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the evaluations for NH-P3 and NH-P10.

935. The principal alternatives are retaining NH-R12 as notified, applying a fixed 20m setback with Non-Complying status within it, adopting Restricted Discretionary status, or retaining Discretionary status with the recommended clarifications.

936. The recommended approach is more effective because Discretionary status enables site-specific consideration of fault-rupture risk, functional or operational need, alternative locations, resilience and mitigation. This appropriately implements NH-P3 and NH-P10 without assuming that a fixed setback will represent the appropriate response in every circumstance.

937. It is also more efficient than establishing a fixed 20m threshold without sufficient site-specific basis or creating separate regulatory pathways for different forms of RSI. Clarifying the application to hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities avoids inadvertently capturing ordinary buildings containing small quantities of hazardous substances and improves integration with the Hazardous Substances chapter.

938. There may be costs associated with Discretionary consent and technical assessment, but these are proportionate to the potential consequences associated with the activities captured by the rule and surface fault rupture. Removing the blanket notification preclusion allows the normal statutory tests to determine notification where appropriate.

939. Given uncertainty regarding the precise location and consequences of fault rupture, retaining a site-specific assessment pathway reduces the risks of both unnecessarily constraining infrastructure and other facilities and enabling highly vulnerable activities without adequate assessment.

940. Overall, I consider the amended NH-R12 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the Natural Hazards objectives and implement NH-P3 and NH-P10.

7.34 Natural Hazards – NH-P4 Natural protection features

941. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 28 original submission points and 10 further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.5
NZ Carbon Farming	192.14
EDS	240.53
FFNZ	246.94
Kā Rūnaka	251.137
ORC	259.34
G & K Taylor	265.26
K & D Weir	267.26
B & K McLeod	269.26
CRC	271.255
DTL	282.26
DHL	283.26
DDL	284.26
B & A Matthews	285.26
P & B Wilson	290.26
P & J Stackhouse	291.26
R & S Borst	292.26
B & G Hamilton	293.26
G Simpson 2	296.26
A & C Gibson	298.26
TT & Cayuga	299.26
A & F Verbakel	300.26
C Thelning	301.26
P & S Mitchell	302.26
T & F Conlan	303.26
K & N McLachlan	304.26
Springbank	312.289
Keeling Dairies	313.30

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
Meridian Energy Limited	FS294

NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	FS152

7.34.1 Submissions

942. NHC [153.5], NZ Carbon Farming [192.14], Kā Rūnaka [251.137], ORC [259.34] and CRC [271.255] support NH-P4 and seek that the policy be retained as notified. Submitters generally support encouraging the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems that provide protection from natural hazard risk.

943. EDS [240.53] supports NH-P4 in part but considers natural protection features should be prioritised.

944. FFNZ [246.94] supports NH-P4 but seeks amendments to policy apply *where practical*, to provide discretion.

945. G & K Taylor [265.26], K & D Weir [267.26], B & K McLeod [269.26], , DTL [282.26], DHL [283.26], DDL [284.26], B & A Matthews [285.26], P & B Wilson [290.26], P & J Stackhouse [291.26], R & S Borst [292.26], B & G Hamilton [293.26], G Simpson 2 [296.26], A & C Gibson [298.26], TT & Cayuga [299.26], A & F Verbakel [300.26], C Thelning [301.26], P & S Mitchell [302.26], T & F Conlan [303.26], K & N McLachlan [304.26], Springbank [312.289] and Keeling Dairies [313.30] support NH-P4 in part but seek amendments to recognise that engineering solutions may be required where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly to protect people, property and infrastructure.

7.34.2 Analysis

946. NH-P4 encourages the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems that provide protection from natural hazard risk. Examples include wetlands and vegetation. I consider this policy remains appropriate, but its relationship with engineered natural hazard mitigation requires clarification.

947. I agree in part with EDS [240.53] that natural protection features should be given greater priority than indicated by the notified word “encourage”. This is also consistent with NHC's further submissions, which support prioritising natural features and methods other than hard engineering. However, I do not consider natural approaches should be treated as an absolute preference irrespective of the hazard, level of risk, effectiveness or practicability.

948. This is particularly important because natural hazard mitigation works differ according to the hazard being managed. Flood protection can include established river and flood-management schemes, stopbanks, river works, vegetation management and opening or lowering river mouths. CRC has specifically sought recognition of the full range of flood and erosion protection works, including earthworks, planting and vegetation clearance, and the notified NH-R5 already

provides a specific pathway for council natural hazard mitigation works within the Flood Assessment Overlays.

949. The coastal environment requires a different approach. As discussed in the Coastal Environment section, hard protection structures and associated earthworks can alter coastal processes, transfer or increase risk elsewhere and create reliance on ongoing protection. The coastal provisions therefore appropriately provide more specific direction on when hard protection may be appropriate and on protecting or restoring natural coastal defences. This should not be displaced by a general Natural Hazards policy.

950. Other natural hazards may require different responses again. Engineered mitigation may be appropriate for some hazards or locations, but its effectiveness and potential to transfer or increase risk must be assessed in the context of the particular hazard. NH-P4 should therefore establish the preference for natural protection features without prescribing the appropriate engineering response for every natural hazard.

951. For these reasons, I agree only in part with the rural submitters seeking explicit direction to require engineering solutions where natural features are unsuitable. Their underlying concern is valid: natural approaches will not always adequately manage risk to people, property or infrastructure. However, requiring engineering solutions through NH-P4 would be too broad and could conflict with the more specific flood, coastal and other hazard provisions. NHC's further submissions similarly caution that hard engineering can increase risk on adjoining sites and create residual risk.

952. I also agree in part with FFNZ [246.94] that practicability is relevant. However, adding “where practical” to the notified policy could unnecessarily weaken the protection of existing natural features. I consider it preferable to distinguish between protecting and maintaining existing natural protection features and using or enhancing natural features as a mitigation response where practicable and effective. This better recognises that creating or enhancing a natural solution may not always adequately manage the identified risk.

953. This approach also aligns with the chapter-wide position taken under NH-P2, NH-P3 and NH-P5: mitigation should be proportionate to the level of risk and should not create or increase natural hazard risk on other sites.

954. I therefore recommend strengthening NH-P4 to prioritise natural protection features, while recognising effectiveness and practicability and leaving engineered mitigation to the relevant hazard-specific provisions. In response to submissions points;

- I recommend NHC [153.5], NZ Carbon Farming [192.14], Kā Rūnaka [251.137], ORC [259.34] and CRC [271.255] be accepted in part, insofar as the policy is retained but amended.
- I recommend EDS [240.53] be accepted in part, through greater priority for natural protection features.

- I recommend FFNZ [246.94] be accepted in part, through recognition of practicability in the use and enhancement of natural protection features.
- I recommend G & K Taylor [265.26] and the other submitters seeking express provision for engineering solutions be accepted in part, insofar as the policy recognises that natural approaches must be effective and practicable but reject requiring engineering solutions through NH-P4.

7.34.3 Recommendations

955. I recommend NH-P4 be amended as follows:

NH-P4 Natural protection features

Priorities ~~Encourage~~ the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk <u>including by:</u>

<u>1.protecting and maintaining existing natural features, buffers and systems that contribute to reducing natural hazard risk; and</u>

<u>2.using and enhancing natural features, buffers and systems as a natural hazard mitigation response where they are practicable and effective in managing the identified risk.</u>

7.34.4 Evaluation

956. The amendments require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the evaluations of NH-P2 and NH-P5 and the relevant flood and coastal hazard provisions.

957. The principal alternatives are retaining the notified encouragement approach, requiring natural approaches in all circumstances, expressly requiring engineered solutions where natural approaches are unsuitable, or adopting the recommended approach.

958. The amendments are more effective because they give greater priority to natural protection features while recognising that their use or enhancement must be practicable and effective for the hazard and level of risk. They also avoid creating a general preference for engineered works that could conflict with the more specific flood, coastal and other hazard-management provisions.

959. The amendments are efficient because they protect the benefits provided by existing natural systems while allowing the appropriate mitigation response to be determined through the relevant hazard-specific provisions. This avoids unnecessary engineering while recognising that natural approaches will not provide an effective response in every circumstance.

960. The costs of protecting or enhancing natural features are balanced by benefits including hazard-risk reduction and maintaining natural processes. The approach also reduces the risk of inappropriate mitigation transferring or increasing natural hazard risk elsewhere.

961. Overall, I consider the amended NH-P4 is the most appropriate way to achieve the Natural Hazards objectives because it prioritises natural protection features without predetermining the appropriate mitigation response for flood, coastal or other natural hazards.

7.35 Natural Hazards – NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays — maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrading

962. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, four original submission points and one further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.17
FFNZ	246.103
Kā Rūnaka	251.147
CRC	271.266

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Director-General of Conservation	FS194

7.35.1 Submissions

963. NHC [153.17] supports NH-R5 and seek that the rule be retained as notified.

964. FFNZ [246.103] supports NH-R5 in part but opposes limiting permitted flood mitigation, stream, or river management works undertaken by or on behalf of a statutory agency. FFNZ seeks amendments to enable landowners to undertake appropriate works on private land.

965. Kā Rūnaka [251.147] seek amendments to NH-R5, considering that permitting natural hazard mitigation works within 25m of existing structures is insufficiently justified. The submitter seeks clearer distinction between hard- and soft-engineering approaches.

966. CRC [271.266] supports a single rule enabling flood resilience protection works within the Waitaki catchment. But seeks amendments to broaden and clarify NH-R5 and appropriately enable natural hazard mitigation works.

Related submission points

967. CRC [271.39], addressed in the Definitions section, seeks amendments to the definition of Natural hazard mitigation works to expressly include the range of

activities associated with flood and erosion protection, including structures, earthworks, planting and vegetation clearance and both soft- and hard-engineering mitigation.

968. The submissions and recommendations on NH-P4 are also relevant. In particular, the recommended approach prioritises the protection and use of natural protection features where practicable and effective, while recognising that engineered responses may be required depending on the hazard and level of risk.

969. The submissions addressed under NH-R1 to NH-R4 concerning effects on existing natural hazard mitigation works and the displacement or transfer of flood risk are also relevant to NH-R5.

7.35.2 Analysis

970. NH-R5 provides a specific pathway for natural hazard mitigation works within the Flood Assessment Overlays. As discussed under NH-P4, I consider it important to distinguish this rule from provisions addressing coastal protection and other forms of natural hazard mitigation.

971. NH-R5 is principally concerned with flood resilience and flood-management works. Such works can comprise combinations of structures, earthworks, vegetation management, planting and other interventions. I therefore agree with CRC [271.39] that the definition of Natural hazard mitigation works should be sufficiently broad to encompass both engineered and natural or nature-based components of an integrated flood-management response. This matter is addressed through the Definitions section rather than by attempting to define different mitigation types within NH-R5.

972. I do not recommend using the defined term Hard protection structure to distinguish engineered works under NH-R5. That term has a particular relationship with coastal hazard management and the Coastal Environment provisions. Coastal protection can affect coastal processes and is subject to the more specific direction applying in the coastal environment. NH-R5 should not inadvertently extend that terminology or regulatory approach to river and flood-management works.

973. I agree in part with Kā Rūnaka [251.147] regarding the evidential basis for the notified permitted activity standards. I have not identified technical evidence establishing that a 25m change in alignment or location, or a 25% increase in footprint, represents a particular level of flood risk or effects. These standards should therefore not be characterised as risk thresholds.

974. However, I consider there remains value in measurable permitted activity standards that distinguish relatively limited changes to existing works from works requiring site-specific assessment. This is consistent with the approach recommended for NH-R4. The 25m and 25% standards provide an ascertainable limit on the extent to which an existing mitigation work can change through the permitted pathway. Where those standards are exceeded, the Restricted Discretionary pathway enables the actual effects of the proposal to be assessed.

975. For the same reason, I do not recommend accepting CRC's request to permit all natural hazard mitigation works undertaken by or on behalf of the identified councils irrespective of their scale or location. Such an approach could enable a substantially enlarged or realigned flood-protection work, or potentially a new work, without district-level assessment of its effects. The fact that a work has a hazard-mitigation purpose does not itself establish that it will not alter flood behaviour, affect natural systems or transfer risk elsewhere.

976. This is particularly relevant to the chapter-wide approach recommended under NH-P2, NH-P5 and NH-R4. Mitigation itself can change the distribution of natural hazard risk. For activities within its scope, the NPS-NH expressly requires associated mitigation measures that create or increase significant natural hazard risk on other sites to be avoided or mitigated proportionately. The NPS-NH also requires consideration of residual risk where the design threshold of mitigation measures is exceeded. While infrastructure is excluded from the direct application of the NPS-NH, these matters remain relevant to the coherent risk-based approach recommended for the Natural Hazards chapter.

977. I therefore recommend retaining the permitted pathway for maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrading of existing natural hazard mitigation works within measurable limits. New works, or works involving more substantial relocation or enlargement, should remain subject to Restricted Discretionary assessment.

978. I agree in part with FFNZ [246.103]. The rule should clearly apply where works are undertaken by or on behalf of the relevant council, including through contractors or agents. Whether a council has the necessary statutory authority to undertake works on privately owned land is a separate matter and does not need to be duplicated through the District Plan rule.

979. I also agree in part with Kā Rūnaka that the assessment framework should better recognise the nature of the mitigation proposed. However, I do not consider separate rule pathways for “hard” and “soft” engineering would be appropriate. Flood-management schemes can incorporate engineered structures, earthworks, vegetation and natural systems in combination. Consistent with NH-P4, the more appropriate approach is to consider effects on natural processes and existing natural protection features, and whether natural or nature-based methods can practicably and effectively contribute to the required flood-risk management outcome.

980. Accordingly, I recommend retaining the basic structure of NH-R5, while strengthening the matters of discretion and clarifying its relationship with the broader definition of Natural hazard mitigation works. This provides a clear distinction between limited changes to existing works and more substantial works requiring effects assessment. In response to submission points;

- recommend NHC [153.17] be accepted in part, insofar as the overall structure and permitted activity pathway are retained.

- I recommend FFNZ [246.103] be accepted in part, insofar as works undertaken on behalf of the identified councils, including through contractors or agents, remain within the permitted pathway where the other standards are met.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.147] be accepted in part, through clarification of the function of the permitted activity thresholds and amendments to the matters of discretion addressing natural and engineered mitigation approaches and their effects.
- I recommend CRC [271.266] be accepted in part, insofar as the rule and associated definition are clarified to recognise the range of flood-management works but reject the relief insofar as it would provide an unrestricted permitted activity pathway for new or substantially enlarged or realigned council works.

7.35.3 Recommendations

981. I recommend NH-R5 be amended as follows;

NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays — maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrading

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The natural hazard mitigation works are within 25m of the existing alignment or location, vertically and horizontally; and

PER-2

The footprint of the natural hazard mitigation works is not increased by more than 25%; and

PER-3

The activity is undertaken by or on behalf of Canterbury Regional Council, Otago Regional Council or Waitaki District Council.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 and/or PER-3

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.the likely effectiveness of the natural hazard mitigation works and the need for them; and

2.the extent of any adverse social, cultural and environmental effects, including on any sensitive environments; and

3.any potential adverse effects of diverting or blocking overland flow path(s), including upstream and downstream flood risks; and

4. ~~any increased flood risk for people, property, or public spaces~~; whether the works will create or increase flood risk on other sites, including risks to people, property, infrastructure or public spaces; and

5. the extent to which alternative locations and options for the natural hazard mitigation works have been considered and the merits of those including the extent to which natural or nature-based methods can practicably and effectively contribute to the required natural hazard risk-management outcome; and

5A. the nature and scale of structural or engineered works and their effects on natural processes and existing natural protection features; and

6. any positive effects of the proposal on the community.

7.35.4 Evaluation

982. The recommended amendments require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the evaluations for NH-P2, NH-P4, NH-P5 and NH-R4.

983. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain NH-R5 as notified; provide a broader permitted pathway for all council natural hazard mitigation works as sought by CRC; establish separate regulatory pathways for engineered and natural or nature-based works; or retain measurable limits for the permitted pathway while strengthening the assessment of works exceeding those limits.

984. I consider the recommended approach is the most appropriate way to achieve the Natural Hazards objectives. The notified 25m and 25% standards provide clear and measurable limits for permitted activities, although the evidence available does not establish that those figures represent particular thresholds of natural hazard risk. Their principal benefit is therefore regulatory certainty in distinguishing relatively limited changes to existing works from works requiring site-specific assessment.

985. A broader permitted pathway for all council works would be more enabling but could permit new, substantially enlarged or realigned works without assessment of their effects on flood behaviour, natural systems or surrounding land. Conversely, requiring consent for all maintenance and upgrading would impose additional costs where changes to established works are limited.

986. Separate regulatory pathways for “hard” and “soft” engineering would provide some differentiation but would be difficult to apply to integrated flood-management schemes that combine structures, earthworks, vegetation and natural systems. The recommended approach is more effective and flexible because the nature of the mitigation and the practicability and effectiveness of natural or nature-based methods can be considered through the Restricted Discretionary assessment.

987. The amendments provide environmental and social benefits by strengthening consideration of natural processes, natural protection features, upstream and downstream effects and the creation or increase of flood risk on other sites. They

retain the benefits of enabling routine maintenance and upgrading of established flood-management infrastructure while requiring greater changes to be assessed.

988. There remains uncertainty regarding the effects of particular mitigation works and the extent to which existing permitted activity thresholds correspond with changes in risk. Requiring site-specific assessment where the measurable limits are exceeded is therefore preferable to assuming that the purpose or ownership of a mitigation work demonstrates that its effects are acceptable.

989. Overall, the recommended amendments provide a more effective and efficient framework by retaining a practicable permitted activity pathway for limited works, requiring assessment of more substantial changes, recognising both natural and engineered mitigation approaches, and maintaining a clear distinction between flood-management works under NH-R5 and hard protection structures addressed through the Coastal Environment provisions.

COASTAL HAZARDS AREAS AND CLIMATE CHANGE

7.36 Coastal Environment – General

990. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 17 original submission points and two (2) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
B de Geest	51.43
M & C Holland	59.6
DOC	194.81, 194.108, 194.82
EDS	240.114
FFNZ	246.224
Kā Rūnaka	251.267, 251.277, 251.287, 251.294
Forest & Bird	253.160, 253.161
ORC	259.78
Telcos	244.95
CRC	271.445
Transpower	309.107

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246

Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.36.1 Submissions

991. M & C Holland [59.6] and DOC [194.81, 194.108] generally support the Coastal Environment chapter and seek that it be retained as notified.

992. B de Geest [51.43] seeks refinement of the coastal hazard overlay provisions to better enable quality residential and economic development.

993. EDS [240.114] and Forest & Bird [253.160, 253.161] seek new policies to better give effect to the NZCPS by enabling and supporting natural adjustments to coastal processes, natural defences, ecosystems, habitats and species in response to climate change. Forest & Bird [253.161] seeks new policy to manage subdivision, use and development where the Coastal Environment supports *highly mobile fauna*, and to define that term consistently with the NPS-IB.

994. FFNZ [246.224] supports the Coastal Environment chapter but considers nine objectives are unnecessary and seeks fewer, outcome-focused suite of objectives.

995. Kā Rūnaka [251.267, 251.277, 251.287, 251.294] seek amendments to better recognise Kāi Tahu connections to the coastal environment. Kā Rūnaka seeks a new objective to safeguard the health, form, function and resilience of the coastal environment, a new policy enabling mana whenua Māori freehold landowners to lead approaches to managing coastal hazard risks affecting Māori Land and Native Reserves, and an integrated management policy addressing land-based effects on the coastal environment.

996. ORC [259.78] supports the Coastal Environment chapter in part but seeks clarification of jurisdiction, including that the District Plan manages land use activities within the coastal environment but outside the coastal marine area, while activities in the coastal marine area are managed by the Regional Plan: Coast.

997. DOC [194.82] opposes the natural hazards introductory wording in part and seeks clearer distinction between natural hazards generally and coastal hazards, consistent with the PORPS.

998. Telcos [244.95] support the user note directing infrastructure and energy activities in the Coastal Environment to the Infrastructure and Energy chapters and seek that it be retained as notified.

999. CRC [271.445] generally supports the user notes but seeks an additional note clarifying that objectives, policies and rules for Natural Hazard Mitigation Work are found in the Natural Hazard chapter.

1000. Transpower [309.107] supports the users notes but seeks clarification that the Coastal Environment chapter does not apply to the National Grid, with all relevant National Grid provisions located in the Infrastructure Chapter.

7.36.2 Analysis

1001. The submissions demonstrate broad support for the overall Coastal Environment chapter. I agree with M & C Holland [59.6] and DOC [194.81, 194.108] that its overall structure should be retained. DOC considers the chapter generally gives effect to the RMA and NZCPS and specifically supports the identification of the Coastal Environment and associated overlays.

1002. I do not consider the general relief sought by B de Geest [51.43] provides a basis for a chapter-wide amendment. The submitter's concern that the coastal hazard framework should differentiate between activities according to their vulnerability and effects is, however, relevant to the assessment of the individual coastal hazard policies and rules. The specific regulatory pathways should therefore be considered under those provisions rather than through a general amendment to the chapter.

1003. A related issue arising across the submissions is the terminology and function of the different coastal hazard areas and overlays. This includes submissions seeking greater clarity regarding coastal natural hazard, significant coastal hazard risk, Coastal margin and the extent and application of the mapped coastal hazard areas. These matters affect the interpretation of a number of provisions and will be considered when assessing those provisions. However, I consider the definitions should ultimately be addressed together in the Definitions section to ensure a consistent terminology and avoid creating different meanings through individual policies and rules.

1004. I agree in part with EDS [240.114] and Forest & Bird [253.160] that the chapter should more clearly recognise the need to provide space for natural coastal processes, habitats and ecosystems to adjust in response to climate change. This is particularly relevant given the relationship between natural coastal processes, natural defences and coastal hazard risk. The appropriate location for that direction is principally within the objectives and policies concerning natural coastal defences, coastal hazards and climate change rather than through a general chapter amendment.

1005. Forest & Bird [253.161] also seeks specific provision for highly mobile fauna. I consider this matter should be assessed against the relevant biodiversity and coastal environment policies rather than addressed through a general amendment to the chapter.

1006. I acknowledge FFNZ [246.224] considers nine objectives unnecessarily complex. However, the Coastal Environment chapter addresses several distinct resource management matters, including natural character, landscape and biodiversity values, public access, tangata whenua values and coastal natural hazards. I do not consider reducing the objectives to two or three would necessarily improve implementation or provide clearer direction. The appropriateness of individual objectives is better assessed under the relevant objective sections.

1007. The Kā Rūnaka submissions raise several broader matters concerning Kāi Tahu relationships with the coastal environment, integrated management and the

management of coastal hazard risk affecting Māori land and Native Reserves. I agree these are important considerations but recommend addressing them through the relevant objectives and policies where the statutory direction and effects can be considered directly rather than inserting a general provision without reference to the particular resource management issue.

1008. I agree with ORC [259.78] that the relationship between district and regional council responsibilities should be clear. In particular, users should be able to distinguish the District Plan's management of land use within the coastal environment from activities within the coastal marine area that are subject to the relevant regional coastal planning framework. This can appropriately be addressed through an introductory user note.

1009. The same issue arises for natural hazard mitigation works. As discussed under NH-P4 and NH-R5, natural hazard mitigation is not a single category of intervention. Flood-management works may extend into the coastal environment, including works associated with river mouths, while coastal hazard responses can include maintaining or restoring natural defences or, in more limited circumstances, hard protection structures. CRC and ORC specifically identify river-mouth opening and lowering as flood-management activities that can occur within coastal hazard areas.

1010. I therefore agree in part with CRC [271.445] that the user notes should identify the Natural Hazards chapter. However, a general statement that all natural hazard mitigation works are regulated only through that chapter could be misleading where works also fall within the Coastal Environment provisions. The user note should instead make clear that relevant provisions in both chapters may apply, depending on the nature and location of the works.

1011. I support retaining the infrastructure and energy user note sought by Telcos [244.95]. In relation to Transpower [309.107], the Infrastructure chapter may contain the substantive National Grid provisions, but I do not consider it appropriate through a general user note to state that the Coastal Environment chapter does not apply to the National Grid unless the complete plan framework establishes that exclusion. The relationship should be addressed consistently through the Infrastructure and Coastal Environment provisions.

1012. Overall, I recommend retaining the chapter structure while improving the introductory cross-referencing and addressing the substantive matters raised by EDS, Forest & Bird and Kā Rūnaka through the relevant objectives and policies. In response to the submissions;

- I recommend M & C Holland [59.6] and DOC [194.81, 194.108] be accepted in part, insofar as the overall Coastal Environment chapter is retained subject to the amendments recommended elsewhere.
- I recommend B de Geest [51.43] be accepted in part, insofar as activity vulnerability and appropriate regulatory pathways are considered through the individual coastal hazard provisions.

- I recommend EDS [240.114] and Forest & Bird [253.160, 253.161] be accepted in part, with natural adjustment and related matters addressed through the relevant objectives and policies.
- I recommend FFNZ [246.224] be rejected insofar as it seeks consolidation of the objectives into two or three objectives.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.267, 251.277, 251.287, 251.294] be accepted in part, with the relief considered through the relevant objectives and policies.
- I recommend ORC [259.78] and CRC [271.445] be accepted in part, through clarification of the relationship between district and regional responsibilities and between the Coastal Environment and Natural Hazards chapters.
- I recommend Telcos [244.95] be accepted.
- I recommend Transpower [309.107] be accepted in part, insofar as the relationship with the Infrastructure chapter should be clear but reject a blanket statement that the Coastal Environment chapter does not apply to the National Grid unless supported by the complete plan framework.

7.36.3 Recommendations

1013. I recommend the User Notes be amended as follows:

User Notes:

For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one chapter in the District Plan. Plan users are encouraged to check all District-Wide Matters chapters, as well as the relevant zone chapter.

Objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within the Coastal Environment are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter.

Activities within the coastal marine area are also subject to the relevant regional coastal planning framework administered by the relevant regional council.

Natural hazard mitigation works within the Coastal Environment may also be subject to the objectives, policies and rules of the Natural Hazards Chapter. The provisions that apply will depend on the nature and location of the works, including whether the works manage flood or coastal natural hazard risk.

For energy activities, the objectives and policies in the Energy chapter also apply.

Provisions related to the preservation of the natural character of riparian margins are contained in the Natural Character chapter.

For earthworks undertaken in the Coastal Environment (excluding within a coastal natural hazard overlay), please refer to the Earthworks chapter.

For activities not provided for as a permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity, please defer to the underlying zone or any other relevant overlay rules to determine the activity status.

The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to provisions in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter, Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, which also apply at a district wide scale and apply within all zones.

Please refer to the General Approach chapter for more information on the steps plan users should take to determine what rules apply to an activity and to determine the consent status of an activity.

7.36.4 Evaluation

1014. The recommended amendments to the user notes are explanatory and do not themselves alter the substantive management framework. Nevertheless, to the extent that they form part of the recommended changes to the Plan, they have been considered under s32AA alongside the original s32 evaluation and the provision-specific evaluations below.

1015. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain the user notes as notified, state that natural hazard mitigation works are addressed exclusively through the Natural Hazards chapter, or clarify the relationship between the Natural Hazards, Coastal Environment and regional coastal planning frameworks.

1016. The recommended approach is more effective and efficient because it improves plan navigation without incorrectly assuming that all natural hazard mitigation works are regulated in the same manner. It recognises that flood-management works may occur within the coastal environment while coastal hazard mitigation may engage separate provisions concerning natural defences and hard protection structures.

1017. The amendments have negligible implementation cost and provide benefits through greater certainty regarding jurisdiction and the interaction between chapters. They also reduce the risk of a user incorrectly relying on one chapter where another relevant planning framework applies.

1018. Overall, the amendments are appropriate because they improve integration and plan usability without altering the substantive outcomes sought by the Coastal Environment provisions.

7.37 Coastal Environment – CE-O5 Climate Change

1019. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, eight original submission points and six (6) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.25
DOC	194.86
EDS	240.109

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Kā Rūnaka	251.272
Forest & Bird	253.149
G & K Taylor	265.224
DTL	282.256
Springbank	312.117

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
PKM Farms Limited	FS287

7.37.1 Submissions

1020. NHC [153.25], DOC [194.86], G & K Taylor [265.224], DTL [282.256] and Springbank [312.117] support CE-O5 and seek that the objective be retained as notified.

1021. EDS [240.109] supports CE-O5 in part but considers it does not give effect to the NZCPS. EDS seeks amendments so that the effects of climate change should be *avoided* or *mitigated* rather than *provided for,* and that the objective should not be limited to climate change effects on coastal natural hazards.

1022. Kā Rūnaka [251.272] seek amendments to CE-O5, considering it does not correctly address climate change obligations under the NZCPS and PORPS. The submitter seeks amendments to wording requiring climate change effects to be *identified and planned for*.

1023. Forest & Bird [253.149] supports the inclusion of a climate change objective but opposes the wording of CE-O5. The submitter seeks amendments to require climate change effects to be managed so avoidable social and economic loss does not occur, natural adjustments to coastal processes and ecosystems can occur and coastal values are protected for future generations.

1024. Further submissions generally support the clearer direction sought by Kā Rūnaka, while FFNZ and Waitaki Property Guardians oppose the broader amendments sought by EDS and Forest & Bird.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1025. The treatment of climate change under CE-O5 should also be read alongside submissions on SD-RRNH-O1, which address the District's ongoing resilience to natural hazards and the effects of climate change. Alliance specifically supported the strategic direction in relation to natural hazards and the potential effects of

climate change, while other submissions sought stronger recognition of the ongoing nature of changing hazard risk.

1026. It should also be read alongside the Natural Hazards provisions, particularly NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5. As recommended earlier in this report, that framework has been strengthened to more expressly incorporate climate change within the assessment and management of natural hazard risk, including through consideration of cumulative, multiple and cascading hazards, vulnerability, resilience and the effects of climate change. ORC's submission on NH-P5 expressly sought inclusion of climate change within the natural hazard risk assessment methodology.

7.37.2 Analysis

1027. I support retaining a specific climate change objective within the Coastal Environment chapter. Climate change is relevant across the District but has particular implications for the coastal environment because it influences both coastal natural hazard risk and the ability of coastal processes, natural defences and ecosystems to adjust over time.

1028. The notified wording requires the effects of climate change to be recognised and provided for. I agree with Kā Rūnaka [251.272], and in part with EDS [240.109] and Forest & Bird [253.149], that this does not clearly express the intended planning outcome. The objective should provide clearer direction that climate change effects are to be identified and planned for, rather than potentially being read simply as effects that are to be accommodated.

1029. This is also more consistent with the approach recommended earlier in this report. SD-RRNH-O1 establishes the strategic direction of improving District resilience through avoiding or mitigating natural hazard risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk. The recommended amendments to NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5 then provide the more detailed risk-based framework, including express consideration of climate change when natural hazard risk is assessed.

1030. CE-O5 should complement, rather than duplicate, that framework. Its particular role is to establish that climate change and its influence on coastal natural hazard risk are anticipated and planned for in the coastal environment.

1031. This approach is consistent with the NZCPS. Objective 5 requires coastal hazard risks to be managed taking account of climate change, including locating new development away from areas prone to risk, considering responses for existing development and protecting or restoring natural defences. Policy 24 requires coastal hazard risk to be assessed over at least 100 years and expressly requires consideration of climate change effects on coastal processes, storm frequency and intensity, sea-level rise and sediment dynamics.

1032. I do not, however, recommend adopting EDS's formulation that the effects of climate change themselves are to be avoided or mitigated. District planning cannot necessarily avoid the occurrence of climate change effects. The relevant planning

function is to identify, anticipate and plan for those effects, including by avoiding or mitigating the resulting natural hazard risk where required. This distinction is consistent with the risk-based approach recommended throughout the Natural Hazards chapter.

1033. I agree with Forest & Bird that climate change also affects natural processes, ecosystems and natural defences. NZCPS Policy 3 specifically requires a precautionary approach that allows natural adjustments of coastal processes, natural defences, ecosystems, habitats and species to occur. However, I do not consider all of the outcomes sought by Forest & Bird need to be incorporated into CE-O5 itself. Those matters are more appropriately addressed through the relevant policies dealing with natural character, biodiversity, natural defences, coastal hazards and adaptation. This also avoids an overly complex objective.

1034. Accordingly, I recommend a relatively focused amendment based substantially on the relief sought by Kā Rūnaka. This strengthens CE-O5 while maintaining a clear hierarchy between the Strategic Direction, the broader Natural Hazards framework, and the more specific management of climate change and coastal hazard risk within the Coastal Environment chapter. In response to submissions;

- I recommend NHC [153.25], DOC [194.86], G & K Taylor [265.224], DTL [282.256] and Springbank [312.117] be accepted in part, insofar as CE-O5 is retained but amended to improve its direction.
- I recommend EDS [240.109] be accepted in part, insofar as the objective is strengthened, but reject the relief insofar as it requires the effects of climate change themselves to be avoided or mitigated through CE-O5.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.272] be accepted.
- I recommend Forest & Bird [253.149] be accepted in part, insofar as CE-O5 is strengthened and the importance of planning for climate change is recognised, with the more detailed outcomes concerning natural adjustment, natural defences, ecosystems and coastal values addressed through the relevant policies.

7.37.3 Recommendations

1035. I recommend CE-O5 be amended as follows:

CE-O5 Climate Change

~~Recognise and provide for~~ The effects of climate change and its influence on the frequency and severity of coastal natural ~~hazards.~~ hazard risks are identified and planned for.

7.37.4 Evaluation

1036. The recommended amendment requires further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the evaluations of SD-RRNH-O1, NH-O1, NH-P2 and NH-P5 earlier in this report.

1037. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain the notified wording; require climate change effects to be avoided or mitigated; adopt the broader suite of environmental and social outcomes sought by Forest & Bird; or clarify that climate change effects and their influence on coastal natural hazard risk are to be identified and planned for.

1038. The recommended amendment is more effective because it establishes a clear outcome of anticipating and planning for changing coastal hazard risk, while complementing rather than duplicating the broader risk-management framework established through the Strategic Direction and Natural Hazards chapter. It is also consistent with the NZCPS direction to take climate change into account when managing coastal hazard risk and to assess coastal hazards over long timeframes.

1039. The amendment has limited additional implementation cost because climate change is already required to be considered through the coastal hazard and natural hazard framework. Its principal benefit is greater clarity and integration between the Strategic Direction, Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions.

1040. The recommended wording also better manages uncertainty than the notified wording by requiring changing conditions to be planned for without prescribing a single response or assuming that climate change effects themselves can always be avoided. More detailed responses, including avoidance, mitigation, adaptation, natural adjustment and natural defences, remain appropriately determined through the relevant policies and rules.

1041. Overall, I consider the amended CE-O5 to be the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.38 Coastal Environment – CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards

1042. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, six original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.30
DOC	194.102
Kā Rūnaka	251.288
G & K Taylor	265.241
DTL	282.273
Springbank	312.135

7.38.1 Submissions

1043. DOC [194.102], G & K Taylor [265.241], DTL [282.273] and Springbank [312.135] support CE-P14 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

1044. NHC [153.30] supports mapping coastal hazards but seeks that CE-P14 be amended to require mapping over at least the next 100 years.

1045. Kā Rūnaka [251.288] seek amendments to CE-P14 to prioritise identifying areas of high risk.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1046. As identified in the General section, submissions also seek clarification of the definitions and terminology applying to coastal natural hazards and the different coastal hazard areas and overlays. In particular, DOC [194.7] seeks a definition of Coastal natural hazard to clarify the relationship between the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions. NHC supports consistent terminology. These matters are relevant to the implementation of CE-P14 but will be addressed together in the Definitions section.

1047. CE-P14 should also be read alongside the recommended amendment to CE-O5, which requires the effects of climate change and their influence on the frequency and severity of coastal natural hazard risks to be identified and planned for, and the earlier recommendations on NH-P1 and NH-P5 concerning use of best available information and consideration of climate change in natural hazard assessment.

7.38.2 Analysis

1048. CE-P14 establishes the spatial information base for the coastal hazard framework by requiring identification and mapping of areas potentially affected by tsunami, coastal inundation and coastal erosion. The notified policy already requires these hazards to be identified and mapped over the next 100 years.

1049. I agree with NHC [153.30] that this should be amended to at least 100 years. This is a small but important distinction and directly reflects NZCPS Policy 24, which requires areas potentially affected by coastal hazards, including tsunami, to be identified and hazard risks assessed over at least 100 years. Policy 24 also requires consideration of sea-level rise, erosion and accretion, inundation, cumulative coastal processes and the effects of climate change, using national guidance and the best available information.

1050. This amendment is also consistent with the NPS-NH 2025, which applies to coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami and requires the potential impacts of climate change to at least 100 years into the future to be considered. Where the NPS-NH and NZCPS conflict, the NZCPS prevails.

1051. I also agree with Kā Rūnaka [251.288] that CE-P14 should expressly prioritise identification of areas at high risk. This directly reflects NZCPS Policy 24, which requires priority to be given to identifying areas at high risk of being affected by coastal hazards.

1052. However, I do not consider this means CE-P14 should only identify or map areas of high risk. There is an important distinction between identifying a hazard area and determining the level of risk associated with subdivision, use or development within it. The mapping identifies areas potentially exposed to coastal hazards; the subsequent policies and rules determine the management response according to the nature and level of risk.

1053. This distinction is important given the submissions seeking clarification of the coastal hazard definitions and overlays. I do not recommend resolving those definitional matters through CE-P14. They should be considered collectively in the Definitions section so the terminology used for coastal erosion, coastal inundation, tsunami and the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays is internally consistent.

1054. I also consider CE-P14 should be read together with the recommended amendment to CE-O5. Mapping over at least 100 years necessarily requires consideration of changing coastal conditions, including the effects of climate change. This is consistent with the broader approach recommended in the Natural Hazards chapter, including the use of best available information under NH-P1 and express consideration of climate change under NH-P5.

1055. I do not consider it necessary to reproduce all of the assessment factors in NZCPS Policy 24 within CE-P14. Doing so would substantially lengthen the policy and duplicate higher-order direction. The key improvements are to expressly require a timeframe of at least 100 years and to give priority to identifying areas at high risk. in response to submission points;

- I recommend DOC [194.102], G & K Taylor [265.241], DTL [282.273] and Springbank [312.135] be accepted in part, insofar as CE-P14 is retained but amended to better reflect higher-order direction.
- I recommend NHC [153.30] be accepted, through clarification that coastal natural hazards are identified and mapped over at least the next 100 years.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.288] be accepted, through an express requirement to give priority to identifying areas at high risk.

7.38.3 Recommendations

1056. I recommend CE-P14 be amended as follows:

CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards

Identify and map areas that may be ~~subject to~~ potentially affected by the following coastal natural hazards, over ~~the next~~ at least 100 years, giving priority to identifying areas at high risk of being affected by:

1.Tsunami Hazard;

2.Coastal Inundation; and

3.Coastal Erosion.

7.38.4 Evaluation

1057. The amendments require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside CE-O5 and the wider coastal and natural hazard framework.

1058. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain the notified wording, amend only the timeframe, or clarify both the timeframe and the function of the policy as identifying areas potentially affected by coastal hazards.

1059. The recommended amendment is more effective because it aligns CE-P14 with NZCPS Policy 24 and more clearly distinguishes hazard identification from subsequent risk assessment. Mapping identifies where coastal hazards may occur over at least 100 years; it does not, by itself, determine the risk associated with individual subdivision, use or development.

1060. The amendment also better accommodates uncertainty and climate change. Coastal erosion and inundation extents and probabilities may change over time as sea level, storm conditions, sediment supply and coastal processes change. Requiring identification over at least 100 years allows those changing hazard characteristics to be incorporated using the best available information without implying certainty about a single future hazard extent or probability.

1061. There is little additional implementation cost because the notified policy already requires 100-year mapping. The benefits are greater consistency with the NZCPS and clearer interpretation of the relationship between mapped hazard areas, exposure and subsequent risk assessment.

1062. Overall, the amendment is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives because it establishes a clear spatial hazard-information base for the risk-based provisions that follow, without conflating mapped hazard exposure with the level of natural hazard risk.

COASTAL HAZARDS ACTIVITIES / DEVELOPMENT

7.39 Coastal Environment – CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development

1063. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 11 original submission points and four (4) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.26
DOC	194.140
EDS	240.110

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
FFNZ	246.228
Kā Rūnaka	251.273
ORC	259.79
G & K Taylor	265.225
DTL	282.257
E Schultz	305.164
WPG 2	306.164
Springbank	312.118

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	FS152

7.39.1 Submissions

1064. NHC [153.26], DOC [194.140], G & K Taylor [265.225], DTL [282.257] and Springbank [312.118] support CE-O6 and seek that the objective be retained as notified.

1065. EDS [240.110] supports CE-O6 in part but considers the objective should not be limited to coastal natural hazards.

1066. FFNZ [246.228], E Schultz [305.164] and WPG 2 [306.164] support the intent of CE-O6 but seek amendments to clarify that the objective applies to new subdivision, use and development, consistent with the title of the provision.

1067. Kā Rūnaka [251.273] seek amendments to CE-O6, considering the objective is too narrowly focused on preventing increased hazard risk and should also direct subdivision, use and development to be located and managed to avoid social, and economic or environmental harm from coastal hazards.

1068. ORC [259.79] opposes CE-O6 because it does not recognise that natural hazard mitigation works regularly occur within the coastal environment. ORC seeks a new objective enabling district or regional authority natural hazard mitigation activities to locate I the coastal environment where there is functional need.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1069. Kā Rūnaka also seeks specific recognition under CE-P12 and CE-P16 of papakāika, marae, Māori land and Native Reserves and mana whenua involvement in managing coastal hazard risk. CE-P12 already provides opportunities for

papakāika, marae and associated development on Māori land. These matters are relevant to the implementation of CE-O6 but are more appropriately addressed through those specific policies rather than by qualifying the general risk outcome in CE-O6.

1070. ORC raises the same natural hazard mitigation issue under CE-O7 and CE-P17. The relief includes works such as opening coastal river mouths during high-flow events. This should be considered together with CE-P17, CE-P18 and the relationship with NH-R5 rather than through CE-O6 alone.

7.39.2 Analysis

1071. CE-O6 establishes the outcome sought for new subdivision, use and development exposed to coastal natural hazards. The notified wording is: "Subdivision, use and development does not increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm from coastal natural hazards"

1072. I agree with FFNZ [246.228], E Schultz [305.164] and WPG 2 [306.164] that the body of the objective should expressly refer to new subdivision, use and development. This resolves an inconsistency between the title and operative wording and maintains the intended distinction between CE-O6 and CE-O7, which addresses existing development.

1073. I also agree in part with Kā Rūnaka [251.273] that the objective should address the location and management of new subdivision, use and development. This better reflects the proactive approach required by the NZCPS. Objective 5 seeks management of coastal hazard risk taking account of climate change, including locating new development away from areas prone to such risks. Policy 25 then provides more detailed direction for subdivision, use and development in areas of coastal hazard risk.

1074. However, I would not frame the objective simply as requiring all social, economic or environmental harm to be avoided. Coastal hazard risk is a function of the likelihood and consequences of a hazard affecting exposed and vulnerable receptors. The appropriate objective is therefore to manage the risk of harm, rather than imply that all effects of coastal hazards themselves can be avoided.

1075. This distinction is also important following CE-P14. The presence of land within a mapped coastal hazard area identifies potential hazard exposure; it does not establish the level of risk associated with a particular subdivision, use or development. CE-O6 provides the outcome for managing the risk arising when new development is proposed in areas potentially affected by those hazards.

1076. I therefore consider that the notified concept of not increasing risk should be retained but strengthened through express reference to locating and managing new subdivision, use and development. This is also consistent with the now-operative ORPS , which directs that on land potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least 100 years, increasing the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from coastal hazards is to be avoided.

1077. I do not recommend accepting EDS [240.110] insofar as it seeks to broaden CE-O6 beyond coastal natural hazards. The broader management of natural hazard risk is already addressed through SD-RRNH-O1 and the Natural Hazards chapter, which this report has recommended strengthening through a risk-based and proportionate framework. CE-O6 has a distinct function within the Coastal Environment chapter and should remain focused on coastal natural hazard risk.

1078. I acknowledge ORC [259.79] that natural hazard mitigation works can have a functional need to occur within the Coastal Environment. This includes flood-management interventions that may occur at the coast and should not automatically be treated as equivalent to hard protection structures responding to coastal erosion or inundation. The ORPS 2021 includes specific direction concerning the functional needs of hazard mitigation measures.

1079. However, I do not recommend inserting the new objective sought by ORC at CE-O6. The issue is not principally an outcome for new subdivision, use and development; it concerns how necessary natural hazard mitigation works are provided for while managing their effects. As identified earlier, flood mitigation works, natural defences and coastal hard protection can have different functions and effects and should not be conflated. I consider that issue is better resolved through CE-P17, CE-P18, the relevant rules and their relationship with NH-R5.

1080. The Kā Rūnaka relief also raises the interaction with papakāika, marae, Māori land and Native Reserves. I do not recommend qualifying CE-O6 itself for those activities. The objective should establish the same overarching outcome concerning coastal hazard risk. The more specific recognition of rakatirataka and the use and development of Māori land can then be addressed through CE-P12, CE-P16 and the relevant higher-order policy direction, rather than establishing a different risk outcome.

1081. Overall, I recommend a focused amendment that clarifies the application to new development and strengthens the connection between location, management and risk, without conflating hazard exposure with risk or prescribing the detailed management response at objective level. In response to submission points;

- I recommend NHC [153.26], DOC [194.140], G & K Taylor [265.225], DTL [282.257] and Springbank [312.118] be accepted in part, insofar as the objective and its underlying risk-management outcome are retained.
- I recommend EDS [240.110] be rejected insofar as it seeks to extend CE-O6 beyond coastal natural hazards.
- I recommend FFNZ [246.228], E Schultz [305.164] and WPG 2 [306.164] be accepted, through clarification that CE-O6 applies to new subdivision, use and development.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.273] be accepted in part, through express recognition that new subdivision, use and development should be located and managed to avoid increasing coastal natural hazard risk, with the specific issues

concerning Māori land, Native Reserves, papakāika and marae addressed through the relevant policies.

- I recommend ORC [259.79] be accepted in part, insofar as the framework should recognise the functional needs of natural hazard mitigation works but reject the relief to insert a separate objective at CE-O6, with this matter addressed through the more specific policies and rules.

7.39.3 Recommendations

1082. I recommend CE-O6 be amended as follows:

CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development

New subdivision, use and development is located and managed so that it does not increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm from coastal natural hazards.

7.39.4 Evaluation

1083. The recommended amendment requires further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the evaluations of SD-RRNH-O1, CE-O5, CE-P14 and the Natural Hazards provisions.

1084. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain CE-O6 as notified; broaden it to address all natural hazards; require avoidance of all social, economic and environmental harm; or clarify its application to new subdivision, use and development and strengthen the connection between location, management and coastal hazard risk.

1085. The recommended amendment is more effective because it clearly distinguishes new from existing development and directs attention to both the location and management of new activities. It retains a risk-based outcome rather than treating presence within a mapped hazard area as establishing a particular level of risk.

1086. The amendment is efficient because it provides clearer direction for the policies and rules without prescribing assessment methodologies or particular responses at objective level. The more detailed consideration of hazard likelihood, exposure, vulnerability, consequences, climate change and appropriate responses remains within the supporting policies and assessment framework.

1087. The costs of the amendment are limited because it largely clarifies the intended application of the notified objective. Its benefits include improved consistency between CE-O6 and CE-O7, clearer alignment with higher-order coastal hazard direction, and reduced potential to conflate mapped hazard exposure with assessed coastal natural hazard risk.

1088. The recommended approach also retains flexibility for the more specific policy framework to recognise functional or operational needs, natural hazard mitigation

works and the particular considerations applying to Māori land and Native Reserves without establishing different overarching risk outcomes.

1089. Overall, the amendment is the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.40 Coastal Environment – CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development

1090. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, eight original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.27
DOC	194.141
EDS	240.111
Kā Rūnaka	251.274
ORC	259.80
G & K Taylor	265.226
DTL	282.258
Springbank	312.119

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	FS152

7.40.1 Submissions

1091. NHC [153.27], DOC [194.141], EDS [240.111], G & K Taylor [265.226], DTL [282.258] and Springbank [312.119] support CE-O7 and seek that the objective be retained as notified.

1092. Kā Rūnaka [251.274] seeks amendments to CE-O7 and considers the drafting is unclear. The submitter seeks amendments so that wording better reflects the NZCPS and pORPS by providing for protection and restoration of natural defences and a range of responses to coastal hazard and climate change risks.

1093. ORC [259.80] opposes CE-O7 because it does not recognise the ongoing need for natural hazard mitigation works within the coastal environment. The submitter seeks a new objective enabling district or regional authority natural hazard

mitigation activities to locate in the coastal environment where there is functional need.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1094. Kā Rūnaka raises related matters under CE-P16 concerning adaptation, relocation and the use and development of Māori land and Native Reserves, including mana whenua leadership in managing coastal natural hazard risk. These matters are relevant to implementing CE-O7 and are addressed more specifically under that policy.

1095. ORC raises the need for natural hazard mitigation works under CE-O6 and CE-P17. Further submissions from NHC and NZTA support recognition of functional need, while also indicating that the appropriate response is not necessarily hard engineering. These matters should be considered alongside the Natural Hazards chapter and the earlier analysis distinguishing natural defences, flood protection works, coastal hard protection structures and other natural hazard mitigation works.

7.40.2 Analysis

1096. I agree with Kā Rūnaka [251.274] that the notified CE-O7 is unnecessarily narrow. It identifies natural defences and relocation as responses to risk but does not clearly articulate the broader outcome sought for existing development and communities exposed to changing coastal natural hazard risk.

1097. Adaptation is already an intended component of the notified Plan framework. The Natural Hazards chapter introduction states that the Plan advocates an adaptive management approach to natural hazards and the effects of climate change, while NH-P5 requires consideration of relocation, recovery and opportunities for adaptive management as part of site-specific risk assessment. More specifically, notified CE-P16 seeks to increase the resilience of exposed communities through an adaptive management approach responsive to changing risk levels and new information, together with managed retreat and relocation where appropriate.

1098. In my view, there is therefore merit in CE-O7 more expressly identifying adaptation to changing coastal natural hazard risk as an objective-level outcome. This would not introduce a new management approach. Rather, it would provide a clearer policy hierarchy between CE-O5, which addresses the effects of climate change; CE-O7, which establishes the outcome sought for existing development and communities; and CE-P16–CE-P18, which provide more detailed direction on the responses available to manage and adapt to coastal natural hazard risk.

1099. I consider this approach preferable to identifying natural defences and relocation as the only responses within CE-O7. Adaptation is broader than any individual response and may involve different measures over time as the characteristics and probability of the hazard, exposure, vulnerability and resulting

risk change. The appropriate response is therefore better determined through the supporting policies, including CE-P16, rather than prescribed by the objective.

1100. This distinction is also important in relation to climate change. As discussed under CE-O5 and CE-P14, climate change may alter the frequency, magnitude or spatial extent of coastal hazards and consequently alter exposure and risk over time. It should not, however, be conflated with the level of risk itself. CE-O7 should therefore provide for adaptation to changing coastal natural hazard risk, including risk influenced by climate change, rather than treating projected climate change effects or location within a mapped overlay as equivalent to a particular level of risk.

1101. I agree in part with ORC [259.80] that natural hazard mitigation works may form part of the range of responses required for existing development. I do not, however, consider that this necessitates a separate enabling objective. As discussed in relation to CE-O6 and the Natural Hazards provisions, natural defences, flood protection and resilience works, coastal hard protection structures and other natural hazard mitigation measures have different functions, effects and policy considerations. Their appropriateness, including any functional or operational need, is better addressed through the relevant policies and rules rather than through a broadly enabling objective.

1102. I therefore recommend amending CE-O7 to establish resilience and adaptation to changing coastal natural hazard risk as the outcome, while leaving the nature and appropriateness of individual adaptation responses to CE-P16–CE-P18 and other applicable provisions. This approach is within the relief sought by Kā Rūnaka [251.274], which expressly seeks recognition of mitigation and adaptation, climate change, natural defences and a range of responses including relocation. In response to submission points;

- I recommend NHC [153.27], DOC [194.141], EDS [240.111], G & K Taylor [265.226], DTL [282.258] and Springbank [312.119] be accepted in part, insofar as the objective and its focus on reducing coastal natural hazard risk to existing development are retained, subject to amendments to more clearly provide for adaptation.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.274] be accepted in part, by expressly recognising resilience and adaptation to changing coastal natural hazard risk, including risk influenced by climate change. This is consistent with the relief sought, which specifically seeks recognition of communities' ability to mitigate and adapt, while retaining the more detailed range of adaptation responses within the supporting policy framework.
- I recommend ORC [259.80] be accepted in part, insofar as natural hazard mitigation works may form part of the range of responses to coastal natural hazard risk. I do not recommend the separate enabling objective sought by ORC. Functional need and the appropriateness of particular mitigation works are more appropriately addressed through CE-P16–CE-P18 and the relevant Natural Hazards provisions and rules.

7.40.3 Recommendations

1103. I recommend CE-O7 be amended as follows:

CE-07 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development

~~*The risk of harm to existing development in coastal natural hazard overlays is reduced through natural defences, and the option to relocate buildings and structures to areas outside coastal natural hazard overlays is available.*~~

Existing development and communities are increasingly resilient to, and adapt to, changing coastal natural hazard risks, including those influenced by climate change, through a range of appropriate risk reduction and adaptation responses.

7.40.4 Evaluation

1104. The recommended amendment requires further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the evaluations of CE-O5 and the related coastal natural hazard provisions.

1105. The reasonably practicable options are to retain CE-O7 as notified, with its focus on natural defences and relocation, or amend it within the scope of Kā Rūnaka [251.274] to establish resilience and adaptation to changing coastal natural hazard risk as the broader objective-level outcome.

1106. The recommended amendment is more effective because it provides a clearer hierarchy with CE-P16, which already provides for adaptive management, changing risk and managed retreat. It also recognises that the appropriate response to existing coastal hazard risk may change over time rather than prescribing natural defences or relocation as the only responses.

1107. The amendment is efficient because it does not introduce a new regulatory process or require a particular adaptation response. Individual responses remain subject to the relevant policies and rules and can be considered having regard to the nature of the hazard, exposure, vulnerability, level of risk and changing information.

1108. The principal benefit is greater clarity and integration between the climate change, natural hazard and coastal adaptation provisions. Additional costs are limited because adaptation and adaptive management are already embedded in the notified policy framework. There remains uncertainty as to how coastal hazards and exposure will change over time; an adaptation-focused objective appropriately provides for responses to evolve as information and risk change without predetermining a particular intervention.

1109. Overall, the recommended amendment is considered the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.41 Coastal Environment – CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development

1110. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision

requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, seven (7) original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.31
DOC	194.103
MOED	242.31
Kā Rūnaka	251.289
G & K Taylor	265.242
DTL	282.274
Springbank	312.136

7.41.1 Submissions

1111. DOC [194.103], MOED [242.31] G & K Taylor [265.242], DTL [282.274] and Springbank [312.136] support CE_P15 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

1112. NHC [153.31] supports CE-P15 in part but seeks amendments so the policy avoids new subdivision, use and development that would result in an *intolerable level of risk*. NHC seeks a definition for *intolerable risk*.

1113. Kā Rūnaka [251.289] seek amendments to CE-P15 to better give effect to PORPS risk-management requirements.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1114. Similar issues concerning proportionality and the scope of natural hazard risk assessment arise under NH-P5. Kā Rūnaka [251.138] seeks assessments commensurate with the level of risk, while ORC [259.35] seeks greater alignment with the regional risk assessment methodology, including consideration of cumulative and cascading hazards, climate change, vulnerability and resilience.

1115. The definition and application of the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays and related coastal hazard terminology are addressed in the Definitions section of this report.

7.41.2 Analysis

1116. CE-P15 is the principal policy for managing new subdivision, coastal hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings and structures within the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays. As notified, it adopts an avoidance-first approach but provides a pathway where a site-specific risk assessment demonstrates that the proposal will not result in increased risk of loss of life, serious injury, environmental harm or economic loss.

1117. I consider the overall avoidance-first structure remains appropriate. It is also important to distinguish the management of new subdivision, use and development

under CE-P15 from the adaptation framework for existing development under CE-O7 and CE-P16. New development generally provides greater opportunity to avoid establishing additional exposure to coastal hazards, whereas existing development may require a range of risk reduction and adaptation responses over time.

1118. I agree with NHC [153.31] that the notified test has a limitation. A requirement that a proposal merely does not increase risk does not adequately address circumstances where the existing level of risk is already sufficiently high that new subdivision, use or development should not occur. Whether a proposal increases risk and whether the resulting level of risk is one at which development should be avoided are related but distinct considerations.

1119. Since notification of the PDP, the NPS-NH has established a national risk-based framework applicable to coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami. It requires natural hazard risk to be assessed using the prescribed risk matrix and requires very high natural hazard risk to be avoided. High and medium risk are to be avoided or mitigated proportionate to the level of risk. The NPS-NH also expressly provides that the NZCPS prevails where there is a conflict.

1120. The NZCPS provides additional and particularly relevant direction for CE-P15. Policy 25 applies in areas potentially affected by coastal hazards over at least the next 100 years and directs that increasing the risk of social, environmental and economic harm from coastal hazards is avoided. The associated DOC guidance describes Policy 25 as the overarching policy for managing coastal hazards and hazard risks identified and assessed under Policy 24.

1121. I therefore agree with the underlying concern raised by NHC, but I do not recommend introducing intolerable risk or a separate district-specific risk tolerance methodology. Doing so would introduce another threshold alongside the risk categories and management responses now established through the NPS-NH and the coastal hazard direction in the NZCPS.

1122. Instead, I consider CE-P15 should distinguish between two questions. First, a site-specific assessment should determine the level of coastal natural hazard risk associated with the proposal and whether that risk is at a level at which subdivision, use or development is required to be avoided. Secondly, where development is not required to be avoided on that basis, it must not increase the risk of social, environmental or economic harm from coastal hazards. This latter requirement reflects the specific direction in NZCPS Policy 25.

1123. I also agree with Kā Rūnaka [251.289] that the scale and detail of the site-specific assessment should be commensurate with the anticipated level of risk. This is consistent with the approach recommended under NH-P5 and with the NPS-NH, which requires decision-makers to consider the scale and detail of information necessary having regard to the anticipated level of risk.

1124. This approach also maintains the distinction discussed under CE-P14 between hazard identification and risk assessment. The Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays identify areas potentially affected by coastal hazards; they do not themselves

determine the level of risk. The site-specific assessment considers the relevant hazard characteristics and likelihood together with the potential consequences for the proposed activity.

1125. Climate change is relevant to that assessment insofar as it may alter the frequency, magnitude or spatial extent of the relevant coastal hazard over time. The NPS-NH requires potential climate change impacts to at least 100 years into the future to be considered, while the NZCPS applies its coastal hazard direction to areas potentially affected over at least the next 100 years. This provides an appropriate link with CE-O5 and CE-P14 without treating climate change, hazard exposure and assessed risk as interchangeable concepts.

1126. I do not consider it necessary to reproduce the detailed risk assessment methodology within CE-P15. The Natural Hazards provisions, including the amendments recommended to NH-P5, provide the broader assessment framework. CE-P15 should remain focused on the decision-making outcome for new subdivision, use and development in areas potentially affected by coastal hazards.

1127. I therefore recommend retaining the avoidance-first structure of CE-P15 but amending the site-specific assessment pathway so that it clearly addresses both the assessed level of risk and whether the proposal would increase coastal hazard risk. This provides a clearer and more implementable test than introducing terms such as appropriately managed, acceptable or intolerable risk. In response to submission points;

- I recommend DOC [194.103], MOED [242.31], G & K Taylor [265.242], DTL [282.274] and Springbank [312.136] be accepted in part, insofar as the avoidance-first structure and site-specific risk assessment pathway are retained, subject to amendments to improve alignment with the higher-order risk framework.
- I recommend NHC [153.31] be accepted in part, insofar as the notified no-increase test does not adequately address circumstances where the existing level of risk is already sufficiently high that new subdivision, use or development should be avoided. I recommend rejecting the requested definition of intolerable risk and the introduction of a separate district-specific risk tolerance methodology.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.289] be accepted in part, by clarifying that the scale and level of detail of the site-specific assessment is commensurate with the anticipated level of risk and by better aligning the policy with the applicable risk-based framework.

7.41.3 Recommendations

1128. I recommend CE-P15 be amended as follows:

CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development

Avoid new subdivision, coastal hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings and structures within the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays, unless a site-specific risk

assessment, of a scale and level of detail commensurate with the anticipated level of risk, demonstrates ~~it will not result in an increased risk of loss of life, or serious injuries, environmental harm, or economic loss in the event of a coastal natural hazard occurrence.~~ that;

1. the subdivision, use or development will not be subject to a level of coastal natural hazard risk that is required to be avoided; and

2. the subdivision, use or development will not increase the risk of social, environmental or economic harm from coastal natural hazards.

7.41.4 Evaluation

1129. The recommended amendments require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the evaluations of CE-O6, CE-P14 and the related Natural Hazards provisions.

1130. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain the notified no-increase test, introduce the intolerable risk threshold sought by NHC, adopt a general test requiring risk to be appropriately or proportionately managed, or distinguish between risk that is required to be avoided and the separate requirement to avoid increasing coastal hazard risk.

1131. The recommended approach is more effective because it establishes two clearer decision-making tests. It requires consideration of whether the assessed level of risk is one at which new subdivision, use or development is required to be avoided and, separately, whether the proposal would increase the risk of social, environmental or economic harm from coastal hazards. This better integrates CE-P15 with the applicable national risk framework and the specific coastal hazard direction in the NZCPS.

1132. The approach is efficient because it avoids establishing an additional district-specific risk tolerance methodology and enables the scale and detail of assessment to be commensurate with the anticipated level of risk. This allows more detailed investigation where the potential risk warrants it without imposing the same assessment burden on all proposals within a mapped hazard area.

1133. The principal benefits are clearer and more consistent risk-based decision-making, avoidance of new development where the assessed risk requires that outcome, and retention of the NZCPS direction to avoid increasing coastal hazard risk. There may be additional assessment costs where the potential risk warrants more detailed investigation, but these costs are proportionate to the information required to determine the applicable risk response.

1134. There remains uncertainty regarding future coastal processes and the influence of climate change on the likelihood, magnitude and spatial extent of coastal hazards. The recommended site-specific assessment approach enables that uncertainty to be considered using the best available information without treating mapped hazard extent or future climate change as equivalent to a predetermined level of risk.

1135. Overall, the recommended amendments provide a clearer and more implementable risk-based framework and are considered the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.42 Coastal Environment – CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development

1136. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, six original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.32
DOC	194.104
Kā Rūnaka	251.290
G & K Taylor	265.243
DTL	282.275
Springbank	312.137

7.42.1 Submissions

1137. NHC [153.32] and DOC [194.104] support CE-P16 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

1138. Kā Rūnaka [251.290] seek amendments to CE-P16 to recognise that native reserves and Māori land must be able to be used and developed, with mana whenua and Māori freehold landowners leading approaches to managing coastal and natural hazards.

1139. G & K Taylor [265.243], DTL [282.275] and Springbank [312.137] support CE-P16 but seeks amendments for clarity. Submitters consider adaptive management is undefined and should occur through plan change or review processes, and that managed retreat should be enabled regardless of whether natural or engineered defences are effective.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1140. Kā Rūnaka [251.290] is related to its submissions on CE-P12 concerning papakāika, marae and associated development and its broader relief concerning rakatirataka and Māori land within the Coastal Environment. CE-P12 as notified already provides opportunities for papakāika, marae and associated development on Māori land by mana whenua.

1141. The relocation and removal of existing buildings is also implemented through CE-R3, which provides a permitted pathway for buildings within a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay to be removed or relocated outside an overlay.

7.42.2 Analysis

1142. CE-P16 is the principal policy addressing adaptation and resilience of existing development and communities exposed to coastal natural hazards. As notified, it seeks to increase resilience through adaptive management, managed retreat where natural defences are ineffective, and limitations on additions to existing buildings.

1143. As discussed under CE-O7, I consider adaptation should be more clearly expressed within the coastal hazard framework. CE-P16 is the appropriate policy to provide that substantive direction. This creates a clear hierarchy from CE-O5, which addresses climate change, through the amended CE-O7 adaptation outcome, to CE-P16, which establishes how adaptation of existing development is to be approached.

1144. I agree with G & K Taylor [265.243], DTL [282.275] and Springbank [312.137] that the term adaptive management is potentially unclear in this context. I do not, however, consider that adaptive responses should be limited to plan changes or reviews. A plan change may be necessary where the regulatory framework itself needs to change, but adaptation can also occur through asset management, physical works, relocation, property-level measures and other actions already enabled by the Plan.

1145. The 2024 MfE Coastal hazards and climate change guidance provides a useful distinction. It promotes adaptation pathways planning, under which a range of responses are considered and pathways can change as risk and information change. The approach incorporates monitoring, signals and triggers so that future decisions can be made before an existing response ceases to achieve the relevant objectives. I therefore consider adaptive planning is clearer terminology for CE-P16 than adaptive management.

1146. I also agree with these submitters that managed retreat should not be conditional on demonstrating that natural defences are ineffective. The notified wording establishes an unnecessary hierarchy in which relocation appears available only after natural defences have failed as a response. Existing development may require different combinations or sequences of adaptation measures depending on the particular place, values, hazards and changing risk.

1147. This is consistent with MfE guidance, which identifies a range of adaptation responses including avoidance, protection, accommodation and retreat. These responses can be combined and the appropriate suite can change over time. CE-P17 and CE-P18 appropriately provide more specific direction on natural defences and hard protection structures respectively; CE-P16 should not predetermine which of those responses must precede relocation.

1148. I therefore recommend removing the qualification "when natural defences are not an effective response to risk". This also better aligns the policy with CE-R3, which already permits relocation or removal of an existing building from a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay without requiring natural defences first to have been assessed or implemented.

1149. I agree in part with Kā Rūnaka [251.290] that adaptation planning affecting Māori land and Native Reserves should recognise rakatirataka and the role of mana whenua and Māori landowners in developing responses to coastal natural hazard risk. However, I do not recommend inserting the requested broad direction to enable use and development of Māori land into CE-P16. CE-P16 concerns the resilience and adaptation of existing development, whereas new development is subject to CE-P15 and the applicable coastal hazard rules. A general enabling provision within CE-P16 could create uncertainty about the relationship with that risk framework.

1150. The ability to use and develop Māori land is already recognised through CE-P12, while the role of mana whenua in the Coastal Environment is recognised through CE-P13. I nevertheless consider there is scope within Kā Rūnaka [251.290] to expressly recognise mana whenua and owners of Māori freehold land in developing adaptation responses affecting their land. This recognises the particular relationship with the land without establishing a different life-safety or coastal hazard risk threshold.

1151. Clause 3 should otherwise be retained. It provides an important distinction between adaptation of existing development and intensification of exposure through additional development. Minor additions can continue where they do not establish a new coastal hazard sensitive activity, while more substantive development remains subject to the wider coastal hazard framework.

1152. Overall, I recommend CE-P16 be reframed around adaptive planning and a range of adaptation responses, rather than treating natural defences followed by managed retreat as a prescribed sequence. In response to submission points;

- I recommend NHC [153.32] and DOC [194.104] be accepted in part, insofar as the overall resilience and adaptation framework in CE-P16 is retained, subject to amendments to improve clarity and implementation.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.290] be accepted in part, by recognising the role of mana whenua and owners of Māori freehold land in developing adaptation responses affecting Māori land and Native Reserves. I do not recommend inserting a separate enabling pathway for new use and development within CE-P16.
- I recommend G & K Taylor [265.243], DTL [282.275] and Springbank [312.137] be accepted in part, by replacing adaptive management with clearer adaptive-planning terminology and removing the requirement that natural defences must first be ineffective before managed retreat, relocation or removal is encouraged

and enabled. I do not recommend limiting adaptive planning to plan changes or reviews.

7.42.3 Recommendations

1153. I recommend CE-P16 be amended as follows:

CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development

Increase the resilience of exposed communities from coastal natural hazard risks within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays by:

1.applying an adaptive ~~management~~ planning approach, which can be adjusted over time and in response to changing risk levels ~~and tolerances~~ or new information including through monitoring and identification of when different adaptation responses may be required; and

2.encouraging and enabling managed retreat, including the relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures from within coastal natural hazards areas to areas outside Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays, when natural defences are not an effective response to risk; and

3.avoiding additions to existing buildings in Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays unless the increase in building footprint is minor and it does not involve the establishment of a new coastal hazard sensitive activity and;

4. recognising rakatirataka by providing for mana whenua, and owners of Māori freehold land in relation to their land, to participate in developing adaptation responses for existing development on Māori land and Native Reserves.

7.42.4 Evaluation

1154. The recommended amendments require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the evaluations of CE-O5, CE-O7 and the related coastal natural hazard provisions.

1155. The reasonably practicable alternatives are to retain the notified sequential approach, require adaptation to occur through formal plan changes or reviews, or provide a broader adaptive-planning framework within which different responses can be selected and adjusted as coastal natural hazard risk changes.

1156. The recommended amendments are more effective because they clarify that adaptation of existing development is an ongoing planning process rather than a requirement to implement natural defences before considering relocation. They also better integrate CE-P16 with CE-P17 and CE-P18, which provide the specific policy direction for natural defences and hard protection structures, and with CE-R3, which already enables relocation and removal.

1157. The amendments are efficient because they do not establish a new regulatory process or require adaptation decisions to be made solely through plan changes. Instead, they enable different responses to be considered over time while retaining the existing regulatory controls applying to physical development.

1158. Recognising mana whenua and owners of Māori freehold land in developing adaptation responses provides cultural and decision-making benefits for Māori land

and Native Reserves without establishing a different coastal hazard risk threshold or exempting development from the wider coastal hazard framework.

1159. The principal benefit of the amendments is greater flexibility to respond to changing coastal hazard risk and new information without unnecessarily locking communities into a particular response. This is consistent with current national coastal adaptation guidance, which recognises that different adaptation options may be combined and may change over time as risks evolve.

1160. The principal risk of retaining the notified wording is that adaptive management may be unclear and that conditioning relocation on natural defences being ineffective may unnecessarily constrain future adaptation choices. Conversely, an overly detailed adaptation-pathways framework within CE-P16 could exceed what is necessary for a district plan policy and duplicate processes more appropriately undertaken through future adaptation planning.

1161. Overall, the recommended amendments provide clearer direction for adaptation of existing coastal development while maintaining the wider coastal natural hazard risk framework and are considered the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.43 Coastal Environment – CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment

1162. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, six original submission points and two (2) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.28
DOC	194.90
Kā Rūnaka	251.278
G & K Taylor	265.230
DTL	282.262
Springbank	312.124

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246

7.43.1 Submissions

1163. G & K Taylor [265.230], DTL [282.262] and Springbank [312.124] support CE-P2 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

1164. NHC [153.28] seeks amendments to CE-P2 to include a definition of *significant coastal hazard risks* for certainty and consistency.

1165. DOC [194.90] supports CE-P2 but seeks deletion of *significant* from the reference to coastal hazard risks.

1166. Kā Rūnaka [251.278] oppose CE-P2 and seeks amendments to clarify whether policy is intended to identify coastal environment areas and values required by PORPS CE-M2.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1167. The identification of the Coastal Environment is specifically addressed through CE-P1, which requires its inland extent to be identified and mapped in accordance with Policy 1 of the NZCPS.

1168. The identification and management of coastal natural hazards is addressed more specifically through CE-P14–CE-P18. These provisions address hazard identification and mapping, new subdivision and development, adaptation of existing development, natural defences and hard protection structures.

1169. As identified elsewhere in this report, submissions concerning the definitions of Coastal natural hazard, the individual coastal hazard areas and overlays, Coastal margin, Natural defences and Hard protection structure are addressed together in the Definitions section.

7.43.2 Analysis

1170. CE-P2 is an overarching policy recognising matters of national importance within the Coastal Environment. More specific identification and management direction is provided by the subsequent policies, including CE-P1 for identification of the Coastal Environment and CE-P14–P18 for coastal natural hazards.

1171. I agree with DOC that the wider coastal hazard framework should not be interpreted as applying only to significant risks. However, I do not consider this requires deletion of significant from CE-P2, given the overarching role of the policy and the more comprehensive risk-management framework in CE-P14–P18.

1172. I also do not recommend the definition sought by NHC. This would unnecessarily introduce a separate risk threshold and potentially create uncertainty with the risk-based framework addressed elsewhere in this report. A minor drafting amendment to refer to “significant risks from coastal natural hazards” more clearly distinguishes the significance of the risk from the hazard itself.

1173. I agree in part with Kā Rūnaka that the role of CE-P2 could be clearer, but do not consider additional identification requirements are necessary. These functions are already addressed through CE-P1 and the subsequent topic-specific policies. In response to submission points;

- I recommend G & K Taylor [265.230], DTL [282.262] and Springbank [312.124] be accepted in part.

- I recommend NHC [153.28], DOC [194.90] and Kā Rūnaka [251.278] be accepted in part.

7.43.3 Recommendations

1174. I recommend CE-P2 be amended as follows:

CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment

Recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

a.the preservation of the natural character of the Coastal Environment and protection of it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and

b.protection of Natural Features and Landscapes of the Coastal Environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and

c.protection of Significant Natural Areas of the Coastal Environment; and

d.the enduring cultural relationship of Kāi Tahu mana whenua to the Coastal Environment; and

e.management of significant ~~coastal hazard~~ risks ~~from~~ from coastal natural hazards.

7.43.4 Evaluation

1175. The recommended amendment is minor and requires a proportionate further evaluation under s32AA.

1176. Retaining CE-P2 as an overarching policy, with a minor clarification to clause (e), is more effective and efficient than introducing a separate definition or risk threshold. The amendment clarifies that significant relates to the level of risk, while the more detailed identification and management of coastal hazard risk remains addressed through CE-P14–P18.

1177. The amendment has negligible additional cost and improves consistency and interpretation of the policy framework. Overall, it is considered the most appropriate approach for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.44 Coastal Environment – CE-P3 Precautionary approach

1178. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, eight original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.29
NPHS	164.20
DOC	194.91

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
WCL	243.88
Forest & Bird	253.152
G & K Taylor	265.231
DTL	282.263
Springbank	312.125

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246

7.44.1 Submissions

1179. NHC [153.29], NPHS [164.20], DOC [194.91] and Springbank [312.125] support CE-P3 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

1180. WCL [243.88] opposes CE-P3, considering a precautionary approach is only necessary in relation to climate change effects. WCL seeks amendments to narrow the policy accordingly.

1181. Forest & Bird [253.152] opposes CE-P3 in part and seeks clearer wording about when the precautionary approach applied and what it requires. The submitter considers the policy should require subdivision, use and development to be avoided or modified where effects are uncertain, until sufficient information can inform how to manage these effects.

1182. G & K Taylor [265.231], DTL [282.263] and Springbank [312.125] acknowledge the policy is required by the NZCPS but note a perceived contradiction; if adverse effects are uncertain, unknown or little understood, their significance cannot be reliably assessed.

7.44.2 Analysis

1183. CE-P3 requires a precautionary approach where potential adverse effects are likely to be significant but are uncertain, unknown or little understood, with particular recognition of climate change effects.

1184. I do not agree with WCL [243.88] that the policy should be restricted to climate change. Uncertainty within the Coastal Environment can arise in relation to a broader range of effects, and the notified wording appropriately identifies climate change as a particular, rather than exclusive, consideration.

1185. I acknowledge the concern raised by Forest & Bird [253.152] regarding implementation, but do not consider its proposed prescriptive requirement to avoid or modify activities until sufficient information is available is necessary. The appropriate response to uncertainty will depend on the nature, scale and potential

significance of the effects. The notified wording provides sufficient flexibility for a precautionary response appropriate to the circumstances.

1186. I also acknowledge the drafting concern raised by G & K Taylor, DTL and Springbank. However, the policy does not require the significance of uncertain effects to be established with certainty; rather, it applies where the potential effects are likely to be significant but uncertainty remains about their nature or consequences. I therefore do not consider amendment is required.

7.44.3 Recommendations

1187. I recommend CE-P3 be retained as notified:

CE-P3 Precautionary approach

Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and development within the Coastal Environment, particularly in relation to potential climate change effects, where the potential adverse effects of those activities are likely to be significant but are also uncertain, unknown or little understood.

7.44.4 Evaluation

1188. As no amendment to CE-P3 is recommended, no further evaluation under s32AA is required.

7.45 Coastal Environment – CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay

1189. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, 14 original submission points and six (6) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.36
NZDF	189.35
EDS	240.115
WCL	243.92
FFNZ	246.237
Kā Rūnaka	251.298
Forest & Bird	253.165
ORC	259.84
G & K Taylor	265.252
CRC	271.448
DTL	282.284

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
E Schultz	305.170
WPG 2	306.170
Springbank	312.145

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS253
Geoff and Katrina Taylor	FS265
Federated Farmers of New Zealand	FS246
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306
Otago Regional Council	FS259
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.45.1 Submissions

1190. NHC [153.36] supports CE-R4 and seeks that the rule be retained as notified.

1191. NZDF [189.35] opposes CE-R4 in part, as TMTA may require temporary buildings, structures and earthworks in the coastal environment. The submitter seeks that these activities are provided for as permitted activities in the Coastal Environment chapter or by excluding TMTA from the Coastal Environment chapter.

1192. EDS [240.115] opposes CE-R4 in part and seeks amendments, so the rule does not permit clearance in overlays where other plan rules prevail.

1193. WCL [243.92] opposes CE-R4 and seeks amendments to provide for earthworks associated with road maintenance.

1194. FFNZ [246.237], E Schultz [305.170] and WPG 2 [306.170] support the intent of CE-R4 but seek broader permitted pathways for repair and maintenance of farm building and primary production infrastructure.

1195. Kā Rūnaka [251.298] seek amendments to require silt and sediment control measures near the CMA.

1196. Forest & Bird [253.165] opposes CE-R4 in part, seeking earthworks limits and that the rule applies to the whole coastal environment and that exposed areas be re-vegetated with indigenous vegetation.

1197. ORC [259.84] and CRC [271.448] generally support CE-R4 but seek amendments to better enable natural hazard mitigation works within coastal hazard overlays.

1198. G & K Taylor [265.252], DTL [282.284] and Springbank [312.145] support CE-R4 but seek amendments to enable earthworks for hard protection structures.

7.45.2 Analysis

1199. CE-R4 provides a targeted permitted pathway for earthworks within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays where associated with council works to protect or restore natural defences, activities otherwise permitted under CE-R1–R3 and CE-R5, and repair and maintenance of specified existing assets. Other earthworks require discretionary consent.

1200. I do not recommend the amendments sought by ORC [259.84] and CRC [271.448] to broaden PER-1 to provide for natural hazard mitigation works or specific river-mouth interventions as permitted activities. ORC seeks a general permitted pathway for natural hazard mitigation works, with opening coastal river mouths identified as an example of the type of intervention undertaken. CRC seeks a more specific pathway for opening river mouths or lowering their crests to manage flooding.

1201. While I recognise the operational need for these activities, the relief sought does not include clearly justified parameters to manage the scale, location or effects of the earthworks. Natural hazard mitigation works can vary considerably in their nature and effects, including effects on coastal processes, natural character, ecological values and risk on other sites. I therefore do not consider there is sufficient basis to provide for these activities as permitted under CE-R4. Where they fall outside the existing permitted pathway, discretionary activity status enables their particular effects and functional or operational need to be considered.

1202. I also do not recommend expressly permitting earthworks associated with hard protection structures as sought by G & K Taylor [265.252], DTL [282.284] and Springbank [312.145]. Hard protection structures are separately managed through CE-R8, and associated earthworks should be considered as part of that proposal rather than independently enabled through CE-R4.

1203. I agree in part with FFNZ [246.237], E Schultz [305.170] and WPG 2 [306.170] that PER-3 can more clearly provide for repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established primary-production assets. The existing rule already permits maintenance of farm tracks, yards, irrigation systems, fences and dams/ponds. Any expansion should remain confined to existing lawfully established assets and earthworks necessary for their repair or maintenance.

1204. I do not recommend the specific TMTA exemption sought by NZDF [189.35] or the road-maintenance amendment sought by WCL [243.92]. Broader permitted pathways are not justified without appropriate parameters for earthworks within mapped coastal hazard areas.

1205. I agree with EDS [240.115] that CE-R4 should not override vegetation-clearance controls that apply elsewhere in the Plan. This is a matter of plan integration and does not require duplication of those controls within CE-R4.

1206. I agree in part with Kā Rūnaka [251.298] that sediment effects are relevant, particularly for earthworks near the CMA. However, I do not recommend duplicating the wider earthworks sediment-control framework or requiring advance notification to Council through CE-R4.

1207. I do not support Forest & Bird [253.165] extending CE-R4 across the entire Coastal Environment or requiring indigenous revegetation in all circumstances. CE-R4 has a specific natural hazard function and should remain confined to Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays. The notified requirement to revegetate exposed areas provides appropriate flexibility for the site and existing land use. In response to submission points;

- I recommend NHC [153.36] be accepted in part.
- I recommend FFNZ [246.237], E Schultz [305.170] and WPG 2 [306.170] be accepted in part.
- I recommend EDS [240.115] and Kā Rūnaka [251.298] be accepted in part.
- I recommend NZDF [189.35], WCL [243.92], Forest & Bird [253.165], ORC [259.84], G & K Taylor [265.252], CRC [271.448], DTL [282.284] and Springbank [312.145] be rejected.

7.45.3 Recommendations

1208. I recommend CE-R4 be amended as follows:

CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay
All zones
Activity status: Permitted
Where:
PER-1
The earthworks are undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, and are for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards or
PER-2
The earthworks are associated with any activity permitted under rules CE-R1, CE-R2, CE-R3 and CE-R5; or
PER-3
The earthworks are undertaken for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established:

1.farm tracks, stock tracks and crossings;
2.yards, and other hardstand areas;
3.water supply and irrigation systems;
4.fences;
5.dams/ponds;
6.walking or cycling tracks;
7.driveways and access; or
8.stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; or
9.Farm buildings

where the ~~width and length are the same and the~~ materials used are the same or similar as that which existed prior to the repair and maintenance ~~being required~~ and; where the earthworks are limited to the extent necessary to undertake the repair or maintenance; and
PER-4
Any exposed areas are re-vegetated as soon as practical, but no later than three months after the completion of the earthworks.
Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Discretionary
Where:
DIS-1
Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and/or PER-4

7.45.4 Evaluation

1209. The recommended amendments to PER-3 require a proportionate further evaluation under s32AA.

1210. The amendments provide greater flexibility for repair and maintenance of existing lawfully established primary-production assets while retaining appropriate limits on the scale and purpose of the earthworks.

1211. No amendment is recommended to provide a permitted pathway for broader natural hazard mitigation works, river-mouth interventions or hard protection structures. These activities can vary materially in scale and effects, and the submissions do not provide sufficient parameters to appropriately manage those effects as permitted activities. Retaining discretionary status where the existing permitted standards are not met enables consideration of coastal processes, natural character, environmental effects and natural hazard risk on a site-specific basis.

1212. Overall, the limited amendments are considered more effective and efficient than substantially broadening the permitted activity pathway and are the most appropriate approach for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.46 Coastal Environment – CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay

1213. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, five original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.40
Kā Rūnaka	251.299
G & K Taylor	265.251
DTL	282.283

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
Springbank	312.144

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	FS306

7.46.1 Submissions

1214. G & K Taylor [265.251], DTL [282.283] and Springbank [312.144] support CE-R5 and seek that the rule be retained as notified.

1215. NHC [153.40] supports the permitted activity status but seeks an additional condition requiring that additions or alterations do not create a habitable area.

1216. Kā Rūnaka [251.299] seek amendments to CE-R5, considering the rule does not clearly manage incremental additions to buildings over time and that a different management approach is required for Māori land and Native Reserves.

7.46.2 Analysis

1217. CE-R5 provides a limited permitted pathway for additions and alterations to existing buildings within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays. As notified, an addition may increase the building footprint by no more than 20 m^2 and must not establish an additional coastal hazard sensitive activity on the site. Non-compliance results in non-complying activity status.

1218. I acknowledge NHC [153.40] seeks to further limit the permitted pathway by preventing additions or alterations that constitute a habitable area. I do not consider this additional restriction necessary. The rule already limits the scale of additions through PER-1 and prevents establishment of an additional coastal hazard sensitive activity through PER-2. A blanket restriction on habitable additions would also prevent small alterations to an existing dwelling that do not establish an additional hazard-sensitive activity or materially increase exposure. I therefore recommend retaining the existing approach.

1219. I agree in part with Kā Rūnaka [251.299] that the notified wording does not clearly address incremental additions over time. Without a defined baseline, successive 20 m^2 additions could potentially satisfy PER-1 individually while cumulatively resulting in a materially larger building within a coastal hazard area. I recommend clarifying that the 20m^2 allowance is cumulative from the date the Plan becomes operative. This retains the intended limited pathway for existing development while preventing repeated reliance on the permitted allowance.

1220. I do not, however, recommend a different activity pathway for Māori land or Native Reserves as sought by Kā Rūnaka. As discussed in relation to the Natural Hazards provisions, the underlying coastal natural hazard risk applies irrespective

of land tenure, and I do not consider a less stringent building standard within a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay appropriate. The relationship of mana whenua with Māori land and opportunities for papakāika, marae and associated development are expressly recognised through CE-P12 and CE-P13. Those provisions should inform consideration of proposals requiring consent, rather than establishing a different permitted natural-hazard threshold under CE-R5.

1221. I otherwise agree with G & K Taylor [265.251], DTL [282.283] and Springbank [312.144] that the permitted pathway should be retained. I recommend NHC [153.40] be rejected, and I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.299] be accepted in part, insofar as the rule is amended to address cumulative additions but reject the request for a different management pathway for Māori land and Native Reserves.

7.46.3 Recommendations

1222. I recommend CE-R5 be amended as follows:

> ***CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay***
> *All zones*
> ***Activity status: Permitted***
> *Where:*
> *PER-1*
> *The additions and/or alterations do not increase the building footprint by more than 20m^2 in total from the date this Plan becomes operative; and*
> *PER-2*
> *The additions or alterations do not establish an additional coastal hazard sensitive activity on the site.*
> ***Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying***
> *Where:*
> *NC-1*
> *Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2*

7.46.4 Evaluation

1223. The recommended amendment requires a proportionate further evaluation under s32AA.

1224. Clarifying that the 20m^2 allowance is cumulative is more effective than the notified wording because it prevents successive permitted additions from incrementally increasing development and exposure within a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay. It retains a practical pathway for minor changes to existing buildings while directing more substantial expansion through the resource consent process.

1225. A separate pathway for Māori land and Native Reserves is not recommended, as the same underlying coastal hazard risk should apply while relevant mana whenua and Māori land considerations can be referred to through recourse to the wider Coastal Environment policy framework.

1226. The amendment has minimal additional cost and improves certainty and effectiveness. Overall, it is considered the most appropriate approach for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.47 Coastal Environment – CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natural hazard overlay

1227. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, six original submission points and one (1) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.37
NZDF	189.37
Kā Rūnaka	251.301
G & K Taylor	265.254
DTL	282.286
Springbank	312.147

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS253

7.47.1 Submissions

1228. NHC [153.37] supports CE-R7 and seeks that the rule be retained as notified.

1229. NZDF [189.37] opposes CE-R7 in part because TMTA may require temporary buildings or structures in the coastal environment. NZDF considers it inappropriate to apply the same requirements to temporary activities as permanent buildings and structures and seeks that temporary buildings, structures and earthworks associated with TMTA are permitted or TMTA are excluded from the Coastal Environment chapter.

1230. Kā Rūnaka [251.301] support the overall intent of CE-R7 but seek amendments to provide a different management approach for Māori land and Native Reserves.

1231. G & K Taylor [265.254], DTL [282.286] and Springbank [312.147] support CE-R7 in part but seek amendments to permit hard protection structures and define *suitably qualified person and experienced expert* for the risk assessment required

with applications under the rule. Springbank also seeks amendments to the restricted discretionary matters.

7.47.2 Analysis

1232. CE-R7 manages new buildings and structures within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays through a restricted discretionary pathway where the building or structure is not used for a coastal hazard sensitive activity and, where it is a building, is relocatable. Where these requirements are not met, the activity is non-complying. Applications under CE-R7 must also include a risk assessment addressing CE-P15.

1233. I agree with NHC [153.37] that the overall rule framework is appropriate and should be retained. It provides a consent pathway for new buildings and structures of lower vulnerability while ensuring that coastal hazard sensitive activities and buildings that cannot be relocated are subject to a more stringent activity status. The matters of discretion enable consideration of hazard risk and mitigation, infrastructure and access, emergency response, future removal or relocation, social, cultural and economic benefits, and public access.

1234. NZDF [189.37] seeks a permitted pathway for temporary buildings and structures associated with temporary military training activities (TMTA), or alternatively exclusion of TMTA from the Coastal Environment chapter. I acknowledge that the temporary nature of a building or structure may reduce the duration of exposure to coastal hazards. However, consistent with my recommendations on the preceding Coastal Environment provisions, I do not consider that this provides sufficient justification for a specific TMTA exemption. Temporary buildings and structures may still be exposed to coastal natural hazards and may have effects relevant to the Coastal Environment provisions. The nature and duration of a particular proposal can appropriately be taken into account through the applicable consent pathway.

1235. I also note that some facilities used by NZDF may independently fall within the Plan's applicable infrastructure provisions, depending on the nature and function of the particular facility. However, a building or structure does not constitute infrastructure simply because it is associated with TMTA or is used by NZDF. Where a particular facility meets the relevant definition of infrastructure, the applicable infrastructure provisions and pathways can be relied upon on that basis. I therefore do not consider the potential for some NZDF facilities to constitute infrastructure justifies a general exemption from CE-R7 for TMTA.

1236. Kā Rūnaka [251.301] supports the overall intent of CE-R7 but seeks a different management approach for Māori land and Native Reserves. Consistent with my recommendations on the preceding Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions, I do not recommend a separate or less stringent natural hazard pathway based on land tenure. New buildings within a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay are subject to the same underlying coastal hazard irrespective of land tenure. The Coastal Environment framework already recognises opportunities for papakāika,

marae and associated development on Māori land through CE-P12 and provides for mana whenua involvement through CE-P13.

1237. These matters can appropriately inform consideration of proposals through the existing consent pathway. In particular, CE-R7 expressly provides for consideration of the positive social, cultural and economic benefits associated with a new building or structure. I therefore do not consider a separate CE-R7 activity pathway for Māori land or Native Reserves is necessary or appropriate.

1238. G & K Taylor [265.254], DTL [282.286] and Springbank [312.147] seek amendments to include hard protection structures within CE-R7. I do not support this relief. Hard protection structures perform a different function and have different potential effects from buildings and structures and are specifically addressed through CE-R8. CE-R8 provides a discretionary pathway for hard protection structures protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure and otherwise applies a non-complying activity status. Including hard protection structures within CE-R7 would therefore undermine the separate policy and rule framework established for coastal protection works.

1239. These submitters also seek clarification of the requirement for the risk assessment to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced expert. Consistent with my conclusions on the equivalent terminology in the Natural Hazards chapter, I do not consider a separate definition is necessary. The expertise required will depend on the particular coastal hazard, site and nature of the assessment, and prescribing a single qualification or professional discipline could unnecessarily constrain the range of appropriately qualified experts.

1240. Springbank also seeks amendments to the matters of discretion. I consider the notified matters are sufficiently comprehensive and appropriately focused on the effects relevant to new buildings and structures within a coastal hazard area. I therefore recommend no amendment to these matters.

1241. Overall, I consider the notified CE-R7 framework provides an appropriate risk-based pathway for new buildings and structures within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays. I recommend that it be retained without amendment. I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.301] be rejected insofar as a different management pathway for Māori land and Native Reserves is sought.

7.47.3 Recommendations

1242. I recommend CE-R7 be retained as notified.

> ***CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natural hazard overlay***
> *All zones*
> *Activity status: Restricted Discretionary*
> *Where:*
> *RDIS-1*
> *The building or structure is not used for a coastal hazard sensitive activity; and*

RDIS-2
The building is a relocatable building.
Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.the potential for the new building or structure to increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm arising out of coastal natural hazards; and
2.the proposed risk reduction and hazard mitigation measures; and
3.the impacts on infrastructure, including access and services; and
4.access for emergency services; and
5.the extent to which the proposal increases the burden on civil defence agencies and emergency services; and
6.any requirement to remove buildings, structures or associated services from the site where the site is affected by natural hazards, including the registration of such requirements through legal instruments, such as covenants; and
7.the positive social, cultural and economic benefits associated with the new building or structure; and
8.any effects on public access.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved:
Non-Complying
Where: *NC-1*
Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1 and/or RDIS-2
Note: Section 88 information Requirements for Applications:
Pursuant to s88 of the RMA, any application for activities made under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a risk assessment, provided by a suitably qualified and experienced expert, addressing the matters set out in CE-P15.

7.47.4 Evaluation

1243. No further s32AA evaluation is required, because no amendment is recommended.

7.48 Coastal Environment – CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay

1244. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, seven original submission points and no further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.39
Kā Rūnaka	251.305
Forest & Bird	253.170
G & K Taylor	265.258
CRC	271.450

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
DTL	282.290
Springbank	312.151

7.48.1 Submissions

1245. NHC [153.39] and Forest & Bird [253.170] support CE-R11 and seek that the rule be retained as notified.

1246. Kā Rūnaka [251.305] support the overall intent of CE-R11 but seek amendments to provide a different management approach for Māori land and Native Reserves.

1247. G & K Taylor [265.258], DTL [282.290] and Springbank [312.151] support CE-R11 but seek amendments to clarify that the rule only applies to new coastal hazard sensitive activities.

1248. CRC [271.450] generally supports CE-R11 but seeks an exception note clarifying that the rule does not apply to works in the coastal marine area or beds of lake and rivers, as those matters are managed under regional plans.

7.48.2 Analysis

1249. CE-R11 applies a non-complying activity status to coastal hazard sensitive activities within a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay. Unlike CE-R7, which provides a restricted discretionary pathway for buildings and structures that are not used for a coastal hazard sensitive activity, CE-R11 provides the more stringent pathway for the sensitive activities themselves.

1250. I agree with NHC [153.39] and Forest & Bird [253.170] that a non-complying activity status is appropriate for new coastal hazard sensitive activities within these overlays. Such activities are, by definition, particularly sensitive to coastal hazard effects, and the rule implements the avoidance-first approach established through CE-P15.

1251. G & K Taylor [265.258], DTL [282.290] and Springbank [312.151] seek to clarify that CE-R11 applies to new coastal hazard sensitive activities. The notified rule heading does not presently include this qualification, although CE-P15 expressly addresses new subdivision, coastal hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings and structures. I agree that adding “New” improves the relationship between the policy and rule and makes clear that CE-R11 is directed at the establishment of a coastal hazard sensitive activity rather than simply the continued existence of an established activity. I therefore recommend this amendment.

1252. Kā Rūnaka [251.305] supports the overall intent of CE-R11 but seeks a different management approach for Māori land and Native Reserves. I acknowledge the importance of enabling papakāika, marae and associated development on Māori land, which is expressly recognised through CE-P12, together with the broader recognition of mana whenua through CE-P13.

1253. However, consistent with my conclusions on the preceding Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions, I do not recommend a separate activity pathway under CE-R11 for Māori land, Native Reserves, papakāika or marae. Where an activity falls within the definition of a coastal hazard sensitive activity, the potential consequences of locating that activity within an identified coastal hazard area remain relevant irrespective of land tenure. The appropriate approach is to recognise the particular cultural, social and land-use context through the wider policy framework rather than applying a lower natural hazard standard. I therefore recommend that Kā Rūnaka [251.305] be rejected insofar as a different CE-R11 activity pathway is sought.

1254. CRC [271.450] seeks an exception note stating that CE-R11 does not apply to works in the coastal marine area or beds of lakes and rivers because these matters are managed under regional plans. I do not consider this amendment necessary to CE-R11. The rule regulates the establishment of a coastal hazard sensitive activity, rather than works in the beds of lakes and rivers or the coastal marine area generally. The requested note could therefore create uncertainty by suggesting a broader exclusion from the District Plan than is necessary. Jurisdictional and cross-boundary matters are better addressed consistently at the chapter or plan-wide level rather than through an exception attached specifically to CE-R11.

1255. Overall, I consider the notified non-complying activity status should be retained, with the limited amendment sought by G & K Taylor, DTL and Springbank to clarify that CE-R11 applies to new coastal hazard sensitive activities. In response to submission points;

- I recommend NHC [153.39] and Forest & Bird [253.170] be accepted in part.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.305] be rejected insofar as a different management pathway for Māori land and Native Reserves is sought.
- I recommend G & K Taylor [265.258], DTL [282.290] and Springbank [312.151] be accepted.
- I recommend CRC [271.450] be rejected.

7.48.3 Recommendations

1256. I recommend CE-R11 be amended as follows:

CE-R11 <u>New c</u>oastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay

All zones

Activity status: Non-Complying

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

7.48.4 Evaluation

1257. The recommended amendment to CE-R11 requires further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation.

1258. Adding "New" clarifies that CE-R11 regulates the establishment of new coastal hazard sensitive activities within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays and improves alignment between the rule and CE-P15. It does not change the non-complying activity status or reduce the level of protection applying to new sensitive activities.

1259. The amendment provides greater certainty for plan users and avoids potential confusion regarding established activities, with no material additional environmental, economic, social or cultural costs. Retaining a consistent non-complying pathway across land tenures maintains the effectiveness of the coastal natural hazard framework while the wider Coastal Environment provisions provide for the relationship of mana whenua with Māori land and the Coastal Environment.

1260. Overall, the amendment is considered a more effective and efficient way of achieving the relevant Coastal Environment objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

COASTAL HAZARD DEFENCES

7.49 Coastal Environment – CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards

1261. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, eight original submission points and three (3) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.33
DOC	194.105
WCL	243.90
Kā Rūnaka	251.291
ORC	259.81
G & K Taylor	265.244
DTL	282.276
Springbank	312.138

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number

Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS253

7.49.1 Submissions

1262. NHC [153.33], DOC [194.105] and WCL [243.90] support CE-P17 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

1263. Kā Rūnaka [251.291] seek amendments to CE-P17, considering the policy generally reflects PORPS but should reflect PORPS HAZ-NH-P7.

1264. ORC [259.81] opposes CE-P17 and seek an additional clause enabling natural hazard mitigation works in the coastal environment where there is a functional need.

1265. G & K Taylor [265.244], DTL [282.276 and Springbank [312.138] support CE-P17 in part but seek amendments to recognise that natural defences are preferred where they exist, and enable landowners and other agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection structures and associated earthworks, where natural defences are unavailable or urgent works are required.

7.49.2 Analysis

1266. CE-P17 recognises natural defences as the preferred method for reducing harm from coastal natural hazards and enables earthworks undertaken by district or regional councils for the protection or restoration of those natural defences, subject to rehabilitation of exposed areas.

1267. I agree with NHC [153.33], DOC [194.105] and WCL [243.90] that the fundamental direction of CE-P17 is appropriate. The NZCPS promotes alternatives to hard protection structures, including natural defences, and directs provision, where appropriate, for the protection, restoration or enhancement of natural defences. Natural defences include features such as beaches, dunes, wetlands, estuaries and coastal vegetation and can provide hazard-reduction benefits alongside natural character, ecological and public-access benefits.

1268. Kā Rūnaka [251.291] seeks closer alignment with the higher-order natural hazard framework, including reducing reliance on hard protection structures. I agree with the underlying intent. In my view, however, CE-P17 should remain focused on natural defences, while the circumstances in which hard protection structures may be appropriate are addressed separately through CE-P18. This maintains a clear policy hierarchy rather than combining fundamentally different hazard-management responses within one policy.

1269. I consider a minor amendment to clause 1 would nevertheless improve that hierarchy. Describing natural defences simply as the “preferred method” could imply that they will always be an available or sufficient response. The NZCPS

direction is more nuanced: it promotes alternatives to hard protection structures and provides for protection, restoration or enhancement of natural defences where appropriate, while recognising that hard protection may sometimes be the only practical means of protecting nationally or regionally important infrastructure. I therefore recommend recognising natural defences as the preferred approach where practicable and effective.

1270. ORC [259.81] seeks a further clause enabling natural hazard mitigation works where they have a functional need to occur in the Coastal Environment. ORC identifies activities such as engineering interventions to open coastal river mouths during high-flow events. NHC supports the principle of enabling mitigation activities where infrastructure or activities have a functional need to be in an area at risk, while Forest & Bird considers functional need alone is insufficient and notes that "natural hazard mitigation works" is undefined.

1271. I agree with ORC that natural defences are not the only form of natural hazard mitigation that may legitimately occur within the Coastal Environment. However, I do not recommend inserting the broad enabling clause sought. "Natural hazard mitigation works" could encompass a wide range of interventions with materially different effects, and functional need alone would not address their effects on natural coastal processes, natural character, ecological values, public access or adjoining land. In addition, hard protection structures are expressly addressed through CE-P18, while earthworks for protecting or restoring natural defences are provided for through CE-R4.

1272. This does not mean that other mitigation works are necessarily precluded. Rather, their appropriateness should be determined through the provisions applicable to the particular type of work. This distinction is important because natural protection, coastal hard protection and other natural hazard mitigation works are not interchangeable concepts and should not be combined into a single broadly enabling policy.

1273. G & K Taylor [265.244], DTL [282.276] and Springbank [312.138] similarly seek broader provision for landowners and agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection and associated earthworks. Their submissions recognise that natural defences may not always be available and refer to circumstances where urgent works may be required.

1274. I agree in part with the proposition that natural defences will not always provide a practicable or effective response. This is appropriately reflected through the proposed qualification to clause 1. I do not, however, support using CE-P17 to generally enable hard protection structures or associated earthworks. The NZCPS discourages hard protection structures and promotes alternatives, while recognising the particular circumstances in which hard protection may be appropriate. Those circumstances are more appropriately addressed through CE-P18.

1275. Overall, I recommend retaining the distinct roles of CE-P17 and CE-P18: CE-P17 establishes the preference for natural defences and their protection and

restoration, while CE-P18 determines when hard protection structures may be appropriate. The limited amendment to CE-P17 clarifies that this preference applies where natural defences are practicable and effective, without implying that they are the only available coastal hazard response.

7.49.3 Recommendations

1276. I recommend the following amendments to CE-P17:

CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards

1.Recognise that natural defences are the preferred ~~method~~ approach, where practicable and effective, to reduce harm from coastal natural hazards; and

2.enable earthworks undertaken by district or regional councils, for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards while ensuring that any exposed areas are appropriately rehabilitated.

7.49.4 Evaluation

1277. The recommended amendment to CE-P17 requires further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the evaluation of the related coastal natural hazard provisions.

1278. The amendment retains the preference for natural defences while clarifying that their use depends on whether they are practicable and effective in managing the identified coastal hazard risk. This provides clearer direction and avoids implying that natural defences will necessarily provide an adequate response in every location or circumstance.

1279. The amendment is effective and efficient because it retains the environmental and resilience benefits associated with natural defences while maintaining the distinct policy pathway in CE-P18 for circumstances where hard protection structures may need to be considered. It does not create a broadly enabling pathway for undefined natural hazard mitigation works and therefore avoids potential adverse effects associated with such works being enabled solely on the basis of functional need.

1280. The amendment has limited additional costs and improves certainty for plan users. Overall, it is considered a more appropriate way of achieving the relevant Coastal Environment objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.50 Coastal Environment – CE-P18 Hard protection structures

1281. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, nine

original submission points and two (2) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.34
DOC	194.106
KiwiRail	233.78
Kā Rūnaka	251.292
Forest & Bird	253.159
ORC	259.82
G & K Taylor	265.246
DTL	282.278
Springbank	312.139

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	FS253
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	FS153

7.50.1 Submissions

1282. DOC [194.106] and KiwiRail [233.78] support CE-P18 and seek that the policy be retained as notified.

1283. NHC [153.34] supports CE-P18 in part but seeks definitions for *immediate and serious harm* and an *acceptable level of coastal hazard risk* for certainty and consistency.

1284. Kā Rūnaka [251.292] seek amendments to CE-P18, considering the policy generally reflects PORPS but should reflect PORPS HAZ-NH-P7.

1285. Forest & Bird [253.159] oppose CE-P18 in part and seek amendments requiring hard protection structures to be designed, constructed and maintained to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on coastal values.

1286. ORC [259.82] opposes CE-P18 and seeks additional policy direction enabling natural hazard mitigation works in the coastal environment where there is a functional need.

1287. G & K Taylor [265.246], DTL [282.278] and Springbank [312.139] support CE-P18 in part but seek amendments to *enable*, rather than *avoid*, hard protection structures.

Related submissions addressed elsewhere in this report

1288. Kā Rūnaka [251.274] seeks amendments to CE-O7 so that Waitaki communities are prepared for and able to mitigate and adapt to coastal natural hazard risks, including the effects of climate change, through protecting and restoring natural defences and developing a range of responses to changing coastal hazard risk, including relocation.

1289. Kā Rūnaka [251.290] also seeks amendments to CE-P16 concerning the management of coastal natural hazard risk and resilience, including enabling mana whenua and Māori landowners to lead approaches to managing coastal natural hazard risks on Māori land and Native Reserves.

7.50.2 Analysis

1290. CE-P18 provides the policy pathway for hard protection structures within the Coastal Environment. It takes an avoidance-first approach but identifies circumstances in which hard protection may be appropriate, including where necessary to address an immediate risk of serious harm or where it is the only practical means of protecting regionally significant infrastructure. It also requires consideration of natural defences, alternative measures, effects on Coastal Environment values and the use of public land for private protection.

1291. As discussed in relation to CE-O7, CE-P16 and CE-P17, I consider that coastal hazard management should be understood within a broader adaptation framework. CE-O7 establishes the resilience and adaptation outcome, CE-P16 provides for adaptation planning and a range of responses over time, and CE-P17 establishes the preference for natural defences where these are practicable and effective. CE-P18 then addresses the circumstances in which hard protection may appropriately form part of that response.

1292. This interpretation is also supported by Kā Rūnaka [251.274], which expressly seeks an approach under which communities are prepared for and able to mitigate and adapt to coastal natural hazard risks, including climate change, through protecting and restoring natural defences and developing a range of responses. I consider this provides scope to better integrate CE-P18 with the adaptation framework addressed through CE-O7 and CE-P16, rather than treating protection and adaptation as separate approaches.

1293. In this context, hard protection may be one component of an adaptation response. Depending on the circumstances, protection may be combined with other measures or provide an interim or transitional response before a different response becomes necessary as hazard characteristics and risk change over time. I do not consider, however, that recognising this role requires hard protection to be generally enabled. The appropriateness of protection remains dependent on the circumstances identified in CE-P18 and its effects on coastal processes, natural defences and other Coastal Environment values.

1294. DOC [194.106] and KiwiRail [233.78] support the notified policy. I agree that its overall structure should be retained, including the specific recognition that hard

protection may be appropriate where it is the only practical means of protecting regionally significant infrastructure.

1295. NHC [153.34] seeks definitions of immediate and serious harm and an acceptable level of coastal hazard risk. This raises the same issue considered earlier in my assessment of the Natural Hazards provisions concerning references to an "acceptable level" of risk. For the reasons set out in that earlier analysis, I do not recommend introducing a separate district-wide risk tolerance metric or definition.

1296. I do, however, agree that the reference to an "acceptable level" in clause 4 is unnecessarily uncertain. Consistent with the approach recommended elsewhere in the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions, I recommend replacing this with clearer direction requiring consideration of whether alternative measures can adequately manage the identified risk. I do not consider that immediate risk of serious harm requires a separate definition. In CE-P18 it identifies the exceptional circumstances in which hard protection may be considered and can be assessed having regard to the particular hazard, exposure, vulnerability and consequences.

1297. Kā Rūnaka [251.292] seeks closer alignment with the relevant PORPS direction. I agree in part. This submission should also be read alongside Kā Rūnaka [251.274], which seeks a broader approach to mitigating and adapting to coastal natural hazard and climate change risks through a range of responses.

1298. As discussed under CE-O7, CE-P16 and CE-P17, I consider the provisions should collectively establish an adaptation framework rather than treating natural defences, hard protection and relocation as isolated responses. Within that framework, hard protection may form part of an adaptation response where the circumstances in CE-P18 are satisfied, including as an interim or transitional response. However, its use should not unnecessarily constrain the ability to transition to other adaptation responses as coastal natural hazard risk changes over time. I therefore recommend a targeted amendment to CE-P18 to expressly recognise this relationship.

1299. Forest & Bird [253.159] seeks amendment to clause 3 so that the effects of the design, construction and maintenance of hard protection structures are addressed, and significant adverse effects are distinguished from other adverse effects. The notified clause is limited to structures being "designed to minimise" effects on social, cultural and environmental values. I agree that this is too narrow. Effects may arise from the design, construction and ongoing maintenance of a structure. I therefore recommend extending clause 3 accordingly and providing clearer direction for significant and other adverse effects.

1300. ORC [259.82] seeks additional direction enabling natural hazard mitigation works where they have a functional need to occur within the Coastal Environment. This issue has been considered above under CE-O7 and CE-P17. For the reasons set out in those sections, I do not recommend adding a broadly enabling pathway for natural hazard mitigation works to CE-P18. Natural hazard mitigation works encompass a wider range of interventions than hard protection structures and may

have materially different effects. Where a proposed response constitutes hard protection, CE-P18 provides the relevant policy pathway; other mitigation responses should be considered under the provisions applying to those activities.

1301. G & K Taylor [265.246], DTL [282.278] and Springbank [312.139] seek to replace "Avoid … unless" with "Enable … where". Their submissions recognise that natural defences will not always provide an available or sufficient response and that hard protection may sometimes be necessary. I agree with that concern to the extent that hard protection may legitimately form part of an adaptation response. However, CE-P18 already provides a pathway for this where its specified circumstances are satisfied.

1302. I therefore do not support replacing the avoidance-first approach with a generally enabling policy. Doing so would reverse the hierarchy established through CE-P17 and CE-P18. The better response is to expressly recognise that hard protection may form part of a longer-term adaptation response while retaining the safeguards applying to its use.

1303. Overall, I consider CE-O7 and CE-P16–CE-P18 should operate as an integrated adaptation framework. CE-O7 establishes the adaptation and resilience outcome; CE-P16 provides for adaptation planning and changing responses over time; CE-P17 prioritises natural defences where practicable and effective; and CE-P18 provides a constrained pathway for hard protection, including where protection forms part of a longer-term adaptation response. This provides for protection as one available adaptation tool without establishing it as the default or necessarily permanent response. In response to submission points;

- I recommend DOC [194.106] and KiwiRail [233.78] be accepted in part.
- I recommend NHC [153.34] be accepted in part.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.292] be accepted in part.
- I recommend Forest & Bird [253.159] be accepted in part.
- I recommend ORC [259.82] be rejected.
- I recommend G & K Taylor [265.246], DTL [282.278] and Springbank [312.139] be rejected insofar as they seek to replace the avoidance-first approach with a generally enabling policy.

7.50.3 Recommendations

1304. I recommend CE-P18 be amended as follows:

CE-P18 Hard protection structures

Avoid hard protection structures unless:

1.they reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to people, property, or infrastructure arising out of coastal natural hazards or if they are the only practical means to protect regionally significant infrastructure; and

2.they would not compromise the function of natural features and systems as natural defences; and

3.they are ~~designed to minimise adverse effects~~ designed, constructed and maintained to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on social, cultural and environmental values of the Coastal Environment; and

4.it is demonstrated that alternative measures would not adequately manage the identified coastal natural hazard risk ~~mitigate the risk to an acceptable level~~; and

4A. where they form part of a longer-term adaptation response, they do not unnecessarily constrain the ability to transition to other adaptation responses as coastal natural hazard risk changes over time; and

5.where they are to protect private land, they are not located on public land, except where they provide a significant public benefit.

7.50.4 Evaluation

1305. The recommended amendments to CE-P18 require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the further evaluations undertaken above for the related Natural Hazards provisions, CE-O7, CE-P16 and CE-P17.

1306. The amendments retain the notified avoidance-first approach and the circumstances in which hard protection structures may be considered, while more clearly integrating hard protection within the broader adaptation framework established by the Coastal Environment provisions.

1307. Expressly recognising that hard protection may form part of a longer-term adaptation response improves the effectiveness of the policy by recognising that protection, natural defences, accommodation, relocation and other responses may need to be combined or sequenced as coastal natural hazard risk changes over time. Requiring hard protection not to unnecessarily constrain transition to other adaptation responses also reduces the potential for a protection response to foreclose future adaptation options.

1308. Replacing the reference to an “acceptable level” with a requirement for alternative measures to adequately manage the identified coastal natural hazard risk improves clarity and consistency with the risk-based approach recommended elsewhere without establishing a separate local risk threshold.

1309. Extending clause 3 to the design, construction and maintenance of hard protection structures more comprehensively addresses the potential effects of these structures over their lifecycle and provides clearer direction regarding significant and other adverse effects on Coastal Environment values.

1310. The alternative of generally enabling hard protection structures would provide greater flexibility for landowners and infrastructure providers but would weaken the avoidance-first hierarchy and the preference for natural defences and other appropriate adaptation responses. Conversely, retaining CE-P18 unchanged would

not as clearly recognise the legitimate role that protection can play within an adaptation pathway or its relationship with CE-O7 and CE-P16.

1311. Overall, the amendments improve the integration of CE-P18 with the wider coastal adaptation framework while retaining appropriate constraints on hard protection. They are considered an effective and efficient means of achieving the relevant Coastal Environment objectives and the most appropriate provisions for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

7.51 Coastal Environment – CE-R8 Hard protection structures

1312. The following table sets out the submission points covered in this section of the report (which may be individually or more broadly discussed). The decision requested in relation to each point is provided in full in **Appendix 2**. Overall, nine original submission points and two (2) further submission points are addressed here.

Submitter Name	Submission Point Number(s)
NHC	153.38
KiwiRail	233.79
Kā Rūnaka	251.302
Forest & Bird	253.167
ORC	259.85
G & K Taylor	265.255
CRC	271.449
DTL	282.287
Springbank	312.148

Further Submitter Name	Further Submission Point Number
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	FS233

7.51.1 Submissions

1313. NHC [153.38], KiwiRail [233.79] and Forest & Bird [253.167] support CE-R8 and seek that the rule be retained as notified.

1314. Kā Rūnaka [251.302] oppose CE-R8, and seek amendments considering it is too broad in allowing hard protection structures for Regionally Significant Infrastructure

1315. ORC [259.85] support CE-R8 in part but seek clarification on how the rule applies to hard protection structures that are Regionally Significant Infrastructure, but which do not protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure.

1316. CRC [271.449] generally supports CE-R8 but seeks clarification that the rule applies to hard protection structures used to protect against coastal processes and seeks amendments to refer to the Coastal Environment rather than all zones.

1317. G & K Taylor [265.255], DTL [282.287] and Springbank [312.148] oppose CE-R8, considering hard protection structures should be enabled and permitted to meet the purpose of the RMA.

7.51.2 Analysis

1318. CE-R8 provides the rule framework for hard protection structures. As notified, hard protection structures are discretionary where they are to protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure and non-complying where that requirement is not met. NHC [153.38], KiwiRail [233.79] and Forest & Bird [253.167] support that framework.

1319. As discussed above in relation to CE-O7, CE-P16, CE-P17 and CE-P18, I consider coastal hazard management should provide for a range of adaptation responses over time. Natural defences are preferred where practicable and effective, while hard protection may be appropriate in more limited circumstances and may, where appropriate, form part of a longer-term adaptation response. CE-R8 should therefore implement that policy hierarchy rather than independently determine when protection is appropriate.

1320. I support retaining a consent requirement for hard protection structures. As discussed under CE-P17 and CE-P18, hard protection can alter coastal processes, affect natural defences, transfer or increase risk elsewhere and create residual risk or reliance on continued protection. Further submissions from NHC similarly identify the potential for hard protection and associated earthworks to increase risk on adjoining sites, create residual risk and result in longer-term reliance on engineered responses. These effects warrant case-by-case assessment and do not support a generally permitted activity pathway.

1321. There is, however, an important inconsistency between CE-P18 and CE-R8. CE-P18 provides for hard protection in two circumstances: where it reduces an immediate risk of serious harm to people, property or infrastructure arising from coastal natural hazards, or where it is the only practical means of protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure. CE-R8 only provides discretionary status for the second of these circumstances. A hard protection structure responding to an immediate and serious risk to people or property would therefore default to non-complying status even though it is expressly contemplated by CE-P18.

1322. I consider CE-R8 should be amended to align the discretionary pathway with the circumstances established by CE-P18. This does not generally enable hard protection. Discretionary activity status still enables the full effects of the proposal, its consistency with CE-P18, alternatives and its role within any longer-term adaptation response to be considered.

1323. This also addresses, in part, Kā Rūnaka [251.302], which considers CE-R8 too broad in allowing hard protection for Regionally Significant Infrastructure and seeks

alignment with the limits sought through its CE-P18 submission. As discussed under CE-P18, I agree that protection of Regionally Significant Infrastructure should not, by itself, establish an unrestricted entitlement to hard protection. The relevant policy test is whether hard protection is the only practical means of protecting that infrastructure, alongside the other requirements of CE-P18. I therefore recommend incorporating that qualification into CE-R8.

1324. The Kā Rūnaka submission should also be read alongside its broader relief on CE-O7 concerning adaptation to coastal hazard and climate-change risks through a range of responses. Consistent with the analysis above, the discretionary pathway does not mean that hard protection becomes the preferred or permanent response. Where protection forms part of a longer-term adaptation response, the amended CE-P18 provides policy direction concerning its relationship with future adaptation options.

1325. ORC [259.85] raises a different but related issue. It seeks clarification regarding hard protection structures that may themselves constitute Regionally Significant Infrastructure, such as groynes associated with river-mouth management, but which are not constructed to protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure. I agree that the notified wording distinguishes between the status of the protection structure itself and what it protects. A structure does not satisfy DIS-1 merely because the structure itself may constitute Regionally Significant Infrastructure; the notified test requires it to be to protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure.

1326. I do not recommend extending CE-R8 on that basis. As discussed under CE-P17 and CE-P18, other natural hazard mitigation works, including river-mouth management, are not necessarily synonymous with hard protection structures and should not be brought within an enabling coastal protection pathway simply because they have a functional need or infrastructure status. Where a structure is a hard protection structure, its pathway should depend on whether it satisfies the circumstances established by CE-P18.

1327. CRC [271.449] seeks clarification that CE-R8 relates to hard protection structures used to protect against coastal processes and that its spatial application is the Coastal Environment rather than “All zones”. The submission material records the requested change from “All zones” to “Coastal environment”. I agree that identifying the spatial application as the Coastal Environment would improve clarity and better reflect the location and purpose of CE-R8. I also agree with the underlying concern that CE-R8 is concerned with coastal hard protection. However, I do not consider additional wording referring to “coastal processes” necessary if the defined term Hard protection structure adequately establishes that scope. The adequacy of that definition is addressed separately in the Definitions section of this report.

1328. G & K Taylor [265.255], DTL [282.287] and Springbank [312.148] seek permitted activity status for hard protection structures. I do not support that relief. As discussed under CE-P17 and CE-P18, recognising protection as a legitimate adaptation response in appropriate circumstances is materially different from

permitting hard protection as of right. The potential effects of hard protection on coastal processes, adjoining land, natural defences and longer-term adaptation options warrant resource consent assessment.

1329. Overall, I consider CE-R8 should continue to provide a discretionary pathway for hard protection in the circumstances contemplated by CE-P18, with non-complying status otherwise. This better integrates the rule with the adaptation hierarchy established through CE-O7 and CE-P16–P18, while retaining appropriate scrutiny of hard protection structures. In response to submission points;

- I recommend NHC [153.38], KiwiRail [233.79] and Forest & Bird [253.167] be accepted in part.
- I recommend Kā Rūnaka [251.302] be accepted in part.
- I recommend ORC [259.85] be accepted in part insofar as clarification of the operation of CE-R8 is sought but reject the relief insofar as it would provide a discretionary pathway merely because a hard protection structure itself constitutes Regionally Significant Infrastructure.
- I recommend CRC [271.449] be accepted in part.
- I recommend G & K Taylor [265.255], DTL [282.287] and Springbank [312.148] be rejected.

7.51.3 Recommendations

1330. I recommend CE-R8 be amended as follows:

CE-R8 Hard protection structures
All zones
Activity status: Discretionary
Where:
DIS-1
The hard protection structure is: ~~to protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure~~.
1. to reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to people, property or infrastructure arising from coastal natural hazards; or
2.the only practical means of protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure
Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying
Where:
NC-1
Compliance is not achieved with DIS-1

7.51.4 Evaluation

1331. The recommended amendments to CE-R8 require further evaluation under s32AA and should be read alongside the original s32 evaluation and the further evaluations undertaken above for CE-O7 and CE-P16–CE-P18.

1332. The principal amendment aligns the discretionary activity pathway with the circumstances in which CE-P18 contemplates hard protection. This removes the current inconsistency whereby protection responding to an immediate risk of

serious harm may be contemplated by the policy but treated as non-complying under the rule.

1333. Retaining discretionary rather than permitted activity status enables the full effects of hard protection to be assessed, including effects on coastal processes and natural defences, risk transferred to other sites, residual risk, alternatives, and consistency with any longer-term adaptation response. Retaining non-complying status outside the circumstances identified in CE-P18 maintains the avoidance-first policy hierarchy.

1334. Requiring hard protection for Regionally Significant Infrastructure to be the only practical means of protection also provides a clearer connection between the rule and CE-P18 and responds to concerns that the notified rule is broader than its supporting policy direction.

1335. Changing the spatial reference from "All zones" to "Coastal Environment" improves plan clarity without materially changing the intended application of a rule located within the Coastal Environment chapter.

1336. Overall, the amendments provide a more coherent relationship between CE-R8 and the adaptation and coastal protection framework established through CE-O7 and CE-P16–CE-P18, while retaining appropriate controls on hard protection. They are considered a more effective and efficient means of achieving the relevant objectives for the purposes of s32(1)(b) and s32AA.

8 Conclusion

1337. Overall, I recommend retaining the fundamental structure and intent of the notified Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions, subject to the targeted amendments identified in this report. The amendments principally improve clarity, internal consistency, implementation of the risk-based framework, and alignment with the higher-order statutory framework that has changed since notification, including the NPS-NH 2025 and the now operative ORPS 2021. The recommendations also provide clearer recognition of climate change, adaptation, infrastructure resilience and the distinction between mapped hazard susceptibility/exposure and site-specific natural hazard risk.

8.1 Definitions & Abbreviations

1338. This section addresses the definitions and terminology relied on throughout the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment provisions, including Annual Exceedance Probability, Coastal hazard sensitive activity, Coastal margin, Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay, Critical facilities, Farm building, Hard protection structure, Natural hazard mitigation works, Natural Hazard Overlay, High Flood Hazard Area and Woodlot, together with requests for new risk-related terminology.

1339. I recommend targeted amendments to improve consistency and certainty, including clearer coastal-hazard terminology and distinctions between natural

defences, mitigation works and hard protection. I do not recommend generic definitions of acceptable level, intolerable risk or appropriately mitigated, as risk is more appropriately assessed through the relevant hazard-specific policy and rule framework.

8.2 Strategic Direction

1340. This section addresses SD-RRNH-O1 – Natural hazards.

1341. I recommend retaining the strategic focus on improving the District's resilience to natural hazards, while expressly recognising climate change, environmental consequences and management proportionate to the level of risk. This provides a clearer strategic foundation for the risk-based Natural Hazards framework without limiting the objective to the NPS-NH concept of significant natural hazard risk.

8.3 Natural Hazard & Coastal Hazard General Matters

1342. This section addresses the overall operation of the Natural Hazards chapter, its relationship with the Coastal Environment chapter, hazard and assessment overlays, chapter cross-references and general submissions affecting more than one provision.

1343. I recommend retaining the overall structure but clarifying that assessment and awareness overlays identify areas where a hazard may be present and further site-specific investigation may be necessary; they do not themselves determine site-specific risk. I also recommend clearer cross-referencing between the Natural Hazards, Coastal Environment, Infrastructure, Energy and SASM provisions.

8.4 Natural Hazards Framework, Risk Based Approach

1344. This section contains NH-O1 – Natural hazard risk, NH-P2 – Risk Based Approach and NH-P5 – Site specific assessment/investigation.

1345. I recommend retaining the notified risk-based framework but refining it to more clearly distinguish hazard from risk and to align with a proportionate approach based on likelihood, consequences, vulnerability and the nature of the activity. The amendments also strengthen consideration of whether development creates or exacerbates risk on other sites and avoid reliance on undefined universal concepts of acceptable risk.

8.4.1 Natural Hazard Areas, Changing Exposure & Climate Change

1346. This section contains NH-P1 – Identification of natural hazard areas and the Planning Maps & Overlays – General assessment.

1347. I recommend retaining the use of mapped hazard and susceptibility information as the starting point for risk management, while more clearly recognising that hazard information will change over time and should be informed by best available information and climate-change effects where relevant. The recommendations

retain site-specific assessment as an important mechanism for resolving the actual nature and level of risk.

8.4.2 Natural Hazard Specific Policy and Rules: Flooding

1348. This section contains NH-P6 – Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, NH-P7 – Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay, NH-R1, NH-R2, NH-R3, NH-R6, NH-R4 – Earthworks, and NH-S1 – Flood assessment certificate.

1349. I recommend retaining the differentiated flood framework but improving its internal consistency and ensuring the rules remain measurable and practicable. The recommendations distinguish between the management of earthworks and buildings or structures, retain clear quantitative controls rather than subjective permitted-activity tests, improve the treatment of off-site flood effects, and clarify the role of site-specific flood assessment and the relevant design event.

8.4.3 Natural Hazard Specific Policy and Rules: Earthquake & Surface Fault

1350. This section contains NH-P9 – Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Subdivision, NH-P10 – Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings, and NH-P11 – Liquefaction Assessment Overlay.

1351. I recommend retaining the use of these overlays as triggers for more detailed investigation, with clearer recognition that they identify susceptibility rather than conclusively establishing site-specific risk. For surface fault rupture, the recommendations retain an avoidance-led approach while allowing mitigation where it is supported by the policy framework. For liquefaction, site-specific assessment remains the appropriate means of determining the nature of the hazard and appropriate response.

8.4.4 Natural Hazard Specific Policy and Rules: Land Instability

1352. This section contains NH-P8 – Moeraki Land Instability Overlay, NH-R11 – High and Very High Risk building activity, NH-R7 – Very Low and Low Risk earthworks, NH-R10 – High and Very High Risk earthworks, NH-R8 – Very Low and Low Risk building activity, and NH-R9 – Moderate Risk earthworks and/or building activity.

1353. I recommend retaining the differentiated Moeraki risk framework, with activity status increasing in stringency as identified risk increases. The recommendations clarify the relationship with the ORPS risk framework and recognise cultural and social considerations through the policy hierarchy, while avoiding separate land-tenure-specific regulatory pathways that could undermine consistent management of the underlying hazard.

8.4.5 Natural Hazard Specific Policy and Rules: Wildfire

1354. This section contains NH-P12 – Wildfire — subdivision and land use and NH-R13 – Wildfire — woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings.

1355. I recommend retaining wildfire as a specifically managed hazard, recognising that it is evolving, spatially complex and not presently managed through a mapped hazard overlay. The recommended amendments improve the relationship between policy and rule, clarify how setbacks are measured and applied, and recognise relevant vegetation characteristics and the relationship with commercial forestry provisions without replacing measurable controls with uncertain subjective tests.

8.4.6 Natural Hazards General / Other Hazards

1356. This section contains NH-P13 – Other natural hazard awareness overlays.

1357. I recommend retaining an awareness-based approach for hazards where detailed risk information or a separate regulatory framework is not available. The policy should require consideration proportionate to the nature of the hazard and activity rather than automatically requiring a full risk assessment in every circumstance.

8.4.7 Natural Hazards Activity / Development Specific Policy & Rules

1358. This section contains NH-P3 – Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, NH-R12 – specified sensitive facilities and infrastructure within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay, NH-P4 – Natural protection features, and NH-R5 – Natural hazard mitigation works in Flood Assessment Overlays.

1359. I recommend clearer recognition of the operational and functional needs of critical facilities and Regionally Significant Infrastructure, while retaining requirements to manage natural hazard risk and maintain resilience as far as practicable. For natural protection and mitigation works, the recommendations distinguish natural systems, engineered mitigation and hard protection, and avoid broadly permitting mitigation works without appropriate parameters or effects assessment.

8.5 Coastal Hazards Areas and Climate Change

1360. This section contains the Coastal Environment – General provisions, CE-O5 – Climate Change, and CE-P14 – Identify coastal natural hazards.

1361. I recommend clearer integration of climate change with both coastal hazard identification and the wider Natural Hazards framework. CE-P14 should continue to identify the geographic extent of coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami over the relevant planning horizon, while maintaining the important distinction between mapped hazard exposure and the subsequent assessment of risk.

8.5.1 Coastal Hazards Activities / Development

1362. This section contains CE-O6 – Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development, CE-O7 – Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development, CE-P15 – new subdivision, use and development, CE-P16 – existing development, CE-P2 – Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment, CE-P3 – Precautionary approach, CE-R4 – Earthworks, CE-R5 – Additions and alterations, CE-R7 – New buildings or structures, and CE-R11 – Coastal hazard sensitive activities.

1363. I recommend retaining a strong distinction between new and existing development. New development should avoid creating or increasing coastal natural hazard risk and be subject to site-specific assessment where required. Existing development requires a broader adaptation framework that allows responses to change over time, including accommodation, modification, relocation and, where appropriate, protection. The recommendations also retain a consistent risk-management approach for Māori land and Native Reserves while recognising their particular cultural, social and land-use context through the policy framework.

8.5.2 coastal hazard defences

1364. This section contains CE-P17 – Natural defences against coastal natural hazards, CE-P18 – Hard protection structures, and CE-R8 – Hard protection structures.

1365. I recommend a clearer hierarchy in which natural defences are preferred where practicable and effective, while hard protection remains a more constrained response. Hard protection may nevertheless form part of a longer-term adaptation pathway, including as an interim or transitional response, provided it does not unnecessarily constrain future adaptation options.

1366. The recommended amendments to CE-P18 and CE-R8 improve alignment between policy and rule, including the circumstances in which hard protection may respond to immediate serious harm or protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure. Discretionary rather than permitted status is retained so that effects on coastal processes, natural defences, adjoining land, residual risk, alternatives and longer-term adaptation can be assessed.

8.6 Overall Recommendation

1367. Taken together, the recommended amendments retain the PDP's underlying risk-based approach while making it clearer, more proportionate and more responsive to changing hazard information, climate change and adaptation. They also improve the relationship between the Natural Hazards and Coastal Environment chapters and between hazard management, infrastructure resilience, natural systems and engineered mitigation.

1368. The complete recommended amendments are shown in Appendix 1, and the recommended decisions on individual submissions and further submissions are set

out in Appendix 2. The report template specifically directs the conclusion to summarise the recommended changes and reasons and, for a report of this scale, to use topic headings to organise that summary.

Appendix 1
Recommended Changes to Provisions

Appendix 2
Recommended Responses to Submissions

Appendix 3
Submissions on Withdrawn Provisions

Appendix 1
Recommended Changes to Provisions

Definitions

Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP)
means the probability that a flood event of a specified magnitude will be equalled or exceeded in any one year. For example, a 0.2% AEP event has a 1 in 500 chance of being equalled or exceeded in any year

Coastal hazard sensitive activity
means the following activities that are sensitive to coastal natural hazards:

1.community facility;
2.educational facility;
3.emergency service facility;
4.hazardous facility;
5.airport;
6.residential activity;
7.retirement village;
8.service stations;
9.visitor accommodation;
10.commercial activity;
11.retail activity;
12.community corrections activity;
13.indoor/outdoor primary production activities that involve water, wastewater and stormwater treatment systems;
14.~~storage of hazardous substances~~ hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities

Coastal margin
means all landward property within 20 metres of mean high-water springs and within the mapped Coastal Environment. Where the 20 metre distance extends beyond the mapped Coastal Environment, that land is not part of the Coastal Margin.

Coastal natural hazard
means a natural hazard arising from coastal processes, including coastal erosion, coastal inundation and tsunami

Critical facilities
means facilities necessary to provide services which, if interrupted, would have a serious effect on the communities within the District or a wider population, and which would require immediate reinstatement. This includes any buildings and structures that support, protect or form part of critical facilities. Critical facilities include:

1.gas storage and distribution facilities
2.petroleum storage and supply facilities
3.public healthcare institutions, including hospitals and medical centres
~~4.fire stations, police stations, ambulance stations, emergency coordination facilities~~ Emergency service facilities, including fire stations, police stations, ambulance stations and emergency coordination facilities.
5.landfills

Farm building
means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:

1.buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and
2.visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with ~~farming~~ primary production activities or a rural farmstay experience.

Hard protection structure
within the coastal environment, has the same meaning as in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010:
means a seawall, rock revetment, groyne, breakwater, stop bank, retaining wall or comparable structure or modification to the seabed, foreshore or coastal land that has the primary purpose or effect of protecting an activity from a coastal hazard, including erosion.
and
outside the coastal environment, means any dam, weir, stop bank, carriageway, groyne, *rip rap*, or reservoir, and any structure or appliance of any kind which is specifically for the purpose of natural hazard mitigation.

Natural hazard mitigation works
means structures and associated ~~engineering works~~ earthworks, engineering works, planting and vegetation clearance undertaken to prevent, reduce or control the effects of natural hazards, and includes soft-engineering and hard-engineering natural hazard mitigation works

Woodlot
means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, the creation of other wood products, ~~a carbon sink,~~ erosion control, pest or wilding tree management purposes, but excludes commercial plantation forestry.

Strategic direction

…

SD-RRNH-O1 – Natural hazards

Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards including the effects of climate change, by avoiding or mitigating natural hazard ~~and where possible, avoid or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigate the~~ risks to people, communities, property, and infrastructure and the environment in a manner proportionate to the level of risk.

…

Natural Hazards

Introduction

The Waitaki district is vulnerable to a wide range of natural hazards. These hazards can affect people, property, infrastructure and the wider environment. More significantly, natural hazards can lead to a loss of human life. Therefore, it is important to recognise these hazards and to manage activities in order to limit the exposure of people, property and the environment to risk.

Flooding:
There are two flooding overlays in the District, the Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay. The Flood Assessment Overlay is split further into two areas — Canterbury and Otago.

The Flood Assessment Overlay includes land identified by the Otago and Canterbury Regional Councils where flood hazard may affect public safety, buildings and the infrastructure that supports communities. Environment Canterbury and Otago Regional Council have reviewed their flood hazard mapping using historic flooding information, up-to-date and accurate topographic information, staff knowledge, site visits, and computer-based flood modelling in a few small areas.

The mapping more accurately defines the major floodplains in the Waitaki District, giving a clearer indication of where flooding is possible. It does not provide any information on how often flooding may happen or how severe it might be. The mapping is intended to identify land where the potential for flooding may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if subdivisions or buildings are proposed. Land within the mapped areas has not necessarily flooded in the past.

The mapping is focused on areas floodable from rivers or major streams and does not include local surface runoff flooding. It is also focused on rivers and streams close to existing development, or where there is potential for future development. There are many rivers and streams in remote areas of the district, which often flow in narrow gorges through steep hill country; these remote streams and upper river catchments are impractical to map and are not under any significant development pressure, so were not included in the mapping.

The Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay covers land on the southern side of the Waitaki River that may be subject to flooding from the Waitaki River and has been developed using a computer hydraulic model to describe and map the flood hazard characteristics associated with the lower Waitaki River floodplain.

Land Instability:
Land instability refers to land, generally steep slopes and cliffs, which have the potential to slip when saturated with water, or during a strong earthquake. Geological characteristics and soil types in the District mean that some areas are ~~at risk of~~ susceptible to land instability. The Moeraki area has an extensive history of land instability and slips.

The chapter includes objectives, policies and rules regulating land use in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay which is supported by detailed research and analysis of the risk to people, property and the environment.

Note that there is no land instability data currently held (at the time of notification) for the Canterbury part of the Waitaki District.

Alluvial Fans:
An Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay has been applied to alluvial fans in the Waitaki district. The alluvial fan information available is limited and the risk is understood to be low, therefore it does not warrant control at an individual development level. Additionally, the alluvial fan mapping has been done at a regional scale which is not sufficiently detailed to support land use planning rules or to trigger resource consenting requirements. The alluvial fans in the Waitaki district are considered lower risk than those that would be found in more mountainous terrain.

Note that there is no alluvial fan data currently held (at the time of notification) for the Canterbury part of the Waitaki district.

Surface Fault Rupture:
Surface fault rupture is a different, and less common, earthquake hazard from earthquake shaking. It is the permanent ripping and warping of the ground surface along a fault as the ground on one side moves sideways and/or up, relative to ground on the other side during an earthquake on that fault. Surface fault rupture will generally only occur when the earthquake on a fault is magnitude 7 or larger. The ripping and buckling of the ground from movement on a fault only affects a narrow area of land a few tens to a few hundreds of metres wide along the fault. If the location of faults is known, development can be avoided or managed in those areas to reduce the likelihood of buildings or infrastructure being damaged in future earthquakes on those faults.

Known and suspected active faults in the District have been mapped as part of regional fault mapping programmes. Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlays are included for awareness purposes. There are also objectives, policies and rules for subdivision, critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement villages and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness overlay areas. ~~Deformation associated with faults has not been mapped at a suitable scale to draw fault avoidance zones.~~ The overlays identify areas where potential for surface fault rupture may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if these activities are proposed.

Liquefaction:
Liquefaction is a process whereby soil behaves more like a liquid than a solid during strong earthquake shaking. This can cause heavy things on the soil (like houses) to tilt or sink, things buried under the soil (like tanks) to float upwards, and can cause sediment to be ejected up to the ground surface to form 'sand boils', or in extreme cases, sheets of sand and silt. The Liquefaction Assessment Overlay in the Plan covers areas identified by the Regional Councils where the local geology, soil type and groundwater level indicate that damage from liquefaction is possible and requires further site-specific investigation.

Wildfire:
Wildfire is a fire which mostly occurs in a rural area, where typically there is a build-up of easily combustible vegetation. Wildfires may be caused by natural sources, such as lightning, accidental man-made ignition, such as a cigarette butt, sparking from the use of machinery, or from an out of control rubbish or crop burn-off fire, or it may start as a result of arson. The Plan manages risk from wildfire through applying setbacks for buildings from woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry.

Other natural hazards
The District is also susceptible to additional hazards, such as severe winds, cyclones, droughts, and other naturally occurring hazards. Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) plays a role in hazard management and some risks from events with low probability but high potential impact are better addressed through measures put in place by CDEM. Along with the District and Regional

Councils, CDEM also plays an education role in responding to natural hazards. WDC also has functions under the Building Act 2004 pertaining to management of natural hazards, such as, in respect of buildings in wind zones, building to withstand earthquake shaking and snow loadings, and building on land subject to natural hazards.

Approach to natural hazards in the Plan
The effects of natural hazards vary in terms of both their likelihood and consequence. Some natural hazards may occur relatively frequently and may damage property, whereas other natural hazards occur infrequently, but when they do occur, they pose serious risk to life.

The Plan manages natural hazards through policies and rules attached to different hazards and overlays. The rules vary according to the type of natural hazard, the risk it poses, and the sensitivity of the activity proposed. The overlays and mapped areas are based on the best available information at the time of preparing the Plan. However, inevitably, due to the scale of areas covered by the research and modelling used to produce the maps, there may be variations at the site-specific level.

A flexible risk-based approach has been adopted to address the risk associated with natural hazards. A risk-based approach to natural hazards balances allowing for people and communities to use their property and undertake activities, whilst also limiting the risk of harm to life or significant assets as a result of a natural hazard event. The District Plan also advocates an adaptive management approach to managing natural hazards and the effects of climate change.

Natural hazards are addressed in two chapters; the Natural Hazards Chapter covers non-coastal hazards, and the Coastal Environment Chapter covers coastal hazards such as coastal erosion, inundation and tsunami. Both chapters take the same risk-based approach to natural hazards. To avoid duplication, this chapter provides an overview of the risk-based approach to managing those hazards (both coastal and non-coastal). However, the objectives, policies and rules in the Natural Hazards Chapter do not cover coastal hazards. The objectives, policies and rules in the Coastal Environment Chapter address coastal hazards.

User Notes:
For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one chapter in the District Plan. Plan users are encouraged to check all District-Wide Matters chapters, as well as the relevant zone chapter. Where activities, including natural hazard mitigation works, may affect other values located within the spatial location they are proposed, any provisions specifically related to that plan section also apply.

This chapter includes objectives, policies and rules for land use and development occurring within the natural hazard overlays. Subdivision within the natural hazard overlays is addressed in the Subdivision Chapter.

The Coastal Environment Chapter contains provisions relating to coastal natural hazards. While this chapter address non-coastal hazards which may also be located in a coastal environment.

Additional objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within areas subject to a natural hazard overlay, are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter. While the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter may also be applicable to infrastructure the rules are located infrastructure rules are in the Infrastructure chapter

Please refer to the General Approach chapter for more information on the steps plan users should take to determine what rules apply to an activity and to determine the consent status of an activity.

Objectives

NH-O1 Natural hazard risk

The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate change, and their impact on people, property and the environment ~~is~~ are recognised and understood, and avoided or appropriately mitigated in a manner proportionate to the level of risk.

Policies

NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas

~~As information becomes available,~~ Using the best available information, identify and map land that may be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change

NH-P2 Risk based approach

Manage ~~Avoid~~ subdivision, use and development in areas where natural hazards may occur, ~~unless it can be demonstrated that the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and the environment can be mitigated to an acceptable level~~, using a risk-based approach that is proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk, taking into consideration:

1. likelihood of the natural hazard event; and
2. type and characteristics of the natural hazard; and
3. potential consequence of the natural hazard event, including cumulative effects; and
4. effects of climate change; and

4A the type and characteristics of the subdivision, use or development, including its vulnerability to the natural hazard; and

4B. whether the subdivision, use or development, including any mitigation measures, will create or increase natural hazard risk on the site or other sites; and

5. in relation to critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, those matters in NH-P~~4~~3

NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure

Manage the location of ~~Avoid locating~~ critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in areas ~~with identified natural hazard risks~~ subject to natural hazard risk, ~~unless~~ taking into account whether it can be demonstrated that:

1.there are no other feasible or practicable alternatives to locating inside the area; and
2.there are operational needs or functional needs for the location; and
3.the design and function are resilient to natural hazard risk as far as practicable; and
4.the location, design and any associated mitigation measures avoid or mitigate the creation or increase of natural hazard risk on other sites in a manner proportionate to the level of risk.

NH-P4 Natural protection features

Priorities ~~Encourage~~ the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk including by:

1.protecting and maintaining existing natural features, buffers and systems that contribute to reducing natural hazard risk; and

2.using and enhancing natural features, buffers and systems as a natural hazard mitigation response where they are practicable and effective in managing the identified risk.

NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation

A risk assessment, of a scale and level of detail proportionate to the anticipated level of risk, will be required for subdivision, use and development in areas ~~subject to risk from~~ where natural hazards may occur that takes into account all of the following:

1.the type, frequency and scale of the natural hazard and whether the effects will likely be temporary or permanent including cumulative effects and multiple or cascading hazards, where relevant; and
2.the type of activity being undertaken and its vulnerability and resilience to natural hazard events; and
3.the consequence of a natural hazard event in relation to the proposed activity; and
4.the suitability of any proposed new allotment and intended future use; and
5.the potential effects, including positive effects on public health and safety the environment and other property; and
5A. the potential effects, on natural defenses or hazard mitigation systems or infrastructure; and
6.the potential effects, including positive effects on social, cultural and economic well-being; and
7.any exacerbation of an existing natural hazard risk; and
8.any risk reduction or hazard mitigation measures proposed, including relocation and recovery and residual risk; and
8A. the potential effect of climate change
9.any opportunities to take an adaptive management approach to addressing the risk.

NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay

Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdivision, use and development in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay where a site-specific assessment identifies the site as a High Flood Hazard Area, unless it can be demonstrated that the risks can be mitigated so that:

1. it is not likely to result in loss of life or serious injuries in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and
2. there is not likely to be significant damage or loss in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and
3. it is not likely to require new or upgraded hazard mitigation works to mitigate or avoid the natural hazard; and
4. it is not likely to exacerbate the effects of the natural hazard or create or increase flood risk on other sites.

In all other cases, except as provided for in NH-P3, where the site is not in a High Flood Hazard Area, provide for subdivision, use and development where:

1.significant adverse effects on people and property are avoided; and
2. the use or development is not likely to suffer material damage in a flood event; and
3. new buildings have a floor level that will avoid inundation in a 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood event or are otherwise designed to mitigate damage to property from a flood event; and
4. spaces that are designed to store quantities of hazardous substances, hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities will not be inundated.

NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay

Except as provided for in NH-P3, provide for subdivision, use and development in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay where:

1. significant adverse effects on people and property and the environment are avoided; and
2. the use or development is not likely to suffer material damage in a flood event; and
3. new buildings have a floor level that will avoid inundation in accordance with the applicable flood assessment requirements ; and
4. spaces that are designed to store quantities of hazardous substances, hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities will not be inundated.
5. the subdivision, use or development will not create or increase flood risk on other sites

NH-P8 Moeraki Land Instability Overlay

1.In the Very High Risk and High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas, require subdivision, use and development to be informed by a geotechnical assessment, proportionate to the anticipated level of risk, which:

a. assesses the natural hazard risk associated with the proposal; and

b. demonstrates that the natural hazard risk will be avoided or mitigated in accordance with the applicable natural hazard risk management framework; and

~~Avoid subdivision, use and development in the Very High Risk and High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas, unless a geotechnical assessment can demonstrate that the risk can be mitigated to an acceptable level;~~ and

2. manage subdivision, use and development in the Low Risk and Very Low Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay areas where the natural hazard risk is assessed and managed in a manner proportionate to the anticipated level of risk ~~a geotechnical assessment can demonstrate that the risk can be mitigated to an acceptable leve~~l.

3. recognise and provide for Kāi Tahu rakatirataka in managing natural hazard risk affecting native reserves and Māori land, including by enabling mana whenua and owners of Māori land to lead the identification and evaluation of appropriate risk-management responses, and include Kāi Tahu in decision-making where natural hazard risk affects the values of wāhi tūpuna

NH-P9 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Subdivision

1.Require applications for subdivision of sites that are identified within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Subdivision to identify and map a ~~fault avoidance zone~~ the zone of fault deformation at a site-specific scale and identify the required setback from the mapped zone of fault deformation ~~at a site-specific scale~~; and

2.provide for subdivision in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay - Subdivision, where future allotments or building sites cannot be located outside the mapped zone of fault deformation and the required setback ~~any future allotments, buildings and infrastructure can be set back from any fault avoidance zone to mitigate the potential effects of fault rupture to an acceptable level~~; and

3.avoid subdivision where future allotments or building sites cannot be located outside the mapped zone of fault deformation and the required setback except where infrastructure has a functional or operational need to cross the mapped zone of fault deformation and the risk from fault rupture is appropriately managed ~~in instances where future allotments, buildings and infrastructure cannot set back from any fault avoidance zone.~~

NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings

Require applications for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement villages and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings to identify the mapped zone of fault deformation and required setback at a site-specific scale and demonstrate that any potential effects of fault rupture are avoided, where avoidance is not practicable because of a functional or operational need ~~or~~ mitigated as far as practicable.

NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay

Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay where it can be demonstrated that the potential risk of liquefaction is avoided or mitigated in a manner proportionate to the level of risk ~~mitigated to an acceptable level~~.

NH-P12 Wildfire — subdivision and land use

Ensure that subdivision and land use in areas where there is actual or potential risk to people and property from wildfire achieve appropriate setbacks and ~~mitigate the risk to an acceptable level~~ avoid or mitigate wildfire risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk and the wildfire risk to existing buildings from the establishment of new woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry is minimised.

NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays

Require ~~Encourage proposals for~~ subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to consider the natural hazard risk identified by the overlay and, reflective of the likelihood of the hazard, the proposed activity and the anticipated level of risk, undertake a natural hazard risk assessment and avoid or mitigate the identified risk in a manner proportionate to the level of risk, including avoiding or mitigating the creation or increase of natural hazard risk on other sites ~~undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk to an acceptable level.~~

Rules

NH — FLOODING

Note: the requirement to identify High Flood Hazard Areas currently only applies to the Canterbury region of the Waitaki district.

PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay
All zones
Activity status: Permitted

Where:
PER-1
The building or structure is:
1.a below ground swimming pool; or
2.a deck; or
3.an unenclosed building without a floor; or
4.a post and wire or post and rail or other open or permeable rural fence including farm-style gates; or
5.a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed or pervious floor;
6.a pole associated with irrigation or stockwater infrastructure.

PER-2
The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building and does not increase the building footprint; or

PER-3
Any building is not greater than 10m^2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m^2 over a 10-year period.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary
Where:
RDIS-1
Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3
Matters of discretion are restricted to:
1.mitigation of flooding effects; and
2.floor levels; and
3.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and
4.risk to people, property and the environment during a flood event; and
5.flooding effects/displacement of flood waters on and/or off site including the extent to which the activity, including any mitigation measures, creates or increases flood risk on other sites; and
6.effects of any proposed mitigation; and
7.the intended use of the building or structure; and
8.any storage of hazardous substances.
9.effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on natural hazard mitigation measures.
Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified.
Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:
Pursuant to section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The building or structure is:

1.a below ground swimming pool; or

2.a deck; or

3.an unenclosed building without a floor; or

4.a post and wire, or post and rail or other open or permeable rural fence, farm-style gate or stockyard ~~fence~~; or

5.a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed or pervious floor

6. Pole, irrigation or stockwater infrastructure; or

7.a small-scale open-frame solar structure that does not materially impede or divert flood flows.;

or

PER-2

The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint; or

PER-3

1.any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and

2. is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2; and

RDIS-2

Compliance is not achieved with PER-3 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.mitigation of flooding effects; and

2.floor levels; and

3.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and

4.risk to people, property and the environment during a flood event; and

5.flooding effects/displacement of flood waters on and/or off site; and

6.effects of any proposed mitigation; and

7.the intended use of the building or structure; and

8.any storage of hazardous substances.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

Where:

NC-1

Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2

Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.

NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The building or structure is:

1.a below ground swimming pool; or

2.a deck; or

3.an unenclosed building without a floor; or

4.a post and wire or post and rail fence or other open or permeable rural fence or farm-style gate; or

5.a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed or pervious floor;

6.a pole; irrigation or stockwater infrastructure; or

7.a small-scale building or structure of no more than $10m^2$ in gross floor area, provided it does not materially obstruct, divert or displace floodwaters

or

PER-2

The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building and does not increase the building footprint.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.mitigation of flooding effects; and

2.floor levels; and

3.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and

4.risk to people, property and the environment during a flood event; and

~~5.flooding effects/displacement of flood waters on and/or off site~~ the extent to which the activity obstructs, diverts or displaces floodwaters, including whether it creates or increases flood risk on other sites; and

6.effects of any proposed mitigation including whether mitigation creates or increases flood risk on other sites; and

7.the intended use of the building or structure; and

8.any storage of hazardous substances, and

9.effects on legally established natural hazard mitigation works

~~**Notification**: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified.~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

NH-R4 Earthworks ~~excluding land disturbance~~ in all Flood Assessment Overlays

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

1.the earthworks do not exceed $10m^3$ per year and $20m^3$ cumulatively in any 10 year period; and

2.the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 200mm above natural ground level; and

3.the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or

PER-2

The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5

Or

The earthworks are for the construction, maintenance or repair of a farm track and the works;

1.do not result in the widening of track footprint;

2.are not located within an overland flow path.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.location, nature and scale of the earthworks; and

2.mitigation of flooding and drainage effects; and

3.effects on land stability, flooding, waterways, ground levels and ~~dispersed effects on and off site.~~

4. The diversion or displacement of floodwaters, including whether the earthworks will create or increase flood risk on other sites, and

5. effects on natural hazard mitigation works.

~~Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified.~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:
Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.

Note: A consent from the regional council may also be required for earthworks within a flood assessment overlay.

NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays — maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrading

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The natural hazard mitigation works are within 25m of the existing alignment or location, vertically and horizontally; and

PER-2

The footprint of the natural hazard mitigation works is not increased by more than 25%; and

PER-3

The activity is undertaken by or on behalf of Canterbury Regional Council, Otago Regional Council or Waitaki District Council.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 and/or PER-3

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.the likely effectiveness of the natural hazard mitigation works and the need for them; and

2.the extent of any adverse social, cultural and environmental effects, including on any sensitive environments; and
3.any potential adverse effects of diverting or blocking overland flow path(s), including upstream and downstream flood risks; and
4. ~~any increased flood risk for people, property, or public spaces~~; whether the works will create or increase flood risk on other sites, including risks to people, property, infrastructure or public spaces; and
5.the extent to which alternative locations and options for the natural hazard mitigation works have been considered and the merits of those including the extent to which natural or nature-based methods can practicably and effectively contribute to the required natural hazard risk-management outcome; and
5A.the nature and scale of structural or engineered works and their effects on natural processes and existing natural protection features; and
6.any positive effects of the proposal on the community.

NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Overlay (except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5)

All zones
Activity status: Permitted
Where:
PER-1
The activity is one of the following:
1.primary production;
2.recreation or leisure activity including sports fields;
3.temporary events;
4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above
5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas

Activity status: Restricted Discretionary
Where:
RDIS-1
Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, and if the activity is located within the Canterbury region of the District, it is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.
Matters of discretion are restricted to:
1.mitigation of flooding effects; and
2.floor levels, including alternative means of complying with any floor level specified in a flood assessment; and
3.methods to manage the activity and people during a flood event; and
4.access, including safe egress from the site/building; and
5.the nature of the activity and the risk and vulnerability to flood events.

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:
Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.
Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying
Where:
NC-1
Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1

Standard — Canterbury Region

NH-S1Flood assessment certificate

Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay;

A flood assessment ~~certificate shall be provided~~ that is valid for three years from the date of issue shall be provided by Canterbury Regional Council, which specifies:

1.whether or not the building or activity is located on land that is within a High Flood Hazard Area; and

2.the minimum finished floor level for any new building or structure that is 300mm above the assessed flood (being the 500-year/200-year ARI flood level).

The flood assessment will be completed with reference to:

1.the most up to date models and maps held by

2.Waitaki District Council or Canterbury Regional Council; and

3.any relevant field information; and

4.any site-specific flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experience professional.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

NH — LAND INSTABILITY PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

NH-R7 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The quantity of earthworks does not exceed:

1.300m^2 in any 12 month period per site in the Settlement Zone; or

2.500m^2 in any 12 month period per site in the General Rural Zone; **and**

PER-2

The volume of earthworks does not exceed 10m^3 per 100m^2; **and**

PER-3

1.the cut batter gradient shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical); and

2.the fill batter gradient shall not exceed 2:1 (horizontal: vertical); and

3.the crest of any cut shall be setback at least 300mm from the boundary; and

4.the toe of any fill shall be setback from the boundary by at least the depth of the fill.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 and/or PER-3

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.potential risk to people, property and the environment; and

2.any mitigation measures proposed; and

3.effects of any mitigation measures; and

4.suitability of any infrastructure to withstand any slope movement.

Notification*: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified.*

RESTRICTED DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES

NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas
All zones
Activity status: Restricted Discretionary
Where:
RDIS-1
An engineering assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced engineer is provided to WDC to confirm that there are no indicators of slope instability.
Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. potential risk to people, property and the environment, including potential risk off-site; and
2. any mitigation measures proposed; and
3. effects of any mitigation measures; and
4. suitability of any infrastructure to withstand slope movement.

~~Note: Where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with any geotechnical conditions of a resource consent that has already been approved within the last two years from 1 March 2025, then this rule can be considered to be complied with.~~
Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying
Where:
NC-1
Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1
Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.

NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — Moderate Risk Area
All zones
Activity status: Restricted Discretionary
Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. potential risk to people, property and the environment, including potential risk off-site; and
2. any mitigation measures proposed; and
3. effects of any mitigation measures; and
4. suitability of any infrastructure to withstand slope movement.

~~Note: Where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with any geotechnical conditions of a resource consent that has already been approved within the last two years from 1 March 2025, then this rule can be considered to be complied with, with respect to proposals for buildings and structures (including additions and alterations).~~

~~Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:
Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by a geotechnical report that demonstrates the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES

NH-R10 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High Risk Areas
Activity status: Discretionary

~~Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by a geotechnical report that demonstrates the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development.
Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

NON-COMPLYING ACTIVITIES

NH-R11 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay — High Risk and Very High-Risk Areas
All zones
Activity status: Non-Complying
~~Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.~~

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by a geotechnical report that demonstrates the appropriateness of the site for the proposed development.
Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

NH — FAULT HAZARD DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES

NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement villages~~ and buildings containing hazardous substances~~ hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings
All zones
Activity status: Discretionary

~~Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.~~

Note: This rule does not apply to natural hazard mitigation works managed under NH-R5.

Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:
Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by an assessment of the surface fault rupture risk (likelihood and potential consequences) posed by the fault, undertaken by a suitably qualified professional, including any recommendations for locating or designing the facility to avoid or mitigate the potential adverse effects of surface fault rupture. The investigation report must also be supplied to Canterbury

Regional Council.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

NH — WILDFIRE PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

NH-R13 ~~Wildfire —~~ woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings – wildfire risk
All zones
Activity status: Permitted
Where:
PER-1
The new woodlot or shelterbelt is no wider than 30m and is setback (as measured from the anticipated outside extent of the mature canopy):

1. 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property; and
2. 30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and
3. 5m from any adjoining lawfully established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building.

PER-2
The plantation forestry is setback (as measured from the anticipated outside extent of the mature canopy):

1. 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property; and
2. 30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and
3. 5m from any adjoining lawfully established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building.

PER-3
1.The residential unit or principal building is setback 30m from the anticipated outside extent of the mature canopy of any woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry.

Note: Commercial forestry activities may also be subject to the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry) Regulations 2017

Note: Discussion with Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) should be undertaken to determine specific steps to manage fire risk and maintain an effective fire break or setback. For further guidance on ways to improve how a house performs when it is affected by wildfire please also refer to the FENZ publication Wildfire Safer
Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary
Where:
RDIS-1
Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 and/or PER-3
Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1. potential risk to people, property and the environment; and
2. the extent to which any vegetation required for visual screening of a principal building affects the wildfire risk to any residential unit or other principal building; and
3. any mitigation measures proposed; and
4. the nature, arrangement and flammability of vegetation, including the use of lower-flammability species; and
5. where relevant, the operational need for a shelterbelt to support primary production, including protection of stock, soil and property.

Coastal Environment

Introduction

This chapter sets out objectives, policies and rules to manage the coastal environment. Waitaki's coastal environment runs from the Waitaki River in the north, to Pleasant River Estuary in the south and is shown on the Planning Maps. It displays a range of natural features and contains many distinguishing features, such as the Moeraki Boulders, spectacular headlands, including Cape Wanbrow, as well as popular beaches. The Waitaki District's coastline is diverse, alternating between cliffs and beaches. High cliffs with hard bedrock dominate the landscape of Cape Wanbrow, Moeraki Point to Katiki Point, Shag Point, and most of the coast south of the Shag River. Softer cliffs (formed by sedimentary material) occur between the Waitaki River mouth and Ōamaru, as well as along much of the shore between Moeraki and Beach Road, south of Cape Wanbrow.
Most bays are made up of sand, gravel, or mixed-sand-and-gravel beaches.

Natural character

Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment and protecting it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development is a matter of national importance under the Resource Management Act. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (2010) contains policies to achieve the purpose of the Act in relation to the coastal environment of New Zealand.

The natural character of Waitaki's Coastal Environment makes an important contribution to the community's economic well-being, social and cultural identity. The degree of natural character depends on various factors, but it tends to be highest in the least modified areas - these areas have been mapped as the Coastal Protection Overlay. A large proportion of the Waitaki District's Coastal Environment is heavily modified, particularly by moderate to intense agricultural uses.

WDC has identified and mapped the landward extent of the Coastal Environment in accordance with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (2010) and the following areas within it:

1. Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation; and
2. Coastal Protection Overlay.

This chapter includes specific objectives, policies and rules to preserve and, over time, improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment.

Coastal natural hazards

The management of significant risks from natural hazards is a matter of national importance. This chapter aims to protect people and property from the risk of coastal natural hazards (those caused by coastal processes). The Natural Hazards Chapter contains objectives, policies and rules relating to other natural hazards that are not related to coastal processes.

WDC has identified and mapped the following areas within the Coastal Environment:

1. Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlay; and
2. Coastal Erosion Hazard Overlay; and
3. Tsunami Hazard Area (mapped for information purposes only).

Coastal natural hazards are influenced by climate change, which is expected to increase the severity of coastal natural hazards over the next 100 years. The Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlay and Coastal Erosion Hazard Overlay incorporate climate change predictions.

Tsunamis have the capacity to cause catastrophic harm but are infrequent events. The Waitaki District's coastline is mostly used for pastoral farming and other rural uses, but there are some residential settlements (Ōamaru and Kakanui) that are vulnerable to the impact from tsunami hazard risk. Trends to develop residential development along the coastline can increase the community's vulnerability to tsunami hazards.

Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity and Natural Features and Landscapes

This chapter includes provisions to protect Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, use and development. It also includes provisions to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna within the Coastal Environment. These provisions apply in addition to those in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity Chapter and the Natural Features and Landscapes Chapter, which apply at a district wide scale and apply within all zones.

User Notes:
For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one chapter in the District Plan. Plan users are encouraged to check all District-Wide Matters chapters, as well as the relevant zone chapter.

Objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within the Coastal Environment are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter.

Activities within the coastal marine area are also subject to the relevant regional coastal planning framework administered by the relevant regional council.

Natural hazard mitigation works within the Coastal Environment may also be subject to the objectives, policies and rules of the Natural Hazards Chapter. The provisions that apply will depend on the nature and location of the works, including whether the works manage flood or coastal natural hazard risk.

For energy activities, the objectives and policies in the Energy chapter also apply.

Provisions related to the preservation of the natural character of riparian margins are contained in the Natural Character chapter.
For earthworks undertaken in the Coastal Environment (excluding within a coastal natural hazard overlay), please refer to the Earthworks chapter.
For activities not provided for as a permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity, please defer to the underlying zone or any other relevant overlay rules to determine the activity status.

The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to provisions in the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori chapter, Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter and Natural Features and Landscapes chapter, which also apply at a district wide scale and apply within all zones.

Please refer to the General Approach chapter for more information on the steps plan users should take to determine what rules apply to an activity and to determine the consent status of an activity.

Objectives

…

CE-O5 Climate Change

~~Recognise and provide for~~ The effects of climate change and its influence on the frequency and severity of coastal natural ~~hazards.~~ hazard risks are identified and planned for.

CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development

New subdivision, use and development is located and managed so that it does not increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm from coastal natural hazards

CE-07 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development

~~The risk of harm to existing development in coastal natural hazard overlays is reduced through natural defences, and the option to relocate buildings and structures to areas outside coastal natural hazard overlays is available.~~

Existing development and communities are increasingly resilient to, and adapt to, changing coastal natural hazard risks, including those influenced by climate change, through a range of appropriate risk reduction and adaptation responses.

…

Policies

…

CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment

Recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

a.the preservation of the natural character of the Coastal Environment and protection of it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and

b.protection of Natural Features and Landscapes of the Coastal Environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and

c.protection of Significant Natural Areas of the Coastal Environment; and

d.the enduring cultural relationship of Kāi Tahu mana whenua to the Coastal Environment; and

e.management of significant ~~coastal hazard~~ risks ~~-~~ from coastal natural hazards.

CE-P3 Precautionary approach

Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and development within the Coastal Environment, particularly in relation to potential climate change effects, where the potential adverse effects of those activities are likely to be significant but are also uncertain, unknown or little understood.

…

CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards

Identify and map areas that may be ~~subject to~~ potentially affected by the following coastal natural hazards, over ~~the next~~ at least 100 years, giving priority to identifying areas at high risk of being affected by:

1.Tsunami Hazard;
2.Coastal Inundation; and
3.Coastal Erosion.

CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development

Avoid new subdivision, coastal hazard sensitive activities and associated buildings and structures within the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays, unless a site-specific risk assessment, of a scale and level of detail commensurate with the anticipated level of risk, demonstrates ~~it will not result in an increased risk of loss of life, or serious injuries, environmental harm, or economic loss in the event of a coastal natural hazard occurrence.~~ that;

1. the subdivision, use or development will not be subject to a level of coastal natural hazard risk that is required to be avoided; and
2. the subdivision, use or development will not increase the risk of social, environmental or economic harm from coastal natural hazards.

CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development

Increase the resilience of exposed communities from coastal natural hazard risks within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays by:

1.applying an adaptive ~~management~~ planning approach, which can be adjusted over time and in response to changing risk levels ~~and tolerances~~ or new information including through monitoring and identification of when different adaptation responses may be required; and
2.encouraging and enabling managed retreat, including the relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures from within coastal natural hazards areas to areas outside Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays, when natural defences are not an effective response to risk; and
3.avoiding additions to existing buildings in Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays unless the increase in building footprint is minor and it does not involve the establishment of a new coastal hazard sensitive activity and;
4. recognising rakatirataka by providing for mana whenua, and owners of Māori freehold land in relation to their land, to participate in developing adaptation responses for existing development on Māori land and Native Reserves.

CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards

1.Recognise that natural defences are the preferred ~~method~~ approach, where practicable and effective, to reduce harm from coastal natural hazards; and
2.enable earthworks undertaken by district or regional councils, for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards while ensuring that any exposed areas are appropriately rehabilitated.

CE-P18 Hard protection structures

Avoid hard protection structures unless:

1.they reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to people, property, or infrastructure arising out of coastal natural hazards or if they are the only practical means to protect regionally significant infrastructure; and
2.they would not compromise the function of natural features and systems as natural defences; and
3.they are ~~designed to minimise adverse effects~~ designed, constructed and maintained to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on social, cultural and environmental values of the Coastal Environment; and
4.it is demonstrated that alternative measures would not adequately manage the identified coastal

natural hazard risk ~~mitigate the risk to an acceptable level~~; and
4A. where they form part of a longer-term adaptation response, they do not unnecessarily constrain the ability to transition to other adaptation responses as coastal natural hazard risk changes over time; and
5.where they are to protect private land, they are not located on public land, except where they provide a significant public benefit.

…

Rules

PERMITTED ACTIVITIES

…

CE- R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment

All zones
Activity status: Permitted
Where: PER-1
The building or structure is not for hazard protection or public access, unless it is being removed by Otago Regional Council, Waitaki District Council or their agents; and

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Discretionary
PER-2
The site will be rehabilitated and revegetated consistent with the natural character of the coastal environment in which it is located; and
PER-3
The building is removed for one of the following reasons:

- it is located within a coastal natural hazard overlay and is being removed or relocated to be located outside a coastal natural hazard overlay; or
- it is removed for the purpose of restoring or rehabilitating the natural character of the coastal environment or for the avoidance of natural hazards; and

PER-4
All in-ground and above-ground infrastructure and services are removed.
Where: DIS-1
Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and/or PER-4

CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay

All zones
Activity status: Permitted
Where:
PER-1
The earthworks are undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, and are for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards or
PER-2
The earthworks are associated with any activity permitted under rules CE-R1, CE-R2, CE-R3 and CE-R5; or
PER-3

The earthworks are undertaken for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established:

1.farm tracks, stock tracks and crossings;
2.yards, and other hardstand areas;
3.water supply and irrigation systems;
4.fences;
5.dams/ponds;
6.walking or cycling tracks;
7.driveways and access; or
8.stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; or
9.Farm buildings

where the ~~width and length are the same and the~~ materials used are the same or similar as that which existed prior to the repair and maintenance ~~being required~~ and; where the earthworks are limited to the extent necessary to undertake the repair or maintenance; and

PER-4

Any exposed areas are re-vegetated as soon as practical, but no later than three months after the completion of the earthworks.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Discretionary

Where:

DIS-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and/or PER-4

CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay

All zones

Activity status: Permitted

Where:

PER-1

The additions and/or alterations do not increase the building footprint by more than 20m^2 in total from the date this Plan becomes operative; and

PER-2

The additions or alterations do not establish an additional coastal hazard sensitive activity on the site.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

Where:

NC-1

Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2

...

CONTROLLED ACTIVITIES

...

RESTRICTED DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES

CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natural

hazard overlay

All zones

Activity status: Restricted Discretionary

Where:

RDIS-1

The building or structure is not used for a coastal hazard sensitive activity; and

RDIS-2

The building is a relocatable building.

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

1.the potential for the new building or structure to increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm arising out of coastal natural hazards; and

2.the proposed risk reduction and hazard mitigation measures; and

3.the impacts on infrastructure, including access and services; and

4.access for emergency services; and

5.the extent to which the proposal increases the burden on civil defence agencies and emergency services; and

6.any requirement to remove buildings, structures or associated services from the site where the site is affected by natural hazards, including the registration of such requirements through legal instruments, such as covenants; and

7.the positive social, cultural and economic benefits associated with the new building or structure; and

8.any effects on public access.

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

Where: NC-1

Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1 and/or RDIS-2

Note: Section 88 information Requirements for Applications:

Pursuant to s88 of the RMA, any application for activities made under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a risk assessment, provided by a suitably qualified and experienced expert, addressing the matters set out in CE-P15.

DISCRETIONARY ACTIVITIES

CE-R8 Hard protection structures

All zones

Activity status: Discretionary

Where:

DIS-1

The hard protection structure is: ~~to protect Regionally Significant Infrastructure~~.

1. to reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to people, property or infrastructure arising from coastal natural hazards; or

2.the only practical means of protecting Regionally Significant Infrastructure

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying

Where:

NC-1

Compliance is not achieved with DIS-1

NON-COMPLYING ACTIVITIES

…

CE-R11 <u>New c</u>oastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay

All zones

Activity status: Non-Complying

Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable

Appendix 2
Recommended Responses to Submissions

Contents

Definitions & Abbreviations 2
Strategic Direction 6
Natural Hazards 7
Coastal Environment 75
Planning Maps 91

Definitions & Abbreviations

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
194.7	Director-General of Conservation	Definitions	General	Oppose	Notes that the PDP does not provide a definition of 'Coastal natural hazard', meaning that the interrelationship of the Natural Hazard and Coastal Environment provisions is unclear. It would improve clarity and certainty if a definition was provided, and the definition in the proposed Otago RPS would ensure consistency with that document.	Add a definition for 'Coastal natural hazard' as follows (or words to similar effect): "means a subset of natural hazards covering tidal or coastal storm inundation, rising sea level, tsunami or meteorological tsunami inundation, coastal erosion (shorelines or cliffs), rise in groundwater levels from storm tides and sea-level rise (plus associated liquefaction), and salinisation of surface fresh waters and groundwater aquifers"	Accept in part add a narrower definition distinguishing coastal hazards from other natural hazards.
271.1	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) means annual exceedance probability in relation to a	Oppose	Opposes the use of Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) as Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) is more easily understood by a lay person. Most people would understand that a 1 in 500-year flood is a significant event but might not understand an AEP of 0.2%. ARI is also more intuitive with a bigger number relating to a bigger flood. CRC does understand though that ORC uses the AEP term, so would be prepared to accept its use if that is the recommendation in the s42A report.	Replace the AEP Definition as follows: ~~Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) means annual exceedance probability in relation to a flood event and is the probability that a flood event of a certain scale will occur in any year.~~ Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) means the average time between floods of a certain size. For example, a 500 year ARI flood will occur on average once every 500 years, and has a 1 in 500 (0.2%) chance of occurring in any given year. A 500 year ARI event can therefore also be described as a 0.2% Annual Exceedance Probability flood event.	Reject in part retain AEP, but add an explanatory probability example.
271.65	Canterbury Regional Council	Abbreviations	AEP Annual exceedance probability	Oppose	Opposes the use of Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) as Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) is more easily understood by a lay person. Most people would understand that a 1 in 500-year flood is a significant event but might not understand an AEP of 0.2%. ARI is also more intuitive with a bigger number relating to a bigger flood. CRC does understand though that ORC uses the AEP term, so would be prepared to accept its use if that is the recommendation in the s42A report.	Replace the AEP Definition as follows: ~~Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) means annual exceedance probability in relation to a flood event and is the probability that a flood event of a certain scale will occur in any year~~. Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) means the average time between floods of a certain size. For example, a 500 year ARI flood will occur on average once every 500 years, and has a 1 in 500 (0.2%) chance of occurring in any given year. A 500 year ARI event can therefore also be described as a 0.2% Annual Exceedance Probability flood event.	Reject in part retain AEP, but add an explanatory probability example.
242.3	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Definitions	Coastal hazard sensitive activity means the following activities that are sensitive to	Support	Supports the inclusion of 'educational facility' within the definition. Considers that this proposed definition is acceptable and acknowledges that Educational Facilities are sensitive to coastal hazards and the associated risks.	Retain as notified.	Accepted in part
246.12	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Definitions	Coastal hazard sensitive activity means the following activities that are sensitive to	Support	Consider that coastal hazard rules and hazardous-substance provisions are overly broad, capturing minor primary-production infrastructure and even household storage due to unclear definitions such as "indoor/outdoor primary production." They seek amendments so that only genuine hazardous facilities regulated under the PDP's Hazardous Substances chapter are included. [see original submission for complete detail]	Amend of the definition of coastal hazard sensitive activities, as follows OR with wording with similar intent. 13.~~indoor/outdoor~~ intensive primary production activities that involve water, wastewater and stormwater treatment systems(and excluding stock water supply); 14.~~storage of hazardous substances~~ Hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities;	Accepted in part
194.4	Director-General of Conservation	Definitions	Coastal margin means all landward property within 20 metres of the mean high-water sprin	Oppose	Considers that the drafting of the definition is unclear what area is "considered to be outside the Coastal margin" in circumstances where the 20m margin extends beyond the mapped Coastal environment.	Amend as follows, or words to like effect: "…. For the purposes of the Coastal environment, if this line is outside the mapped Coastal environment area, ~~this~~ the area outside the mapped coastal environment is considered to also be outside the coastal margin."	Accept clarify that the Coastal Margin does not extend beyond the mapped Coastal Environment.
153.41	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Definitions	Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay means the area/s mapped and identified as a Coastal Inund	Amend	Seek the definition is expanded to also include the Tsunami Hazard Area Overlay. Tsunami are a low likelihood event but can have severe consequences.	Seek that the following amendment: … means the area/s mapped and identified as a Coastal Inundation Hazard Overlay, Tsunami Hazard Area Overlay and/or Coastal Erosion Hazard Overlay.	Reject
163.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Definitions	Critical facilities means facilities necessary to provide services which, if interrupted	Oppose	Support the inclusion of 'fire stations' and 'emergency coordination facilities' in the definition of critical facilities to the extent that these facilities are necessary to provide services which, if interrupted, would have a serious effect on the communities within the district or a wider population, and which would require immediate reinstatement. Considers that the definition for 'emergency service facility' be adopted to be consistent with defined terms used elsewhere in the PDP.	Seeks an amendment to the definition as follows: 4.Emergency service facilities including ~~fire stations, police stations, ambulance stations,~~ emergency coordination facilities	Accept in part – use Emergency service facilities terminology.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
244.4	Telecommunication Companies	Definitions	Critical facilities means facilities necessary to provide services which, if interrupted	Support	Considers that while telecommunications would ordinarily qualify as a critical facility, it is clear and appropriate that they are not defined as such given the locational constraints in the plan and the direction in Regulation 57 of the NESTF.	Retain as notified.	accept in part as the substance of the definition is retained.
271.7	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	Critical facilities means facilities necessary to provide services which, if interrupted	Support	Supports the Critical facilities Definition in the PDP as together with Regionally significant infrastructure this covers infrastructural prioritisation.	Retain the Definition of 'Critical facilities' as notified.	accept in part as the substance of the definition is retained.
195.3	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Oppose the definition of farm building as buildings used for Intensive Indoor Primary Production (IIPP) are farm buildings, and excluding them from the plan's definition creates unnecessary confusion. Because IIPP sites include many types of structures—some housing animals and others serving storage, infrastructure, or operational needs—flood hazard controls should be based on a building's function and its vulnerability, not on whether it is part of an IIPP. The current approach inconsistently excludes certain buildings on IIPP sites while regulating identical buildings on other farms, so the definition should be revised to ensure hazard management is fair, clear, and risk-based.	Amend the definition to ensure that a building's vulnerability to flood hazards is determined by its function and the activities occurring within it, rather than its association with a specific type of farming.	Reject insofar as IIPP is sought to be included.
246.16	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Support	Support inclusion of a definition for farm building but oppose the exclusion of buildings associated with intensive indoor primary production as part of that definition.	Amend the definition of farm building as follows: means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes: 1. buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, ~~intensive indoor primary production~~ and forestry activities; and 2. visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with farming activities or a rural farmstay experience.	Reject
265.4	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept replacement of farming activities with primary production activities.
266.1	The Egg Producers Federation of New Zealand (EPFNZ) and the Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand (PIANZ)	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Amend	Considers that the current exclusion of farm buildings used for intensive indoor production from the definition of 'farm building' introduces ambiguity about whether primary production is a 'farming' activity. Also considers that these farm buildings are a critical component of farming operations and should be included to reflect actual land use and regulatory consistency.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of farming activities, including buildings for the purposes of intensive indoor primary production ~~and excludes: buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with farming activities or a rural farmstay experience.~~	Reject
267.4	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
269.4	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
271.13	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Support	Generally, supports the 'Farm building' Definition. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Retain Definition of 'Farm building' as notified.	Accept in part
282.4	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
283.4	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
284.4	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
285.4	Barry and Anne Matthews	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
290.4	Philip and Becky Wilson	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept
291.4	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept
292.4	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept
293.4	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept
296.4	Gavin Simpson	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept
297.4	Parkside Holdings Ltd	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	for consistency use 'primary production' activities rather than 'farm'	replace 'farm' with 'primary production' in definition	Accept
298.4	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
299.4	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Opposes in part the definition of Farm building. Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Amend the definition of 'Farm building' as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: 1. buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and 2. visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with farming activities or a rural farmstay experience.'	Accept

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
300.4	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Opposes in part the definition of 'Farm building' and seeks an amendment for consistent language throughout the plan.	Amend the definition of 'Farm building' as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: 1. buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and 2. visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with farming activities or a rural farmstay experience.'	Accept
301.4	Carolyn Thelning	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept
302.4	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept
303.4	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Opposes in part the definition of Farm building. Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Amend the definition of Farm building as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
304.4	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Seeks to amend as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: ...	Accept
305.4	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Support	Support in part and seeks to amend language for consistency with all primary production activities	Seeks to amend definition as follows: 'means a building used for the exercise of~~farming~~primary productionactivities and excludes: 1. buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and 2. visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with farming activities or a rural farmstay experience.'	Accept
306.4	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Support	Support in part and seeks to amend language for consistency with all primary production activities	Seeks to amend definition as follows: 'means a building used for the exercise of~~farming~~primary productionactivities and excludes: 1. buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and 2. visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with farming activities or a rural farmstay experience.'	Accept
312.12	Springbank	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Amend	The submitters opposes the farm building definition in part, seeking amendments to ensure language consistency.	Amendment sought: Farm building definition - should be amended for consistent language across the plan: 'means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes: 1. buildings for the purposes of residential activities, home occupations, intensive indoor primary production and forestry activities; and 2. visitor accommodation and temporary accommodation that is not associated with farming activities or a rural farm stay experience.'	Accept
313.9	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Definitions	Farm building means a building used for the exercise of farming activities and excludes:	Oppose	Opposes in part the definition of Farm building. Considers the term 'primary production activities' should be used consistently in the PDP.	Amend the definition of Farm building as follows: means a building used for the exercise of ~~farming~~ primary production activities and excludes:	Accept

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
						...	
194.11	Director-General of Conservation	Definitions	Hard protection structure within the coastal environment, has the same meaning as in the	Oppose	Seeks consequential amendment to the Definition of 'Hard protection structure' to ensure consistency with the Otago RPS through reference to 'rip rap'.	Amend 'Hard protection structure' as follows or words to similar effect: "...outside the coastal environment, means any dam, weir, stop bank, carriageway, groyne, rip rap or reservoir, and any structure or appliance..."	Accept in part retain NZCPS meaning in the Coastal Environment and add rip rap to the non-coastal definition.
271.16	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	Hard protection structure within the coastal environment, has the same meaning as in the	Support	Generally, supports the Definition of 'Hard protection structure' that has the same meaning as in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Retain the Definition of 'Hard protection structure' in its entirety.	Reject in part retain AEP, but add an explanatory probability example.
271.23	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	High Flood Hazard Area has the same meaning as the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement:	Support	Generally, supports the 'High flood hazard area' Definition as finding commonality with the ECAN RPS use of the term. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Retain the 'High flood hazard area' Definition as notified.	Accept
240.10	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Definitions	Natural defences means defences that rely on natural processes to reduce coastal erosion	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept
271.39	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	Natural hazard mitigation works means structures and associated engineering works to pre	Support	Supports in part the 'Natural hazard mitigation works' Definition however the Definition needs to clearly include all flood and erosion protection works (flood resilience work), including associated river enhancement works, structures, earthworks, planting and vegetation clearance undertaken by councils, or an alternative definition added. Amendments are suggested to capture this. Either the definition needs to clearly apply throughout a full river protection scheme area, or this needs to be achieved through the wording in the rules that this definition is applied (as recommended for NH-R5).	Amend definition as follows: means structures and associated ~~engineering earthworks~~ works, plantings, and vegetation clearance to prevent or control the impacts of natural hazards and includes both soft engineering natural hazard mitigation and hard engineering natural hazard mitigation.	Accept in part
271.40	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	Natural Hazard Overlay means the area/s mapped and identified as an Alluvial Fan Awarene	Support	Generally, supports the 'Natural hazard overlay' Definition as there is recognition that where there is no exacerbation of natural hazard risk to people and property then this provides confidence that existing facilities can operate into the future. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Retain the 'Natural hazard overlay' Definition as notified.	Accept
192.9	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group	Definitions	Woodlot means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, the creation of other wood	Support	Supports in part however the Submitter does not support the inclusion of 'Carbon sink' in the definition of 'Woodlot' on the basis that the term 'Carbon sink' is not defined and serves little purpose in subsequent provisions of the PDP. The definition of 'Woodlot' includes things not commonly understood to be woodlots e.g. a carbon sink. The Submitter considers that the definition of 'Woodlot' may overlap with definitions in the NES-CF and therefore may have unintended consequences. Requests reconsidering the relationship between the various definitions, rules and NES-CF Regulations [which] requires ensuring there is no ambiguity in respect of the provisions (and Regulations) that apply.	Amend the definition of 'Woodlot' as follows: "means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, the creation of other wood products, ~~a carbon sink~~, erosion control, pest, or wilding tree management purposes, but excluding commercial ~~plantation~~ forestry." Reconsider the relationship between the various definitions, rules and NES-CF Regulations [which] requires reconsideration to ensure there is no ambiguity in respect of the provisions (and Regulations) that apply.	Accept in part
271.64	Canterbury Regional Council	Definitions	Woodlot means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, the creation of other wood	Support	Generally, supports the 'Woodlot' Definition	Seeks to retain as notified	Accept in part

Strategic Direction

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
163.9	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Support	Supports the objective given Fire and Emergency additional functions under the Fire and Emergency Act 2017 and the Fire and Emergency Risk Reduction Strategy 2019-2029.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
190.15	Alliance Group Limited	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Support	Alliance supports SD-RRNH-O1 Natural Hazards insofar as it seeks to protect people, communities, and property from natural hazards and the potential effects of climate change.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
232.11	Hampden Community Energy Society	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Support	Considers the objective needs to be amended to reflect that as hazardous events, largely driven by climate change, are becoming more frequent and significant, it must be clear this will be an ongoing process for the foreseeable future.	Seeks that SD-RRNH-O1 'Natural hazards' is amended as follows: SD-RRNH-O1 Responding to Natural hazards Continually strengthen ~~Improve~~ the District's resilience to natural hazards, and where possible, avoid or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigate the risks to people, communities, property, and infrastructure.	Accept in part
243.5	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Support	Considers that gravel extraction has the capacity to improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, including flooding, and should be recognised throughout the Plan.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
251.45	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Amend	Considers the Natural Hazards objective should provide stronger direction for avoiding and managing hazard risks in the district. The submission supports the reference to resilience but suggests including direction around reducing significant risk and addressing climate change.	Seeks to amend as follows: Improve and safeguard the District's resilience to natural hazards and coastal natural hazards, including the effects of climate change, and where possible reduce significant risks ~~avoid or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigate the risks~~ to people, communities, property, the environment, and infrastructure.	Accept in part
256.20	Fish and Game (Otago and Central South Island Fish and Game Councils)	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Amend	he RMA section 31, TA's are required to avoid and mitigate natural hazards including in respect to natural and physical resources of the district where they are influenced by use and development.	Amend to include: ..."mitigate the risks to people, communities, property, and infrastructure and natural resources."	Accept in part
259.16	Otago Regional Council	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Support	Considers the objective appropriate for managing infrastructure-related environmental effects.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
294.18	Meridian Energy Limited	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Oppose	Considers that 'avoid where possible' is unnecessarily restrictive and is not consistent with Part 2 of the Act and broader national policy direction and that focusing on improving resilience by managing significant risks is more appropriate.	Seeks to amend as follows: Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, ~~and where possible, avoid or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigate~~ by managing the significant risks to people, communities, property, and infrastructure.	Accept in part
295.81	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Strategic Direction	SD-RRNH-O1 Natural hazards Improve the District's resilience to natural hazards, and wh	Support	Supports the objective - no specific reasons given.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part

Natural Hazards

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
251.130	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	A flexible risk-based approach has been adopted to address the risk associated with natural hazards.	Amend	Considers the introduction generally appropriate but notes it should emphasise that activities must not exacerbate natural hazard risk. The submitter considers the adaptive management approach useful but incomplete without this clarification.	Seeks to amend as follows: ... The Plan adopts a flexible risk-based approach ~~has been adopted~~ to address the risk associated with natural hazards. A risk-based approach to natural hazards balances allowing for people and communities to use and develop land ~~their property~~ and undertake activities, whilst also limiting the risk of harm to life,~~or~~significant assets, and other aspects of the environment as a result of a natural hazard event. The District Plan also advocates an adaptive management approach to managing natural hazards and the effects of climate change, while ensuring that activities do not exacerbate natural hazard risk.	Accept in part
51.39	James White	Natural Hazards	Alluvial Fans: An Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay has been	Oppose	Considers that the AFAO Overlay should be removed from all properties affected by the AFAO Overlay (including those owned by the submitter). [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the AFAO Overlay, where present, is removed from all Plan properties affected (including those owned by the submitter).	Reject

			applied to alluvial fans in the Waitaki di			[Refer to original submission for full reasons]	
107.4	Cameron Leckie	Natural Hazards	Alluvial Fans: An Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay has been applied to alluvial fans in the Waitaki di	Oppose	Considers for AFA Overlays that there is a: Lack of activity differentiation and risk (active vs dormant/stabilised areas, low/high risk); No distinction in hazard type or severity (e.g., debris flow vs. floodwater); Inappropriate reliance on coarse-scale mapping for regulating land use; No field-based verification or geotechnical confirmation for individual sites; Contradiction between the Overlay's presence and the Plan's own low-risk conclusion. The PDP clearly states that the alluvial fan information that the overlay is based on is limited, the risks are low, and control at individual development level is not warranted; No clear associated rules or thresholds, creating regulatory uncertainty and cost risk for landowners; Without clear rules or thresholds for what is allowed or restricted within the overlay, landowners face project delays and increased costs. This is especially problematic when new Council staff interpret the overlays inconsistently.	Seeks to: Remove the AFA Overlay from the PDP NH Chapter and Maps entirely; Acknowledge that current alluvial fan hazard mapping is inadequate for regulating individual development or infrastructure upgrades; Undertake a more rigorous, site-specific risk assessment in partnership with the ORC and publicly consult on the findings before reapplying any Overlay. Ensure that any future overlay: Is based on verified hazard risk and activity level; Distinguishes between fan types and degrees of hazard; Includes a clear, risk-based rule framework; Provides Permitted or Controlled activity pathways for development in low-risk areas.	Reject
259.32	Otago Regional Council	Natural Hazards	Approach to natural hazards in the Plan	Oppose	Considers that the last paragraph of the introduction creates confusion by separating coastal and non-coastal hazards, despite hazards such as tsunami or earthquakes affecting both areas.	Seeks amendments to clarify which provisions apply in these two circumstances, consistent with the provisions of the pORPS.	Accept in part
107.2	Cameron Leckie	Natural Hazards	Flooding: There are two flooding overlays in the District, the Flood Assessment Overlay and the Wait	Oppose	Opposes the WRFA Overlay across the Omarama, Otematata, Kurow and Duntroon areas due to its conservative, broad-brush nature; no consideration of the WPS flow regimes; resultant regulatory burden and costs.	Seeks consideration of: - Clarifying the process for obtaining 'Flood Assessment Certificates' from ECan; Council-led solutions including a global consent approach; modelled freeboard standards threshold exemptions; improved more recent flood mapping information; implications upon insurance availability. Seeks deletion / amendment through: - Significantly refining the WRFA Overlay where it applies to the full catchment area based upon further investigation, site-specific technical evidence and acknowledging the WPSs flow management regime.	Reject
164.18	NPHS Te Waipounamu	Natural Hazards	General	Support	Considers that the section is appropriate and supported because it is clearly grounded in the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 and is reinforced by Ministry for the Environment guidance and regional HAIL registers. Considers that asbestos poses a significant health risk within the Waitaki District, noting that exposure can occur not only through direct contact but also through accidental disturbance during routine activities and through asbestos present in soil, underground, or landfill materials.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept
189.25	New Zealand Defence Force	Natural Hazards	General	Oppose	Opposes in part NH Chapter Overlays and requests an amendment to permit TMTA in the NH provisions as temporary structures associated with temporary military training activities (TMTA) may be required for training to undertake its statutory obligations under the Defence Act and at times, TMTA require the placement and use of a temporary building or structure which are removed after the exercise. The provisions in the NH Chapter do not appear to distinguish between temporary and permanent buildings / structures / activities.	Seeks to amend the NH Chapter as follows: - including a statement or rule in the Natural Hazards chapter and / or the Temporary Activities chapter exempting TMTA from the Natural Hazards rules; or - amending each rule in the Natural Hazards chapter to provide an exclusion; or - amending Rule NH-R6 to permit temporary activities, including temporary military training activities including associated buildings/structures and earthworks.	Accept in part
190.29	Alliance Group Limited	Natural Hazards	General	Support	Supports the Introduction NH Chapter particularly as it relates to providing flexibility in the management response for existing developed areas subject to NHs.	Retain NH Introduction as notified.	Accept
194.38	Director-General of Conservation	Natural Hazards	General	Support	Generally, supports the NH Chapter but is concerned that there is a lack of clarity about the management of coastal hazards. For example, high hazard areas in the Coastal environment.	Retain as notified, except where specific changes are required below.	Accept in part
216.6	Livingstone Creek Farming ltd	Natural Hazards	General	Oppose	Considers that the liquefaction assessment overlay is inaccurate and could lead to a loss of production, land value and landowner engagement.	Seeks a complete halt until the council genuinely engages with landowners and local experts.	Reject

216.7	Livingstone Creek Farming ltd	Natural Hazards	General	Oppose	Considers that the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Canterbury Flood assessment Overlay are inaccurately mapped and could lead to loss of production, land value and landowner engagement.	Seeks a complete halt until the Council genuinely engages with landowners and local experts.	Reject
246.92	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	General	Support	Support the flexible risk-based approach has been adopted to address the risk associated with natural hazards in this chapter of the PDP and the Introduction describing the natural hazards of the district, and the approach taken to managing natural hazards in the PDP.	Retain as notified or wording of similar intent	Accept
251.129	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	General	Amend	Considers that the Natural Hazards chapter requires updating to align with PORPS direction on not exacerbating natural hazard risk. The submitter also considers it important that Kāi Tahu and Māori landowners are enabled to lead natural hazard management on their land.	Seeks to amend the chapter to address the matters raised by this submission.	Accept in part
251.133	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	General	Amend	Considers a new policy necessary to give effect to PORPS requirements for Kāi Tahu involvement in natural hazard management. The submitter considers this omission significant given its relevance to both natural and coastal hazard contexts.	Seeks to add a new policy addressing the matters in the PORPS HAZ-NH-P11 for natural hazards outside of the coastal environment.	Accept in part
271.263	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	General	Amend	Considers that new policy is needed to support Natural Hazard Mitigation Works undertaken by a local authority.	Insert new policy: NH-PX Natural hazard mitigation works undertaken by or on behalf of the Crown: Natural Hazard Mitigation Works undertaken by a Regional or District Council are enabled, where community scale hazard mitigation is necessary to protect existing communities from natural hazard risk which cannot reasonably be avoided, and any adverse effects on the identified values and qualities of Outstanding Landscapes and Features, the Coastal Environment, Visual Amenity Landscapes, Significant Natural Areas, High Naturalness Waterbodies Areas, Sites of Significance to Māori, Historic Heritage, cultural, and archaeological areas sites, riparian margins and Notable Trees are mitigated.	Accept in part
271.249	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	Known and suspected active faults in the District have been mapped as part of regional fault mapping	Support	Considers it appropriate to amend the NH Introduction to highlight in the surface fault rupture and liquefaction sections of the Introduction the same concept that is mentioned in the flooding sections – that the overlay identifies where potential for flooding may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if subdivision or other activities are proposed. For the Canterbury mapping, the potential for surface flooding was considered.	Amend as follows: ~~Deformation associated with faults has not been mapped at a suitable scale to draw fault avoidance zones.~~ The overlays identify areas where potential for surface fault rupture may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if these activities are proposed.	Accept
271.247	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	Land Instability: Land instability refers to land, generally steep slopes and cliffs, which have the	Support	Generally, supports the Introduction concerning 'Land instability'. However, it would be useful to highlight in the surface fault rupture and liquefaction sections of the introduction the same concept that is mentioned in the flooding sections – that the overlay identifies where potential for flooding may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if subdivision or other activities are proposed. For the Canterbury mapping, the potential for surface flooding was considered.	Amend the 'Land Instability' first paragraph as follows: Land instability refers to land, generally steep slopes and cliffs, which have the potential to slip when saturated with water, or during a strong earthquake. Geological characteristics and soil types in the District mean that some areas are ~~at risk of~~ susceptible to land instability. The Moeraki area has an extensive history of land instability and slips.	Accept
51.38	James White	Natural Hazards	Liquefaction: Liquefaction is a process whereby soil behaves more like a liquid than a solid during	Amend	Considers that where properties owned by Brian De Geest across Ōamaru and the Waitaki District (and those across the Waitaki District, generally) are affected by a Liquefaction Assessment Overlay, then major concerns with the Plan overlay include: No clear associated rules or thresholds, creating regulatory uncertainty and cost risk for landowners. Without clear rules or thresholds for what is allowed or restricted within the overlay, landowners face project delays and increased costs. This is especially problematic when new WDC staff interpret the overlays inconsistently.	Seeks clarification/clear guidelines on what information requirements will be needed to address Liquefaction Assessment Overlay at time of development.	Accept in part
271.250	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	Liquefaction: Liquefaction is a process whereby soil behaves more like a liquid than a solid during	Support	Considers it appropriate to highlight in the surface fault rupture and Liquefaction sections of the Introduction the same concept that is mentioned in the flooding sections – that the overlay identifies where potential for flooding may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if subdivision or other activities are proposed. For the Canterbury mapping, the potential for surface flooding was considered.	Amend the Liquefaction paragraph as follows: The Liquefaction Assessment Overlay in the Plan covers areas identified by the Regional Councils where the local geology, soil type and groundwater level indicate that ~~damage from liquefaction is possible and requires further~~ liquefiable soils may be present and a site-specific investigation involving testing of the soils should be undertaken to determine the liquefaction hazard and mitigate it if necessary prior to subdivision or other activities.	Accept in part

194.39	Director-General of Conservation	Natural Hazards	Natural hazards are addressed in two chapters; the Natural Hazards Chapter covers non-coastal hazard	Oppose	Considers that the User Notes for the Natural Hazards chapter indicate that the Coastal Environment chapter contains provisions relating to natural hazards. However, it is unclear whether the two chapters overlap for some hazards, or if they deal with separate hazards. It would be clearer to take the approach in the proposed Otago RPS, whereby coastal hazards are limited to hazards which are specific to the coast.	Amend the Natural Hazards Chapter, and / or the Coastal environment Chapter, to clearly distinguish between Natural hazards generally and Coastal hazards as defined in the proposed Otago RPS.	Accept in part
153.1	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Amend	Supports avoiding or mitigating the risks from natural hazards and recommend including a definition for what is considered "appropriately mitigated" to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies.	Seek the following definition from Mackenzie District Council be adopted as follows: Appropriately Mitigated means a) The effectiveness of any proposed natural hazard mitigation works and the alternative design options considered, including low impact design. b) Any adverse effects on the environment of any proposed mitigation measures. c) The extent to which the mitigation works transfer, or create, unacceptable hazard risk to other people, property or infrastructure. d) The potential for the proposal to exacerbate natural hazard risk, including transferring risk to any other site. e) Whether or not the work would be carried out under the supervision of either a Chartered Professional Engineer with experience in geotechnical engineering or a Professional Engineering Geologist (IPENZ registered).	Reject
163.36	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports as notified as reducing risk is the most effective way to protect people, property, and the environment.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
166.26	Horticulture New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
192.13	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports Objective NH-O1 'Natural hazard risk' on the basis that the Objective seeks that the risks from natural hazards are avoided or appropriately mitigated. Supports NH-O1 to reduce risk to people, property and infrastructure. Notes that forestry operations can contribute positively to natural hazard management through slope stabilisation, erosion control, and flood mitigation.	Retain Objective NH-O1 'Natural hazard risk' as notified.	Accept in part
238.40	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Objective NH-O1 Objective NH-O1 is supported as it adopts a risk-based approach to natural hazards management.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
251.132	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Amend	Considers NH-O1 appropriate in principle but incomplete without explicit recognition that activities must not exacerbate hazard risk. The submitter considers grammatical improvements necessary for clarity.	Seeks to amend NH-O1 to give effect to PORPS HAZ-NH chapter regarding managing activities so that risks are not exacerbated – otherwise provide this relief through amendments to the policies. Seeks to amend as follows: The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate change, and their impact on people, property and the environment ~~is~~ are recognised and understood, and avoided or appropriately mitigated.	Accept in part
265.22	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Oppose	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
267.22	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
269.22	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows:	Accept in part

			hazards, including the effects of climate			The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	
271.251	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports the intent of the NH-O1 'Natural hazard risk' Objective.	Retain NH-O1 'Natural hazard risk' as notified.	Accept in part
282.22	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
283.22	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
284.22	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
285.22	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
290.22	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
291.22	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
292.22	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
293.22	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
295.131	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Support for the objective and notes it doesn't require full avoidance of activities in hazard areas. Considers that mining at Macraes can help reduce hazard risks, such as stabilising fault-prone areas and 'mining out' unstable areas, and questions the accuracy of the proposed Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay.	Seeks to ensure that the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay is correct in its application through the SPZMM and recognition that certain activities can be beneficial in mitigating natural hazard risk by increasing stabilisation of known risk areas.	Accept in part
296.22	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
298.22	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows:	Accept in part

			hazards, including the effects of climate			The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	
299.22	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports NH-O1 with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Amend NH-O1 as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
300.22	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports NH-O1 with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Amend NH-O1 as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
301.22	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
302.22	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
303.22	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports NH-O1 with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Amend NH-O1 as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
304.22	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Support	Supports with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Seeks to amend as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
312.285	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Amend	Opposes in part Considers that considering the risks from natural hazards as 'understood' is too subjective. an aim should be included in the objective to ensure avoidance and mitigation measures are proportionate to the level of risk.	Seeks following amendments Reword NH-01. The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part / Reject in part
313.26	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-O1 Natural hazard risk The risks from natural hazards, including the effects of climate	Amend	Supports NH-O1 with modifications to include proportionality of the avoidance and mitigation to the level of risk.	Amend NH-O1 as follows: The impact on people, property and the environment from the risks of natural hazards and the effects of climate change are recognised, avoided or mitigated relative to the level of risk.	Accept in part
153.2	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support the policy as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
163.37	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
164.17	NPHS Te Waipounamu	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Supports the approach as notified as Land Instability and Alluvial Fan reports are not available for Canterbury and the effects of Climate Change are only being quantified now with extreme rainfall events likely to increase in frequency and intensity over time.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part

240.50	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part. Considers council should actively source information to identify and map hazard areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~As information becomes available~~, identify and map land that may be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change	Accept in part
251.134	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Amend	Considers NH-P1 insufficient because it does not explicitly require the use of best available information.	Seeks to amend as follows: Using best available information, ~~As information becomes available,~~ identify and map land that may be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Accept
265.23	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Oppose	Oppose in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
267.23	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
269.23	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
271.252	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Oppose	Opposes proposed NH-P1 'Identification of natural hazard areas' because land that may be subject to natural hazards has been identified and mapped and is included in the PDP.	Delete NH-P1 'Identification of natural hazard areas' in its entirety.	Reject
282.23	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Oppose in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
283.23	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Oppose in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
284.23	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Oppose in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
285.23	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
290.23	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
291.23	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject

292.23	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
293.23	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
296.23	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
298.23	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
299.23	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Supports in part NH-P1 with modification to better focus the policy given the stringent provisions in natural hazard overlays.	Amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
300.23	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Supports in part NH-P1 with modification to better focus the policy given the stringent provisions in natural hazard overlays.	Amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
301.23	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
302.23	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
303.23	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Supports in part NH-P1 with modification to better focus the policy given the stringent provisions in natural hazard overlays.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
304.23	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Support	Support in part with modification to better focus the policy.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
312.286	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Amend	Opposes in part Considers that the stringent provisions in the NH overlays, the policy should be more focused.	Seeking the following amendments: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject
313.27	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P1 Identification of natural hazard areas As information becomes available, identify an	Amend	Supports in part NH-P1 with modification to better focus the policy given the stringent provisions in natural hazard overlays.	Seeks to amend as follows: As information becomes available, identify and map land that ~~may~~ is known to be subject to natural hazards, including taking into account the effects of climate change.	Reject

153.9	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings Requir	Amend	Support demonstrating that any potential effects of fault rupture be avoided but recommend requiring a site-specific fault avoidance zone to be mapped and removing the option for the potential effects of fault rupture to be mitigated. Effects from fault rupture include significant ground movement and there is no way of accurately predicting how and where ground deformation will occur in an earthquake.	Seek that the following amendments be made: 1. Require applications for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings to identify and map a fault avoidance zone at a site-specific scale; ~~and to demonstrate that any potential effects of fault rupture are avoided or mitigated as far as practicable.~~ 2. Avoid critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay unless it can be demonstrated that the site is at least 20m away from the fault.	Accept in part
190.31	Alliance Group Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings Requir	Support	Supports NH-P10 'Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings' as being appropriate to demonstrate how activities and buildings that may be subject to a fault rupture avoid or mitigate potential effects as far as practicable.	Retain NH-P10 'Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings'.	Accept in part
242.17	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Natural Hazards	NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings Requir	Support	Supports NH-P10 and acknowledges the risk that fault ruptures have on tamariki, rangatahi, kaimahi and the wider community as well as to the Ministry's assets. Support this provision and the need for any potential effects to be avoided and / or mitigated where possible.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
271.259	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings Requir	Support	Supports NH-P10 'Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings'. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Retain NH-P10 'Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings' as notified.	Accept in part
295.136	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings Requir	Oppose	Considers that the policy and rule NH-R12 create uncertainty for mining activities in the area and recommends clearly excluding these provisions and ensuring all mining activities are appropriately addressed within the SPZMM.	Seeks to ensure that the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay is correct in its application through the SPZMM. Seeks to ensure that the SPZMM is a stand alone chapter in terms of the rules that apply to activities within the zone and that subdivision for the purposes of mining activities would not be subject to this provision.	Reject
309.94	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings Requir	Oppose	Supports the intent of the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard policy but requests removing references to critical and regionally significant infrastructure, relying instead on NH-P3	Seeks to amend as follows: Require applications for ~~critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure,~~ education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings to demonstrate that any potential effects of fault rupture are avoided or mitigated as far as practicable.	Reject
310.38	Graymont (NZ) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P10 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings Requir	Amend	Support for the intent but considers it should be extended to include regionally significant industry. Notes that mineral extraction often cannot avoid natural hazard areas and considers there should an amendment to allow such activities within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Overlay to be managed to avoid or mitigate adverse effects as far as practicable.	Seeks to amend as follows: Require applications for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure and industry, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay– Activities and Buildings to demonstrate that any potential effects of fault rupture are avoided or mitigated as far as practicable. Alternatively, if the above changes are not made, seks to provide a pathway for those activities with a functional need to be located within, or within close proximity to the overlay to occur where they are able to avoid, or mitigate potential adverse effects, as far as practicable.	Reject
107.5	Cameron Leckie	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Opposes LA Overlay over the district's properties as: there are no clear rules resulting in delays and increased project costs.	Seeks NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay rules to provide guidance and clarity as to how to avoid, remedy or mitigate the NH thereby reducing uncertainty and costs.	Accept in part
153.10	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Amend	Support reducing potential risk from liquefaction, however, seek that a definition or metric of what council deems "an acceptable level" is included to avoid confusion and ensure consistency. NHC has developed a Risk Tolerance Methodology' [See original submission for link]	Seek a definition and/or metric for an “acceptable level” of risk is included.	Accept in part
265.35	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

			for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm				
267.35	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
269.35	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
271.260	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	Supports NH-P11 'Liquefaction Assessment Overlay'	Retain NH-P11 'Liquefaction Assessment Overlay' in its entirety.	Accept in part
282.35	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
283.35	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
284.35	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
285.35	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
290.35	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
291.35	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
292.35	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
293.35	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
296.35	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
298.35	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

299.35	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	Accept in part
300.35	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	Accept in part
301.35	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
302.35	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
303.35	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	Accept in part
304.35	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.293	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	Supports NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Retain NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Accept in part
313.34	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P11 Liquefaction Assessment Overlay Provide for subdivision in the Liquefaction Assessm	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain NH-P11 as notified.	Accept in part
153.11	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Amend	Support the policy in principle but seek definitions for "appropriate setbacks" and an "acceptable level" to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application. Guidance for protecting homes in the rural/urban interface are provided and the NHC "Risk Tolerance Methodology" [Links provided in original submission]	Seek inclusion of a definition for "appropriate setbacks" and a definition or metric of "acceptable level"	Accept in part
163.41	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	Supports as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
192.15	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	Supports in part as it seeks to protect natural features that reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property and infrastructure from damage by Natural hazards. Such Natural features include firebreaks which can comprise a natural physical barrier against the spread of fire from or into any area of continuous flammable material. That said, the Submitter considers that the management of wildfire risk should be achieved collectively for all types of forestry and accordingly seeks a limited amendment to the Policy.	Amend Policy NH-P12 'Wildfire – subdivision and land use' as follows: "Ensure that subdivision and land use in areas where there is actual or potential risk to people and property from wildfire achieve appropriate setbacks and mitigate the risk to an acceptable level and the wildfire risk to existing buildings from the establishment of new woodlots, shelterbelts and ~~plantation~~ forestry is minimised."	Accept in part
246.98	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	Supports NH-P12 but has concerns about the need to achieve appropriate setbacks for shelterbelts and what these setbacks are (as proposed in NH-R13). The planting of shelterbelts should not be unreasonably restricted as this could lead to the loss of HPL and raise animal welfare issues because landowners may be required to place their shelterbelts in unsuitable locations.	Amendment of NH-P12 as follows: Ensure that subdivision and land use in areas where there is actual or potential risk to people and property from wildfire achieve appropriate setbacks and mitigate the risk to an acceptable level and the wildfire risk to existing buildings from the establishment of new woodlots, shelterbelts and plantation forestry is minimised,<u>while providing for the needs of shelterbelts in primary production to protect stock, soils, and property.</u>	Reject insofar as specific shelterbelt recognition is sought

265.36	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
267.36	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
269.36	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
271.261	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	Supports NH-P12 'Wildfire – subdivision and land use' whereby the Policy is supported as it seeks to protect natural features that reduce the susceptibility of people, communities, property and infrastructure from damage by natural hazards such as fire breaks which comprise a natural physical barrier against the spread of fire from or into any area of continuous flammable material. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Retain NH-P12 'Wildfire – subdivision and land use' as notified.	Accept in part
282.36	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
283.36	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
284.36	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
285.36	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
290.36	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
291.36	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
292.36	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
293.36	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
296.36	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

298.36	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
299.36	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	Accept in part
300.36	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	Accept in part
301.36	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
302.36	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
303.36	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	Accept in part
304.36	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.294	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	Supports NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Retain NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Accept in part
313.35	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P12 Wildfire – subdivision and land use Ensure that subdivision and land use in area	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain NH-P12 as notified.	Accept in part
153.12	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Amend	Consider that assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporating methods to reduce or mitigate risk in proposals for subdivision, use and development be made a requirement for all proposals rather than just encouraging it. Also seeks a definition for "acceptable level" of risk be included. NHC has developed a 'risk tolerance methodology' [See submission for link]	Seek a definition and/or metric for what the Council deems as an “acceptable level” of risk is included and the following amendments be made: Require~~Encourage~~ proposals for subdivision, use and development (...)	Accept in part
163.42	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports as it aligns with the submitter's setback guidance. [See original submission for link to guidance]	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
251.142	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Amend	Considers that the natural hazard awareness overlays lack clarity around expected risk levels and how risks should be prevented from being exacerbated. The submitter also considers that amendments are needed so these overlays better align with the required risk-based approach. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~ and ensure risks are not exacerbated.	Accept in part
265.27	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Oppose	Considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there’s no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows:	Accept in part

						Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	
267.27	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
269.27	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
271.262	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports NH-P13 'Other natural hazard awareness overlays'.	Retain NH-P13 'Other natural hazard awareness overlays' as notified.	Accept in part
282.27	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
283.27	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
284.27	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part

285.27	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
290.27	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
291.27	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who deter mines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to anacceptable level.~~	Accept in part
292.27	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to anacceptable level.~~	Accept in part
293.27	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk.~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
296.27	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an~~ acceptable level.	Accept in part
298.27	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness	Seeks to amend as follows:	Accept in part

			Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an		overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an~~ acceptable level.	
299.27	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part NH-P13 with modifications. Considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Amend NH-P13 as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~. Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend NH-P13 as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~.	Accept in part
300.27	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~. Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~.	Accept in part
301.27	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an~~acceptable level.	Accept in part
302.27	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an~~acceptable level.	Accept in part
303.27	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part NH-P13 with modifications. Considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Amend NH-P13 as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~. Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend NH-P13 as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~.	Accept in part
304.27	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Support	Supports in part but considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk. ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part

						Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	
312.295	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Amend	Opposes in part The submitter considers an assessment may not be needed in all circumstances. The acceptable level is not defined in the plan, not whom the level is acceptable to. Considers the policy suitable regarding subdivision or development but 'use' lacks definition and is too broad. [contains incomplete sentence in original submission]	Seeks amendment by rewording NH-P13 Encourage proposals for subdivision~~, use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~ Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain the policy should be reworded to be proportionate to the broad nature of the policy. Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level.~~	Accept in part
313.36	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P13 Other natural hazard awareness overlays Encourage proposals for subdivision, use an	Amend	Supports in part NH-P13 with modifications. Considers an assessment should not be required in all cases, especially when there's no evidence that a specific use is at risk from an awareness overlay. Considers there is no clear definition of what constitutes an 'acceptable level' of risk and who determines it.	Amend NH-P13 as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, ~~use~~ and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to undertake an assessment of natural hazard risk and incorporate any methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~. Alternatively, if 'use' is to remain, seeks to amend NH-P13 as follows: Encourage proposals for subdivision, use and development in a natural hazard awareness overlay to ~~undertake an assessment~~ consider the effects of natural hazard risk and incorporate methods to reduce or mitigate the risk ~~to an acceptable level~~.	Accept in part
153.3	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Amend	Support in part but recommend providing a definition and/or metric for what the Council deems as an "acceptable level" to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies. NHC has developed a Risk Tolerance Methodology that is designed to integrate a risk tolerance assessment into existing risk management approaches. This methodology could be used by the Council to develop a metric to determine "acceptable" levels of risk. [See original submission to link for risk tolerance methodology]	Seek inclusion of a definition and/or metric for an "acceptable level" of risk.	Accept in part
163.38	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Support as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
166.27	Horticulture New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Supports as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
195.15	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Support policy for a risk-based approach.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
235.7	Cormorants on Waterfront Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Oppose	Opposes the policy in part as it sets a strong direction to avoid development where hazards may occur, which appears inconsistent with the Plans strategic direction and provisions to enhance the areas where people live, work and play and enable the ongoing use and adaptive re-use of heritage areas. Considers that the policy does not account for existing built form and constraints, or the policy tension with protecting the character of the district's town centres, heritage precincts and Oamaru Harbour area.	Seeks to amend as follows: '~~Avoid~~Manage subdivision, use and development in areas where natural hazards may occur, ~~unless it can be demonstrated that the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and the environment can be mitigated to an acceptable level~~, taking into consideration: 1. likelihood of the natural hazard event; and 2. type and characteristics of the natural hazard; and 3. potential consequence of the natural hazard event, including cumulative effects; and 4. effects of climate change; and 5. in relation to critical infrastructure, those matters in NH-P	Accept in part

238.41	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Policy NH-P2 Policy NH-P2 is supported as it adopts a risk-based approach to natural hazards management.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
240.51	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Support in part. Considers the reference in clause (5) should be NH-P3	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept in part
242.16	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Supports this policy as it acknowledges the risk that natural hazards can pose to people and infrastructure, while it also acknowledges that some activities, including educational facilities, may need to locate in natural hazard areas if they have an operational need.	Seeks to amend as follows: Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural hazards may occur, unless it can be demonstrated that the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and the environment can be mitigated to an acceptable level, taking into consideration: ... 4. effects of climate change; and in relation to critical infrastructure, those matters in NH-P4;<u>and</u> <u>5. the operational need for educational facilities.</u>	Reject
243.40	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Oppose	Opposes proposed NH-P2 as it is unclear whether use includes maintenance or repairs. Considers that the purpose of this chapter is to protect activities in the District from Natural Hazards. Preventing the efficient operation of existing activities in these areas is not in the interests of the District and has the potential to increase the threat posed by these hazards.	Seeks to amend provisions to clarify that 'use' does not include maintenance or repair. Or seeks to add the following text as a note below the provisions to assist WDP readers: Note: for clarity 'use' does not include maintenance or repairs.	Reject
246.93	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Support identifying and mapping areas affected by natural hazards provided a risk-based approach is used to identify these areas.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
251.135	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Amend	Considers NH-P2 overly restrictive and inconsistent with PORPS' risk-based framework. The submitter also considers that the policy should assess the characteristics of proposed activities, not only the hazard itself. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: - Direct how subdivision, use and development are to be managed to avoid significant risk, or to maintain tolerable or acceptable risks. - Insert into the matters of consideration (or wording to this effect): <u>X. type and characteristics of the proposed activity, including whether the activity exacerbates natural hazard risks to the site or to surrounding sites and properties</u> - Delete the words "critical infrastructure" and replace with a defined term OR clarify the meaning of critical infrastructure.	Accept in part
265.24	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
267.24	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
269.24	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
271.253	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Generally, supports NH-P2 'Risk based approach'. However, NH-P2 refers to 'areas where natural hazards may occur', NH-P3 refers to 'areas with identified natural hazard risks' and NH-P5 refers to 'areas subject to risk from natural hazards'. These could all be interpreted in slightly different ways to mean slightly different areas. Use 'areas with identified natural hazard risks' or 'areas subject to risk from natural	Amend the policy as follows: Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas <u>subject to</u> ~~where~~ natural hazards ~~may occur~~, unless it can be demonstrated that the risk from natural hazards	Accept in part

					hazards' for NH-P2 and NH-P3 because, in theory, you have done the site-specific investigation and identified the risk, so you want to avoid, or mitigate to an acceptable level.	to people, property, and the environment can be mitigated to an acceptable level, taking into consideration:	
282.24	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
283.24	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
284.24	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
285.24	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
290.24	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
291.24	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
292.24	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
293.24	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
295.133	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Support for a risk based approach to hazard management.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
296.24	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
298.24	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
299.24	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	Accept in part
300.24	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	Accept in part

			development in areas where natural				
301.24	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
302.24	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
303.24	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	Accept in part
304.24	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
309.90	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Amend	Supports the intent of the risk-based approach to natural hazards but requests amendments to avoid strict avoidance requirements for regionally significant infrastructure, recognising operational needs.	Seeks to amend as follows: <u>Except as provided for in NH-P3, A</u>avoid subdivision, use and development in<u>areas where natural hazards may occur, unless it can be demonstrated that the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and the environment can be mitigated to an acceptable level, taking into consideration:</u> ... 4. effects of climate change~~; and~~ ~~5. in relation to critical infrastructure, those matters in NH-P4.~~	Reject
310.36	Graymont (NZ) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Amend	Considers that mineral extraction and quarrying must often occur near the resource, which can mean operating in areas with natural hazard risks, and that requiring avoidance would hinder activities important to community wellbeing. Considers that the policy should recognise the functional needs of such activities and clarify that it applies to new rather than existing operations, and notes that any works near hazard overlays at their site would be subject to geotechnical assessment and mitigation.	Seeks to amend as follows: Avoid <u>any new</u> subdivision, use and development in areas where natural hazards may occur, unless it can be demonstrated that the risk from natural hazards to people, property, and the environment can be mitigated to an acceptable level, taking into consideration: 1. likelihood of the natural hazard event; and 2. type and characteristics of the natural hazard; and 3. potential consequence of the natural hazard event, including cumulative effects; and 4. effects of climate change; and 5. in relation to critical infrastructure, those matters in NH-P4;<u>and</u> <u>6. the functional requirements of the activity to be undertaken in the area of natural hazard risk.</u>	Reject
312.287	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	Support NH-P2 and NH-P3 as notified	Retain NH-P2 and NH-P3 as notified	Accept in part
313.28	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P2 Risk based approach Avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where natural	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain NH-P2 as notified.	Accept in part
152.49	New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Supports the policy as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part

153.4	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
163.39	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Supports as notified subject to changes to the critical facilities definition. [Refer to submission point 163.3]	Retain as notified subject to relief sought for the critical facilities definition. [Refer to submission point 163.3]	Accept in part
233.67	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Supports a policy recognising that some infrastructure, like the rail network, may need to be located in hazard areas due to operational and functional constraints, as relocation is often not feasible.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
238.42	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Oppose	The submitter opposes in part Policy NH-P3. They note that "petroleum storage and supply facilities" are classified as critical facilities, which would capture service stations and truck stops. Because NH-P3 is an avoid policy, they consider it inconsistent with the risk-based approach in NH-O1 and NH-P2. Many of the submitter's sites fall within natural hazard overlays, yet these activities are generally resilient due to engineering standards, HSNO requirements, and underground storage systems designed to withstand natural hazard effects. Service stations also do not involve large or immobile populations, unlike genuinely vulnerable activities such as hospitals or childcare centres. They consider the requirement to avoid natural hazard unless there is no other alternative found, is inappropriate for activities that are not sensitive to natural hazard risks. They also note that only one rule (NH-R12) restricts critical facilities, and only within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay. Given this, the matter is already addressed by NH-P10, and NH-P3 is unnecessary. The submitter seeks a risk-based approach that recognises the resilience of these activities and avoids blanket avoidance policies.	The submitters seek to amend Policy NH-P3 as follows: ~~Avoid locating~~ Manage the location of critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in areas with identified natural hazard risks, ~~unless it can be demonstrated that~~ taking into account: ~~1. there are no other feasible or practicable alternatives to locating inside the area; and~~ 2.~~there are~~ the operational needs or functional needs ~~for the location~~ of the facility or infrastructure; and 3. the design and function are resilient to natural hazard risk. OR, in the alternative, Amend Policy NH-P3 as follows: Avoid locating critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in areas with identified ~~natural hazard risks~~ Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay, unless it can be demonstrated that: OR Delete Policy NH-P3 on the basis that Policy NH-P10 applies to critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay.	Accept in part
240.52	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Support in part. Considers new development in hazard risk areas should demonstrate that they will not increase the risk associated with natural hazards	Seeks to add new clause (4) as follows: 4.the development will not increase natural hazard risk	Accept in part
251.136	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Amend	Considers NH-P3 incomplete because it does not state that activities must not exacerbate hazard risks. The submitter considers alignment with PORPS effects-management direction essential.	Seeks to amend as follows: 4. The activity does not exacerbate natural hazard risks to the site or to surrounding sites and properties Seeks to amend NH-P3 to be consistent with the PORPS EIT-INF chapter and HAZ-CL chapters	Accept in part
259.33	Otago Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Considers that the policy appropriately provides for future flood-protection and drainage works.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
265.25	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
267.25	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

269.25	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
271.254	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Generally, supports NH-P3 'Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure'. However, NH-P2 refers to 'areas where natural hazards may occur', NH-P3 refers to 'areas with identified natural hazard risks' and NH-P5 refers to 'areas subject to risk from natural hazards'. These could all be interpreted in slightly different ways to mean slightly different areas. Use 'areas with identified natural hazard risks' or 'areas subject to risk from natural hazards' for NH-P2 and NH-P3 because, in theory, you have done the site-specific investigation and identified the risk, so you want to avoid, or mitigate to an acceptable level. May need to add 'as far as practicable' onto '3. The design and function are resilient to natural hazard risk'. For example, a road may need to cross a fault but it can't really be designed to be resilient to surface fault rupture as well – you just have to fix it if it is offset by a fault rupture, and that is generally considered an acceptable risk.	Amend the policy as follows: Avoid locating critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in areas <u>subject to</u> ~~with identified~~ natural hazard<u>s</u> ~~risks~~, unless it can be demonstrated that: there are no other feasible or practicable alternatives to locating inside the area; and there are operational needs or functional needs for the location; and the design and function are resilient to natural hazard risk<u>, as far as practicable.</u>	Accept in part
282.25	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
283.25	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
284.25	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
285.25	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
288.64	Network Waitaki Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Amend	Supports the policy to provide for regionally significant infrastructure in natural hazard areas. Considers that point 3 as currently proposed sets a very high bar that may not be appropriate or achievable for an electricity distribution network. Noting that electricity distribution consists of extensive linear assets that span wide geographical areas, including remote and hazard-prone areas, considers that making the entire network resilient is neither feasible nor economically practical. Instead, electricity distribution networks rely on risk management strategies to mitigate hazards to acceptable levels. Seeks to amend the clause to reflect a more practical and achievable approach to addressing natural hazard risks.	Seeks to amend as follows: NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in areas with identified natural hazard risks, unless it can be demonstrated that: 1. there are no other feasible or practicable alternatives to locating inside the area; and 2. there are operational needs or functional needs for the location; and 3. the design and function<u>demonstrate consideration of, and responsiveness to,</u>~~are resilient to~~<u></u>natural hazard risk.	Accept in part
290.25	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
291.25	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
292.25	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

293.25	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
296.25	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
298.25	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
299.25	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	Accept in part
300.25	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	Accept in part
301.25	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
302.25	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
303.25	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	Accept in part
304.25	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
309.91	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Amend	Supports the policy in part, and considers a strict avoidance policy is inappropriate given the operational and functional needs of infrastructure.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Avoid locating~~ Allow critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure to locate in areas with identified natural hazard risks, where ~~unless~~ it can be demonstrated that: ...	Accept in part
310.37	Graymont (NZ) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Amend	Support for the policy as it recognises that critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure may sometimes need to be located in areas with natural hazard risks due to operational or functional needs. However, considers that the policy also include regionally significant industry, such as its Makareao Plant and Quarry, which can face similar constraints.	Seeks to amend as follows: Critical Facilities and Regionally Significant Infrastructure and Industry Avoid locating critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure and industry in areas with identified natural hazard risks, unless it can be demonstrated that: ...	Reject
312.288	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure Avoid locating critica	Support	Support NH-P2 and NH-P3 as notified	Retain NH-P2 and NH-P3 as notified	Accept in part
313.29	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P3 Critical facilities and regionally significant	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain NH-P3 as notified.	Accept in part

			infrastructure Avoid locating critica				
153.5	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Seek the provision is retained as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
192.14	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Supports NH-P4 'Natural protection features' which encourages the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features and vegetation that provide protection from natural hazard risk. Notes that well-managed forestry operations can contribute significantly to natural hazard protection through soil stabilization, reducing runoff, and mitigating erosion.	Retain Policy NH-P4 in its entirety.	Accept in part
240.53	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support in part. Considers natural protection features should be prioritised.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Encourage~~ Prioritise the use, protection, ...	Accept in part
246.94	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Supports the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems which provide protection form natural hazard risk. However, an element of practicality needs to be incorporated into this policy to provide some discretion.	Amendment of NH-P4 as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where practical.	Accept in part
251.137	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Considers NH-P4 appropriate and supportive of natural hazard risk mitigation. The submitter considers natural features such as wetlands and vegetation important components of resilience.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
259.34	Otago Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Considers that encouraging nature-based flood-risk solutions is appropriate and consistent with the pORPS.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
265.26	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
267.26	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
269.26	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
271.255	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Supports NH-P4 'Natural protection features' as they provide protection from Natural hazard risk. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Retain NH-P4 'Natural protection features' in its entirety.	Accept in part
282.26	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part

283.26	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
284.26	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
285.26	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
290.26	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
291.26	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
292.26	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
293.26	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
296.26	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
298.26	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
299.26	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Supports in part with recommendation to widen scope to specifically require engineering solutions where natural protection features are not appropriate, such as where protection of infrastructure, people and property may require a more certain method.	Amend NH-P4 as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part

300.26	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Supports in part with recommendation to widen scope to specifically require engineering solutions where natural protection features are not appropriate, such as where protection of infrastructure, people and property may require a more certain method.	Amend provision as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
301.26	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
302.26	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
303.26	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Supports in part with recommendation to widen scope to specifically require engineering solutions where natural protection features are not appropriate, such as where protection of infrastructure, people and property may require a more certain method.	Amend NH-P4 as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
304.26	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Support	Support with recommendation to expand scope to explicitly require engineering solutions where natural protection features are unsuitable, particularly in cases involving the protection of infrastructure, people, and property, where more reliable methods may be necessary.	Seeks to amend as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
312.289	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Amend	Supports in part The submitters considers that the scope of NH-P4 be widened to require engineering solutions where natural protection features are not appropriate. The submitters property is subject to flooding and appreciate both natural and engineering solutions to natural hazards.	Seeks the following amendments to NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
313.30	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P4 Natural protection features Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhanc	Amend	Supports in part with recommendation to widen scope to specifically require engineering solutions where natural protection features are not appropriate, such as where protection of infrastructure, people and property may require a more certain method.	Amend NH-P4 as follows: Encourage the use, protection, maintenance and enhancement of natural features, buffers and systems, such as wetlands and vegetation, which provide protection from natural hazard risk where engineering solutions are not required to mitigate risk to people, property and infrastructure.	Accept in part
153.6	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
163.40	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Supports as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
195.16	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Support the policy	Retain as notified	Accept in part
235.8	Cormorants on Waterfront Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Supports the intent to manage development in hazard areas but considers the requirement for site specific assessments for all subdivision inconsistent with the Plan's strategic direction.	Seeks to amend as follows: 'A risk assessment will be required fornewsubdivision, use and development in areas subject to risk from natural hazards that takes into account all of the following: 1. the type, frequency and scale of the natural hazard and whether the effects will likely be temporary or permanent; and	Reject

					Considers that the policy does not account for existing built form and constraints or the policy tension with protecting the character of the district's town centres, heritage precincts and Oamaru Harbour area. Considers that the adaptive re-use of existing buildings should be encouraged where natural hazard risks can be appropriately managed, and seeks that the policy focus on new development where those risks are significant.	2. the type of activity being undertaken and its vulnerability to natural hazard events; and 3. the consequence of a natural hazard event in relation to the proposed activity; and 4. the suitability of any proposed new allotment and intended future use; and 5. the potential effects, including positive effects on public health and safety and other property; and 6. the potential effects, including positive effects on social, cultural and economic well- being; and 7. any exacerbation of an existing natural hazard risk; and 8. any risk reduction or hazard mitigation measures proposed, including relocation and recovery; and 9. any opportunities to take an adaptive management approach to addressing the risk; 10.constraints of any existing built form and protection of existing character values.'	
238.43	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Policy NH-P5 Policy NH-P5 is supported as it adopts a risk-based approach to natural hazards management.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
240.54	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Support in part. Considers potential effects, including on the environment need to be taken into account.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept in part
243.41	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Oppose	Opposes proposed NH-P5 as it is unclear whether use includes maintenance or repairs. Considers that the purpose of this chapter is to protect activities in the District from Natural Hazards. Preventing the efficient operation of existing activities in these areas is not in the interests of the District and has the potential to increase the threat posed by these hazards.	Seeks to amend provisions to clarify that 'use' does not include maintenance or repair. Or seeks to add the following text as a note below the provisions to assist WDP readers: Note: for clarity 'use' does not include maintenance or repairs.	Reject
246.95	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Support site-specific assessment and investigation of natural hazard risk.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
251.138	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Amend	Considers NH-P5 too demanding because it mandates risk assessments in all hazard areas without proportionality. The submitter considers this inconsistent with PORPS, which requires assessments commensurate with the level of risk.	Seeks to amend to give effect to the PORPS in regards to risk assessments being prepared commensurate to the risk.	Accept in part
259.35	Otago Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Considers that the requirement for risk assessments in hazard areas is appropriate but not fully aligned with the pORPS methodology and amendments are needed to ensure fuller alignment with APP6, including cumulative effects and climate change. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend to ensure greater alignment with the process steps, matters and criteria in APP6 – Methodology for natural hazard risk assessment in the pORPS; including considering 1. cumulative effects including multiple and cascading hazards, where present 2. the effects of climate change 3. assessing vulnerability and resilience	Accept in part
265.32	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
267.32	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
269.32	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

			risk assessment will be required for subdiv				
271.256	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Amend	Amend NH-P5 'Site specific assessment / investigation' as NH-P2 refers to 'areas where natural hazards may occur', NH-P3 refers to 'areas with identified natural hazard risks' and NH-P5 refers to 'areas subject to risk from natural hazards'. These could all be interpreted in slightly different ways to mean slightly different areas. Use 'areas where natural hazards may occur' for NH-P5, because the overlays (where natural hazards may occur) trigger the need for a site-specific investigation. These wording changes will result in language that is more technically correct.	Amend the policy as follows: A ~~risk~~ site specific hazard assessment will be required for subdivision, use and development in areas ~~subject to risk from~~ that are potentially susceptible to natural hazards that takes into account all of the following: ...	Accept in part
282.32	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
283.32	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
284.32	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
285.32	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
290.32	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
291.32	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
292.32	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
293.32	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
296.32	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
298.32	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
299.32	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	Accept in part

300.32	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	Accept in part
301.32	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
302.32	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
303.32	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	Accept in part
304.32	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.290	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	Support NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Retain NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Accept in part
313.31	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P5 Site specific assessment/investigation A risk assessment will be required for subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain NH-P5 as notified.	Accept in part
153.7	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Amend	Support in part the policy but seek that a definition for "significant adverse effects" be provided to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies	Seek a definition for "significant adverse effects"	Reject
172.2	Bog Roy Station Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Oppose	Considers that Lot 2 DP 570687 and the adjoining Lot 1 DP 570687 (3570 Ōmārama-Otematata Road) are not susceptible to flooding due to the rising topography and that there are no significant flow paths that affect the site. Notes that recent flood events in the Ōmārama area have not resulted in flooding of the site.	Seeks to remove the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay from Lot 2 DP 570687 and the adjoining Lot 1 DP 570687 (3570 Ōmārama Otematata Road).	Reject
238.44	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Oppose	Policy NH-P6 Oppose in part The submitter considers that avoiding the inundation of spaces that store hazardous substances is not risk-based. Underground fuel storage tanks are not generally at risk during a flood event due to compliance with regulations and industry best practice. Underground fuel storage tanks often intercept the watertable, and are therefore designed to withstand inundation on a daily basis. Therefore, these tanks are more than capable of maintaining their integrity and function during flood events	The submitters seek to amend Policy NH-P6 as follows: In all other cases, where the site is not in a High Flood Hazard Area, provide for subdivision, use and development where: 1. significant adverse effects on people and property are avoided; and 2. the use or development is not likely to suffer material damage in a flood event; and 3. new buildings have a floor level that will avoid inundation in a 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood event or are otherwise designed to mitigate damage to property from a flood event; ~~and~~ ~~4. spaces that store hazardous substances will not be inundated.~~	Accept in part
246.96	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	Seeks amendments because there is concern that NH-P6 would apply to existing farmland activities within the overlay and requests that it apply only to new subdivision, use, and development. The submitter also seeks refinement of condition (4) so that it captures only hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities regulated under the Hazardous Substances chapter, rather than everyday storage areas such as sheds, cupboards, or farm buildings.	Amendment of NH-P6 as follows: Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid new subdivision, use and development in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay where a site-specific assessment identifies the site as a High Flood Hazard Area, unless it can be demonstrated that the risks can be mitigated so that:.... 4.hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities ~~spaces that store hazardous substances~~ will not be inundated.	Accept in part / Reject in part

251.139	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Amend	Considers that the policy's use of "material damage" is unclear and risks enabling development that exacerbates hazard impacts. The submitter also considers that activities should avoid significant adverse effects on the wider environment, including Māori land and wāhi tūpuna. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: - Clarify the meaning of "material damage". - Provide consistency with the PORPS by inserting under each list of requirements wording to the effect of: 5. It will not exacerbate the effects or risks of the natural hazard upon surrounding sites and properties, including Māori land and Native Reserves - For the second part of the policy which provides for subdivision, use and development in sites not in the High Flood Hazard Area, inserting under the list of requirements as follows: 1. significant adverse effects on people ~~and,~~ property, and other aspects of the environment are avoided; and 6. The activity avoids adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) to natural hazard mitigation measures	Accept in part
265.33	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
267.33	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
269.33	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
271.257	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	Supports NH-P6 'Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay' with support extended to the focus on vulnerable activities to implement the risk-based approach. [Inferred as specific reasons not given]	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
282.33	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
283.33	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
284.33	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
285.33	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
290.33	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
291.33	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

292.33	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
293.33	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
296.33	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
298.33	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
299.33	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	Accept in part
300.33	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	Accept in part
301.33	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
302.33	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
303.33	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	Accept in part
304.33	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
309.92	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	Supports an exception for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay policies, but considers that critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure could be inadvertently captured by the second part of this policy and requests clarification to avoid duplication.	Seeks to amend as follows: ... Except as provided for in NH-P3, in ~~In~~ all other cases where the site is not in a High Flood Hazard Area, provide for subdivision, use and development where:	Accept in part
312.291	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	Support NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Retain NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Accept in part
313.32	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P6 Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdiv	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain NH-P6 as notified.	Accept in part

153.42	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Amend	Consider that a site-specific assessment is required in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay to determine High Flood Hazard Areas, and subsequently avoiding subdivision, use and development in these areas. High Flood Hazard Areas should be defined in the same way as it is for the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay. Also seek a definition is provided for what the Council deems as "significant adverse effects" to avoid confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies.	Seek that the following amendments: Except as provided for in NH-P3, avoid subdivision, use and development in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay <u>where a site-specific assessment identifies the site as a High Flood Hazard Area, unless it can be demonstrated that the risks can be mitigated so that:</u> <u>1. it is not likely to result in loss of life or serious injuries in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and</u> <u>2. there is not likely to be significant damage or loss in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and</u> <u>3. it is not likely to require new or upgraded hazard mitigation works to mitigate or avoid the natural hazard; and</u> <u>4. it is not likely to exacerbate the effects of the natural hazard.</u> <u>In all other cases, where the site is not in a High Flood Hazard Area, provide for subdivision, use and development where:</u> 1. significant adverse effects on people and property are avoided; and 2. the use or development is not likely to suffer material damage in a flood event; and 3. new buildings have a floor level that will avoid inundation in a 0.5% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood event or are otherwise designed to mitigate damage to property from a flood event; and 4. spaces that store hazardous substances will not be inundated. And; A definition for 'significant adverse effects.'	Reject
190.30	Alliance Group Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Oppose	Opposes the NH-P7 'Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay' as it is not clear what flood level is to be managed for in subclauses 3. and 4. For this reason, Alliance is opposed to this Policy and seeks clarity on the flood level to be managed and to ensure that the flood level selected is appropriate for the Plant.	Submitter seeks clarity about the flood level to be managed in NH-P7 subclauses 3. and 4. and to address other comments or else delete the provision.	Accept in part
238.45	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Oppose	Policy NH-P7 Oppose in part The submitter considers avoiding the inundation of spaces that store hazardous substances is not risk-based. Underground fuel storage tanks are not generally at risk during a flood event due to compliance with regulations and industry best practice. Underground fuel storage tanks often intercept the watertable, and are therefore designed to withstand inundation on a daily basis. Therefore, these tanks are more than capable of maintaining their integrity and function during flood events	The submitters seek to amend policy NH-P7 as follows: Except as provided for in NH-P3, provide for subdivision, use and development in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay where: 1. significant adverse effects on people and property are avoided; and 2. the use or development is not likely to suffer material damage in a flood event; and 3. new buildings have a floor level that will avoid inundation; ~~and~~ ~~4. spaces that store hazardous substances will not be inundated.~~	Accept in part
246.97	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	Seek amendment to align NH-P7, condition (4) with provisions in the Hazardous Substances chapter, which control only hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities. As currently proposed, the wording captures every space that stores hazardous substances. This means that a garden shed or storage cupboard in the laundry or garage, and farm storage buildings would be caught, which is disproportionate to the level of risk they pose.	Amendment of NH-P7 (4) as follows: 4.<u>hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities</u> ~~spaces that store hazardous substances~~ will not be inundated.	Accept in part
251.140	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Amend	Considers the meaning of "material damage" unclear in relation to flood events. The submitter also considers the policy incomplete because it does not require assessment of whether activities exacerbate natural hazard risks or affect mitigation measures. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: - Clarify the meaning of "material damage". - Give effect to the PORPS by inserting under the list of requirements wording to the effect of: … 1. significant adverse effects on people~~and~~, property, <u>and other aspects of the environment</u>are avoided; and <u>5. the activity will not exacerbate the effects or risks of the natural hazard upon surrounding sites and properties, including Māori land and Native Reserves; and</u>	Accept in part

						6. the activity avoids adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) to natural hazard mitigation measures	
259.36	Otago Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	Considers the policy highlights the need to appropriately assess the potentially significant effects of flood hazards on development activities within this area.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
265.34	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
267.34	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
269.34	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
282.34	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
283.34	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
284.34	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	None specified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
285.34	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
290.34	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
291.34	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
292.34	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
293.34	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
296.34	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

298.34	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
299.34	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	Accept in part
300.34	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	Accept in part
301.34	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
302.34	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
303.34	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested - refer to original submission]	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	Accept in part
304.34	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
309.93	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	Supports the exception for critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure in the policy.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
312.292	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	Supports NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Retain NH-P5, NH-P6, NH-P7, NH-P11, NH-P12 as notified	Accept in part
313.33	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P7 Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay Ex	Support	[No specific reason given beyond decision requested]	Retain NH-P7 as notified.	Accept in part
153.8	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P8 Moeraki Land Instability Overlay Avoid subdivision, use and development in the V	Amend	Support avoiding development in the Very High Risk and High Risk Moeraki Land Instability Overlay area and managing subdivision, use and development in the Low Risk and Very Low Risk areas but recommend a definition and/or metric for what the Council deems as an “acceptable level” of risk. Suggest using the NHC 'Risk Tolerance Methodology'. [See original submission for link]	Support the policy but seek that a definition and/or metric for an 'acceptable level' of risk is included.	Accept in part
243.42	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P8 Moeraki Land Instability Overlay Avoid subdivision, use and development in the V	Oppose	Opposes proposed NH-P8 as it is unclear whether use includes maintenance or repairs. Considers that the purpose of this chapter is to protect activities in the District from Natural Hazards. Preventing the efficient operation of existing activities in these areas is not in the interests of the District and has the potential to increase the threat posed by these hazards.	Seeks to amend provisions to clarify that ‘use’ does not include maintenance or repair. Or seeks to add the following text as a note below the provisions to assist WDP readers: Note: for clarity ‘use’ does not include maintenance or repairs.	Reject
251.141	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and	Natural Hazards	NH-P8 Moeraki Land Instability Overlay Avoid	Oppose	Considers that the evidence base for managing land instability at Moeraki has not been sufficiently explained. The submitter also considers that the policy does not	Seeks amendments to give effect to the PORPS requirement to identify tolerable risk level and the effects management approach for any areas which may be identified in future as moderate hazard risk	Accept in part

	Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki		subdivision, use and development in the V		address how risk should be managed in areas that may be identified as tolerable risk in future. [refer to original submission for full reasons]		
153.43	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-P9 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Subdivision Require application	Amend	Support requiring a fault avoidance zone at a site-specific scale and ensuring that all subdivision avoids this zone to reduce the impacts to people and property in future earthquake events. We recommend following MfE's guidance document for planning. [link in original submission]. Also recommend providing a definition for what the Council deems an "acceptable level". NHC has developed a Risk Tolerance Methodology that is designed to integrate a risk tolerance assessment into existing risk management approaches that could be adopted.	Seek the following amendment be made: 2. provide for subdivision in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Subdivision, where any future allotments, buildings and infrastructure can be set back <u>at least 20m</u> from any fault avoidance zone to mitigate the potential effects of fault rupture to an acceptable level; and A definition for what the Council deems as an "acceptable level" of mitigation of the potential effects from fault rupture is included.	Accept in part
271.258	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-P9 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Subdivision Require application	Amend	Amend Policy NH-P9 'Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Subdivision' as Points 2 and 3 are too restrictive. Despite its name, a fault avoidance zone doesn't necessarily need to be avoided, just avoided or mitigated. Prefer to steer away from the use of 'fault avoidance zone'. I think it is reasonable in this case to avoid putting allotments and buildings in a zone of potential fault deformation in Waitaki District because none of the Overlay covers already subdivided or zoned sites where there is already an expectation to build in an intensive manner, so it should be a reasonable expectation that you could avoid the zone of potential deformation. However, some subdivision infrastructure, particularly linear infrastructure like roads and water / electricity infrastructure cannot always avoid the zone of potential deformation – it may need to cross it, so this needs some rewording. Also, the related Rule SUB-R16 refers to 'buildings and structures', not 'allotments, buildings and infrastructure'.	Amend the policy as follows: Require applications for subdivision of sites that are identified within the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Subdivision to identify and map ~~a fault avoidance zone~~ <u>the zone of fault deformation</u> at a site-specific scale; and provide for subdivision in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay - Subdivision, where any future allotments, buildings <u>and structures,</u> and infrastructure can be set back from any ~~fault avoidance zone mapped zone~~ <u>of fault deformation</u> to mitigate the potential effects of fault rupture to an acceptable level; and avoid subdivision in instances where future allotments, buildings <u>and structures,</u> and infrastructure cannot set back from any ~~fault avoidance zone~~ <u>mapped zone of fault avoidance.</u>	Accept in part
295.134	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-P9 Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Subdivision Require application	Oppose	The submitter questions the relevance of this policy to subdivision in the SPZMM, as such activities are unlikely to involve residential development.	Seeks to ensure that the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay is correct in its application through the SPZMM. Seeks to ensure that the SPZMM is a stand alone chapter and that subdivision for the purposes of mining activities would not be subject to this provision.	Reject
153.13	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Amend	Support the rule in part but seek that buildings are only permitted when they are outside of a High Flood Hazard Area to reduce the impact to people and property in future flood events. Changes will make this rule consistent with NH-R2.	Seek the following amendments: PER-3 ~~Any building is not greater than 10m in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m over a 10-year period.~~ <u>1. any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and</u> <u>2. is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1.</u>	Reject
195.17	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Oppose the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from farm buildings definition, and from the permitted activity pathway in NH-R1 as it creates unnecessary inconsistency, as similar structures on other farms remain permitted. Hazard controls should be based on a building's actual function and vulnerability, and existing provisions (PER-2 and PER-3) already provide appropriate management without singling out IIPP activities.	Delete the exclusion of Intensive Indoor Primary Production from the definition of Farm Buildings.	Accept in part
238.46	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Oppose in part Rule NH-R1 permit enclosed buildings without a floor (refer PER-1, clause 3 of each rule) in the flood assessment overlays. The submitters consider it unclear why this only applies to "enclosed" buildings. There are a range of other buildings without floors that are not enclosed and resilient to the effects of flooding, such as forecourt canopies. In addition, PER-1 applies to a structure, which has a broad meaning, and would capture the likes of small-scale ancillary structures, such as cabinets and signage.	The submitter seeks to amend Rules NH-R1, NH-R2 and NH-R3 (PER-1, clause 3 and PER-3, in each case) as follows: Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 3.~~an unenclosed b~~uilding without a floor; or PER-3 Any building <u>or structure</u> is not greater than 10m2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m2 over a 10-year period.	Accept in part
240.55	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Support	Support in part. Considers non-notification of hazard-related activities inappropriate due to public importance.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Reject

246.99	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Support	Seeks amendments because the submitter opposes excluding buildings used for intensive indoor primary production from the permitted activity pathway and requests that such buildings be included in the definition. The submitter also seeks clarification that a post-and-wire fence covers a range of fencing types, including deer fencing, temporary and electric fences, as well as gates.	Amendment of NH-R1 as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: 4. a post and wire or post and rail fence,or other fence used for the purposes of primary production, or farm-style gating;or Federated Farmers also seek amendment of the definition of farm building to remove the exclusion of buildings used for intensive indoor primary production.	Accept in part
251.143	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Amend	Considers that activities in flood overlays should require assessment of the effects on hazard mitigation and surrounding areas. The submitter also considers that current matters of discretion omit important considerations such as reverse sensitivity effects.	Seeks to amend the matters of discretion to include: 9. Effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) on natural hazard mitigation measures; and 10. The extent to which the activity causes or exacerbates natural hazard risks to surrounding sites and properties	Accept in part
265.28	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
267.28	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
269.28	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
282.28	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ...	Accept in part

						3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	
283.28	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
284.28	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
285.28	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
290.28	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part

291.28	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stock water infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
292.28	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
293.28	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
296.28	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
298.28	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ...	Accept in part

						6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	
299.28	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R1 with modifications. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend NH-R1 as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. a below ground swimming pool; or 2. a deck; or 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or 4. a post and wire or post and rail fence; or 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed, concrete or pervious floor; or 6. a pole; or 7. Irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'.	Accept in part
300.28	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R1. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend the rule as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. a below ground swimming pool; or 2. a deck; or 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or 4. a post and wire or post and rail fence; or 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed, concrete or pervious floor; or 6. a pole; or 7. Irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
301.28	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stock water infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
302.28	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those alreadylisted, andmay even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure	Accept in part

						Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	
303.28	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R1 with modifications. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'. Amend NH-R1 as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. a below ground swimming pool; or 2. a deck; or 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or 4. a post and wire or post and rail fence; or 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed, concrete or pervious floor; or 6. a pole; or 7. Irrigation or stockwater infrastructure	Accept in part
304.28	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: ... 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or ... 6. a pole; or 7. irrigation or stockwater infrastructure Seeks clarification on the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional'	Accept in part
305.42	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Opposes NH-R1 as the distinction between Canterbury and Otago Flood Assessment Overlay is confusing for the PDP user, and these rules should be combined. NH-R2, PER-3 could specify that this is applicable to Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay only. The effects of a pervious floor of a farm building will not result in a justifiable increase in adverse effects to adjoining land or properties in the rural zone or to the flood hazard that requires a distinction. Given the extent of the hazard mapping, especially through the Kurow and Omarama basin areas, the rule could unnecessarily restrict farm buildings which are low risk given these do not accommodate people. There are sufficient other mechanisms available to Council to remove liability if a farm building experienced flood damage should a landowner choose to construct a farm building within a flood hazard overlay, including s72-73 of the Building Act.	Amend rule as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. below ground swimming pool; or ... 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone ~~that has an unsealed or pervious floor~~; or PER-2 The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint more than 10m^{2}or PER-4 Within the Otago Flood Assessment overlay, any building is not greater than 10m^2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m^{2}over a 10-year period. PER-4 Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3	Accept in part

					RDIS-2Compliance is not achieved with PER-~~3~~ 4 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and ... 8. any storage of hazardous substances. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2 Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 or RDIS-2 is precluded from being publicly notified.	
306.42	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones	Oppose	Opposes NH-R1 as the distinction between Canterbury and Otago Flood Assessment Overlay is confusing for the PDP user, and these rules should be combined. NH-R2, PER-3 could specify that this is applicable to Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay only. The effects of a pervious floor of a farm building will not result in a justifiable increase in adverse effects to adjoining land or properties in the rural zone or to the flood hazard that requires a distinction. Given the extent of the hazard mapping, especially through the Kurow and Omarama basin areas, the rule could unnecessarily restrict farm buildings which are low risk given these do not accommodate people. There are sufficient other mechanisms available to Council to remove liability if a farm building experienced flood damage should a landowner choose to construct a farm building within a flood hazard overlay, including s72-73 of the Building Act.	Amend rule as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. below ground swimming pool; or ... 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone ~~that has an unsealed or pervious floor~~; or PER-2 The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint more than 10m^2 or PER-4 Within the Otago Flood Assessment overlay, any building is not greater than 10m^2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m^{2}over a 10-year period. PER-4 Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3 RDIS-2Compliance is not achieved with PER-~~3~~ 4 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and ... 8. any storage of hazardous substances. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2 Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 or RDIS-2 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Accept in part
312.296	Springbank			Amend	Opposes in part	Seeks following amendment to rule NH-R1	Accept in part

					The submitters seeks that the plan clearly defines what counts as a suitably qualified and experienced professional and proposes the term be simplified to 'suitably qualified person'. Considers the rule allowing unenclosed buildings without floors appears intended to accommodate structures like hay barns and pole sheds. Consider floor types, such as concrete,may also be appropriate and should be considered within the permitted definition.	NH-R1	Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and 2. floor levels; and 3. access, including safe egress from the site/building; and 4. risk to people, property and the environment during a flood event; and 5. flooding effects/displacement of flood waters on and/or off site; and 6. effects of any proposed mitigation; and 7. the intended use of the building or structure; and 8. any storage of hazardous substances. Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified. Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications: Pursuant to section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.
		Natural Hazards	NH-R1 Buildings, structures and fences in the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay All zones			All zones	Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. a below ground swimming pool; or 2. a deck; or 3. an unenclosed building without a floor or with a concrete floor; or 4. a post and wire or post and rail fence; or 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed, concrete or pervious floor; or 6.a pole; or 7. Irrigation or stock water infrastructure PER-2 The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building and does not increase the building footprint; or PER-3 Any building is not greater than 10m^{2}in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m^{2}over a 10-year period.	
240.131	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R10 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – High Risk and Very High Risk Areas	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R10]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept
251.152	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R10 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – High Risk and Very High Risk Areas	Amend	Considers that the discretionary and non-complying statuses applied to earthworks and buildings in high-risk areas may be unnecessarily restrictive. The submitter also considers that minor works or culturally important activities may warrant a more flexible approach. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks clarification on the reasoning for the stringency of approach taken. Seeks amendments to reduce the stringency upon building activities which are minor additions and alterations, improvements, or for non-residential purpose and use in the high and very high risk areas.	Reject insofar as a less stringent pathway is sought

153.22	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R11 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – High Risk and Very High-Ris	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
240.132	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R11 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – High Risk and Very High-Ris	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R11]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept
251.153	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R11 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – High Risk and Very High-Ris	Amend	Considers that the stringency applied to building activity in high-risk areas may not always be appropriate. The submitter also considers that the rule could inhibit improvements that enhance resilience. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks clarification on the reasoning for the stringency of approach taken. Seeks amendments to reduce the stringency upon building activities which are minor additions and alterations, improvements, or for non-residential purpose and use in the high and very high risk areas.	Accept in part
153.23	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Amend	Support in part support this activity being discretionary only where it can be demonstrated that the activity is at least 20m away from the fault, as recommended by MfE's guidance for land use planning around active faults.	Seek that the following amendment be made: Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay — Activities and Buildings Activity status: Discretionary 1. Where it can be demonstrated that the activity is at least 20m away from the fault Activity status when compliance is not achieved: ~~Not Applicable~~ Non Complying	Reject
190.34	Alliance Group Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Amend	Considers NH-R12 'Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings' requires an amendment as the Submitter considers the note attached to this Rule specifying an information requirement under section 88 of the RMA would be more appropriate as Matters of Discretion to a Restricted Discretionary Activity status, rather than a Discretionary Activity. Considers changes are needed to provide improved clarity on when the rule applies.	Seeks to amend as follows: NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village, ~~and~~new buildings containing hazardous substances, and extension or upgrades to existing hazardous facilities where the extension and/or upgrade alters the existing (pre-extension / upgrade) location where hazardous substances are stored, used or disposed of onsite in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay - Activities and Buildings. All Zones Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1) The surface fault rupture risk (likelihood and potential consequences) posed by the fault; 2) The recommendations of a suitably qualified professional for locating or designing the facility to avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects; 3) The provision of an assessment addressing the above, completed by a suitability qualified professional, to Canterbury Regional Council. Notification: Any application made under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. ~~Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications:~~ ~~Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act, any application made under this rule must be accompanied by an assessment of the surface fault rupture risk (likelihood and potential consequences) posed by the fault, undertaken by a suitably qualified professional, including any recommendations for locating or designing the facility to avoid or mitigate the potential adverse effects of surface fault rupture. The investigation report must also be supplied to Canterbury Regional Council.~~	Accept in part
240.133	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R12]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept

246.105	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Support	Supports in part: The submitters seeks amendments to the policy for clarify purposes so that only the hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities otherwise controlled by provisions in the Hazardous Substances chapter of the PDP are controlled. The submitters consider that should the amendment not be made, houses, garden sheds and farm buildings need a discretionary consent. Considering it unclear in the s32 report if this is Councils intention or not.	The submitters seek amendment of NH-R12 as follows: NH-R12 - Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and ~~buildings containing hazardous substances~~ hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings.	Accept
271.268	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Support	Supports NH-R12 'Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings' to the extent that the Definition of Regionally significant infrastructure should be amended as requested along with the Rule as drafted.	Amend the definition of Regionally Significant Infrastructure as requested AND Amend the rule as follows: Add note: Note: This rule does not apply to Natural Hazard Mitigation Works captured under Rule NH-R5	Accept in part
305.46	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Oppose	Opposes NH-R12 'Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings' as considers that the rule does not account for the fact that hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities located outside of buildings are designed to meet HSNO regulations and are best managed by provisions in the Hazardous Substances Chapter of the Plan. It will not improve safety or environmental outcomes.	Amend rule as follows: 'Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and ~~buildings containing hazardous substances~~hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings.'	Accept
306.46	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Oppose	Opposes NH-R12 'Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings' as considers that the rule does not account for the fact that hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities located outside of buildings are designed to meet HSNO regulations and are best managed by provisions in the Hazardous Substances Chapter of the Plan. It will not improve safety or environmental outcomes.	Amend rule as follows: 'Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, retirement village and ~~buildings containing hazardous substances~~ hazardous facilities and major hazard facilities in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings.'	Accept
309.95	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Amend	Considers discretionary activity status for regionally significant infrastructure in Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Overlay too onerous and requests deletion of infrastructure from the rule.	Seeks to amend as follows: NH-R12 Critical facilities ~~and regionally significant infrastructure,~~ education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings	Reject
310.39	Graymont (NZ) Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R12 Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure, education facilities, re	Amend	Considers there should be an amendment to the rule on critical facilities in hazard overlays to include regionally significant industry or provide a pathway for activities with a functional need.	Seeks to amend as follows: Critical facilities and regionally significant infrastructure and industry, education facilities, retirement village and buildings containing hazardous substances in the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay – Activities and Buildings… Alternatively, if the above changes are not made seeks to provide a pathway for those activities with a functional need to be located within or within close proximity to the overlay to occur where they are able to avoid, or mitigate potential adverse effects as far as practicable.	Reject
153.24	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Support in part the rule but recommend confirming whether this rule is intending that the outside extent of the canopy is measured from the mature tree extent. The extent of a tree can vary significantly from initial planting to reaching its full mature extent. Clarifying this rule will avoid confusion and ensure the consistent application of rules and policies.	Seek that the following amendment be made: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The woodlot or shelterbelt is no wider than 30m and is setback (as measured from the outside extent of the mature tree canopy):	Accept
166.30	Horticulture New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Support	Supports as it is consistent with other provisions.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
192.16	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation	Support	Opposes in part NH-R13 'Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings' as concerned that Rule NH-R13 does not manage all commercial forestry and is inconsistent with the NES-CF.	Amend NH-R13 as follows: "NH-R13: Wildfire- woodlots, shelterbelts, ~~plantation forestry~~ and buildings	Accept in part

			forestry and buildings All zones		NZCF considers that, if it is necessary to manage production forestry in Rule NH-R13, there is no rationale for confining the Rule to Production forestry as opposed to Commercial forestry. The Submitter notes that the relevant Section 32 does not address this distinction and it is inconsistent with the NESCF. If retained, NZCF considers that: • the Rule should apply to Commercial forestry; and • the Rule must clearly state the Regulation in the NES-CF over which the Rule prevails.	.... ~~PER-2 the plantation forestry is setback (as measured from the outside extent of the canopy):~~ ~~1. 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property; and~~ ~~2. 30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and~~ ~~3. 5m from any adjoining lawfully established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building.~~ ... Note: The Resource Management Act (National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry) Regulations 2017 apply to Commercial forestry, including setbacks.”	
195.22	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Support	Support 30m setback from residential unit or principal.	Retain as notified	Accept in part
246.106	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Support	Supports in part: The submitters is uncomfortable with some of the proposed setbacks in PER-1 and PER-3. Seeking amendments to NH-R13 to ensure it only applies to new planting. [See original submission for full reasons]	The submitters seek amendment of NH-R13 to apply to new plantings only, and to exclude HPL: Wildfire –new woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings PER-1 The woodlot or shelterbelt planted after [operative date of this plan] is no wider than 30m, and not located on highly productive land, and is setback (as measured from the outside extent of the canopy): 1. 30m from any residential unit or other principal building on an adjoining property; and 2. 30m from any zone that is not a rural zone; and 3. 5m from any adjoining lawfully established accessway to a residential unit or other principal building. The submitters also seek the following addition to the matters of discretion: 4. the need for the shelterbelt to support primary production and protect stock, soil, and property.	Accept in part
265.38	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
267.38	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
269.38	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: With landowner permission, identify Historic Heritage Items and their associated heritage settings throughout the Waitaki district that warrant protection in SCHED2 – Historic Heritage Items, and are significant in terms of one or more of the following values:...	Reject
271.269	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Support	Generally, supports NH-R13 'Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings'. However, the proposed Rule sounds as though wildfire is a Permitted activity and amendment is required.	Amend the rule as follows: NH-R13 ~~Wildfire – w~~ Woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings (wildfire risk)	Accept
282.38	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows:	Reject

			forestry and buildings All zones			PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	
283.38	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
284.38	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
285.38	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
290.38	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
291.38	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
292.38	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
293.38	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The wood lot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
296.38	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The wood lot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
298.38	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
299.38	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports in part NH-R13 with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Amend NH-R13 as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory. ...	Reject

						Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 PER-3 and/or ~~PER-3~~ PER-4	
300.38	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports in part NH-R13 with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Add new PER-4 as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory. And amend NH-R13 to reference the new provision: Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 PER-3 and/or ~~PER-3~~PER-4	Reject
301.38	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
302.38	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The wood lot, shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
303.38	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports in part NH-R13 with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Amend NH-R13 as follows: ... PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory. ... Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 PER-3 and/or ~~PER-3~~ PER-4	Reject
304.38	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory.	Reject
312.301	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports in part The submitters considers that planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses, should be encourages and proposes a PER-4 to include this.	Seeks the following amendments NH-R13 — Reject All zones — Reject Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2PER-3and/or~~PER-3~~PER-4 Matters of discretion are restricted to:	Reject

						1. potential risk to people, property and the environment; and 2. the extent to which any vegetation required for visual screening of a principal building affects the wildfire risk to any residential unit or other principal building; and 3. any mitigation measures proposed.	
313.40	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R13 Wildfire – woodlots, shelterbelts, plantation forestry and buildings All zones	Amend	Supports in part NH-R13 with modification to encourage the planting of low flammability plants, particularly near houses.	Amend NH-R13 as follows: ... PER-4 The woodlot , shelterbelt or plantation forestry is a species listed in the FENZ Low Flammability Plant Directory. ... Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 PER-3 and/or ~~PER-3~~PER-4	Reject
66.1	Janeen Benny	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Amend	Considers that while the Maerewhenua River has historically flooded over this land, the Waitaki River has not. There are unnecessary flooding overlays with resultant NH-R2 and NH-R3 duplication. NH-R2 and NH-R3 reference a post and rail fence. However, it is unclear whether 'stockyards' are Permitted given that they can be either post and rail or steel. They are an integral part of farming and should be a Permitted Activity. Consultation regarding the other overlays is supported where the scope has been reduced following WDC thoughtfully listening to local farmers.	The Submitter seeks that: The property is amended to retain a single flood overlay while considering deleting the other. If both flood layers are retained ensure consistency between applicable rules. An activity should not be permitted under one flood overlay and require resource consent under the other. Preference would be that the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay applies, providing an opportunity for a building to be considered as a Permitted Activity, if this is supported by a flood assessment as per NH-S1. Amend NH-R2 & NH-R3 to explicitly provide for 'stockyards' as a Permitted Activity or amend the definition of post and rail fences to include stockyards, regardless of the base of the yards. Preference would be to explicitly provide for stockyards. Retain the Plan as notified in relation to only having a flood overlay that applies to this section of land, do not include any additional overlays.	Accept in part
66.2	Janeen Benny	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Amend	Considers that while the Maerewhenua River has historically flooded over this land, the Waitaki River has not. There are unnecessary flooding overlays with resultant NH-R2 and NH-R3 Rules duplication. NH-R2 and NH-R3 reference a post and rail fence. However, it is unclear whether 'stockyards' are Permitted given that they can be either post and rail or steel. They are an integral part of farming and should be a Permitted Activity. Consultation regarding the other overlays is supported where the scope has been reduced following WDC thoughtfully listening to local farmers.	The Submitter seeks that: The property is amended to retain a single flood overlay while considering deleting the other. If both flood layers are retained ensure consistency between applicable rules. An activity should not be permitted under one flood overlay and require resource consent under the other. Preference would be that the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay applies, providing an opportunity for a building to be considered as a Permitted Activity, if this is supported by a flood assessment as per NH-S1. Amend NH-R2 & NH-R3 to explicitly provide for 'stockyards' as a Permitted Activity or amend the definition of post and rail fences to include stockyards, regardless of the base of the yards. Preference would be to explicitly provide for stockyards. Retain the Plan as notified in relation to only having a flood overlay that applies to this section of land, do not include any additional overlays.	Accept in part
153.14	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
195.18	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Oppose the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from farm buildings definition, and from the permitted activity pathway in NH-R1 as it creates unnecessary inconsistency, as similar structures on other farms remain permitted. Hazard controls should be based on a building's actual function and vulnerability, and existing provisions (PER-2 and PER-3) already provide appropriate management without singling out IIPP activities.	Delete the exclusion of Intensive Indoor Primary Production from the definition of Farm Buildings	Accept in part

212.33	Glenbrook Station	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Amend	Considers Rule NH-R2 should exempt solar and irrigation structures due to low hazard sensitivity. The submitter considers amendments are required to include these structures in exemptions. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that Rule NH-R2 PER-1.3 is amended to refer to solar and irrigation structures.	Accept in part
238.47	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Oppose in part Rule NH-R2 permits enclosed buildings without a floor (refer PER-1, clause 3 of each rule) in the flood assessment overlays. The submitters consider it unclear why this only applies to "enclosed" buildings. There are a range of other buildings without floors thatare not enclosed and resilient to the effects of flooding, such as forecourt canopies. In addition, PER-1 applies to a structure, which has a broad meaning, and would capture the likes of small-scale ancillary structures, such as cabinets and signage.	The submitter seeks to amend Rules NH-R1, NH-R2 and NH-R3 (PER-1, clause 3 and PER-3, in each case) as follows: Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 3.~~an unenclosed~~ building without a floor; or PER-3 Any building or structure is not greater than 10m2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m2 over a 10-year period.	Accept in part
240.125	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R2]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Reject
246.100	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Support	Opposes excluding buildings used for intensive indoor primary production from the permitted activity pathway and requests their inclusion in the definition of farm buildings. The submitter also seeks clarification that a post-and-wire fence includes a range of fencing types such as deer, temporary, and electric fences, as well as gates.	Amend as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: 4. a post and wire or post and rail fence, or other fence used for the purposes of primary production, or farm-style gating; or Federated Farmers also seek amendment of the definition of farm building to remove the exclusion of buildings used for intensive indoor primary production.	Accept in part
251.144	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Amend	Considers that activities in certain hazard areas should include assessment of effects on hazard mitigation measures and nearby properties. The submitter also considers that a clearer framework is needed to ensure activities do not worsen natural hazard risks.	Seeks to amend the matters of discretion to include: 9. Effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) on natural hazard mitigation measures; and 10. The extent to which the activity causes or exacerbates natural hazard risks to surrounding sites and properties	Accept in part
265.29	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
267.29	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
269.29	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
271.264	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Amend	[See original submission]	Amend as: NH-R2 Buildings, ~~structures and fences~~ in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building ~~or structure~~ is: ~~1. a below ground swimming pool; or~~ ~~2. a deck; or~~	Accept in part

						3. an unenclosed building without a floor; or ~~4. a post and wire or post and rail fence; or~~ 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone that has an unsealed or pervious floor; or	
282.29	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
283.29	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
284.29	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
285.29	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
290.29	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
291.29	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
292.29	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	eeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
293.29	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks toadd provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure	Accept in part
296.29	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
298.29	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
299.29	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R2. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
300.29	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R2. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part

301.29	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
302.29	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
303.29	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R2. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
304.29	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
305.43	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Opposes NH-R2 as the distinction between Canterbury and Otago Flood Assessment Overlay is confusing for the PDP user, and these rules should be combined. NH-R2, PER-3 could specify that this is applicable to Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay only. The effects of a pervious floor of a farm building will not result in a justifiable increase in adverse effects to adjoining land or properties in the rural zone or to the flood hazard that requires a distinction. Given the extent of the hazard mapping, especially through the Kurow and Omarama basin areas, the rule could unnecessarily restrict farm buildings which are low risk given these do not accommodate people. There are sufficient other mechanisms available to Council to remove liability if a farm building experienced flood damage should a landowner choose to construct a farm building within a flood hazard overlay, including s72-73 of the Building Act.	Amend rule as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. below ground swimming pool; or ... 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone ~~that has an unsealed or pervious floor~~; or PER-2 The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint more than $10m^2$or PER-4 Within the Otago Flood Assessment overlay, any building is not greater than $10m^2$in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed $20m^2$over a 10-year period. PER-4 Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3 RDIS-2Compliance is not achieved with PER-~~3~~4 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and ... 8. any storage of hazardous substances. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2	Accept in part

						Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 or RDIS-2 is precluded from being publicly notified.	
306.43	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Opposes NH-R2 as the distinction between Canterbury and Otago Flood Assessment Overlay is confusing for the PDP user, and these rules should be combined. NH-R2, PER-3 could specify that this is applicable to Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay only. The effects of a pervious floor of a farm building will not result in a justifiable increase in adverse effects to adjoining land or properties in the rural zone or to the flood hazard that requires a distinction. Given the extent of the hazard mapping, especially through the Kurow and Omarama basin areas, the rule could unnecessarily restrict farm buildings which are low risk given these do not accommodate people. There are sufficient other mechanisms available to Council to remove liability if a farm building experienced flood damage should a landowner choose to construct a farm building within a flood hazard overlay, including s72-73 of the Building Act.	Amend rule as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. below ground swimming pool; or ... 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone ~~that has an unsealed or pervious floor;~~ or PER-2 The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint more than 10m^2 or PER-4 Within the Otago Flood Assessment overlay, any building is not greater than 10m^2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m^2 over a 10-year period. PER-4 Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3 RDIS-2Compliance is not achieved with PER-~~3~~ 4 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and ... 8. any storage of hazardous substances. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2 Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 or RDIS-2 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Accept in part
312.297	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Amend	Opposes in part The submitters state they opposes NH-R2 and NH-R3 for the same reasons as NH-R1. They consider that there are other structures on farm which would not be any more affected by flood nor exacerbate a flood any more than those listed. Considers unenclosed buildings without floors allows for structures like hay barns and pole sheds. Consider floor types, such as concrete, may also be appropriate and should be considered within the permitted definition.	Seeks amendments which make addition for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure	Accept in part
313.37	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R2 Buildings, structures and fences in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay All z	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R2. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
66.8	Janeen Benny	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki	Amend	The submitter considers that the majority of this land is now part of the Waitaki River riverbed, through historic flooding. The submitter therefore accepts that all of the	The Submitter seeks that:	Accept in part

			River Floodplain Assessment Overlay		subject land should be subject to a single flood overlay. However, there are unnecessary flooding overlays with resultant NH-R2 and NH-R3 duplication.	The property is amended to retain a single flood overlay while considering deleting the other. If both flood layers are retained ensure consistency between applicable rules. An activity should not be permitted under one flood overlay and require resource consent under the other. Preference would be that the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay applies, providing an opportunity for a building to be considered as a Permitted Activity, if this is supported by a flood assessment as per NH-S1.	
153.15	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Amend	Support in part the rule but recommend including a condition that means buildings are only permitted when they are outside of a High Flood Hazard Area. Avoiding any development within a High Flood Hazard Area will reduce the impact to people and property in future flood events	Seek that the following amendment is made: PER-3 1. any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and 2. is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1.	Reject
190.32	Alliance Group Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers it appropriate for NH-R3 'Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay' to provide for buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay as a permitted activity with the fallback as a restricted discretionary activity. However, similar to the comment on NH-P7, there should be clarity about what size flood event the matters of discretion relate to. Alliance also wishes to ensure that the flood level selected is appropriate. This could be supported by the outputs of flood mapping for the site for the specified event to assist in understanding the implications for the Plant.	Amend NH-R3 'Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay' and provide clarity about the flood level to be managed in sub-clauses 3. and 4. and address other comments or otherwise delete the provision.	Accept in part
195.19	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Oppose the exclusion of intensive indoor primary production from farm buildings definition, and from the permitted activity pathway in NH-R1 as it creates unnecessary inconsistency, as similar structures on other farms remain permitted. Hazard controls should be based on a building's actual function and vulnerability, and existing provisions (PER-2 and PER-3) already provide appropriate management without singling out IIPP activities.	Delete the exclusion of Intensive Indoor Primary Production from the definition of Farm Buildings.	Accept in part
238.48	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Oppose in part Rule NH-R3 permit enclosed buildings without a floor (refer PER-1, clause 3 of each rule) in the flood assessment overlays. The submitters consider it unclear why this only applies to "enclosed" buildings. There are a range of other buildings without floors that are not enclosed and resilient to the effects of flooding, such as forecourt canopies. In addition, PER-1 applies to a structure, which has a broad meaning, and would capture the likes of small-scale ancillary structures, such as cabinets and signage.	The submitters seek to amend Rules NH-R1, NH-R2 and NH-R3 (PER-1, clause 3 and PER-3, in each case) as follows: Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 3.~~an unenclosed~~ building without a floor; or PER-3 Any building or structure is not greater than 10m2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m2 over a 10-year period.	Accept in part
240.126	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R3]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept
246.101	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Support	Support in part: The submitter opposes the exclusion of building used for intensive indoor primary production from this permitted activity pathway and seek that the definition of farm building is amended to include intensive indoor primary production.The submitters also seek that a post and wire fence (as referenced in PER-1) covers various fencing types and gates,	The submitter seeks amendment of NH-R3 as follows: PER-1 The building or structure is: 4. a post and wire or post and rail fence, or other fence used for the purposes of primary production, or farm-style gating; or Federated Farmers also seek amendment of the definition of farm building to remove the exclusion of buildings used for intensive indoor primary production.	Accept in part
251.145	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Amend	Considers that the matters of discretion for these rules should include whether activities may increase natural hazard risks. The submitter also considers that reverse-sensitivity effects on hazard mitigation measures should be explicitly assessed.	Seeks to amend the matters of discretion to include: 9. Effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) on natural hazard mitigation measures; and 10. The extent to which the activity causes or exacerbates natural hazard risks to surrounding sites and properties	Accept in part

265.37	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
267.37	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
269.37	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
282.37	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
283.37	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
284.37	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
285.37	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
290.37	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
291.37	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
292.37	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
293.37	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
296.37	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
298.37	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
299.37	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R3. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part

			River Floodplain Assessment Overlay		hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]		
300.37	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R3. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
301.37	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and May even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
302.37	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
303.37	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R3. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk. Considers the term 'suitably qualified and experienced professional' should be clarified. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
304.37	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Considers the definition should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
305.44	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Opposes NH-R3 as the distinction between Canterbury and Otago Flood Assessment Overlay is confusing for the PDP user, and these rules should be combined. NH-R2, PER-3 could specify that this is applicable to Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay only. The effects of a pervious floor of a farm building will not result in a justifiable increase in adverse effects to adjoining land or properties in the rural zone or to the flood hazard that requires a distinction. Given the extent of the hazard mapping, especially through the Kurow and Omarama basin areas, the rule could unnecessarily restrict farm buildings which are low risk given these do not accommodate people. There are sufficient other mechanisms available to Council to remove liability if a farm building experienced flood damage should a landowner choose to construct a farm building within a flood hazard overlay, including s72-73 of the Building Act.	Amend rule as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. below ground swimming pool; or ... 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone ~~that has an unsealed or pervious floor~~; or PER-2 The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint more than $10m^2$or PER-4 Within the Otago Flood Assessment overlay, any building is not greater than $10m^2$in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed $20m^2$over a 10-year period. PER-4 Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3	Accept in part

						RDIS-2Compliance is not achieved with PER-~~3~~4 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and ... 8. any storage of hazardous substances. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2 Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 or RDIS-2 is precluded from being publicly notified.	
306.44	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Opposes NH-R3 as the distinction between Canterbury and Otago Flood Assessment Overlay is confusing for the PDP user, and these rules should be combined. NH-R2, PER-3 could specify that this is applicable to Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay only. The effects of a pervious floor of a farm building will not result in a justifiable increase in adverse effects to adjoining land or properties in the rural zone or to the flood hazard that requires a distinction. Given the extent of the hazard mapping, especially through the Kurow and Omarama basin areas, the rule could unnecessarily restrict farm buildings which are low risk given these do not accommodate people. There are sufficient other mechanisms available to Council to remove liability if a farm building experienced flood damage should a landowner choose to construct a farm building within a flood hazard overlay, including s72-73 of the Building Act.	Amend rule as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The building or structure is: 1. below ground swimming pool; or ... 5. a farm building in a Rural Zone ~~that has an unsealed or pervious floor~~; or PER-2 The building activity is for the maintenance, repair or alteration of an existing building; and does not increase the building footprint more than 10m^2 or PER-4 Within the Otago Flood Assessment overlay, any building is not greater than 10m^2 in area and the cumulative area of additions does not exceed 20m^2 over a 10-year period. PER-4 Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, any building has a finished floor level equal to or higher than the minimum floor level specified in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1; and is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment prepared in accordance with NH-S1. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with any of PER-1, PER-2, and/or PER-3 RDIS-2Compliance is not achieved with PER-~~3~~ 4 and the building, structure or fence is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area, as determined by a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and ... 8. any storage of hazardous substances. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-2 Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 or RDIS-2 is precluded from being publicly notified.	Accept in part
312.298	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki	Amend	Opposes in part The submitters state they opposes NH-R2 and NH-R3 for the same reasons as NH-R1. They consider that there are other structures on farm which would not be any more	Seeks amendments which make addition for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part

			River Floodplain Assessment Overlay		affected by flood nor exacerbate a flood any more than those listed.Considers unenclosed buildings without floors allows for structures like hay barns and pole sheds. Consider floor types, such as concrete, may also be appropriate and should be considered within the permitted definition.		
313.335	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R3 Buildings, structures and fences in the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay	Oppose	Opposes in part NH-R3. Considers the rule should acknowledge that other farm structures, like poles or irrigation infrastructure, are not more flood-prone or hazardous than those already listed, and may even mitigate risk.	Seeks to add provision for other floors in buildings and structures like poles and water infrastructure.	Accept in part
153.16	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
166.28	Horticulture New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Oppose	Opposes as it does not enable erosion and sediment controls which are required to support primary production activities.	Amend to include 'ancillary rural earthworks' [see relief sought in submission point 166.1] as a permitted activity.	Accept in part
190.33	Alliance Group Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Amend	Seeks that NH-R4 'Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays' be amended. The Submitter seeks changes to this Rule to more realistically provide for earthworks height and volume limits in Overlays.	Amend NH-R4 'Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays' as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 1.the earthworks do not exceed 500m^2 ~~10m^3~~ per year ~~and 20m^3 cumulatively in any 10 year period~~; and 2.the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 500mm ~~200mm~~ above natural ground level; and 3.the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5.	Reject
195.20	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Oppose	Oppose the provision as it does not enable erosion and sediment controls that might typically be required to support a primary production activity.	Seel provision of a permitted activity pathway for earthworks associated with erosion and sediment controls in flood assessment overlays.	Accept in part
212.28	Glenbrook Station	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Oppose	Considers the earthworks limits in NH-R4 to be impractical for large rural properties and ineffective for managing flood displacement, noting that cuts and fills often balance out and flood catchments are extensive. Overall, the submitter considers the standards to impose unnecessary costs, undermine the purpose of the General Rural Zone, and result in most farm buildings no longer being permitted. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks amendments to the rule as follows: a. PER-1.1 of Rule NH-R4 does not apply to earthworks for a building that has building consent. b. PER-1.2 and PER1.3 of Rule NH-R4 do not apply for properties over 40 ha where the earthworks are located over 100m from a natural hazard sensitive activity.	Reject
212.35	Glenbrook Station	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Amend	Considers earthworks for solar farms typically minor and disproportionately regulated under Rule NH-R4.	Seeks an exemption for earthworks for solar farms.	Reject
238.49	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Oppose	The submitter opposes NH-R4 as the earthworks restrictions in PER-1 are not consistent with those provided under the NESCS. The submitters consider activities provided under the NESCS should be encouraged by the Council. NESCS does not aim at addressing natural hazard risks, its activities are restricted by their scale and duration. Which the submitters consider not contrary to the PDP approach in the natural hazards chapter. The submitters also consider the title of the rule "Earthworks excluding land disturbance" to be unclear given that the definition of earthworks includes "disturbance of land". The submitters believe this should be clarified in the rule or in an advice note on the rule that achieves the intent of the change sought. For the avoidance of doubt, the Submitters consider that Rule NH-R6 (which applies to	The submitters seek to amend Rule NH-R4 through the addition of PER-3 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5or PER-3	Reject

					the flood overlay areas, except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5) should be amended to clarify to land disturbance is a permitted activity in all flood overlays.	The earthworks are undertaken in accordance with the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011	
240.127	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R4]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept
243.43	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Oppose	Opposes proposed NH-R4 as the rule creates potential confusion with respect to earthworks associated with road maintenance	Seeks to add new clause as follows: PER-3 The Earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of a Road including deposition of clean fill.	Accept in part
246.102	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports in part: The submitters support the intent of NFL-R4 but consider the inclusion of earthworks provision in NH chapter creates confusion and inconsistency with NPS. The submitters are concerned that the flood assessment overlays capture large areas of farmland. The submitters consider that the limitations on volume, cut and height in PER-1 are too conservative. There is no evidence or justification in the s32 report for why additional earthworks restrictions beyond those general restrictions in the EW Chapter, are necessary. The submitters request an exclusion for infrastructure / asset maintenance (as provided for in other overlays), noting any linkages to provisions in the ENG, INF and TRANS chapters. Support the restricted discretionary rule status where compliance with PER-1 and PER-2 is not achieved	The submitters seek that NH-R4 be relocated to the EW chapter, as required by the NPS. The submitters also seek amendment of NH-R4 as follows: ~~PER-1~~ ~~the earthworks do not exceed 10m3 per year and 20m3 cumulatively in any 10 year period; and~~ ~~the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 200mm above natural ground level; and~~ ~~the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or~~ PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5.,or PER-3 The earthworks are undertaken for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established: 1. farm tracks, stock tracks and crossings; 2. yards and other hardstand areas; 3. water supply and irrigation systems; 4. fences; 5. dams/ponds; 6. walking and cycling tracks; 7. driveways and access; 8. stormwater infrastructure, sediment, detention ponds, culverts and stormwater, drains; 9. farm buildings; 10 aircraft landing areas (permitted by GRUZ-R5); 11. firebreaks 12. offal or farm rubbish pits or silage pits.	Accept in part
251.146	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Amend	Considers that the earthworks rule should connect more clearly with changes sought to hazard mitigation works. The submitter also considers that amendments are needed to ensure consistency with related policy relief.	Seeks to amend NH-R4 in accordance with relief sought to NH-R5. [refer submission point 251.147]	Accept in part
265.30	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
267.30	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows:	Accept in part

			Assessment Overlays All zones			PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	
269.30	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
271.265	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Amend	Amend NH-R4 'Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays' as this rule permits some earthworks that fall below arbitrary thresholds and requires consent for earthworks exceeding these thresholds. This means that some earthworks that could cause off-site flood effects will be allowed without control of effects, and some earthworks that cause no effects will require resource consent. This is also a better place to address offsite effects associated with buildings and structures. Suggest modifying this rule to align with that used in other district plans, which would in turn allow for NH-R2 to focus on buildings as per suggested changes.	NH-R4 Earthworks, buildings, and structures excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays Where: PER-1 ~~1. the earthworks do not exceed 10m^3 per year and 20m^3 cumulatively in any 10 year period; and~~ ~~2. the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 200mm above natural ground level; and~~ ~~3. the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or~~ Flooding will not be worsened on another property through the diversion or displacement of floodwaters ~~PER-2~~ ~~The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5.~~ Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 ~~and/or PER-2~~ Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. location, nature and scale of the earthworks, buildings, and structures and their associated effects; and 2. mitigation of flooding and drainage effects; and 3. effects on land stability, flooding, waterways, ground levels and dispersed effects on and off site. ...	Accept in part
282.30	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
283.30	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
284.30	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
285.30	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part

290.30	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
291.30	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
292.30	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
293.30	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
296.30	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
298.30	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
299.30	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports in part NH-R4 with modification to permit the building of tracks.	Amend NH-R4 as follows: PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5; or PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
300.30	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports in part NH-R4 with modification to permit the building of tracks.	Amend NH-R4 as follows: PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5; or PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
301.30	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
302.30	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
303.30	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports in part NH-R4 with modification to permit the building of tracks.	Amend NH-R4 as follows: ... PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5; or	Accept in part

						PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track. ...	
304.30	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports with recommendation to permit the building of tracks.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	Accept in part
305.45	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Oppose	Opposes NH-R4 'Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays' as Earthworks associated with a permitted building or structure should be precluded from this rule to avoid unnecessary resource consenting requirements. Earthworks undertaken on community scale / natural hazard mitigation structures are appropriate. Given the scale of hazard mapped areas, the thresholds would unnecessarily constrain primary production activities, especially where cut and depth standards are also included and are better thresholds to manage any modifications to the land contour.	Amend rule as follows: 'Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 1.the earthworks are associated with a permitted building or structure by NH-R1-R3; or 2. the earthworks do not exceed ~~1~~20m^3 per year ~~and 20m^3 cumulatively in any 10 year period~~; and 3. the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 200mm above natural ground level; and 4. the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5.	Reject
306.45	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Oppose	Opposes NH-R4 'Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays' as Earthworks associated with a permitted building or structure should be precluded from this rule to avoid unnecessary resource consenting requirements. Earthworks undertaken on community scale / natural hazard mitigation structures are appropriate. Given the scale of hazard mapped areas, the thresholds would unnecessarily constrain primary production activities, especially where cut and depth standards are also included and are better thresholds to manage any modifications to the land contour.	Amend rule as follows: 'Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 1.the earthworks are associated with a permitted building or structure by NH-R1-R3; or 2. the earthworks do not exceed ~~1~~ 20m^3 per year ~~and 20m^3 cumulatively in any 10 year period~~; and 3. the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 200mm above natural ground level; and 4. the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5.	Reject
312.299	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Amend	Supports in part The submitter considers that given the desirability of ensuring egress of people from a flood zone it would be beneficial to permit the building of tracks.	Seeking the following amendments to NH-R4 NH-R4 — Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones — Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 1. the earthworks do not exceed 10m3 per year and 20m3 cumulatively in any 10 year period; and 2. the earthworks do not involve the filling of more than 200mm above natural ground level; and Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and/or PER-2 Matters of discretion are restricted to:	Accept in part

						3. the earthworks do not involve the cut of more than 500mm below natural ground level; or PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5;or PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track.	1. location, nature and scale of the earthworks; and 2. mitigation of flooding and drainage effects; and 3. effects on land stability, flooding, waterways, ground levels and dispersed effects on and off site. Notification: Any application made under RDIS-1 is precluded from being publicly notified. Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications: Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must contain a flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional.
313.38	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R4 Earthworks excluding land disturbance in all Flood Assessment Overlays All zones	Support	Supports in part NH-R4 with modification to permit the building of tracks.	Amend NH-R4 as follows: ... PER-2 The earthworks relate to the maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrade of natural hazard mitigation works permitted under NH-R5; or PER-3 The earthworks are for the construction of a farm track. ...	Accept in part
153.17	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays – maintenance, repair,	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
246.103	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays – maintenance, repair,	Support	Supports in part: The submitter supports the purpose of this rule but object to the requirement that flood mitigation or stream, or river management works are only permitted when done by or on behalf of a statutory agency or their nominated agent. Seeking to ensure that mitigation works involving private land within natural hazard areas undertaken by a statutory agency, or their nominated contractors or agents are undertaken in a manner that is compliant with section 181 of the Local Government Act 2002.	The submitters seek amendment of NH-R5 as follows: PER-3 The activity is undertaken by or on behalf of Canterbury Regional Council, Otago Regional Council or Waitaki District Councilin accordance with powers in relation to construction of works on private land under the Local Government Act 2002.	Accept in part
251.147	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays – maintenance, repair,	Amend	Considers that allowing natural hazard mitigation works within 25 metres of existing structures as a permitted activity is insufficiently justified. The submitter also considers that a stronger distinction is required between hard-engineering solutions and softer, more appropriate approaches.	Seeks to amend NH-R5 to address matters raised in this submission.	Accept in part
271.266	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays – maintenance, repair,	Amend	Considers that a single rule NH-R5 to enable flood resilience protection within the Waitaki catchment is supported. However, note that Earthwork rules don't apply if the NHMW Rule applies - removal of 'maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrading' as there is no other obvious Rule that this escalates to.	Amend the rule as follows: NH-R5 Natural hazard mitigation works in all Flood Assessment Overlays~~- maintenance, repair, replacement and upgrading~~ Activity status: Permitted PER-1	Accept in part

						The activity is undertaken by or on behalf of Canterbury Regional Council, Otago Regional Council or Waitaki District Council; or PER-2 The natural hazard mitigation works are within 25m of the existing alignment or location, vertically and horizontally; and ~~PER-The~~ footprint of the ~~natural hazard mitigation~~ works is not increased by more than 25%.; ~~and~~ ~~PER-3The activity is undertaken by or on behalf of Canterbury Regional Council, Otago Regional Council or Waitaki District Council.~~ Exemption Note: Where PER-1 is met, other rules within the Plan do not apply Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, and/or PER-2 ~~and/or PER-3~~ ...	
83.10	Waitaki District Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Amend	Submitter seeks to improve grammar and clarity	Seeks to add commas after the words 'PER-1' and 'District' as per the following: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, and if the activity is located within the Canterbury region of the District, it is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.	Accept
153.18	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
166.29	Horticulture New Zealand	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
195.21	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Amend	Support the permitted activity status for primary production.	Amend to include a permitted activity pathway for Farm Buildings that include those associated with Intensive Indoor Primary Production.	Reject
212.30	Glenbrook Station	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Oppose	Considers Glenbrook Station to be a suitable location for an airfield due to its elevation. The submitter supports GRUZ-R15, but considers Rule NH-R6 problematic because it may require consent for commercial or emergency flights within the flood overlay, depending on how airstrips are classified. The submitter opposes this rule, noting that aircraft are mobile and can be relocated during flood events, making the requirement unnecessary and unclear.	Seeks to add a new clause (5) as follows: Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas	Accept in part
212.34	Glenbrook Station	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Amend	Considers solar farms not sensitive to flooding and therefore inappropriately regulated under Rule NH-R6. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seek an exemption for solar farms.	Accept in part
238.50	Fuel Companies	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Oppose	Rule NH-R6 Oppose in part For the reasons noted on Rule NH-R4 the submitters seek clarification that land disturbance is a permitted activity in all flood overlays under Rule NH-R6. In the absence of this clarification, it could be interpretated that all land disturbance is a restricted discretionary activity under Rule NH-R6.	The submitters seek to amend rule NH-R6 as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The activity is one of the following: 1. primary production; 2. recreation or leisure activity including sports fields; 3. temporary events;	Reject

						4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above; 5.land disturbance	
246.104	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	The submitters support NH-R6 land use activities associated with primary production being provided for as a permitted activity within the flood assessment overlays (except as provided for in NH-R4 and NH-R5).	The submitters seek retention of NH-R6 as notified in the PDP.	Accept in part
251.148	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Amend	Cconsiders that primary production as a permitted activity in flood overlays is inappropriate because contaminants mobilised during flooding can harm culturally significant environments. The submitter also considers that intensive production should be excluded due to the greater risk it poses. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: - Exclude intensive indoor primary production and intensive outdoor primary production from PER-1(1) - Set a new rule/activity status for intensive indoor primary production and intensive outdoor primary production land use activities in the stated flood assessment overlays.	Reject
265.31	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
267.31	Kelvin and Debbie Weir	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
269.31	Brenda & Ken McLeod	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
271.267	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Oppose	Opposes NH-R6 'Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Overlay (except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5)' as these activities will be permitted by default, and this rule does not impose any conditions on them.	Deletion of NH-R6 'Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Overlay (except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5)'.	Reject
282.31	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
283.31	Dogterom Hohepa Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
284.31	Dogterom Duntroon Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
285.31	Barry and Anne Matthews	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
290.31	Philip and Becky Wilson	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter takeoff and landing areas.	Accept
291.31	Peter and Janine Stackhouse	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas.	Accept

292.31	Robert and Sylvia Borst	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter takeoff and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
293.31	Brock and Gemma Hamilton	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
296.31	Gavin Simpson	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take-off and landing areas.	Accept
298.31	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
299.31	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports in part NH-R6 with modification to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Amend NH-R6 as follows: PER-1 The activity is one of the following: 1. primary production; 2. recreation or leisure activity including sports fields; 3. temporary events; 4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
300.31	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports in part NH-R6 with modification to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Amend NH-R6 as follows: PER-1 The activity is one of the following: 1. primary production; 2. recreation or leisure activity including sports fields; 3. temporary events; 4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
301.31	Carolyn Thelning	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
302.31	Peter and Sandra Mitchell	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Accept
303.31	Terry and Fiona Conlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports in part NH-R6 with modification to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Amend NH-R6 as follows: PER-1 The activity is one of the following: 1. primary production; 2. recreation or leisure activity including sports fields; 3. temporary events; 4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above	Accept

						5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.				
304.31	Kirsty and Nathan McLachlan	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports with recommendation to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Seeks to amend as follows: 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.				Accept
312.300	Springbank	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Amend	Supports in part NH-R6 The submitters consider there to be other land uses compatible with the objectives and policies of the NH chapter. (i.e airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas often serving as dual use with primary production areas)	Seeks the following amendments NH-R6 — Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and the Waitaki River Floodplain Overlay (except as provided for by NH-R4 and NH-R5) All zones	Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The activity is one of the following: 1. primary production; 2. recreation or leisure activity including sports fields; 3. temporary events; 4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1 and if the activity is located within the Canterbury region of the District it is not located in a High Flood Hazard Area as determined in a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. mitigation of flooding effects; and 2. floor levels, including alternative means of complying with any floor level specified in a flood assessment; and 3. methods to manage the activity and people during a flood event; and 4. access, including safe egress from the site/building; and 5. the nature of the activity and the risk and vulnerability to flood events. Note: Section 88 Information Requirements for Applications: Pursuant to Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991, any application made under this provision must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a flood assessment certificate prepared in accordance with NH-S1.	Accept

						Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1 Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1	
313.39	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Natural Hazards	NH-R6 Land use activities in the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, the Otago Flood Assessme	Support	Supports in part NH-R6 with modification to add other uses which are compatible with the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazards chapter such as airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas.	Amend NH-R6 as follows: PER-1 The activity is one of the following: 1. primary production; 2. recreation or leisure activity including sports fields; 3. temporary events; 4. parking and loading areas at ground level or above 5. Aeroplane airstrips and helicopter take off and landing areas. ...	Accept
240.128	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R7 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R7]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Reject
251.149	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R7 Earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Very Low Risk and Low Risk Areas	Support	Considers that the approach to earthworks in the Moeraki Land Instability area is generally appropriate. The submitter also considers that future policy must remain linked to how building activity is managed in this risk context.	Seeks to retain as notified.	
83.7	Waitaki District Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Very Low Risk and Low Risk A	Amend	Submitter considers note is superfluous	*Note: Where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with any geotechnical conditions of a resource consent that has already been approved within the last two years from 1 March 2025, then this rule can be considered to be complied with.*	Accept
153.20	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Very Low Risk and Low Risk A	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
240.129	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Very Low Risk and Low Risk A	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R8]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Reject
251.150	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R8 Building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Very Low Risk and Low Risk A	Oppose	Considers that requiring restricted discretionary status for building in very low and low risk areas is overly stringent. The submitter also considers that such restrictions are not justified by the evidence base provided.	Seeks amendments to enable building activities for the very low and low risk areas in terms of use of the Moeraki Native Reserve by Kāi Tahu.	Accept in part
83.8	Waitaki District Council	Natural Hazards	NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Moderate Risk	Amend	Submitter considered note is superfluous	Seeks deletion of note ~~*Note: Where a building or structure is constructed in accordance with any geotechnical conditions of a resource consent that has already been approved within the last two years from 1 March 2025, then this rule can be considered to be complied with, with respect to proposals for buildings and structures (including additions and alterations).*~~	Accept
153.21	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Moderate Risk	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part

240.130	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Natural Hazards	NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Moderate Risk	Support	Support in part. Opposes the non-notification clauses [NH-R9]. Considers natural hazard risk is of significant public importance and activities in hazard risk areas should be subject to normal notification processes.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept
251.151	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	NH-R9 Earthworks and/or building activity in the Moeraki Land Instability Overlay – Moderate Risk	Amend	Considers that the justification for a restricted discretionary status in moderate-risk areas is unclear. The submitter also considers that further clarity is needed regarding the rationale for this risk categorisation.	Seeks clarification on the reasoning for the stringency of approach taken.	Accept in part
153.19	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Natural Hazards	NH-S1 Flood assessment certificate Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay; A	Amend	Support requiring a flood assessment certificate for activities within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay but recommend also requiring a flood assessment certificate for activities within the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay to identify High Flood Hazard Areas and minimum floor height requirements. For these hazard overlays, the flood assessment certificate will need to be provided by Otago Regional Council.	Seekt the following amendment be made: Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay, Otago Flood Assessment Overlay, and Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay; A flood assessment certificate shall be provided by Canterbury Regional Council, or Otago Regional Council which specifies: (…) 1. the most up to date models and maps held by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, or Canterbury Regional Council; and (…)	Reject
271.270	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	NH-S1 Flood assessment certificate Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay; A	Amend	Seeks that WDC revises the wording to NH-S1 'Flood assessment certificate' that reflects the approach that is preferred by WDC and the Mackenzie District Council. It is important that the standard refers to a specific flood event magnitude, as referring to 'the assessed flood level' is not sufficiently certain. Their suggested wording references the 500-year ARI flood event, but this could be reduced to a 200-year ARI standard, which is the minimum required by the CRPS.	Amend the NH-S1 'Flood assessment certificate' as follows: NH-S1 Flood Assessment Certificate Within the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay; A flood assessment has been issued (that is valid for three years from the date of issue) ~~certificate shall be provided by Canterbury Regional Council,~~ which specifies: 1. whether or not the building or activity is located on land that is within a High Flood Hazard Area; and 2.~~the~~ a minimum finished floor level for any new building ~~or structure~~ that is 300mm above the ~~assessed~~ 500 year ARI flood level. The flood assessment will be completed with reference to: 1. the most up to date models and maps held by Waitaki District Council or Canterbury Regional Council; and 2.any relevant field information; ~~and~~ ~~3. any site-specific flood assessment prepared by a suitably qualified and experience professional.~~ Note: Compliance with this standard shall be demonstrated by a flood assessment prepared by a person or organisation that has been certified by the Waitaki District Council as being suitably qualified and experienced. This includes the Canterbury Regional Council.	Accept in part
271.248	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	Note that there is no alluvial fan data currently held (at the time of notification) for the Canterb	Support	Considers it appropriate to amend the NH Introduction to highlight in the surface fault rupture and liquefaction sections of the Introduction the same concept that is mentioned in the flooding sections – that the overlay identifies where potential for flooding may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if subdivision or other activities are proposed. For the Canterbury mapping, the potential for surface flooding was considered.	Amend as follows: Note that there is no alluvial fan data currently held (at the time of notification) for the Canterbury part of the Waitaki district. However, most alluvial fans are included in the Flood Assessment Overlay for Canterbury.	Accept in part
126.3	Wendy Nash and Konrad Jankowitz	Natural Hazards	The Flood Assessment Overlay includes land identified by the Otago and Canterbury Regional Councils	Oppose	Opposes the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay extent on the Submitters property (628 Palmerston-Dunback, Palmerston-Dunback) that should be reduced by 10m due to the rising topography of the land.	The Otago Flood Assessment Overlay as detailed in the NH Introduction, to be amended in its present location by a 10m reduction.	Reject
271.246	Canterbury Regional Council	Natural Hazards	The mapping is focused on areas floodable from rivers or major streams and does not include local su	Support	Generally, supports the NH Introduction. However, it would be useful to highlight in the surface fault rupture and liquefaction sections of the Introduction, the same concept that is mentioned in the flooding sections – that the overlay identifies where potential for flooding may exist and should be investigated further at a site-specific level if subdivision or other activities are proposed. For the Canterbury mapping, the potential for surface flooding was considered.	Delete the Flooding fourth paragraph as follows: ~~The mapping is focused on areas floodable from rivers or major streams and does not include local surface runoff flooding. It is also focused on rivers and streams close to existing development, or where there is potential for future development.~~	Accept in part

51.40	James White	Natural Hazards	The Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay covers land on the southern side of the Waitaki Rive	Oppose	Considers that the WRFAO Overlay should be removed from all properties affected by the WRFAO Overlay that are owned by the submitter. [refer to original submission for full reasons] [n.b. The Submitter's Otematata properties: 9 East Road; 14 Lindis Crescent; 2-4 Tasman Road mentioned zoned LCZ and GRZ are affected by the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay ("CFAO") and not the WRFAO.]	Seeks that the CFAO Overlay, where present, is deleted from Plan properties affected in Otematata that are owned by the submitter. [Inferred relief sought. Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Reject
244.82	Telecommunication Companies	Natural Hazards	User Notes: For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one c	Support	Considers that the infrastructure chapter addresses how infrastructure interacts with natural hazards is supported, however the natural hazard chapter should not apply to infrastructure, which needs to be clearly stated in the user notes.	Seeks to amend the User notes as follows: ~~Additional~~objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within areas subject to a natural hazard overlay, are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter.As such, the natural hazards chapter does not apply to those activities.	Accept in part
251.131	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Natural Hazards	User Notes: For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one c	Amend	Considers that users should be clearly directed to the SASM chapter when natural hazard mitigation works may affect wāhi tūpuna. The submitter considers the current omission to be misleading given overlaps between SASM areas and hazard overlays.	Seeks amendments to include reference to the SASM chapter.	Accept
309.89	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Natural Hazards	User Notes: For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one c	Amend	Requests clearer user notes in the Natural Hazards chapter to specify which objectives, policies, and rules apply to infrastructure, aiming to reduce duplication. Considers all infrastructure provisions should be located in the Infrastructure chapter, but due to the plan's structure, seek clarification that only the objectives and policies of the Natural Hazard chapter apply to infrastructure.	Seeks to amend as follows: Additional objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within areas subject to a natural hazard overlay, are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter. Only the objectives and policies within the Natural Hazard chapter apply to infrastructure. All rules relating to infrastructure activities within Natural Hazard overlay are found within the Infrastructure Chapter.	Accept in part

Coastal Environment

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
153.25	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
194.86	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Support	Consdiers the objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-O2 CE-O5 'Climate Change' as notified.	Accept in part
240.109	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Support	Support in part. Considers the objective does not give effect to the NZCPS and that the effects of climate change should not be "provided for" but avoided or mitigated. Considers the objective should not be restricted to the effects climate change will have on coastal natural hazards	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept in part
251.272	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Amend	Considers that the objective does not correctly address climate-change obligations under the NZCPS and PORPS. The submitter considers that the plan must instead identify and plan for climate-related risks, particularly coastal hazard risks. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Recognise and provide for t~~The effects of climate change, and its influence on ~~he frequency and severity of~~ coastal natural hazards~~ risks~~, are identified and planned for.	Accept
253.149	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Oppose	Opposes The submitter supports the inclusion of a climate change objective. The submitters considers the wording of the objective to be problematic. Considers the objective to imply enabling or accommodating the effects, rather than taking active steps to avoid, remedy, or mitigate them. The objective should be redrafted to implement NZCPS direction on the use and management of the Coastal Environment subject to climate change effects The submitter also seeks the inclusion of NZCPS requirements for councils to support the natural adjustment of habitats and ecosystems in response to the changing climate into the objective	Amend CE-O5 as follows: Recognise and ~~provide for~~ manage the ~~effects~~ of climate change ~~and its influence on the frequency and severity of coastal natural hazards.~~so that: a. avoidable social and economic loss and harm to communities does not occur, b. natural adjustments for coastal processes, natural defences, ecosystems, habitat and species are allowed to occur, and c. the natural character, public access, amenity and other values within the Coastal Environment meets the needs of future generations.	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
						Identify and map areas of the Coastal Environment and adjoining land that are likely to be subject to natural adjustments for coastal processes, natural defences, ecosystems, habitats and species as a result of climate change.	
265.224	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
282.256	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.117	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O5 Climate Change Recognise and provide for the effects of climate change and its in	Support	Supports CE-O5 as notified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
153.26	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
194.140	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	Supports CE-O6 'Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development' as these objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-O6 'Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development' as notified.	Accept in part
240.110	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	Support in part. Considers the objective should not be restricted to coastal natural hazards.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Reject
246.228	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	Support in part: The submitters note that the title of CE-O6 refers to new subdivision, use and development, but the wording of the objective applies to subdivision, use and development in general. They seek amendments to make it clear the objective is intended to address new activities.	The submitters seek amendment of CE-O6 as follows: New ~~S~~subdivision, use and development does not increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm from coastal natural hazards.	Accept
251.273	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Amend	Considers that the objective focuses too narrowly on preventing increased hazard risk without ensuring development occurs in appropriate locations. The submitter considers that clearer direction is needed to manage subdivision and development to avoid social, economic, or environmental harm from coastal hazards. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: CE-O6 :New subdivision, use and development subject to ~~C~~coastal natural hazard risks ~~and~~ Subdivision, use and development are located and managed to avoid increasing ~~does not increase~~ the risk of social, economic or environmental harm from coastal natural hazards.	Accept in part
259.79	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Oppose	Considers that although the objectives recognise natural hazard risks, they fail to acknowledge that natural hazard mitigation works regularly occur within the coastal environment. The submitter considers that an additional objective and policy are needed to reflect the functional need for such mitigation works, consistent with the direction in the pORPS. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add new objective as follows: CE-Ox Natural hazard mitigation activities undertaken by the district or regional authority are enabled to be located in the Coastal Environment where there is a functional need.	Accept in part
265.225	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
282.257	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
305.164	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	Support in part. Support for the intent but considers the objective needs to be clear regarding new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: 'New ~~S~~subdivision, use and development does not increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm from coastal natural hazards.'	Accept
306.164	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	Support in part. Support for the intent but considers the objective needs to be clear regarding new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: 'New ~~S~~subdivision, use and development does not increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm from coastal natural hazards.'	Accept
312.118	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O6 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Subdivision	Support	Supports CE-O6 as notified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
153.27	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development The risk of harm to existin	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
194.141	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development The risk of harm to existin	Support	Supports CE-O7 'Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development' as these objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-O7 as notified.	Accept in part
240.111	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development The risk of harm to existin	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
251.274	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development The risk of harm to existin	Amend	Considers that the drafting of CE-O7 is unclear because it mixes mitigation and adaptation while relying heavily on hazard overlays. The submitter considers that responses should reflect NZCPS and PORPS, including restoring natural defences and enabling relocation. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: CE-O7:Mitigating and adapting to ~~C~~coastal natural hazard risks ~~and existing development~~ Waitaki communities are prepared for and able to mitigate and adapt to coastal natural hazard risks, including the effects of climate change, by: 1. Protecting and restoring natural defences to reduce risk to existing development, and 2.Developing a range of responses to the impacts and risks of natural hazards and climate change, including the option to relocate buildings and structures. ~~The risk of harm to existing development in coastal natural hazard overlays is reduced through natural defences, and the option to relocate buildings and structures to areas outside coastal natural hazard overlays is available.~~	Accept in part
259.80	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development The risk of harm to existin	Oppose	Considers that the objectives and policies fail to recognise the ongoing need for natural hazard mitigation works within the coastal environment, despite regularly required engineering interventions such as opening coastal mouths during high-flow events. The submitter considers that an additional objective and policy should be inserted to acknowledge these activities and to align with the pORPS direction to provide for the functional needs of hazard mitigation measures. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add new objective as follows: CE-Ox Natural hazard mitigation activities undertaken by the district or regional authority are enabled to be located in the Coastal Environment where there is a functional need.	Accept in part
265.226	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development The risk of harm to existin	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
282.258	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development The risk of harm to existin	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.119	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O7 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing	Support	Supports CE-O7 as notified	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
			development The risk of harm to existin				
153.30	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards Identify and map areas that may be subject to t	Amend	Support mapping these coastal hazards, however, recommend mapping these hazards over at least the next 100 years. This change would be in line with wording from the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement	Seeking that the following amendment be made: Identify and map areas that may be subject to the following coastal natural hazards, over the next at least100 years: (...)	Accept
194.102	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards Identify and map areas that may be subject to t	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P14 as notified.	Accept in part
251.288	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards Identify and map areas that may be subject to t	Amend	Considers the policy broadly aligns with NZCPS requirements but fails to meet PORPS directions and considers that the policy must prioritise identifying areas of high risk.	Seeks amendments to give effect to the PORPS as regards giving priority to identifying areas of high risk.	Accept
265.241	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards Identify and map areas that may be subject to t	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
282.273	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards Identify and map areas that may be subject to t	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.135	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P14 Identify coastal natural hazards Identify and map areas that may be subject to t	Support	Supports CE-P14 as notified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
153.31	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Avoid new	Amend	Support in part but seek amendments to specify that risk must not be increased to an intolerable level and for the Council to provide a definition for what it deems to be "intolerable risk". An "increased risk" does not acknowledge any instances where the level of risk to loss of life, serious injuries, environmental harm, or economic loss is already high within the Coastal Environment. NHC has developed a Risk Tolerance Methodology to integrate risk tolerance assessments into existing risk management approaches and could be used by Council [see original submission for link].	Seek the following amendments be made: Avoid new subdivision (...) result in an intolerable level of risk both now and in the future.~~Increased risk of loss of life, or serious injuries, environmental harm, or economic loss in the event of a coastal natural hazard occurrence~~ Include a definition for an "intolerable level" of risk.	Accept in part
194.103	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Avoid new	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P15 as notified.	Accept in part
242.31	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Coastal Environment	CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Avoid new	Support	Supports CE-P15 and acknowledges that coastal hazard sensitive activities, which includes educational facilities should avoid being located within the Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays were possible. Considers that there may be a functional and/or operational need to locate educational facilities within these overlays, particularly to serve existing communities, and this policy provides for subject to demonstration of measures that mitigate, if not avoid, the risk of the aforementioned hazards on people and property.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
251.289	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Avoid new	Amend	Considers the policy is inconsistent with PORPS risk-management requirements and that assessments must address resilience, risk thresholds, proportionality, and interaction with other policies. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks amendments to give effect to the PORPS in regards to risk assessments being prepared commensurate to the risk	Accept in part
265.242	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Avoid new	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
282.274	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Avoid new	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.136	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P15 Coastal natural hazard risks and new subdivision, use and development Avoid new	Support	Supports CE-P15 as notified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
153.32	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development Increase the resilience of	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
194.104	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development Increase the resilience of	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P16 as notified.	Accept in part
251.290	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development Increase the resilience of	Amend	Considers the policy incorrectly treats resilience as requiring avoidance of new built form. The submitter considers that Māori land must be able to be used and developed, with mana whenua leading approaches to managing hazard risk. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: ... 4. enabling the use and development of native reserves and Māori land, and recognising rakatirataka over this land, by enabling mana whenua, and owners of Māori freehold land in relation to their land, to lead approaches to managing coastal natural hazard risks. Seeks amendments to the title of the policy in line with the amendments sought in this submission and other changes to this policy as required to address the matters raised by this submission.	Accept in part
265.243	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development Increase the resilience of	Support	Support with amendments for clarity, noting that adaptive management is undefined and risks bypassing formal plan processes, and that buildings should be enabled to be removed from Coastal Natural Hazard overlays regardless of the effectiveness of natural or engineered defences.	Seeks to amend as follows: Increase the resilience of exposed communities from coastal natural hazard risks within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays by: 1. applying an adaptive management approach through plan changes, ~~which can be adjusted over time~~ and in response to changing risk levels and tolerances or new information; and 2. encouraging and enabling managed retreat, including the relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures from within coastal natural hazards areas to areas outside Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays.,~~when natural defences are not an effective response to risk; and~~ 3. avoiding additions to existing buildings in Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays unless the increase in building footprint is minor and it does not involve the establishment of a new coastal hazard sensitive activity.	Accept in part
282.275	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development Increase the resilience of	Support	Support with amendments for clarity, noting that adaptive management is undefined and risks bypassing formal plan processes, and that buildings should be enabled to be removed from Coastal Natural Hazard overlays regardless of the effectiveness of natural or engineered defences.	Seeks to amend as follows: Increase the resilience of exposed communities from coastal natural hazard risks within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays by: 1. applying an adaptive management approach through plan changes, ~~which can be adjusted over time~~ and in response to changing risk levels and tolerances or new information; and 2. encouraging and enabling managed retreat, including the relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures from within coastal natural hazards areas to areas outside Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays.,~~when natural defences are not an effective response to risk; and~~ 3. avoiding additions to existing buildings in Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays unless the increase in building footprint is minor and it does not involve the establishment of a new coastal hazard sensitive activity.	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
312.137	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development Increase the resilience of	Support	Support with amendments for clarity, noting that adaptive management is undefined and risks bypassing formal plan processes, and that buildings should be enabled to be removed from Coastal Natural Hazard overlays regardless of the effectiveness of natural or engineered defences.	Seeks the following amendments Use the plan review or plan change processes in the RMA to change management approaches. CE-P16 Coastal natural hazard risks and existing development Increase the resilience of exposed communities from coastal natural hazard risks within Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays by: 1. applying an adaptive management approach through plan changes, ~~which can be adjusted over time and~~ in response to changing risk levels and tolerances or new information; and 2. encouraging and enabling managed retreat, including the relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures from within coastal natural hazards areas to areas outside Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays., ~~when natural defences are not an effective response to risk;~~ and 3. avoiding additions to existing buildings in Coastal Natural Hazard Overlays unless the increase in building footprint is minor and it does not involve the establishment of a new coastal hazard sensitive activity.	Accept in part
153.33	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
194.105	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
243.90	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Support	Considers that the earthworks such as erosion protection measures should be provided for in the Plan.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
251.291	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Amend	Considers the policy generally reflects PORPS direction but needs amendment to prioritise reducing reliance on hard protection structures. The submitter considers that the policy should specifically reflect PORPS HAZ-NH-P7	Seeks amendments to address the matters raised in this submission including amendment to reflect PORPS HAZ-NH-P7.	Accept in part
259.81	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Oppose	Considers that although the objectives acknowledge natural hazard risks, they fail to recognise that natural hazard mitigation works routinely occur within the coastal environment, including engineering interventions such as opening coastal river mouths during high-flow events. The submitter considers that an additional objective and policy should be included to reflect these regular mitigation activities and to align with the pORPS direction to provide for the functional needs of hazard mitigation measures. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend CE-P17 to include an additional clause as follows: (3) Enable natural hazard mitigation works within the coastal environment where these activities have functional need to occur in the coastal environment.	Accept in part
265.244	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Support	Support with expansion to allow landowners and other agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection and associated earthworks, noting that natural defences are not always available, time constraints may preclude consent applications, and enabling such works aligns better with NZCPS Policy 27(c) and (d) than the proposed “avoid” approach.	Seeks to amend as follows: 1. Recognise that natural defences are the preferred method where they exist to reduce harm from coastal natural hazards; and 2. enable earthworks ~~undertaken by district or regional councils~~, for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards while ensuring that any exposed areas are appropriately rehabilitated.	Accept in part
282.276	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Support	Support with expansion to allow landowners and other agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection and associated earthworks, noting that natural defences are not always available, time constraints may preclude consent applications, and enabling such works aligns better with NZCPS Policy 27(c) and (d) than the proposed “avoid” approach.	Seeks to amend as follows: 1. Recognise that natural defences are the preferred methodwhere they existto reduce harm from coastal natural hazards; and 2. enable earthworks~~undertaken by district or regional councils~~, for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards while ensuring that any exposed areas are appropriately rehabilitated.	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
312.138	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards Recognise that natural defence	Amend	Support with expansion to allow landowners and other agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection and associated earthworks, noting that natural defences are not always available, time constraints may preclude consent applications, and enabling such works aligns better with NZCPS Policy 27(c) and (d) than the proposed "avoid" approach.	Seeks the following amendments CE-P17 Natural defences against coastal natural hazards 1. Recognise that natural defences are the preferred method <u>where they exist</u> to reduce harm from coastal natural hazards; and 2. enable earthworks ~~undertaken by district or regional councils,~~ for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards while ensuring that any exposed areas are appropriately rehabilitated	Accept in part
153.34	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Amend	Support in part but seek that the Council provides a definition for what they deem to be "immediate and serious harm" and an "acceptable level" to reduce confusion and ensure the consistent application of rules and policies. NHC has a risk tolerance methodology that could be adopted to develop a metric for acceptable risk. [link in original submission]	Seek to include a definition for "immediate and serious harm". Seek to include a definition for an "acceptable level" of risk from coastal hazards.	Accept in part
194.106	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P18 'Hard protection structures' as notified.	Accept in part
233.78	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Support	Supports a policy allowing hard structures in the coastal environment where needed to protect infrastructure, noting that parts of the Main South Line run along the coast and are vulnerable to storm surges and high tides.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
251.292	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Amend	Considers the policy should align more closely with NZCPS and PORPS regarding appropriate circumstances for hard protection structures and that clause (1) currently goes further than required and should be corrected.	Seeks amendments to align with NZCPS Policy 27 and PORPS HAZ-NH-P7.	Accept in part
253.159	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Oppose	Opposes in part: Considers Clause 3 to be in direct conflict with NZCPS higher order direction as it directs design to minimise effects. Construction and maintenance could affect values too – not just the design of hard protection structures. Seeks that the policy recognises this.	Amend clause 3 as follows: 'they are designed, <u>constructed and maintained</u> to <u>avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy and mitigate</u> ~~minimise~~ adverse effects on social, cultural and environmental values of the Coastal Environment; and	Accept in part
259.82	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Oppose	Considers that although the objectives recognise natural hazard risks, they overlook the fact that natural hazard mitigation works—such as engineering interventions to open coastal mouths during high-flow events—regularly occur within the coastal environment. The submitter considers that an additional objective and policy are needed to acknowledge these ongoing activities and to align with the pORPS direction to provide for the functional needs of hazard mitigation measures. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend CE-P17 to include an additional clause as follows: <u>(3) Enable natural hazard mitigation works within the coastal environment where these activities have functional need to occur in the coastal environment.</u>	Reject
265.246	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Support	Support with expansion to allow landowners and other agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection and associated earthworks, noting that natural defences are not always available, time constraints may preclude consent applications, and enabling such works aligns better with NZCPS Policy 27(c) and (d) than the proposed "avoid" approach.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Avoid~~ <u>Enable</u> hard protection structures ~~unless~~ where: ... 5. where they are to protect private land. ~~they are not located on public land, except where they provide a significant public benefit.~~	Reject
282.278	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Support	Support with expansion to allow landowners and other agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection and associated earthworks, noting that natural defences are not always available, time constraints may preclude consent applications, and enabling such works aligns better with NZCPS Policy 27(c) and (d) than the proposed "avoid" approach.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Avoid~~<u>Enable</u>hard protection structures~~unless~~where: ... 5. where they are to protect private land.~~they are not located on public land, except where they provide a significant public benefit.~~	Reject
312.139	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P18 Hard protection structures Avoid hard protection structures unless: they reduce	Amend	Support with expansion to allow landowners and other agencies to undertake natural hazard defence works, including hard protection and associated earthworks, noting that natural defences are not always available, time constraints may preclude	Seeks the following amendments CE-P18 Hard protection structures ~~Avoid~~ <u>Enable</u> hard protection structures ~~unless~~ where:	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
					consent applications, and enabling such works aligns better with NZCPS Policy 27(c) and (d) than the proposed "avoid" approach.	1. they reduce an immediate risk of serious harm to people, property, or infrastructure arising out of coastal natural hazards or if they are the only practical means to protect regionally significant infrastructure; and 2. they would not compromise the function of natural features and systems as natural defences; and 3. they are designed to minimise adverse effects on social, cultural and environmental values of the Coastal Environment; and 4. it is demonstrated that alternative measures would not mitigate the risk to an acceptable level; and 5. where they are to protect private land, ~~they are not located on public land, except where they provide a significant public benefit.~~	
153.28	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment Recognise and provide for th	Amend	Consider recommend providing a definition for what the Council deems as "significant coastal hazard risks" to reduce confusion and ensure consistent application of rules and policies.	Seek to include a definition for "significant coastal hazard risks".	Accept in part
194.90	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment Recognise and provide for th	Support	As drafted, CE-P2 'Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment' generally gives effect to the NZCPS and Part 2 of the RMA. The Director-of-Conservation however notes that limiting reference to Coastal hazard risks to only where they are significant would not give effect to the NZCPS Policies 24-27, which require all risks to be managed.	Amend CE-P2 as follows: "... e. management of ~~significant~~ coastal hazard risks"	Accept in part
251.278	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment Recognise and provide for th	Oppose	Considers that the policy lacks clarity on its purpose beyond restating RMA section 6. The submitter considers that the policy must clarify whether it is intended to identify areas and values as required in PORPS CE-M2.	Seeks amendments to clarify the matters raised by this submission	Accept in part
265.230	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment Recognise and provide for th	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
282.262	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment Recognise and provide for th	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
312.124	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P2 Recognise the importance of the Coastal Environment Recognise and provide for th	Support	Supports CE-P2 as notified	Retain as notified	Accept in part
153.29	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev	Support	Support the provision as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept
164.20	NPHS Te Waipounamu	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev	Support	Supports the precautionary approach particularly in relation to potential climate change effects as the coastline will be vulnerable to coastal erosion and rainfall is projected to increase in quantity and intensity annually and during winter with summer rainfall decreasing. [See original submission for full reasons]	Retain as notified.	Accept
194.91	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P3 as notified.	Accept
243.88	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-P3 as other than in relation to climate change effects it is unnecessary to adopt a precautionary approach.	Seeks to amend as follows: In relation to potential climate change<u>effects</u>, where the potential adverse<u>effects</u>of those activities are likely to be significant but are also uncertain, unknown or little	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
			precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev			understood, adopt a precautionary approach tosubdivision, use and development within the Coastal Environment.	
253.152	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev	Oppose	Opposes in part: The submitter seeks that the policy be redrafted, so it is clearer when the precautionary approach applies, and what taking a precautionary approach means and requires. At present the policy is only addressing climate change effects, which is better placed in CE-O5 and climate change related CE policies.	Amend CE-P3 as follows: Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and development within the Coastal Environment, ~~particularly in relation to potential climate change effects, where the potential adverse effects of those activities are likely to be significant but are also uncertain, unknown or little understood.~~ When the effects are uncertain, unknown, or little understood, but potentially significantly adverse. A precautionary approach requires that proposed subdivision, use, and development is avoided or modified until sufficient information is available to determine the nature and extent of effects and how they can be appropriately managed.	Reject
265.231	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev	Amend	Acknowledges the mandatory inclusion from the NZCPS, but highlights its inherent contradiction that if an adverse effect is uncertain, unknown, or little understood, its significance cannot be reliably assessed.	Retain as notified	Accept
282.263	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev	Amend	Acknowledges the mandatory inclusion from the NZCPS, but highlights its inherent contradiction that if an adverse effect is uncertain, unknown, or little understood, its significance cannot be reliably assessed.	Retain as notified	Accept
312.125	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P3 Precautionary approach Adopt a precautionary approach to subdivision, use and dev	Support	Supports Acknowledges mandatory inclusion from the NZ CPS noting it has an inherent contradiction. If an adverse effect is uncertain, unknown or little understood then it's likelihood of being a significant adverse effect cannot possibly be assessed.	Retain as notified	Accept
153.39	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
251.305	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All	Amend	Considers the overall intent of the rule is supported but a different management approach is required for Māori land and Native Reserves.	Seeks amendments to address the matters raised in this submission.	Reject
253.170	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All	Support	Retain as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
265.258	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: New Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay	Accept
271.450	Canterbury Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All	Support	Generally, supports CE-R11 'Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay'. However, it is similar to the Submitter's request under ECO-R4 and R5 in that the rule is in need of an amendment in the form of a note as to cross boundary matters that are beyond the jurisdiction of WDC.	Amend the rule as follows: Exception note: this rule does not apply to works in the coastal marine area or beds of lakes and rivers, as these are also managed within the jurisdiction of the Regional Plans, and may require resource consent from those Councils.	Reject
282.290	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: New coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay	Accept
312.151	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R11 Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks the following amendments CE-R11 New Coastal hazard sensitive activities within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones	Accept

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
						Activity status: Non-Complying Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable	
153.36	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part
189.35	New Zealand Defence Force	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Opposes in part CE-R4 'Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay' as TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in the coastal environment to enable training exercises such as beach landings.	Provide for temporary buildings and structures and earthworks associated with TMTA as a permitted activity, either explicitly in the CE Chapter or preferably by excluding the application of the CE Chapter to TMTA.	Reject
240.115	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Oppose in part. Considers this rule should not permit clearance in overlays, where other rules in other chapters of the plan prevail.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.	Accept in part
243.92	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-R4 as for clarity and certainty maintenance of Road should be provided for	Seeks to amend PER.1 as follows: The earthworks are undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, and are for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards <u>and roads</u>;or	Reject
246.237	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Support	They support the intent of CE-R4 but find earthworks rules in the CE chapter confusing and inconsistent with the NPS (earthworks provisions should be in Earthworks chapter). They want all farm-asset maintenance included in PER-1. Oppose PER-1's requirement to limit earthworks to the existing footprint and oppose the requirement for "same or similar" materials, which is irrelevant to earthworks effects. They also oppose discretionary status for non-compliance with PER-1–PER-4, preferring restricted discretionary to provide clearer, more efficient pathways.	The submitters seek that CE-R4 be relocated to the EW chapter, as required by the NPS. The submitters also seek amendment of CE-R4 as follows: PER-3 The are undertaken for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established: 1. farm tracks, <u>stock tracks and crossings;</u> 2. yards <u>and other hardstand areas;</u> 3. water supply and irrigation systems; 4. fences; 5. dams/ponds; 6. walking and cycling tracks; 7. driveways and access; or 8. stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; 9.<u>farm buildings;</u> 10.<u>aircraft landing areas (permitted by GRUZ-R5);</u> 11.<u>firebreaks</u> 12.<u>offal or farm rubbish pits or silage pits; and</u> ~~Where the width and length are the same and the materials used are the same or similar as that which existed prior to the repair and maintenance being required~~ <u>The earthworks limited to the smallest extent necessary to complete the repair or maintenance PER X1The clearance is of indigenous vegetation that is causing an imminent danger to human life, livestock, structures or infrastructure.</u> The submitters seek replacement of the discretionary activity status with restricted discretionary status, and addition of a list of the matters to which discretion is restricted.	Accept in part
251.298	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard	Amend	Considers that additional sediment control measures consistent with ECO-R3 are needed for earthworks near the CMA and that similar provisions should be applied to earthworks elsewhere in the coastal environment	Seeks to amend as follows: <u>PER-5</u>	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
	Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki		overlay All zones Activity status: P			Silt and sediment control measures are in place to prevent discharge of silt and/or sediment into the coastal marine area and notice is provided to Council 10 working days prior to the commencement of works. Seeks to make similar amendments to relevant earthworks rules elsewhere, for example EW-R2, EW-R4.	
253.165	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Opposes in part: To give effect to the NZCPS: Earthworks limits including area (in m^2), height, cut and fill limits must be included in this rule. Considers that the rule should apply to the whole Coastal Environment not only 'coastal natural hazard overlay'. Seeks PER-4 to specify re-vegetation must be within indigenous vegetation.	Seeks to insert limits on earthworks including area, height, cut and fill. Seeks to rename rule to 'Earthworks within the Coastal Environment'. Amend PER-4 to: Any exposed areas are re-vegetated with indigenous vegetation as soon as practical, but no later than three months after the completion of the earthworks.	Reject
259.84	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Considers that although the rule enables earthworks for protecting or restoring natural coastal defences, it does not account for the broader range of engineering works that regularly occur within the coastal hazard overlay, such as opening coastal mouths to release high flows. The submitter considers that limiting earthworks to coastal-hazard-related purposes restricts necessary operational responsiveness. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: Where earthworks are undertaken by ... Otago Regional Council... or their agents, and are for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal hazards or to undertake natural hazard mitigation works.	Reject
265.252	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Support	Support with addition to enable hard protection structures.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The earthworks ~~are undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, and~~ are for the protection or restoration of natural defences or hard protection structures against coastal natural hazards; or	Reject
271.448	Canterbury Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Support	Generally, supports CE-R4 'Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay'. However, CRC advocates for PER-1 to also allow Earthworks as required by the Councils to open river mouths, or lower the crests at river mouths, to protect people and property from flooding.	Amend the rule as follows: PER-1 The earthworks are undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, and are for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards, or to open river mouths, or lower the crests at river mouths, to protect people and property from flooding; or ...	Reject
282.284	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Support	Support with addition to enable hard protection structures.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-1 The earthworks ~~are undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents,and~~ are for the protection or restoration of natural defences or hard protection structures against coastal natural hazards; or	Reject
305.170	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Support	The intent of managing earthworks in coastal natural hazard areas is supported but considers repair and maintenance of farm buildings and primary production infrastructure should be expressly provided for.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3The are undertaken for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established: 1. farm tracks, stock tracks and crossings; 2. yards and other hardstand areas; 3. water supply and irrigation systems; 4. fences; 5. dams/ponds; 6. walking and cycling tracks; 7. driveways and access; or 8. stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; 9. farm buildings;	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
						10. aircraft landing areas (permitted by GRUZ-R5); 11. firebreaks 12. offal or farm rubbish pits or silage pits; and ~~Where the width and length are the same and the materials used are the same or similar as that which existed prior to the repair and maintenance being required~~ The earthworks limited to the smallest extent necessary to complete the repair or maintenance	
306.170	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Support	The intent of managing earthworks in coastal natural hazard areas is supported but considers repair and maintenance of farm buildings and primary production infrastructure should be expressly provided for.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-3The are undertaken for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established: 1. farm tracks, stock tracks and crossings; 2. yards and other hardstand areas; 3. water supply and irrigation systems; 4. fences; 5. dams/ponds; 6. walking and cycling tracks; 7. driveways and access; or 8. stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; 9. farm buildings; 10. aircraft landing areas (permitted by GRUZ-R5); 11. firebreaks 12. offal or farm rubbish pits or silage pits; and ~~Where the width and length are the same and the materials used are the same or similar as that which existed prior to the repair and maintenance being required~~ The earthworks limited to the smallest extent necessary to complete the repair or maintenance	Accept in part
312.145	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: P	Amend	Support CE-R4 with addition to enable hard protection structures.	Seeks the following amendments CE-R4 Earthworks within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The earthworks ~~are undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, and~~are for the protection or restoration of natural defences or hard protection structures against coastal natural hazards; or PER-2 The earthworks are associated with any activity permitted under rules CE-R1, CE-R2, CE-R3 and CE-R5; or PER-3 The earthworks are undertaken for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established: 1. farm tracks; 2. yards; 3. water supply and irrigation systems; 4. fences;	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
						5. dams/ponds; 6. walking or cycling tracks; 7. driveways and access; or 8. stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; where the width and length are the same and the materials used are the same or similar as that which existed prior to the repair and maintenance being required; and PER-4 Any exposed areas are re-vegetated as soon as practical, but no later than three months after the completion of the earthworks. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Discretionary Where: DIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2, PER-3 and/or PER-4	
153.40	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay	Amend	Support the permitted activity status, however, recommend an additional condition is added to ensure that any additions or alterations to an existing building in a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay does not constitute a habitable area (i.e. bedroom) of the building.	Seek the following inclusion PER-3 The additional and/or alterations do not constitute a habitable area of the building.	Reject
251.299	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay	Amend	Considers the rule does not clearly manage incremental additions to buildings over time. The submitter considers that Māori land and Native Reserves need a different management approach under this rule.	Seeks amendments to address the matters raised in this submission	Accept in part
265.251	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
282.283	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified	Accept in part
312.144	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R5 Additions and alterations to existing buildings in a coastal natural hazard overlay	Support	Supports CE-R5 as notified	retain as notified	Accept in part
153.37	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natu	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept
189.37	New Zealand Defence Force	Coastal Environment	CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natu	Oppose	Oppose in part CE-R7 'New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natural hazard overlay' as TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in the Coastal environment to enable training exercises such as beach landings. These are temporary activities, and it is not appropriate for the same requirements to be applied as for permanent buildings and structures.	Provide for temporary buildings, structures and earthworks associated with TMTA as a permitted activity, either explicitly in the CE Chapter or preferably by excluding the application of the CE Chapter to TMTA. It is appropriate that less-hazard sensitive activities within a Coastal Natural Hazard Overlay be permitted.	Reject
251.301	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natu	Amend	Considers the overall intent of the rule is supported but, in line with relief sought for CE-P12, a different management approach is required for Māori land and Native Reserves.	Seeks amendments to address the matters raised in this submission	Reject
265.254	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard	Support	Support with modification to permit hard protection structures and definition of a suitably qualified expert.	Seeks to permit hard protection structures and to amend as follows: Note: Section 88 information Requirements for Applications:	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
			protection structures) within a coastal natu			Pursuant to s88 of the RMA, any application for activities made under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a risk assessment, provided by a suitably qualified person ~~and experienced expert~~ [define SQP here], addressing the matters set out in CE-P15.	
282.286	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natu	Support	Support with modification to permit hard protection structures and definition of a suitably qualified expert.	Seeks to permit hard protection structures and to amend as follows: Note: Section 88 information Requirements for Applications: Pursuant to s88 of the RMA, any application for activities made under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a risk assessment, provided by a suitably qualifiedpersonand experienced expert[define SQP here], addressing the matters set out in CE-P15.	Reject
312.147	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natu	Amend	Support with modification to permit hard protection structures and definition of a suitably qualified expert.	Seeks the following amendments CE-R7 New buildings or structures (excluding hard protection structures) within a coastal natural hazard overlay All zones Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 The building or structure is not used for a coastal hazard sensitive activity; and RDIS-2 The building is a relocatable building. Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. the potential for the new building or structure to increase the risk of social, economic or environmental harm arising out of coastal natural hazards; and 2. the proposed risk reduction and hazard mitigation measures; and 3. the impacts on infrastructure, including access and services; and 4. access for emergency services; and 5. the extent to which the proposal increases the burden on civil defence agencies and emergency services; and 6. any requirement to remove buildings, structures or associated services from the site where the site is affected by natural hazards, including the registration of such requirements through legal instruments, such as covenants; and 7. the positive social, cultural and economic benefits associated with the new building or structure; and 8. any effects on public access. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Non-Complying Where: NC-1 Compliance is not achieved with RDIS-1 and/or RDIS-2 Note: Section 88 information Requirements for Applications: Pursuant to s88 of the RMA, any application for activities made under this rule must provide, in addition to the standard information requirements, a risk assessment, provided by a suitably qualified person ~~and experienced expert~~ [define SQP here], addressing the matters set out in CE-P15.	Reject
153.38	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
233.79	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Support	Support for discretionary activity status for hard protection structures within the Coastal Environment.	Seeks to retain as notified.	Accept in part
251.302	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Oppose	Considers that CE-R8 is too broad in allowing hard protection structures for Regionally Significant Infrastructure and that the rule should be amended to match the limits sought in their submission on CE-P18.	Seeks amendments to address the matters raised in this submission	Accept in part
253.167	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Support	Retain as notified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
259.85	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Support	Support in part. Considers it is unclear what activity status would be applied to hard protection infrastructures that are regionally significant infrastructure, such as groynes to ensure the security of the river mouth etc.	Seeks to provide clarification or guidance as to the applicability of rules for hard protection structures that are regionally significant infrastructure, but which do not protect regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept in part
265.255	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Oppose	Considers that hard protection structures should be enabled and permitted to meet the purpose of the RMA.	Seeks for the rule to permit hard protection structures.	Reject
271.449	Canterbury Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Support	Generally, supports CE-R8 'Hard protection structures'. However, the Submitter contends that it needs to be clear that this restriction only relates to hard protection structures used to protect against coastal processes.	Amend the rule as follows: ~~All zones~~ Coastal environment	Accept in part
282.287	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Oppose	Considers that hard protection structures should be enabled and permitted to meet the purpose of the RMA	Seeks for the rule to permit hard protection structures.	Reject
312.148	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R8 Hard protection structures All zones Activity status: Discretionary Where: DI	Oppose	Opposes Considers that hard protection structures should be enabled and permitted to meet the purpose of the RMA.	Seeks amendments to the rule to permit Hard protection structures.	Reject
51.43	James White	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	The submitter would like Council to consider the following as relief [in other sections of the Plan]: Rules relating to Coastal Hazard Overlays could benefit from a tiered approach where low-impact or relocatable structures are permitted subject to performance standards.	Seeks for Council to refine the Plan to assist in enabling quality residential and economic development as set out in submission.	Accept in part
59.6	Mike and Christine Holland	Coastal Environment	General	Support	Supports the CE Section as it has good provisions which incorporate the protection of the Coastal Environment and protection from Coastal Hazards.	Retain the 'Coastal Environment' Section as notified.	Accept in part
194.81	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	General	Support	Generally, supports the CE Chapter as the provisions, mapping, generally give effect to Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. In particular, support the mapping of the CE and the specific identification of the CPA Overlay and CAORR (Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation).	Retain the CE Chapter as notified, except where specific changes are requested below.	Accept in part
194.108	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	General	Support	Supports the Rule framework CE-R1 to R11 for works within the CE as being in accordance with the CE objectives and policies.	Retain CE-R1 to R11 as notified.	Accept in part
240.114	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	Considers new policies are needed to enable and support natural adjustments and protect specified highly mobile fauna, as required by the NZCPS	Seeks to insert new policies for the reasons provided	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
246.224	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	General	Support	The submitters advocate for regulations that are simple and easy to use and understand. We believe nine separate objectives for the CE chapter is unnecessary, and that the objectives should be combined to form two or three objectives.	The submitters seek the Council develop a simpler suite of objectives in the CE chapter, for example by combining them, and ensure they are outcomes focussed and allow identification of the resource management issue.	Reject
251.267	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	Considers that the introduction fails to acknowledge mana whenua connections to the coastal environment. The submitter considers that the plan must clarify its approach to coastal infrastructure and recognise Kāi Tahu cultural relationships. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to add a new section to the introduction as follows: Kāi Tahu and the Coast The coastal environment is of great significance to Kāi Tahu, providing a highly important place of settlement, means of travel, and critical source of food and resources for centuries. Many Kāi Tahu stories, traditions and place names are associated with the coast. Te Tai o Arai te Uru (the entire Otago Coastal Marine Area) is a Statutory Acknowledgment (Schedule 103) under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act. Many wāhi tūpuna or Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori have been mapped in the Coastal Environment. Seeks to amend PDP to address and clarify the approach to managing infrastructure in the coastal environment.	Accept in part
251.277	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	Considers that a new objective is required to give effect to NZCPS Objective 1 and PORPS CE-O1A, CE-O1, CE-P1A, CE-P3(5) and CE-M4(3A) to safeguard and enhance natural coastal processes, and to recognise the effects of activities across jurisdictional boundaries.	Seeks to add new objective as follows: Safeguarding the coastal environment The health, form, function and resilience of the coastal environment is safeguarded, including through: 1. the dynamic and interdependent natural biological and physical processes in the coastal environment being maintained or enhanced, 2. providing for the natural function of coastal processes at the interface between land, fresh water and coastal water, and 3. the effects of terrestrial uses and activities on coastal waters and ecosystems being recognised and understood.	Accept in part
251.287	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	Considers that a new policy is needed to give effect to PORPS HAZ-NH-P11 and MW-P4 and that a parallel policy is also required to manage natural hazard risks that are not coastal hazards.	Seeks to insert a new policy which gives effect to PORPS HAZ-NH-P11 and MW-P4 for coastal hazard risks. Alternatively, seeks to refer to the relief sought in relation to CE-P13 (above) and insert into CE-P13 as new subclause (5) wording to the effect of: 5. enabling mana whenua, and owners of Māori freehold land in relation to their land, to lead approaches to managing coastal natural hazard risks affecting native reserves and Māori land	Accept in part
251.294	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	General	Oppose	Considers that the PDP fails to show how PORPS provisions on land-based effects on the coastal environment are given effect. The submitter considers that a new integrated management policy is required.	Seeks amendments to include an integrated management policy to address the matters raised here and make consequential amendments to rules and matters of discretion as necessary to implement this policy.	Accept in part
253.160	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	Opposes in part: Seeks a new policy relating to enabling and supporting natural adjustments as described in the NZCPS as a result of climate change. In recognition that they may adjust outside of the Coastal Environment, include an adapted version of this policy in all zone/overlay chapters adjoining the Coastal Environment. Giving effect to the NPS-IB (policy 15).	Seeks to insert policy relating to enabling and supporting natural adjustments as follows: To enable and support the natural adjustment of coastal processes, natural defences, ecosystems, habitats and species in response to the effects of climate change, avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where such adjustments are likely to occur.	Accept in part
253.161	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	Opposes in part: Seeks a new policy relating to enabling and supporting natural adjustments as described in the NZCPS as a result of climate change. In recognition that they may adjust outside of the Coastal Environment, include an adapted version of this policy in all zone/overlay chapters adjoining the Coastal Environment. Giving effect to the NPS-IB (policy 15).	Insert policy relating to specified highly mobile fauna as follows: Where the Coastal Environment supports specified highly mobile for part of their life cycle, subdivision, use and development is managed to maintain their populations across their natural range. And define specified highly mobile fauna in accordance with the NPS-IB.	Accept in part
259.78	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	General	Support	Support in part. To clarify the jurisdiction of the Plan in the Coastal Environment.	Seeks to clarify the jurisdiction of the Waitaki District Plan as follows: • the jurisdiction of the Waitaki district plan is over those areas that are located within the coastal environment but outside the landwards extent of the coastal marine	Accept in part

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
						environment and that land use activities in this space are managed by the district plan and • activities in the coastal marine area are managed by the Regional Plan: Coast.	
194.82	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	The management of significant risks from natural hazards is a matter of national importance. This ch	Oppose	Opposes in part as there is an absence of a definition of Coastal natural hazards as those caused by coastal processes. It would be clearer to take the approach in the proposed Otago RPS, whereby Coastal hazards are limited to hazards which are specific to the coast.	Amend the NH Chapter, and / or the CE Chapter, to clearly distinguish between Natural hazards generally and Coastal hazards as defined in the proposed Otago RPS.	Accept in part
244.95	Telecommunication Companies	Coastal Environment	User Notes: For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one	Support	Considers that the note stating Objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within the Coastal Environment are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter is supported.	Retain as notified.	Accept
271.445	Canterbury Regional Council	Coastal Environment	User Notes: For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one	Support	Generally, supports the User Notes. However, the User Notes should include the addition of a note that objectives, policies and rules relating to Natural Hazard Mitigation Work (or Flood and erosion protection and drainage work), are found within the Natural Hazards chapter.	Amend the User Notes as follows: Objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within the Coastal Environment are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter. Objectives, policies and rules relating to Natural Hazard Mitigation Work are found in the Natural Hazards chapter. For energy activities...	Accept in part
309.107	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Coastal Environment	User Notes: For some activities, a resource consent may be required by rules in more than one	Support	Supports user notes in the Coastal Environment chapter but requests clarification that the chapter does not apply to the National Grid.	Seeks to amend as follows and to include all provisions relevant to the National Grid within the Coastal Environment in the Infrastructure chapter. Objectives, policies and rules relating to infrastructure activities within the Coastal Environment are found in the Infrastructure Chapter and Energy Chapter. For the avoidance of doubt, this chapter does not apply to the National Grid.	Reject

Planning Maps

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
10.1	Mark Kensington	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that the Natural Hazard Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay on part of the property is inaccurate as there has been a history of 6" of rain and yet still no flooding on the property in the past.	Seeks to delete the Natural Hazard Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay from the property.	Reject
16.1	Diane Rigby	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes Otago Flood Assessment and Alluvial Fan Awareness overlays as not being applicable to the 674 Palmerston-Waikouaiti Road, RD1, Palmerston property topography.	Delete Otago Flood Assessment and Alluvial Fan Awareness overlays on 674 Palmerston-Waikouaiti Road, RD1, Palmerston property and reassess to ensure clarity and consistency.	Reject
22.1	Matt Menzies	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that the extent of the Flood Risk (Natural Hazards overlay) mapping is incorrect and should be removed. The land covered by the Natural Hazard (Map 40) is mitigated through 1m piles and Cirrus Place properties are distant from a watercourse. It appears the current ground level of the house was not taken into account and is not reflected in the Natural Hazard overlay in relation to flooding.	Seeks deletion of the Canterbury Flood Assessment (Natural Hazards Overlay) on the Planning Maps for the subject property as Flood Risk is mitigated through house 1m pile foundation height. There needs to be robust and transparent engagement.	Reject
22.2	Matt Menzies	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that community-based participation/consultation with regards to affected property owners prior to Proposed Plan Mapping, including Natural Hazards overlay identification, is necessary to ensure accuracy rather than a broad-brush approach. Albeit there would be potential costs associated with such an approach that Council would need to accept.	Opposes Plan Mapping that is not site specific due to the inaccuracies of a blanket modelling approach. There is a duty on the Council to consult each affected party.	Reject
22.3	Matt Menzies	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that evidence for flooding should be included in the background Natural Hazard Assessment of Council for this location and 11 Cirrus Place, in order to support the introduction of a Flood (Natural Hazard) overlay.	Seeks to remove the Flooding (Natural Hazard) overlay from 11 Cirrus Place and properties in Cirrus Place.	Reject
23.1	Malcolm Cameron	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay is not applicable to Omarama and will hinder local investment and lower property values.	Delete the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay as notified from Omarama. Robust and transparent engagement with locals regarding risk is required.	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
25.1	Paul Bryant	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes Otago Flood Assessment, Alluvial Fan Awareness and Liquefaction Awareness overlays as not being applicable to either the 42A Black Peak Road, Omarama subject property or else other similarly blighted Omarama property owners with compensation required by Council for any direct or indirect loss or damage arising from this.	Seeks justification of the overlays being applicable to the 42A Black Peak Road, Omarama subject property and/or else other similar Omarama property owners. With deletion if they are inaccurate to ensure clarity and consistency. If they are confirmed, Council compensation is required for direct or indirect damages.	Reject
30.1	Garry and Desiree Jones	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori Overlay (SASM040) on Lot: 2 DP: 546534 (Bobbys Head Road, Goodwood). Considers that there is insufficient justification for the Overlay and it will impact private property rights and the ability to undertake farming activities. This is also the case with the Coastal Erosion Hazard; Coastal Protection; Coastal Environment; Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation together with Significant Natural Features (SNF64) overlays.	Delete SASM040, SNF64, Coastal Erosion Hazard; Coastal Protection; Coastal Environment and Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation overlays from this property. [Inferred relief sought]	Reject
37.2	James White	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes proposed AFA Overlay for St Kevin's College (44A Redcastle Road / Taward Street, Ōamaru - Pt S: 54 Blk: I SD: Ōamaru) as there are inadequate standards of flood mitigation due to a lack of information covering areas that may not be subject to flooding. It is not effects based. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Delete the AFA Overlay for St Kevin's College (44A Redcastle Road / Taward Street, Ōamaru - Pt S: 54 Blk: I SD: Ōamaru).	Reject
54.1	Gavin Wills	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Considers that ECan's recent Omarama flood investigation results should be incorporated into the current CFAO through an amendment to remove the incorrect impression that most of Omarama town and its environs is in a potential flood zone. According to ECan this is not the case.	The submitter seeks that: 1.The recent ECan flood hazard mapping should be included and an amendment accordingly made for all of Omarama town and its environs on the WDC CFAO Maps. 2.The flood assessment boundary drawn through the property at 05 Ahuriri Heights should be redrawn to reflect the reality of its high elevation.	Reject
55.1	James Kerr	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes proposed CFAO affecting properties in the Ahuriri heights, Omarama area on the Maps as inconsistent with the revised ECan Map that was prepared in conjunction with a local property owner. The revised ECan CFAO map should be incorporated into the Plan and not the CFAO data as notified in the Plan.	Seeks that the revised ECan CFAO map is incorporated into the Plan and not the out-of-date CFAO as has been notified in the Plan. Ahuriri Heights is not known to be subject to flooding.	Reject
66.4	Janeen Benny	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Opposes the extent of SASM013 Maerewhenua in relation to Sec 74 Blk III Maerewhenua so that it only applies to the limestone escarpment. In general consult with farmers to both protect SASM values and farming productivity / livelihoods. Retain the limestone escarpment as an ONF while ensuring that the adjacent farmland is not included as part of the ONF and retain the removal of the Flood Assessment Overlay from the terraces in this block of land since the Plan was notified.	The Submitter seeks to: a. Retain the change that has removed the flood assessment overlay from the terraces in this block, since the plan was notified. b. Reduce the extent of the SASM013 overlay, so that it only applies to the limestone escarpment itself. As a general comment, work with farmers so they are aware of what management methods they undertake that could impact on the values that need to be protected, and work together to find practical solutions to protect values while retaining the ability to farm and live on the property. c. Retain the limestone escarpment as ONF27 but ensure that the adjacent farmland is not included as part of the ONF.	Reject
66.5	Janeen Benny	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Considers that while the Maerewhenua River has historically flooded over this land, the Waitaki River has not. There are unnecessary flooding overlays with resultant NH-R2 and NH-R3 duplication. Opposes the extent of SASM013 Maerewhenua in relation to Sec 76 Blk III Maerewhenua so that it only applies to the limestone escarpment. Retain the limestone escarpment as ONF27 while ensuring that the adjacent farmland is not included as part of the ONF. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	The Submitter seeks that: The property is amended to retain a single flood overlay while considering deleting the other. If both flood layers are retained ensure consistency between applicable rules. An activity should not be permitted under one flood overlay and require resource consent under the other. Preference would be that the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay applies, providing an opportunity for a building to be considered as a Permitted Activity, if this is supported by a flood assessment as per NH-S1. Reduce the extent of the SASM013 overlay so that it only applies to the limestone escarpment itself. Also retain the limestone escarpment as ONF27 while ensuring that the adjacent farmland is not included as part of the ONF.	Reject
66.6	Janeen Benny	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Considers that the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay should be retained as notified given that there is no unnecessary competing Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay. Opposes the extent of SASM013 Maerewhenua in relation to Sec 2 SO 567298 so that it only applies to the limestone escarpment. The Livingstone-Duntroon Road runs	The Submitter seeks to: a. Retain the change that has removed the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay in this lot, since the plan was notified. b. Reduce the extent of the SASM013 overlay, so that it only applies to the limestone escarpment itself. As a general comment, work with farmers so they are aware of what management methods they undertake that could impact on the values that need	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
					between the limestone escarpment and the lot. In general consult with farmers to both protect SASM values and farming productivity / livelihoods.	to be protected, and work together to find practical solutions to protect values while retaining the ability to farm and live on the property.	
66.7	Janeen Benny	Planning Maps	General	Support	The majority of this land is now part of the Waitaki River riverbed, through historic flooding. The submitter therefore accepts the Flood overlays and approach of the WDP to this piece of land.	Retain Map 17 with regards to Pt S: 17 Blk: IV SD: Maerewhenua as notified.	Reject
66.9	Janeen Benny	Planning Maps	General	Support	The majority of this land is now part of the Waitaki River riverbed, through historic flooding. The submitter therefore accepts the Flood overlays and approach of the WDP to this piece of land.	Retain Map 17 with regards to Pt S: 14 Blk: IV SD: Maerewhenua as notified.	Reject
68.1	Chris Bell	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the proposed Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay modelling on the Planning Maps (including 8 Totara Peak Crescent, Omarama) due to mistakes such as an area that encompasses State Highway 83 / Omarama-Otematata Road between Chain Hill and Benmore Village that is approximately 50 metres above Lake Benmore and has a small catchment.	Seeks the deletion of the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay as notified (including from 8 Totara Peak Crescent, Omarama) and its replacement with [the] Review of the Canterbury part of the Waitaki District Plan flood hazard mapping - June 2020. Report No. R20/26 ISBN 978-1-99-002788-8 as Report No. R20/26 is more detailed, accurate and the submitter believes ultimately less likely to be challenged.	Reject
69.1	Chris Bell	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that as the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay for 8 Totara Peak Crescent, Omarama has now been deleted from the Planning Maps, given that the ECan updated liquefaction mapping for Waitaki 2023 under the 2 Method, 2.1 2017 MBIE/MfE guidance framework [that the] second paragraph is only a basic desktop assessment, it is their belief that this Overlay can easily be proved wrong.	Seeks to remove the ECan updated liquefaction overlay for Waitaki 2023 from the supporting documents technical report.	Reject
71.1	Chris Bell	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the proposed Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay modelling on the Planning Maps (including affecting 21 Pinot Noir Court, Omarama) due to mistakes. Instead, R20/26 should replace Flood Mapping [Report No. R23/47] as an overlay for the Plan. This I believe is more detailed and accurate and therefore less likely to be challenged.	Seeks the deletion of the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay as notified (including from 21 Pinot Noir Court, Omarama) and its replacement with the Review of the Canterbury part of the Waitaki District Plan flood hazard mapping - June 2020. Report No. R20/26 ISBN 978-1-99-002788-8 as Report No. R20/26 is more detailed, accurate and the submitter believes ultimately less likely to be challenged.	Reject
81.2	Bryce and Rachel Kane	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that the CE, CPA, ONF36, SASM022, [CAORR / CEH] Overlays (with their resultant Rules) require amendment on [88] Bushy Beach Road, South Hill, Ōamaru with consultation with the submitters.	Considers that the CE, CPA, ONF36 - Makotukutuku, SASM022 - Makotukutuku (Cape Wanbrow), [CAORR / CEH] Overlays (with their resultant Rules) are inaccurately modelled on [88] Bushy Beach Road, South Hill, Ōamaru and consultation with the submitters will be able to achieve better consistency with the associated provisions.	Reject
83.9	Waitaki District Council	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Seeks flood mapping is updated	Refer to map within full submission	Reject
88.1	Colin Leith Begg & Linda Rose Begg	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers Planning Map 38 Goodwood - Waihemo showing an AFA Overlay on 977 Goodwood Road, Palmerston (Lot: 1 DP: 3099) is a longstanding existing drain that was present when the property was purchased by the submitters approximately 30 years ago and has existing use rights.	Seeks that clarity is sought in the mapping to show with the spatial extent of the drain on the AFA Overlay for 977 Goodwood Road, Palmerston (Lot: 1 DP: 3099) that existing use rights for the drain apply to the mapping layer on the subject property.	Reject
93.4	Ian Carter	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Seeks that CEH, CPA, CE are amended for the property. The submitter acknowledges the risk that natural hazards pose to hazard sensitive activities. However, these areas need to be amended / ground-truthed to better reflect the actual area that is affected.	Amend the extent of the area covered by CEH, CPA, CE on the maps for the property.	Reject
99.1	Garry Mcleod	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that 1386 Weston-Ngapara Road, Ngapara-Weston (Sec: 95 Blk: IX SD: Awamoko) should not be unnecessarily impacted by inaccurate modelling of the Otago Flood Assessment and Liquefaction Assessment Overlays.	Seeks that the NH Overlays are redrafted accurately to ensure that they reflect the new information in so far as 1386 Weston-Ngapara Road, Ngapara-Weston (Sec: 95 Blk: IX SD: Awamoko) is concerned.	Reject
102.1	Cameron Leckie	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the extent and application of the CFA Overlay on 1 Highland Way, Omarama as it overstates the flood risk and will create regulatory burdens, costs and stifle much needed development unnecessarily.	Seeks flood assessment certificates clarification in the Plan on timeframes / costs from ECan; better site-specific mapping of the CFA Overlay; freeboard standards and insurance implications consideration. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Reject
104.1	James White	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that the CEH, CIH, CPA, THA, LA Overlays on 9 Kakanui Bay Road, Kakanui (Lot: 2 DP: 518350) should be removed as a resource consent for the property has recently been granted (RC 202.2023.2301) with a supporting coastal erosion assessment showing very low risk of coastal erosion. The Overlays add unnecessary costs, delays, and burden on the landowners.	Seeks that: 1. Remove or reduce the Coastal Erosion and Inundation Hazard Overlays on the inland portion of our site, where there is little to no risk. 2. Refine the Coastal Environment and Coastal Protection Overlays to stop at the limit of actual coastal features. The overlays currently extend too far inland and include modified areas that do not show any natural coastal character.	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
						3. Remove the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay unless backed by site-specific testing (by Council) or strong evidence of moderate to high risk. 4. Ensure that existing consents such as RC 202.2023.2301 are not undermined by the new overlays. Lawful, approved activity should not be made harder to continue. 5. Allow minor changes and maintenance of permitted activities without triggering additional consents, particularly where activities remain low impact and meet the purpose of the Plan. 6. Review, study and undertake maintenance of the existing stormwater network where it serves a public benefit, especially in areas not connected to formal Council systems. 7. Commission and use more accurate, site-specific information to define natural hazard areas, rather than broad district-wide mapping. Allow landowners to review the updated technical reports before overlays are finalised. 8. Take into account the upstream extraction of gravel from the Kakanui River, which may contribute to beach erosion. Do not overstate the risk on individual sites without recognising these wider causes.	
112.1 (part)	Gavin Simpson	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that is virtually impossible to flood this block of land (348 Prydes Gully Road, Island Cliff (Sec: 35 Blk: VII SD: Maerewhenua)) because there simply isn't the catchment on the uphill side of the ridge to deliver any significant volume of water.	Delete: The CFA Overlay from the block;	Reject
112.4 (part)	Gavin Simpson	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Considers that the 47 Dip Hill Road, Tokarahi (PtL: 1 DP: 2561) Sec: 88 Blk: VII SD: Maerewhenua) Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay in the Plan is incorrect as there is not enough land to form a catchment that would threaten the block.	Seeks to delete: Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay from the block;	Reject
122.2	Kitty Culp	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers applying an AFA Overlay will preclude inconsistent application and the uncertainties in the mapped Overlay developed impose inaccurate and unnecessary geotechnical and development constraints that affect property value.	Seeks that the AFA Overlay be removed from the river terrace area in the Waitaki Valley (1788 Georgetown-Pukeuri Road, Pukeuri-Georgetown PtS: 37 Blk: I SD: Awamoko) and that WDC re-evaluate this classification based on accurate geomorphological and hydrological evidence.	Reject
129.15	Sharne Adele Paton	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Considers that the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay is too broad brush. Use the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay instead.	Amend the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay as it is too broad brush. Use the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay instead to include areas that have the potential for flooding.	Reject
130.1	Noel and Jill Davie	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Considers that for the OFA Overlay for 24 Reading Street, Waynes has been applied inconsistently with the mapped Natural hazard Overlay requiring amendment as confirmed by ORC LIDAR data.	Amend the OFA Overlay mapping for the vicinity of 24 Reading Street, Waynes to that confirmed recently by ORC.	Reject
157.3	Conrad Anderson	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers there is insufficient evidence for the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay to extend onto Part Section 2 of 61 Block IV Moeraki Survey District, held in OT331/149.	Remove the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay from Part Section 2 of 61 Block IV Moeraki Survey District, held in OT331/149.	Reject
169.1	Neville and Michelle Kitchen	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Objects to the Canterbury Flood Assessment overlay with particular focus on the Ahuriri Heights area of Ōmārama. Considers the mapping inaccurately represents flood risk for their property (5 Ahuriri Heights) and others in the area. Considers that historical data shows no flooding occurred in this area or during the 2022 floods and that the boundaries of the overlay are inconsistent with actual elevation data that shows the submitters property is significantly higher than surrounding areas. Considers that the natural topography of the area would divert floodwaters away from Ahuriri Heights. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Seeks that the ECan flood risk assessments should be included for all of the Ōmārama area on the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay. Seeks that the Canterbury Flood Assessment boundary drawn through the property at 5 Ahuriri Heights is amended to reflect its higher elevation.	Reject
178.6	Alastair & Sandra Gibson	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay to be inaccurate.	Seeks for the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay to be reassessed to correctly reflect land topography.	Reject
178.7	Alastair & Sandra Gibson	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay to be inaccurate.	Seeks for the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay to be reassessed to correctly reflect land topography.	Reject
178.8	Alastair & Sandra Gibson	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay to be inaccurate.	Seeks for the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay to be reassessed to correctly reflect land topography.	Reject
184.51	Lake Ohau Station Limited	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the CFA Overlay on the attached Lake Ohau Station Farm Base Area that is elevated above any floodplain area.	Seeks that the CFA Overlay is removed from the Lake Ohau Station Farm Base Area in Attachment [B] to this submission and recent LIDAR data mapping recently obtained from Canterbury Regional Council is mapped instead.	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
185.1	Resident's Association of Omarama	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay for the Ōmārama town and surrounding areas to be incomplete and inaccurate and does not incorporate the (site specific) detailed flood risk mapping undertaken by Environment Canterbury in 2020 and amended in 2022. Considers that the current PDP mapping misrepresents flood risk resulting in unnecessary costs for landowners (consents, insurance, adverse LIMs). Considers that the overlay implies a broader flood risk than what ECan's data supports, affecting land that is not considered flood-prone by ECan.	Seeks for the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay to be corrected for Ōmārama town and surrounding areas to align with ECan's flood hazard assessments.	Reject
188.24	Mackenzie District Council	Planning Maps	General	Support	Considers that it is noted that the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard overlays are new mapping feature(s) being introduced by the PDP with a mapping notation for subdivision and a separate mapping notation for activities and buildings. The Mackenzie ePlan also address a Fault Hazard, being the Ostler Fault Hazard Overlay. It may be beneficial for Plan users to have greater consistency in mapping appearance for what is a cross-boundary hazard - the Ostler Fault Hazard Overlay.	Seeks that the PDP ePlan uses the same colour scheme / notation (orange strips as seen in the Mackenzie ePlan) that the Mackenzie ePlan uses for the Ostler Fault Hazard Overlay mapping. [Refer to original submission for full relief sought.]	Accept
191.2	Hadleigh Bognuda and Magdalena Stanuch	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that Lot 2 DP 570687 and the adjoining Lot 1 DP 570687 are not susceptible to flooding due to their topography (ranging from 2 metres to over 40 metres above lake level) and no significant flow paths affect the site. Refers to recent flood events in Ōmārama that did not affect the site. Considers that the mapped Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay does not accurately reflect the actual flood risk for the lots.	Seeks to remove the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay from Lot 2 DP 570687 and Lot 1 DP 570687.	Reject
193.21	Ohau Company Trust (Shelton Downs Station)	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Delete the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay from Shelton Downs.	Delete the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay from Shelton Downs as notified.	Reject
196.7	Mark and Jayne Strachan	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay to be inaccurate.	Seeks for the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay to be reassessed to correctly reflect land topography.	Reject
196.8	Mark and Jayne Strachan	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay to be inaccurate.	Seeks for the Waitaki River Floodplain Assessment Overlay to be reassessed to correctly reflect land topography.	Reject
196.9	Mark and Jayne Strachan	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay to be inaccurate.	Seeks for the Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay to be reassessed to correctly reflect land topography.	Reject
203.2	Z Energy Limited	Planning Maps	General	Support	Supports the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay of [6 Pukeuri-Oamaru Road].	Retain the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay of [6 Pukeuri-Oamaru Road] as notified.	Reject
203.3	Z Energy Limited	Planning Maps	General	Support	Supports the Flood Assessment Overlay of [6 Pukeuri-Oamaru Road].	Retain the Flood Assessment Overlay of [6 Pukeuri-Oamaru Road] as notified.	Reject
203.9	Z Energy Limited	Planning Maps	General	Support	Supports the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay of [22 Severn Street].	Retain the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay of [22 Severn Street] as notified.	Reject
203.12	Z Energy Limited	Planning Maps	General	Support	Supports the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay of [112 Ronaldsay Street].	Retain the Liquefaction Assessment Overlay of [112 Ronaldsay Street] as notified.	Reject
203.13	Z Energy Limited	Planning Maps	General	Support	Supports the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay of [112 Ronaldsay Street].	Retain the Alluvial Fan Awareness Overlay of [112 Ronaldsay Street] as notified.	Reject
213.1	Leslie McAuley	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes CFA, flood assessment static mapping and LA Overlays that are inaccurate and create uncertainty for current and potential landowners. Considers that WDC must accept responsibility for accuracy and lay the groundwork through conversations with communities and affected property owners about their placement.	Seeks that CFA, flood assessments and LA Overlays mapping is accurate and agreed to by affected property owners with WDC responsible for accuracy.	Reject
235.17	Cormorants on Waterfront Limited	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that the Tsunami Hazard Area Information layer should be removed from 7-8 Waterfront Road and the District Plan maps, given its information-only purpose and absence of corresponding rules. Considers that the inclusion of this information layer could create unnecessary burdens on the property title during the building consent process and constraints on financing and insurance. Considers that this information be retained in Council's mapping databases or policies rather than the District Plan.	Seeks to remove the Tsunami Hazard Area information layer only overlay from the Planning maps and in particular from 7-8 Waterfront Road.	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
254.1	Elizabeth Bell	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the Plan for displaying an incorrect Floodplain Overlay on the PDP Planning Maps (Hardcopy Maps 7, 40) that compromised development of Ōmārama as the data proposed did not provide certainty nor confidence to landowners and developers. This was followed by a Liquefaction Susceptibility Overlay and then the current Canterbury Flood Assessment Overlay.	Seeks that all Overlays are deleted from the Ōmārama township properties and that the review of the Canterbury part of the Waitaki District Plan Flood Hazard mapping - June 2020. Report No. R20/26 is overlaid instead with Flood mapping for the Mackenzie and Waitaki District Plan Reviews Report No. R23/47 as this would resolve the current limitations of the proposed overlays.	Reject
259.92	Otago Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	Support	Considers that inclusion of the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay is appropriate but notes that recent ORC work indicates parts of the mapping may be inaccurate in some areas. The submitter considers that updated findings and upcoming community engagement will support WDC in determining necessary map changes ahead of the hearing process. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks the following: • reconsiders the Otago Flood Assessment Overlay in the proposed WDP maps (or any other relevant provisions in the proposed WDP) once provided with new information on flood overlay mapping from ORC. • Consider all available procedural options to ensure the information, once available, can be appropriately considered by any interested parties within the draft plan process.	Reject
271.271	Canterbury Regional Council	Planning Maps	General	Support	Generally, supports the Planning Maps. However, notes that the WRFA Overlay Overlaps with the Canterbury part of the Flood Hazard Assessment Overlay which means duplication of rules, and makes building in the overlapping areas much more onerous than is necessary. Considers it necessary that the WRFA Overlay needs to be removed from the Canterbury part of the District.	Delete the WRFA Overlay in the Planning Maps from the Canterbury part of the District.	Accept in part
281.24	Mainland Poultry Limited	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers that the Alluvial Fans Awareness overlay is low risk, and not based on robust evidence and do not affect land use and serve no useful purpose [refer to original submission section 4.1]	Seeks removal of AFA's from the PDP entirely, or in the alternative from the Sites. [1555 Horse Range Road, 193 McKerrow Road, and 69 Pillbrow Road - see original submissions for full details of sites].	Reject
295.135	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Planning Maps	General	Amend	The submitter understands the intent of this policy, however questions how it could be applicable to subdivision activities that may be undertaken within the Macraes Mining Zone, which are unlikely to be developed for housing / residential type land use activities	Seeks to ensure that the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay is correct in its application through the Macraes Mining Zone. Seeks to ensure that the Macraes Mining Zone is a 'stand alone' chapter of the Plan, such that subdivision for the purposes of mining activities would not be subject to this provision.	Reject
295.137	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Planning Maps	General	Amend	The submitter questions the accuracy of the proposed Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay within the SPZMM.	Seeks to ensure that the Surface Fault Rupture Hazard Awareness Overlay is correct in its application through the SPZMM.	Reject
295.234	OceanaGold (New Zealand) Limited	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Considers natural hazard overlays may impose unnecessary constraints, as risks are already well understood and managed in an operational mining environment and that the associated rules could create unnecssary limitations on current activities.	Seeks to remove the natural hazard overlays from within the SPZMM.	Reject
296.331	Gavin Simpson	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Oppose in part the Canterbury Flood Overlay due to elevation-based anomalies and mapping inaccuracies, particularly around Maerewhenua River, Grants Rd, Little Rd, and Dip Hill Rd, and considers that this raise doubts about the overlay's validity and consistency with known plan errors such as those at Ōmārama.	Seeks for a review of the Canterbury Flood Assessment overlay mapping.	Reject
298.310	Alastair and Carrie Gibson	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes in part the Canterbury Flood Overlay due to elevation-based anomalies and mapping inaccuracies, particularly around Maerewhenua River, Grants Rd, Little Rd, and Dip Hill Rd, and considers that this raise doubts about the overlay's validity and consistency with known plan errors such as those at Ōmārama.	Seeks for a review of the Canterbury Flood Assessment overlay mapping.	Reject
299.310	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Planning Maps	General	Support	Supports the Otago Flood Assessment. Considers that this model appears to overestimate areas that may flood compared to the GNS geomorphology report. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks for a review of the Otago Flood Plain overlay mapping.	Reject
299.331	Twin Terraces Ltd & Cayuga Ltd	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the Waitaki Plains Flood Assessment. Considers the Otago Flood overlay which is based more on expertise and experience should be used for rules instead of the Waitaki Plains model. Considers that both models appear to overestimate areas that may flood compared to the GNS geomorphology report. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks the removal of the Waitaki Plains Flood Assessment overlay mapping, or alternatively for the removal of its rules by deleting NH-R3.	Reject
300.310	Adrianus and Francisca Verbakel & others	Planning Maps	General	Oppose	Opposes the Canterbury Flood Assessment in part, due to elevation-based anomalies and mapping inaccuracies, particularly around the river, and considers that this raises doubts about the overlay's validity and consistency with known plan errors such as those at Ōmārama.	Seeks for a review of the Canterbury Flood Assessment overlay mapping.	Reject

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary	Recommendation
313.25	Geoff & Jan Keeling - Keeling Dairies Limited	Planning Maps	General	Amend	Opposes the Canterbury Flood Assessment as it applies to the submitter's site, due to elevation-based anomalies and mapping inaccuracies. Considers that this raise doubts about the overlay's validity and consistency with known plan errors. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks for a review of the Canterbury Flood Assessment overlay mapping.	Reject

Appendix 3
Submissions on Withdrawn Provisions

Contents

Coastal Environment 2

Coastal Environment

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
194.83	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Support	Considers the objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-O1 'Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment' as notified.
243.83	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-O1 as it is not always possible for necessary land use activities to prevent the further decline of natural character values.	Seeks to amend as follows: There is no further decline of natural character values as a result of land use activities,to the extent reasonably practicable.
246.225	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Support	The submitters support in part. They consider CE-O1 generally consistent with s6(a) RMA and NZCPS Policy 13 but seek amendments to better reflect s6(a) and to positively acknowledge that appropriate activities can occur in the coastal environment. They note the plan lacks objectives recognising the appropriate use of natural and physical resources. They also see their proposed amendments as aligning with CE-O3 (s6(b)) and helping to more clearly identify the underlying resource-management issue.	The submitters seek amendment of CE-O1, and merge it with CE-O3, as follows: ~~There is no further decline of~~ The natural character ~~values~~ of the coastal environment and natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment are preserved to support its natural function and its social and cultural values, ~~as a result of land use activities~~ while enabling appropriate subdivision, use and development to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities.
251.268	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Amend	Considers that the objective should explicitly state preservation of natural character to align with the NZCPS. The submitter considers that “inappropriate activities” is a more accurate term than “land use.”	Seeks to amend as follows: Natural character is preserved by ~~T~~there ~~is~~ being no further decline of natural character values as a result of ~~land use~~ inappropriate activities.
253.143	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Oppose	Opposes The submitter supports the overall intent of the objective but consider the wording could be made more direct and consistent with the strong protective intent of Section 6 of the RMA.1991 and NZCPS.	Amend CE-O1 as follows: ~~There is no further decline of natural character values as a result of land use activities.~~ Natural character values in the Coastal Environment are preserved and protected from inappropriate subdivision, land use activities and development.
265.220	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Oppose	Opposes CE-O1 which is more restrictive over a broader area than the NZCPS requires. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: There is no further decline of natural character values as a result of land use activities where the CE is identified as Outstanding. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment.
282.252	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Oppose	Opposes CE-O1 which is more restrictive over a broader area than the NZCPS requires. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: There is no further decline of natural character values as a result of land use activities where the CE is identified as Outstanding. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment.
305.162	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Support	Considers that the coastal natural character objective broadly aligns with RMA and NZCPS but considers amendments are needed to better align with RMA direction.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~There is no further decline of~~ The natural character ~~values~~ of the coastal environment and natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment are preserved to support its natural function and its social and cultural values, ~~as a result of land use activities~~ while enabling appropriate subdivision, use and development to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities.
306.162	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Support	Considers that the coastal natural character objective broadly aligns with RMA and NZCPS but considers amendments are needed to better align with RMA direction.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~There is no further decline of~~ The natural character ~~values~~ of the coastal environment and natural features and landscapes within the coastal environment are preserved to support its natural function and its social and cultural values, ~~as a result of land use activities~~ while enabling appropriate subdivision, use and development to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities.
312.111	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further d	Oppose	Opposes The objective is more restrictive than what the NZCPS requires for managing natural character in the coastal environment. The NZCPS requires councils to identify specific areas where subdivision, use, or development is inappropriate, but Waitaki District Council has instead	Seeks the following amendments CE-O1 Preserving the natural character of the Coastal Environment There is no further decline of natural character values as a result of land use activities where the CE is identified as Outstanding. Avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
					mapped almost the entire coastline, despite acknowledging that much of it is heavily modified. The ASLA report notes that the coastline is not outstanding and that much of it has degraded character, meaning the NZCPS only requires avoiding significant adverse effects—not all adverse effects. CE-O1 therefore exceeds national policy direction and should be amended to align with NZCPS requirements. Natural character is not defined, and the Anne Steven report shows intensively farmed land has low natural character, yet such land is still included in the overlay simply because it falls within 150 m of the coast. The submitters support excluding Oamaru from the coastal environment overlay and argue the same logic should apply to coastal farmland, given its modified state.	other adverse effects of activities on natural character in all other areas of the coastal environment.
194.84	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Support	Considers the objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-O2 'Improving the natural character of the Coastal Environment' as notified.
240.107	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Support	Support in part. Considers more directive language is appropriate.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~The natural character of the Coastal Environment is improved, over time.~~ The natural character of the Coastal Environment is restored.
243.84	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-O2 considering a consequence of erosion and climate change is that the natural character of the Coastal Environment cannot always be improved.	Seeks to amend as follows: Where reasonably practicable,the natural character of theCoastal Environmentis improved, over time.
251.269	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Amend	Considers that the phrase “over time” is redundant in an objective. The submitter considers that restoration should be explicitly included to reflect NZCPS and PORPS direction	Seeks to amend as follows: The natural character of the Coastal Environment is improved, ~~over time~~ including through restoration of areas where natural character has been lost.
253.144	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Oppose	Opposes in part: The submitter supports the intent of the objective, but considers it lacks clarity about what improvements in natural character are sought. Considers the term “improvement” ambiguous and less directive than what is required.	Amend CE-O2 as follows: ~~The natural character of the Coastal Environment is improved, over time.~~ The natural character of the Coastal Environment is restored.
265.221	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.253	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
312.114	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O2 Improving the natural character of Coastal Environment The natural character of t	Support	Supports CE-O2 as notified	Retain as notified
194.85	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Support	Considers the objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-O3 as notified
243.85	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-O3 as activities such as quarrying which have a functional or operational need to be located in the Coastal Environment should be provided for.	Seeks to amend as follows: Natural Features and Landscapes within theCoastal Environmentare protected from inappropriatesubdivision, use and development,unless there is an operational or functional need for their location in the Coastal Environment.
246.226	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Support	Support in part: The submitters support the policy intent but consider there to be no objectives acknowledging the appropriate use of natural and physical resources in the coastal environment, and suggest amendments to address this.	The submitters seek amendment of CE-O3 by merging it with CE-O1. Alternatively, if the Council prefers to retain CE-O3, the submitters seek amendment as follows: Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment are protected from inappropriate are preserved to support its natural function and its social and cultural values, while enabling appropriate subdivision, use and development to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
251.270	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Amend	Considers that the objective should include restoration of landscape values in accordance with NZCPS and PORPS.	Seeks to amend as follows: Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, and restoration of landscape values is encouraged.
253.145	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Oppose	Opposes in part: For clarity and consistency, the submitter considers the objective should refer to 'outstanding' and 'other' natural features and landscapes.	Amend CE-O3 as follows: Outstanding and all other ~~N~~natural ~~F~~features and ~~L~~landscapes within the Coastal Environment are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.
265.222	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Support	Support on the condition that changes are made to ONF22 as recommended by GNS Science along the principles extended to ONF22 by Andrew Craig. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Retain as notified
282.254	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Support	Support on the condition that changes are made to ONF22 as recommended by GNS Science along the principles extended to ONF22 by Andrew Craig. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to retain as notified.
305.163	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Support	Support in part. Considers the objective is generally consistent with the requirements of the RMA and NZCPS but considers amendments are needed to enable appropriate uses.	Seeks to amend as follows: Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment are ~~protected from inappropriate~~ preserved to support its natural function and its social and cultural values, while enabling appropriate subdivision, use and development to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities.
306.163	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Support	Support in part. Considers the objective is generally consistent with the requirements of the RMA and NZCPS but considers amendments are needed to enable appropriate uses.	Seeks to amend as follows: Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment are ~~protected from inappropriate~~ preserved to support its natural function and its social and cultural values, while enabling appropriate subdivision, use and development to provide for the wellbeing of people and communities.
312.115	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O3 Protection of Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Natu	Support	Supports Subject to changes being made to ONF22 as recommended by GNS Science along the principles extended to ONF22 by Andrew Craig.	Retain as notified
194.88	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Support	Considers the intent of this objective is appropriate, but the drafting could be clearer about the roles of protection and enhancement as part of maintaining indigenous biodiversity.	Amend as follows, or words to similar effect: "There is no net loss of Indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment ~~and~~ including that Indigenous biodiversity is enhanced where appropriate, and Significant Natural Areas are protected."
240.108	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Oppose	Oppose in part. Considers that some indigenous biodiversity must be protected so that it is maintained. The concept of no net loss is not always appropriate in the coastal environment and does not give effect to Policy 11 of the NZCPS.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~There is no net loss of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment and that indigenous biodiversity is enhanced where appropriate, and Significant Natural Areas are protected.~~ Indigenous biological diversity within the Coastal Environment is maintained and protected from the adverse effects of activities, subdivision and use. Seeks to insert new standalone objective dealing with indigenous biodiversity restoration as follows: Indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems are restored within the Coastal Environment. Seeks to insert new standalone objective dealing with protection of significant natural areas: Significant Natural Areas within the Coastal Environment are protected. [refer submission point 240.#]
243.86	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-O4. As a consequence of coastal processes works may be required that will effect biodiversity. Those works may be functionally and operationally necessary. The provision should be drafted in a way that is more compatible with CE-O5.	Seeks to amend as follows: As far as reasonably practicable, there is no net loss of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment and that indigenous biodiversity is enhanced where appropriate, and Significant Natural Areas are protected.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
246.227	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Support	Support in part: The submitters support the inclusion of CE-O1, but request it be more aligned with ECO-O1 (including their requested amendments).	Subject to our request that the Council consider streamlining its nine CE objectives, the submitters seek amendment of CE-O4 as follows: ~~There is no net loss of~~ indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment is managed to support the long-term health, resilience and functioning of ecosystems, while recognising the mana of takata whenua as kaitiaki and people and communities, including landowners, as guardians ~~and that indigenous biodiversity is enhanced where appropriate, and Significant Natural Areas are protected.~~
251.271	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Amend	Considers that while the objective's intent is supported, it is unclear when enhancement of indigenous biodiversity would not be appropriate.	Seeks to amend as follows: There is no net loss of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment,~~and that~~ indigenous biodiversity is enhanced ~~where appropriate~~, and Significant Natural Areas are protected.
253.146	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Oppose	Opposes in part: The submitters seek the objective be more directive to give effect to the NZCPS. The submitter also seeks that the objective address one matter at a time as it currently addresses numerous matters in one.	Amend CE-O4 as follows: ~~There is no net loss of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment and that indigenous biodiversity is enhanced where appropriate, and Significant Natural Areas are protected.~~ Indigenous biological diversity within the Coastal Environment is maintained and protected from the adverse effects of activities, subdivision and use.
265.223	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.255	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
312.116	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O4 Protection and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment	Support	Supports CE-O4 as notified	Retain as notified
194.142	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O8 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Mana whenua's relationship with the Coast	Support	Supports CE-O8 'Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment' as these objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS.	Retain CE-O8 'Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment' as notified.
251.275	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O8 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Mana whenua's relationship with the Coast	Amend	Considers that the objective needs expansion to clarify the full range of outcomes relating to Kāi Tahu's role in and relationship to the coast..	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Mana whenua's~~ The enduring Kāi Tahu relationship with the Coastal Environment is recognised and provided for, including:, 1. their cultural values, traditions and customary uses, including mahika kai; 2.their role as kaitiaki and the use of tikaka and mātauraka in managing coastal resources; and 3. the exercise of rakatirataka, including in relation to the use of Māori land and Native Reserves.
265.227	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O8 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Mana whenua's relationship with the Coast	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.259	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O8 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Mana whenua's relationship with the Coast	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
312.120	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O8 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Mana	Support	Supports CE-O8 as notified	Retain as notified

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
			whenua's relationship with the Coast			
194.87	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Support	Consdiers the objectives give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-O9 as notified.
246.229	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Support	Support in part: The submitters support the intent of CE-O9. Considers it appropriate and legal to limit access across private property when unsafe or disrupts farming activities. Seek amendments to CE-O9 to ensure adverse effects on private land are minimised.	The submitters seek amendment of CE-O9 as follows: Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced while also ensuring that adverse effects on private land, including primary production activities, are minimised. OR wording to similar effect.
251.276	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Amend	Considers that the policy must control vehicle access and explicitly maintain and enhance recreation and customary access. The submitter considers that access for mahika kai should also be supported in line with the PORPS.	Seeks to amend as follows: Public access, recreation opportunities and access for customary uses in the coastal environment ~~is~~ are maintained and enhanced and vehicle access is controlled.
253.150	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Oppose	Oppose in part: The submitter considers that public access in the coastal environment is sometimes not appropriate, in particular where indigenous species and vegetation are present can result in trampling, disturbance, injury or death by people, pets and vehicles. The objective should include this qualifier, and a new objective, with direction on when public access should be restricted to give effect to the NZCPS.	Amend CE-O9 as follows: Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced where appropriate.
265.228	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Support	Support with amendments to the Public Access chapter and clarify that access requirements apply only to subdivision and access to the Coastal Marine Area, not private land within the broader Coastal Environment. Notes that public access obligations under the NZCPS focus on the Coastal Marine Area, and access through farmland may be restricted for health and safety reasons.	Seeks to amend as follows: Public access to the coastal marine area ~~in the coastal environment~~ is maintained and enhanced where appropriate.
282.260	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Support	Support with amendments to the Public Access chapter and clarify that access requirements apply only to subdivision and access to the Coastal Marine Area, not private land within the broader Coastal Environment. Notes that public access obligations under the NZCPS focus on the Coastal Marine Area, and access through farmland may be restricted for health and safety reasons.	Seeks to amend as follows: Public access to the coastal marine area ~~in the coastal environment~~ is maintained and enhanced where appropriate.
305.165	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Support	Support in part. Considers that maintaining and enhancing public access to the coastal environment is appropriate but considers that the objective should better recognise that public access arrangements that traverse private property can impact on permitted activities such as primary production.	Seeks to amend as follows: Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced while also ensuring that adverse effects on private land, including primary production activities, are minimised
306.165	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Support	Support in part. Considers that maintaining and enhancing public access to the coastal environment is appropriate but considers that the objective should better recognise that public access arrangements that traverse private property can impact on permitted activities such as primary production.	Seeks to amend as follows: Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced while also ensuring that adverse effects on private land, including primary production activities, are minimised
312.121	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-O9 Public Access Public access in the coastal environment is maintained and enhanced	Amend	Supports in part The submitters' propose amendments to the Public Access chapter [Refer to points 13.1 to 13.9.1 in original submission] and clearer wording in CE-O9 itself. The Coastal Environment (CE) has been mapped very broadly, the objective should not require enhanced public access across private land within the CE. Access requirements should be limited to subdivision and to providing access to the Coastal Marine Area (CMA), which is the only access obligation under the NZCPS. Most private land within the CE is farmland, where public access raises health and safety risks; under NZCPS Policy 19(3)(e), walking access may be restricted for this reason.	Seeks the following amendments CE-O9 Public Access Public access to the coastal marine area ~~in the coastal environment~~ is maintained and enhanced where appropriate.
194.89	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P1 Identify the Coastal Environment Identify and map the location of the inland exte	Support	Consdiers the policy directly gives effect to the NZCPS Policy 1, and is also the most efficient and effective means of managing the Coastal environment.	Retain as notified.
265.229	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P1 Identify the Coastal Environment Identify and map the location of the inland exte	Support	Supports, but notes that the inland edge mapping was self-reviewed by a single landscape architect using a criterion based on the first main ridgeline or seaward-facing slope. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Coastal Environment overlay is remapped using NZCPS criteria only and removing CE from inland areas not explicitly required for inclusion by the NZCPS.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
282.261	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P1 Identify the Coastal Environment Identify and map the location of the inland exte	Support	Supports, but notes that the inland edge mapping was self-reviewed by a single landscape architect using a criterion based on the first main ridgeline or seaward-facing slope. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks that the Coastal Environment overlay is remapped using NZCPS criteria only and removing CE from inland areas not explicitly required for inclusion by the NZCPS.
312.122	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P1 Identify the Coastal Environment Identify and map the location of the inland exte	Support	Supports Submitters points out that the coastal environment (CE) mapping was carried out and self-reviewed by a single landscape architect, using a method defining the inland boundary at the first seaward-facing ridgeline. This approach relies heavily on a Tasman District methodology, case law shows ridgelines alone cannot determine the inland extent of the coastal environment; consideration must be given to ecological, landscape, cultural, and perceptual factors. There are Environment Court decisions [Refer to 15.23 in original submission] demonstrating that the CE boundary is context-specific, not a fixed topographical rule. Other councils use multi-factor assessments, not automatic ridgeline boundaries. The submitters consider the Waitaki approach does not align with the NZCPS, relevant case law, or CE-P1, resulting in excessively large CE area. Despite the significant expansion of the CE and concerns about the methodology, no independent peer review has been provided.	Seeks the following amendments Coastal Environment overlay be remapped by peer review using the NZ CPS criteria only and thereby removing CE from inland areas not explicitly required for inclusion by the NZ CPS.
194.98	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P10 Protect Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Protect N	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P10 as notified.
240.113	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-P10 Protect Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Protect N	Support	Support in part. Considers the management of effects needs to be extended to other natural features and landscapes, in accordance with Policy 15 of the NZCPS.	Seeks amendments for the reasons provided.
246.232	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P10 Protect Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Protect N	Support	Support in part They acknowledge CE-P10 reflects NZCPS Policy 15, but they oppose the inclusion of RSL, noting only a very small area of RSL land sits within the coastal environment overlay, making the proposed restriction unnecessarily broad.	The submitters seek reference to RSL be removed from CE-P10.
251.284	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P10 Protect Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Protect N	Amend	Considers that mapping of SNF and RSL is too limited to give effect to NZCPS Policy 15. The submitter considers that policies should also promote landscape restoration or enhancement.	Seeks amendments to address matters raised by this submission
253.158	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P10 Protect Natural Features and Landscapes within the Coastal Environment Protect N	Oppose	Opposes in part: Considers that Policy 15 of the NZCPS requires Council to avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy, or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on 'other natural features and natural landscapes' in the coastal environment. As drafted the policy only includes 'Significant Natural Features' and 'Rural Scenic Landscapes'.	Amend clause 2 of CE-P10 as follows: 2. avoiding significant adverse effects, and avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any other adverse effects of subdivision, use and development, on: a.Significant Natural Features, b.Rural Scenic Landscapes, and c. All other natural features and landscapes within the Coastal Environment.
194.99	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P11 Managing conservation land within the Coastal Environment Avoid significant adve	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P11 as notified.
265.238	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P11 Managing conservation land within the Coastal Environment Avoid significant adve	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.270	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P11 Managing conservation land within the Coastal Environment Avoid significant adve	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
312.132	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P11 Managing conservation land within the Coastal	Support	Supports CE-P11 as notified	Retained as notified

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
			Environment Avoid significant adve			
194.100	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P12 Papakāika, marae and associated development within the Coastal Environment Provi	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P12 as notified.
251.285	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P12 Papakāika, marae and associated development within the Coastal Environment Provi	Amend	Considers the policy must be enabling for Kāi Tahu and include Native Reserves to give effect to PORPS. The submitter considers that Kāi Tahu must be able to lead management approaches and that effects on Māori land may be appropriate. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Provide opportunities for~~ Enable papakāika, marae and associated development on Māori land and Native Reserves by ~~mana whenua~~ Kāi Tahu within the Coastal Environment, including by: 1. enabling mana whenua, and owners of Māori freehold land in relation to their land, to lead approaches to the management of the effects of use and development of Native Reserves and Māori land in accordance with mātauraka and tikaka, and ~~traditional cultural practices~~ 2. acknowledging that effects of the use and development of Native Reserves and Māori land may be appropriate on that land.. For Kāi Tahu use of these areas, this policy applies instead of CE-P4, CE-P7, CE-P8, CE-P9, CE-P10, CE-P15 and CE-P16. Seeks to make consequential to all CE rules and relevant rules in other chapters to implement this policy.
265.239	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P12 Papakāika, marae and associated development within the Coastal Environment Provi	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.271	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P12 Papakāika, marae and associated development within the Coastal Environment Provi	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
312.133	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P12 Papakāika, marae and associated development within the Coastal Environment Provi	Support	Supports CE-P12 as notified	Retain as notified
194.101	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P13 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Enable mana whenua to: exercise their c	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain Policy CE-P13 as notified.
251.286	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P13 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Enable mana whenua to: exercise their c	Amend	Considers the policy requires amendments to properly reflect PORPS CE-P13 and that implementation involves parties other than mana whenua (for example council and Crown agencies) and should be broadened accordingly.	Seeks to amend as follows: Recognise and give practical effect to Kāi Tahu rakatirataka by ~~Enable mana whenua to:~~ 1.enabling mana whenua to exercise their customary responsibilities as kaitiaki of the Coastal Environment, including by providing for their involvement in decision- making in relation to the Coastal Environment; 2.identifying, protecting, and improving where degraded, sites, areas and values of importance to Kāi Tahu within the coastal environment, and managing these in accordance with tikaka, 3. incorporating the impact of land-based activities on customary fisheries and mātaitai reserves in decision making,and 4.enabling mana whenua to undertake customary uses, including mahika kai activities within the Coastal Environment.
265.240	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P13 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Enable mana whenua to: exercise their c	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.272	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P13 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Enable mana whenua to: exercise their c	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
312.134	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P13 Mana whenua and the Coastal Environment Enable mana whenua to: exercise their c	Support	Supports CE-P13 as notified	retain as notified
194.107	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P19 as notified.
246.233	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Support	Support in part They are concerned that policies to "maintain and enhance" public access overlook the real impacts on private rural land, where access often crosses working farms. They seek a more balanced policy that recognises public access can occur over private land, addresses the potential adverse effects, and ensures access is managed so landowners can continue their lawful activities without disruption.	The submitters seek amendment of CE-P19 as follows: CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, where adverse effects are avoided or mitigated, including adverse effects on: 1. public health and safety; and 2. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; and 3. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes; and 4. Significant Natural Areas, indigenous vegetation and/or habitats of indigenous fauna.; and 5. private land and primary production activities.
251.293	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Amend	Considers that vehicle access to the coast must be controlled to give effect to NZCPS and PORPS.	Seeks to amend as follows: Maintain and enhance public walking access to the coastal environment, while controlling vehicle access, where adverse effects are avoided or mitigated, including adverse effects on: ....
265.247	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Support	Support with changes to align with CE-O9, clarifying that the NZCPS requires public access only to the Coastal Marine Area, not the wider Coastal Environment. Considers that land-based activities, especially primary production, must be considered due to health, safety, and privacy concerns, and this should be reflected alongside the Public Access and Subdivision chapters.	Seeks to amend as follows: Maintain and enhance public access to the ~~coastal environment~~ coastal marine area, where adverse effects are avoided or mitigated, including adverse effects on: 1. public health and safety; and 2. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; and 3. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes; and 4. Significant Natural Areas, indigenous vegetation and/or habitats of indigenous fauna.;and 5. Land based activities and Primary Production.
282.279	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Support	Support with changes to align with CE-O9, clarifying that the NZCPS requires public access only to the Coastal Marine Area, not the wider Coastal Environment. Considers that land-based activities, especially primary production, must be considered due to health, safety, and privacy concerns, and this should be reflected alongside the Public Access and Subdivision chapters.	Seeks to amend as follows: Maintain and enhance public access to the ~~coastal environment~~ coastal marine area, where adverse effects are avoided or mitigated, including adverse effects on: 1. public health and safety; and 2. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; and 3. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes; and 4. Significant Natural Areas, indigenous vegetation and/or habitats of indigenous fauna.;and 5. Land based activities and Primary Production.
305.167	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Support	Support in part. Supports the intent of public access policies while recognising that access across private land can adversely affect permitted activities such as primary production, and seeks consultation with landowners where access routes affect their property.	Seeks to amend as follows: 'Maintain and enhance existing public access to the coastal environment, where adverse effects are avoided or mitigated, including adverse effects on: 1. public health and safety; and 2. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; and 3. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes; and 4. Significant Natural Areas, indigenous vegetation and/or habitats of indigenous fauna; and 5. Private land and primary production activities.'

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
306.167	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Support	Support in part. Supports the intent of public access policies while recognising that access across private land can adversely affect permitted activities such as primary production, and seeks consultation with landowners where access routes affect their property.	Seeks to amend as follows: 'Maintain and enhance existing public access to the coastal environment, where adverse effects are avoided or mitigated, including adverse effects on: 1. public health and safety; and 2. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; and 3. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes; and 4. Significant Natural Areas, indigenous vegetation and/or habitats of indigenous fauna; and 5. Private land and primary production activities.'
312.140	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the coastal environment, whe	Amend	Support with changes to align with CE-O9 [Refer to points 15.16 to 15.19.1 in original submission], clarifying that the NZCPS requires public access only to the Coastal Marine Area, not the wider Coastal Environment. Considers that land-based activities, especially primary production, must be considered due to health, safety, and privacy concerns, and this should be reflected alongside the Public Access and Subdivision chapters.	Seeks the following amendments CE-P19 Public access Maintain and enhance public access to the ~~coastal environment~~ coastal marine area, where adverse effects are avoided or mitigated, including adverse effects on: 1. public health and safety; and 2. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; and 3. Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes; and 4. Significant Natural Areas, indigenous vegetation and/or habitats of indigenous fauna~~.~~; and 5. Land based activities and Primary Production.
194.92	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain as notified.
240.112	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Support	Support in part. Considers adverse effects on outstanding natural character must be avoided, in accordance with Policy 13 of the NZCPS. Also considers natural character needs to be assessed, including by mapping or otherwise identifying at least areas of high natural character.	Seeks to add new clause (1), and any other amendment to give effect to the reasons provided: 1. Avoiding adverse effects on natural character in areas of outstanding natural character
243.89	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-P4 noting that aggregate resources are locationally constrained and there are demands for them in the coastal environment. As set out in this submission costs of transporting materials are significant and therefore the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the community is supported by providing a pathway to obtain necessary resources efficiently.	Seeks to delete quarrying activities from clause 4.
251.279	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Amend	Considers that the intent of the policy is supported but that clarification is needed regarding natural character. The submitter considers that commercial forestry, landfills, wastewater plants, quarrying, and mining should be discouraged in the coastal environment. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to amend as follows: 4. discouraging ~~plantation~~ commercial forestry, landfill, wastewater treatment plants, quarrying activities and mining activities within the Coastal Environment.
253.153	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Oppose	Opposes in part: The submitter supports the intent and drafting of the policy however for certainty and effectiveness, the elements of natural character as described in Policy 13 of the NZCPS should be inserted into the policy text. Consider earthworks to directly conflict with preservation of natural character if not managed appropriately. Earthworks should be inserted in clause 3 of the policy.	Seeks to insert the elements of natural character to be preserved and protected into the policy. Seeks to insert 'earthworks' into clause 3 of the policy.
265.232	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.264	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
308.42	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.
312.126	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P4 Preserve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Preserve the natural ch	Support	Supports CE-P4 as notified	Retain as notified
194.93	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P5 Identify coastal areas with opportunities for restoration and rehabilitation Iden	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P5 as notified.
251.280	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P5 Identify coastal areas with opportunities for restoration and rehabilitation Iden	Amend	Considers that the policy intent is sound but lacks explanation on how restoration areas were identified or prioritised. The submitter considers that the relationship to NZCPS Policy 14 and cultural landscape restoration needs clarification.	Seeks amendments to address the matters raised by this submission
265.233	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P5 Identify coastal areas with opportunities for restoration and rehabilitation Iden	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.265	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P5 Identify coastal areas with opportunities for restoration and rehabilitation Iden	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
312.127	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P5 Identify coastal areas with opportunities for restoration and rehabilitation Iden	Support	Supports CE-P5 as notified	Retain as notified
194.94	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P6 as notified.
246.230	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Support	Support in part: The submitters support incentives for landowners within 'Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation' where they plant, fence, or restore wetlands. Not clear how this will work in practice or how landowners access this. Seeking amendments to provide clarity on this and suggest a method is included in the plan.	The submitters seek retention of CE-P6 as notified in the PDP. The submitters also seek inclusion of a method to provide clarification around the incentive for landowners within 'Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation' where they undertake certain activities.
251.281	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Amend	Considers that CE-P6 should explicitly require restoration of natural character. The submitter considers that commercial forestry should be included due to its similar effects to plantation forestry.	Seeks to amend as follows: Improve and restore the natural character of the Coastal Environment 1. Actively support improvements to and restoration of the natural character of the Coastal Environment, including by ... 2. ... a. cease ~~plantation~~ commercial forestry,
253.154	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Oppose	Opposes in part: The submitters seek that the terms restore, restoration and rehabilitation should be used for consistency with restoration and rehabilitation methods included in Policy 14 of the NZCPS. • imposition of restoration or rehabilitation conditions on resource consents and designations • restoring indigenous habitats and ecosystems using local genetic stock • encouraging natural regeneration of indigenous species • effective animal pest management • creating or enhancing habitat for indigenous species • rehabilitating other natural coastal features or processes	Amend policy title to 'Restore the natural character of the Coastal Environment' and replace 'improvements to' with 'restoration or rehabilitation of' in the chapeau of the policy. In clause d. insert 'animal pest management' Insert the other restoration and rehabilitation methods set out in Policy 14 of the NZCPS into the CE-P6

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
					• restoring riparian margins • removing redundant materials • restoring cultural landscape features • redesign of structures that interfere with ecosystem processes	
265.234	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Support	Support with modifications to enable removal of any buildings or structures in the Coastal Environment regardless of redundancy or natural character impact. Considers that without financial incentives or compensation for landowners, the policy may be ineffective.	Seeks to amend as follows: ... e. enabling the removal of ~~redundant~~ buildings, or structures.~~where they are adversely affecting the natural character of the Coastal Environment.~~ 2.~~Consider~~ Provide incentives for landowners within Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation where they: ...
282.266	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Support	Support with modifications to enable removal of any buildings or structures in the Coastal Environment regardless of redundancy or natural character impact. Considers that without financial incentives or compensation for landowners, the policy may be ineffective.	Seeks to amend as follows: ... e. enabling the removal of ~~redundant~~ buildings, or structures.~~where they are adversely affecting the natural character of the Coastal Environment.~~ 2.~~Consider~~ Provide incentives for landowners within Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation where they: ...
308.43	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.
312.128	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment Actively support improv	Amend	Supports in part Amendments are sought to make the policy more practical. Removal of buildings or structures from the CE should be enabled regardless of whether they are redundant or whether or not they affect the natural character. Without the provision for financial incentive for landowners to support the policy it is considered redundant. Compensation will be required to incentivise a landowner to cease any of the listed activities and effectively rewild or retire their land which will continue to bear rates expenses.	Seeks the following amendments CE-P6 Improve the natural character of the Coastal Environment 1. Actively support improvements to the natural character of the Coastal Environment, including by: a. re-establishing native dune systems; and b. using a range of tools, including education and advocacy to encourage owners, community groups and others to take action to expand and connect natural areas; and c. enabling planting of indigenous vegetation; and d. enabling the removal of non-indigenous vegetation, including those identified as a pest species or an organism of interest in the Otago Regional Pest Management Plan; and e. enabling the removal of ~~redundant~~ buildings, or structures. ~~where they are adversely affecting the natural character of the Coastal Environment.~~ 2. ~~Consider~~ Provide incentives for landowners within Coastal Areas with Opportunities for Restoration and Rehabilitation where they: a. cease plantation forestry, quarrying activities, or pastoral farming; b. remove weeds; c. plant indigenous vegetation; d. restore wetlands; and/or e. fence an area of land to promote natural regeneration.
194.95	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P7 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment In relation to subdivision in the Coas	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P7 as notified.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
251.282	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P7 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment In relation to subdivision in the Coas	Oppose	Considers that an overly restrictive subdivision policy forecloses Kāi Tahu use of historically occupied areas. The submitter considers that the policy and related rules must be reviewed to support appropriate Kāi Tahu settlement use.	Seeks amendments to address matters raised by this submission, including reviewing CE-P7 and making consequential changes to SUB-R14 and other rules as necessary
253.155	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P7 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment In relation to subdivision in the Coas	Oppose	Opposes in part: Considers that boundary adjustments may result in development potential for new buildings and structures. The policy should cover this eventuality. New allotments directly adjoining existing townships may also have the effect of encouraging ongoing sprawl. If expansion is needed to meet demand, then this should be signalled in the policy. Considers that Clause 2. b. may have the inadvertent effect of encouraging sprawling and sporadic development.	Seeks to remove boundary adjustments from the policy or qualify they must be for a particular purpose such as 'unless it is for a boundary adjustment for the purpose of [xyz]' Seeks to remove 'or directly adjoining' from clause a. Seeks to remove clause b. and apply requirement to incorporate works to actively rehabilitate and restore natural character to clause a.
265.235	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P7 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment In relation to subdivision in the Coas	Support	Supports with clarification that points i–iv under clause 2(b) should apply only where relevant, as some sites may lack features like wetlands or redundant structures.	Seeks to amend as follows: ... b. for sites outside existing townships or settlements, it incorporates works to actively rehabilitate or restore the natural character of the site, ~~including~~ which may include: ...
282.267	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P7 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment In relation to subdivision in the Coas	Support	Supports with clarification that points i–iv under clause 2(b) should apply only where relevant, as some sites may lack features like wetlands or redundant structures.	Seeks to amend as follows: ... b. for sites outside existing townships or settlements, it incorporates works to actively rehabilitate or restore the natural character of the site, ~~including~~ which may include: ...
312.129	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P7 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment In relation to subdivision in the Coas	Amend	Supports with clarification that points i–iv under clause 2(b) should apply only where relevant, as some sites may lack features like wetlands or redundant structures.	Seeks the following amendments CE-P7 Subdivision within the Coastal Environment In relation to subdivision in the Coastal Environment: 1. avoid new subdivision within the Coastal Protection Overlay unless it is for a boundary adjustment, or required for infrastructure or a utility allotment. 2. provide for subdivision outside of the Coastal Protection Overlay where: a. new allotments are within or directly adjoining existing townships or settlements, and a consolidated urban or rural-residential form is retained and sprawling or sporadic development is avoided; or b. for sites outside existing townships or settlements, it incorporates works to actively rehabilitate or restore the natural character of the site, ~~including~~ which may include: i. planting of endemic indigenous vegetation to mitigate the adverse effects of built form; ii. clearance of vegetation that is identified in the Otago Regional Pest Management Plan as a pest, pest agent, or organism of interest; iii. removal of redundant structures; and/or iv. restoration of wetlands.
194.96	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Seeks that CE-P8 'Buildings and structures within the Coastal margin' is retained as notified.
233.77	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	Support for a policy that recognises that in some instances there are operational and functional needs for buildings and structures to be located in certain locations, which can include within the coastal margin.	Seeks to retain as notified.
235.16	Cormorants on Waterfront Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Oppose	Considers that the policy direction within the Coastal Environment chapter may constrain the use and development where there are existing buildings and development. Considers that the	Seeks to amend as follows: NewBuildings and structures within the coastal margin

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
					policy should encourage the adaptive reuse to meet the strategic direction of the Plan where natural hazard risks are appropriately managed.	Avoidnewbuildings and structures within the coastal margin unless they have a functional need or operational need for their location.
242.30	Ministry of Education Te Tāhuhu o Te Mātauranga	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	Supports CE-P8 and recognises that educational facilities may be required to provide for communities in coastal environments.	Retain as notified.
246.231	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	Support as notified	Retain as notifed
251.283	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Amend	Considers that buildings and structures should only be allowed in the coastal margin where there is a functional need and that operational need is unnecessary and should be removed.	Seeks to amend as follows: Avoid buildings and structures within the coastal margin unless they have a functional need ~~or operational need~~ for their location.
253.156	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	Retain as notified.	Retain as notified.
265.236	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	No specific reasons given	Retain as notified
282.268	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
305.166	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Oppose	Oppose in part. Considers that restrictive controls on buildings within the coastal margin may unduly limit use of existing development and that development should be enabled where hazard risks can be adequately managed or where there is a functional or operational need.	Seeks to amend as follows: CE-P8 New Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid new buildings and structures within the coastal margin unless they have a functional need or operational need for their location or the risk can be adequately mitigated
306.166	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Oppose	Oppose in part. Considers that restrictive controls on buildings within the coastal margin may unduly limit use of existing development and that development should be enabled where hazard risks can be adequately managed or where there is a functional or operational need.	Seeks to amend as follows: CE-P8 New Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid new buildings and structures within the coastal margin unless they have a functional need or operational need for their location or the risk can be adequately mitigated
308.44	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to provide for slash traps as a permitted activity under the policy. Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.
312.130	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P8 Buildings and structures within the coastal margin Avoid buildings and structures	Support	Supports CE-P8 as notified	Retain as notified
194.97	Director-General of Conservation	Coastal Environment	CE-P9 Protect indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment Protect indigenous	Support	Considers the policies generally give effect to relevant higher order documents, particularly Part 2 of the RMA and the NZCPS. Although the language differs in some respects, it is reasonable that this reflects local aspirations while still achieving national requirements.	Retain CE-P9 'Protect indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment' in its entirety.
253.157	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-P9 Protect indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment Protect indigenous	Support	Supports in part: Seeks for the policy to include the full list set out in policy 11 (a) and (b) of the NZCPS for ease of use of the plan.	Amend the policy to include the lists from policy 11 of the NZCPS.
265.237	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-P9 Protect indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment Protect indigenous	Support	Support, but considers it would be helpful if NZCPS Policy 11(a) was reproduced in the text.	Seeks to add NZCPS policy 11(a) to the text.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
282.269	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-P9 Protect indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment Protect indigenous	Support	Support, but considers it would be helpful if NZCPS Policy 11(a) was reproduced in the text.	Seeks to add NZCPS policy 11(a) to the text.
312.131	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-P9 Protect indigenous biodiversity within the Coastal Environment Protect indigenous	Support	Support, but considers it would be helpful if NZCPS Policy 11(a) was reproduced in the text.	Seeks to add NZCPS policy 11(a) to the text.
246.234	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	The submitters oppose the application of restrictions to planting non-pest species exotic vegetation in the coastal environment. Consider there is no policy to support this restriction.	The submitters seek deletion of CE-R1.
251.295	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Amend	Considers that the definition of amenity planting is too broad and risks allowing inappropriate planting in sensitive coastal areas. The submitter considers that kaitiaki-related matters of discretion should be added.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~PER-2 The planting is amenity planting;~~ Alternatively seeks to tighten the definition of amenity planting as sought earlier in this submission Seeks to add a new matter of discretion as follows: effects on kaitiakitaka and the values of indigenous vegetation, taoka species and habitats, and biodiversity to mana whenua
253.163	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Opposes in part: PER-2 should be removed from the rule. Amenity planting may result in the introduction of invasive vegetation in the CE.	Seeks to remove PER-2 from CE-R1.
259.83	Otago Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Oppose in part. Considers the rules fail to recognise that the Flood Protection Management Bylaw may limit the ability to undertake such planting. The ORC has a designated cross bank partially within the Coastal Environment near the mouth of the Waitaki.	Seeks to amend the rules to include cross reference to the Otago Regional Council's Flood Protection Management Bylaw 2022.
265.248	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Support	Support with addition to allow maintenance of improved pasture for primary production which is the main activity in the Coastal Environment. Considers that requiring resource consents for pasture renewal would duplicate regional council regulations and impose an unnecessary burden, highlighting the need for peer review of the CE overlay.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The planting is maintenance of improved pasture.
271.446	Canterbury Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Support	Generally, supports in part. However, if the Submitter's primary request under NH-R5 is adopted, PER-3 will not be required. Otherwise, CRC supports a permitted activity rule that enables the council to continue flood and erosion protection within the riverine environment that overlaps with the Coastal Environment. In regards, to the Canterbury Regional Council, this is only the lower ~200m of the true right bank (south) of the Waitaki River.	Should the requested amendment to NH-R5 not be granted: Amend the rule as follows: PER-3 The planting is undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards or for natural hazard mitigation works.
282.280	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Support	Support with addition to allow maintenance of improved pasture for primary production which is the main activity in the Coastal Environment. Considers that requiring resource consents for pasture renewal would duplicate regional council regulations and impose an unnecessary burden, highlighting the need for peer review of the CE overlay.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The planting is maintenance of improved pasture.
305.168	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Opposes controls on planting non-pest species exotic vegetation in the CE, which could result in restrictions for pasture and shelterbelts.	Seeks to delete the rule. Alternatively, seeks to amend to include vegetation required for primary production activities.
306.168	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Opposes controls on planting non-pest species exotic vegetation in the CE, which could result in restrictions for pasture and shelterbelts.	Seeks to delete the rule. Alternatively, seeks to amend to include vegetation required for primary production activities.
308.45	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
312.141	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: P	Amend	Support with addition to allow maintenance of improved pasture for primary production which is the main activity in the Coastal Environment. Considers that requiring resource consents for pasture renewal would duplicate regional council regulations and impose an unnecessary burden, highlighting the need for peer review of the CE overlay.	Seeks the following amendments CE-R1 Planting vegetation within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 The planting is indigenous vegetation; or PER-2 The planting is amenity planting; or PER-3 The planting is undertaken by Waitaki District Council, Otago Regional Council, Canterbury Regional Council, or their agents, for the protection or restoration of natural defences against coastal natural hazards-; or PER-4 The planting is maintenance of improved pasture. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 and/or PER-3 Matters of discretion are restricted to: 1. the effects on sedimentation; and 2. the effects on erosion or flood management; and 3. the effects on natural character values; and 4. the effects on amenity values; and 5. the effects on the naturalness and openness of the landscape; and 6. the effects on indigenous biodiversity; and 7. the effects on public access.
240.118	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
243.93	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Oppose	Opposes proposed CE-R10. Aggregate resources are locationally constrained and there are demands for them in the coastal environment. As set out in this submission costs of transporting materials are significant and therefore the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of the community is supported by providing a pathway to obtain necessary resources efficiently.	Seeks to amend the activity status of Quarrying within the Coastal Environment to Discretionary.
246.239	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Oppose	The submitters oppose CE-R10. Considers the Council has offered no evidence or justification for restricting farm quarries.	Federated Farmers seek amendment to CE-R10 to provide for farm quarries as a permitted activity.
251.304	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Amend	Considers that landfills and wastewater plants should be added to the rule. The submitter considers that these activities have had past adverse effects and should be controlled alongside mining and quarrying	Seeks to amend as follows: Mining activities or quarrying activities,landfills, wastewater treatment plants within the Coastal Environment
253.169	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Support	Retain as notified.	Retain as notified.

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
	New Zealand Incorporated					
265.257	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: New Mining activities or new quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment
282.289	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: New Mining activities or new quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment
305.171	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Support	Support in part. The rule intent for mining and quarrying in the coastal environment is supported but considers the rule should apply only to new quarries so existing operations are not unintentionally captured.	Seeks to amend as follows: 'CE-R10 Mining activities or new quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment'
306.171	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Support	Support in part. The rule intent for mining and quarrying in the coastal environment is supported but considers the rule should apply only to new quarries so existing operations are not unintentionally captured.	Seeks to amend as follows: 'CE-R10 Mining activities or new quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment'
308.49	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.
312.150	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R10 Mining activities or quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zon	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Submission Summary CE-R10NewMining activities or new quarrying activities within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: Non-Complying Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable
240.116	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Oppose	Oppose in part. Considers this rule should not permit clearance in overlays, where other rules in other chapters of the plan prevail and the activity status where compliance is not achieved should be discretionary. Also considers an area limit should be included.	Seeks to amend as follows, and any other amendments to give effect to the reasons provided. PER 1A The vegetation clearance is not within an overlay
243.91	Whitestone Contracting Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Oppose	Opposed proposed CE-R2 as for clarity and certainty maintenance of Road should be provided for	Seeks to insert PER-4: The indigenousvegetation clearanceis necessary for repair or maintenance of the transport network.
246.235	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Support	The submitters support permitting indigenous vegetation clearance in the coastal environment but consider CE-R2 too narrow. If CE-R2 is to apply, they want all farm-maintenance activities included in PER-1. They also suggest linking CE-R2 to relevant provisions in the INF and TRANS chapters. They oppose PER-1(2)'s requirement to limit clearance strictly to the existing footprint. They support a restricted discretionary pathway where permitted standards are not met, provided the permitted rule is made more	The submitters seek amendment of CE-R2 as follows: PER X1 The indigenous vegetation clearance is maintenance of improved pasture for farming, PER X2 The vegetation clearance is for the construction of a post and wire fence or other fence used for the purposes of primary production, and farm-style gating and the vegetation clearance occurs only within the area necessary for its construction; or ... PER X3 The clearance is of indigenous vegetation that is causing an imminent danger to human life, livestock, structures or infrastructure. The submitters also seek clarification in CE-R2 that vegetation clearance related to infrastructure is covered by rules in the INF and TRAN chapters, and removal of infrastructure from PER-1. If the Council declines to provide for vegetation clearance for farm 'infrastructure' in the INF and TRAN chapters, amend PER-1 as follows:

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
						1. The vegetation clearance is necessary for maintaining or operating a firebreak, or is for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established: a. farm tracks,stock tracks and crossings; b. yardsand other hardstand areas; c. water supply and irrigation systems; d. fences; e. dams/ponds; f. walking and cycling tracks; g. driveways and access; or h. stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; i. foundation of a building or structure; j. flood and erosion protection undertaken by the Regional or District Council; ~~and~~ k.aircraft landing areas (permitted by GRUZ-R5); l.offal or farm rubbish pits or silage pits; and 2. the vegetation clearance ~~occurs only within the existing footprint of the item being repaired or maintained~~ is limited to the smallest extent necessary to complete the repair or maintenance.
251.296	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Amend	Considers the rule should include a matter of discretion that mirrors the kaitiaki provisions in the ECO rules.	Seeks to amend as follows: the effects onkaitiakitaka and the~~cultural~~valuesof indigenous vegetation, taoka species and habitats, and biodiversity tomana whenua
253.164	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Oppose	Opposes in part: Considers that the rule must include area limits over a 12-month period and the lifetime of the plan to ensure effects are appropriately managed.	Seeks to insert area limit for vegetation clearance over both a 12-month period and the lifetime of the plan.
265.249	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Support	Support with addition to allow maintenance of improved pasture for primary production which is the main activity in the Coastal Environment. Considers that requiring resource consents for pasture renewal would duplicate regional council regulations and impose an unnecessary burden, highlighting the need for peer review of the CE overlay.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The planting is maintenance of improved pasture.
271.447	Canterbury Regional Council	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Support	Generally, supports CE-R2 'Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment'. However, this could benefit with consistent wording as requested for SASM-R3 etc.	Amend the rule as follows: PER-1 Flood and erosion protection or drainage works undertaken by the Regional or District Council; and ...
282.281	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Support	Support with addition to allow maintenance of improved pasture for primary production which is the main activity in the Coastal Environment. Considers that requiring resource consents for pasture renewal would duplicate regional council regulations and impose an unnecessary burden, highlighting the need for peer review of the CE overlay.	Seeks to amend as follows: PER-4 The planting is maintenance of improved pasture.
308.46	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.
312.142	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activi	Amend	Support with addition to allow maintenance of improved pasture for primary production which is the main activity in the Coastal Environment. Considers that requiring resource consents for pasture renewal would duplicate regional council regulations and impose an unnecessary burden, highlighting the need for peer review of the CE overlay.	Seeks the following amendments CE-R2 Indigenous vegetation clearance within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: Permitted Where:

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
						PER-1 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance is necessary for maintaining or operating a firebreak, or is for the repair and maintenance of existing and lawfully established: a. farm tracks; b. yards; c. water supply and irrigation systems; d. fences; e. dams/ponds; f. walking and cycling tracks; g. driveways and access; h. stormwater infrastructure, sediment detention ponds, culverts and stormwater drains; i. foundation of a building or structure; j. flood and erosion protection undertaken by the Regional or District Council; and 2. the indigenous vegetation clearance is limited to within 2m of the items listed in PER-1.1; or PER-2 The indigenous vegetation clearance is undertaken for mahika kai purposes in accordance with tikaka Māori by mana whenua; or PER-3 The indigenous vegetation clearance occurs within an urban environment allotment or the domestic curtilage of a residential unit.; or PER-4 The indigenous vegetation clearance is maintenance of improved pasture. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 Compliance is not achieved with PER-1, PER-2 and/or PER-3 Matters of discretion are restricted to: the effects from sedimentation; and the effects on erosion and/or flood management; and the effects on natural character values; and the effects on amenity values; and the effects on the naturalness and openness of the landscape; and the effects on indigenous biodiversity; and the effects on cultural values of mana whenua; and the effects on public access.
153.35	Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Support	Support the rule as drafted	Retain as notified
246.236	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Oppose	The submitters query the need for CE-R3 within the GRUZ. No explanation or evidence why PDP restrictions on this activity are necessary.	The submitters seek deletion of CE-R1, or exclusion of GRUZ land.
251.297	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Amend	General support but considers that the rule focuses too narrowly on removal and should also ensure improvement of natural character.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Relocation or~~ Removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment PER-2

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
						The site will be rehabilitated and revegetated consistent with or to improve the natural character of the coastal environment in which it is located;
265.250	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.282	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
305.169	Erin Nivonne Schultz	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Oppose	Considers that relocation or removal of buildings to address coastal hazard risk should be encouraged and that such activities should not require management through plan rules.	Seeks to delete the provision.
306.169	Waitaki Property Guardians Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Oppose	Considers that relocation or removal of buildings to address coastal hazard risk should be encouraged and that such activities should not require management through plan rules.	Seeks to delete the provision.
312.143	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R3 Relocation or removal of existing buildings or structures within the Coastal Environment	Support	Supports CE-R3 as notified	Retain as notified
189.36	New Zealand Defence Force	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Oppose	Considers that CE-R6 'Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment' is opposed in part as it pertains to the NZDF as TMTA may require the placement of temporary buildings and structures in the Coastal environment to enable training exercises such as beach landings. These are temporary activities, and it is not appropriate for the same requirements to be applied as for permanent buildings and structures.	Seeks provision for temporary buildings, structures and earthworks associated with TMTA as a permitted activity, either explicitly in the CE Chapter or preferably by excluding the applicability of the CE Chapter to TMTA.
246.238	Federated Farmers of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Oppose	They note there is no permitted activity for buildings or structures in the coastal environment, and the Council has provided no evidence that such restrictions are necessary. They also oppose CE-R6 applying to existing buildings and structures, arguing it is unreasonable to require consent for features that already form part of the established environment.	The submitters seek amendment to CE-R6 to provide for various buildings and structures, including those with a functional or operational need, as a permitted activity.
251.300	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Oppose	Considers the overall intent of the rule is supported but, in line with relief sought for CE-P12, a different management approach is required for Māori land and Native Reserves.	Seeks amendments to address the matters raised in this submission.
253.166	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Oppose	Opposes. Considers controlled activities must be granted consent. Also considers that it is inappropriate that under this rule though, Council would have to grant consent pursuant to section 104A of the Act.	Amend activity status for CE-R6 to Restricted Discretionary and where compliance is not achieved amend activity status to discretionary.
265.253	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Support	No specific reason given	Retain as notified
282.285	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
308.47	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to provide for slash traps as a permitted activity under the rule. Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.
312.146	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R6 Buildings and structures within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity stat	Support	Supports CE-R6 as notified	Retain as notified

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
38.13	PF Olsen Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Oppose	Opposes non-complying activity status for plantation forestry in the CE to ONF/ONL and SNAs only. For all other areas within the CMA, align activity status with Regulation 17(3) of the NES-CF (restricted discretionary). This would allow site-specific assessments while avoiding the unnecessary duplication of National Environmental Standards.	Amend the CE-R9 Rule as follows: CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the ONF/ONL and SNAs in the Coastal Environment.
187.11	Wenita Forest Products Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Oppose	Opposes CE-R9 'Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment'. By imposing a blanket non-complying activity status under the rule the PDP overrides the NES-CF and the accompanying Section 32 report lacks specific evidence to justify why the NES-CF provisions are insufficient.	Amend CE-R9 to restrict its application to ONF&Ls and SNAs within the Coastal Environment. Align all other restrictions with requirements under the NES-CF. Ensure that the transitional effects on existing forest owners are recognised and provided for appropriately. Consider not applying the rule to existing commercial forests in the Coastal Environment.
192.35	New Zealand Carbon Farming Group	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Oppose	[Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Seeks to delete Rule [CE]-[R]9 in its entirety.
240.117	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Support	No specific reason given.	Seeks to retain as notified.
251.303	Te Rūnanga o Waihao, Te Rūnanga o Moeraki and Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Amend	Support for the rule but considers it should be changed to 'commercial forestry', as continuous-cover exotic forestry (carbon forestry), has the same effects as plantation forestry.	Seeks to amend as follows: ~~Plantation~~ Commercial forestry within the Coastal Environment
253.168	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Support	Retain as notified.	Retain as notified.
265.256	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: New Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment
282.288	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks to amend as follows: New Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment
308.48	Port Blakely Limited	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Oppose	Considers that commercial forestry activities are regulated by the NES-CF and there is no justification for greater stringency in the PDP. Considers that the PDP should differentiate between existing and new commercial forestry activities as existing forestry activities already form part of the existing environment and that existing use rights for lawfully established commercial forestry activities should be recognised by the PDP.	Seeks to delete this provision to show that the NES-CF prevails over the Proposed Plan and to amend policies and rules relating to existing commercial forestry activities to clarify that they do not apply to existing commercial forestry activities.
312.149	Springbank	Coastal Environment	CE-R9 Plantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: N	Support	Support with amendment to clarify existing use rights by only applying the rule to new activities.	Seeks the following amendments CE-R9NewPlantation forestry within the Coastal Environment All zones Activity status: Non-Complying Activity status when compliance is not achieved: Not Applicable
240.134	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS)	Coastal Environment	General	Oppose	Considers some indigenous biodiversity must be protected so that it is maintained and the concept of no net loss is not always appropriate in the coastal environment and does not give effect to Policy 11 of the NZCPS.	Seeks to insert new standalone objective dealing with protection of significant natural areas: Significant Natural Areas within the Coastal Environment are protected.
253.147	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	General	Oppose	Opposes in part: The submitters seek the objective be more directive to give effect to the NZCPS. The submitter also seeks that the objective address one matter at a time as it currently addresses numerous matters in one.	Insert new standalone objective dealing with indigenous biodiversity restoration as follows: Indigenous vegetation, habitats and ecosystems are restored within the Coastal Environment.
253.148	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of	Coastal Environment	General	Oppose	Opposes in part:	Insert new standalone objective dealing with protection of significant natural areas:

Sub	Submitter	Section	Provision	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief/Decision Sought Summary
	New Zealand Incorporated				The submitters seek the objective be more directive to give effect to the NZCPS. The submitter also seeks that the objective address one matter at a time as it currently addresses numerous matters in one.	Significant Natural Areas within the Coastal Environment are protected from the adverse effects of activities, subdivision and use.
253.151	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	General	Oppose	Opposes in part: The submitter considers that public access in the coastal environment is sometimes not appropriate, in particular where indigenous species and vegetation are present can result in trampling, disturbance, injury or death by people, pets and vehicles. The objective should include this qualifier, and a new objective, with direction on when public access should be restricted to give effect to the NZCPS.	Seeks to insert new objective – restriction of public access in the Coastal Environment as follows: Walking, public and vehicle access within the Coastal Environment is restricted where harm to ecosystems, or to indigenous flora and fauna and their habitats may result.
253.162	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated	Coastal Environment	General	Amend	Seeks to insert a new policy is required to ensure public access is restricted where necessary in accordance with policies 19 and 20 of the NZCPS.	Seeks to insert policy describing when public access should be restricted.
265.219	Geoff and Katrina Taylor	Coastal Environment	General	Oppose	The submitter is partly affected by several coastal overlays and considers that the extent of the coastal environment has been inconsistently mapped over time, with the 2015 and 2020 methodologies expanding inland areas beyond NZCPS criteria, including arbitrary inland extensions like 150m based on Canterbury practices rather than because of features in that area or its relation to the NZCPS criteria	Seeks for the Coastal Environment overlay be remapped using the NZCPS criteria only to be as permissive as possible by removing CE from inland areas not explicitly required for inclusion by the NZCPS. Also seeks for natural character values to be defined in the plan.
282.251	Dogterom Thomson Ltd	Coastal Environment	General	Oppose	The submitter is partly affected by several coastal overlays and considers that the extent of the coastal environment has been inconsistently mapped over time, with the 2015 and 2020 methodologies expanding inland areas beyond NZCPS criteria, including arbitrary inland extensions like 150m based on Canterbury practices rather than because of features in that area or its relation to the NZCPS criteria.	Seeks for the Coastal Environment overlay be remapped using the NZCPS criteria only to be as permissive as possible by removing CE from inland areas not explicitly required for inclusion by the NZCPS. Also seeks for natural character values to be defined in the plan.